PICKING SIDES IN THE ARAB-ISRAELI CONFLICT:

THE INFLUENCE OF RELIGIOUS BELIEF ON FOREIGN POLICY

A Thesis

Presented to the Faculty of the Robertson School of Government

Regent University

In partial fulfillment

Of the requirements for the degree

Master of Arts

By

Rachel Sarah Wills

Virginia Beach, Virginia

April 2012

APPROVAL SHEET

This thesis is submitted in partial fulfillment

Of the requirements for the degree of

Master of Arts in Government

Rachel Sarah Wills

May 2012

Spencer Meredith, Ph.D., Committee Chairman	Date
Philip Bom, Ph.D., Committee Member	Date
Joseph Kickasola, Ph.D., Committee Member	Date

To Greg and Kate

SDG

The views expressed in this thesis
are those of the student and do not
necessarily express any official positions
of Regent University.

CONTENTS

ABSTRACT

PICKING SIDES IN THE ARAB-ISRAELI CONFLICT:
THE INFLUENCE OF RELIGIOUS BELIEF ON FOREIGN POLICY

This thesis seeks to analyze the motives that correlate to nations' choices to defend one side to the exclusion of the other side in the Arab-Israeli conflict. The research focuses on the division between the United States and the European Union in the context of this conflict and analyzes the religious influences within their societies to understand the observable foreign policy pattern in reference to the side of the conflict they support. This study gives civilian religious beliefs a place of significance based upon the democratic norm that the government represents the will of the people. Israel's society acts as a research control in order to evaluate the correlation between religious beliefs and policy in a democratic nation that makes up one side of the conflict.

INTRODUCTION

The Arab-Israeli conflict has raged for many years, contributing to the violence and unrest within the region. Nations have lined up on varying sides of the issue, setting would-be allies at odds with one another. Though no resolution has come despite periodic perceived progress, the actors involved remain committed in their beliefs and allegiances towards the Palestinians and Israelis.

This thesis will explore the potential impact of religious motivations on political decision-makers regarding the Arab-Israeli conflict. It will examine the presence of religious beliefs and their implementation as foreign policy through elite personal conviction and popular input in democratic polities. This thesis will explore the pattern of preference nations show to one side of the conflict more than the other. For example, why do the EU and the U.S. frequently end up on opposite sides of matters involving Israel and the Palestinians? Does the contrasting modern secularism of parts of the EU and the continuing Christian influence in the U.S. account for any part of this difference? These common associations will be analyzed based upon documented religious association and belief survey data from the Pew Research Center and upon the philosophical or religious values and morals represented in their policies. This study will examine the association within democratic nations (or groups of nations in the case of the EU) between the

religious beliefs of a nation's leaders and citizens and the foreign policy of that nation in regard to the conflict between the Palestinians and Israelis. In democracies where governmental policy reflects the will of the people, it is essential to evaluate the association between the beliefs of citizens and a nation's policies. Therefore, this thesis will explore the influence religious beliefs have on the foreign policy of the democratic nations of the United States, Israel, and those that make up the European Union. The study will show that, though the nations of the European Union may pursue individual policies, the Union's Common Foreign and Security Policy (CFSP) aggregates the national policies to create a single foreign policy actor in the context of this conflict. The varied national religious situations will be examined to determine whether the CFSP can be regularly and repeatedly associated with any religious belief system or whether there is an observable absence of religion within the policy institutions of the Union.

Discussions of political matters often underappreciate the influence of religious belief under the guise of neutrality and to uphold the separation of church and state. However, it will be demonstrated that belief is unavoidable and may affect policy in a variety of ways. Jennifer Jefferis states in her study of religion's influence on violence, "In an age of secularization, it is critical to assess the significance of belief, if only because it is that which is most likely to be overlooked, as it is not a variable traditionally understood to be rational or predictive."[1] Though all belief may not be termed "religious," every person acts and forms opinions based upon what he thinks is best,

[1] Jennifer Jefferis, *Religion and Political Violence: Sacred Protest in the Modern World* (New York: Routledge, 2010), 112.

right, or fair. Other things contribute to a person's decisions, but his perspective of the world, as defined in his beliefs, colors his approach.[2]

Therefore, this thesis will examine the alternative national policies towards the Arab-Israeli conflict to evaluate how religious belief has and continues to shape policymakers' decisions. In order to evaluate the potential influence of religious belief, this key term will be examined in greater depth to understand how belief may lead to actions. This thesis will examine how and why alternative sets of religious beliefs may be associated with corresponding perspectives on this conflict. By examining citizen groups with varied religious beliefs and backgrounds within democratic structures, this thesis will explore the association between religious beliefs and foreign policy.

[2] For further discussion on religious cognition, see Kevin S. Reimer et al., "Varieties of Religious Cognition: A Computational Approach to Self-Understanding in Three Monotheist Contexts," *Psychology and Religion* 45, no. 1 (2010): 75-90.

LITERATURE REVIEW

Current scholarship has identified various causes for the Arab-Israeli conflict, allowing religion varying degrees of influence over actions and policy. However, few draw direct correlations between the specific beliefs of citizen groups and policy. Even in the face of widespread religious political activism in the U.S., many marginalize the use of religion in political dialogue, emphasizing strategic, political, and economic concerns. On the other extreme, those studying the secularist environment that pervades much of the European Union limit the discussion of religion to its generic cultural influence. Only within the context of Middle East policy issues do European Muslims' beliefs appear to offer the possibility of influencing policy. A number of scholars evaluate the significance of Israel's "Jewish" designation as it relates to their democratic system,[3] but frequently the religiosity of the Ultra-Orthodox and settlers' movement are marginalized and

[3] See As'ad Ganim, *Ethnic Politics in Israel: The Margins and the Ashkenazi Center* (New York: Routledge, 2010); Jonathan Fox and Jonathan Rynhold, "A Jewish and Democratic State? Comparing Government Involvement in Religion in Israel with other Democracies," *Totalitarian Movements and Political Religions* 9, no. 4 (2008): 507-531; Daphne Barak-Erez, *Outlawed Pigs: Law, Religion, and Culture in Israel* (Madison, WI: University of Wisconsin Press, 2007).

Jewishness in Israel becomes primarily a cultural matter of identity, which the state enforces in the public realm.[4]

Within the research already done on this and similar subjects relating to the association between religious beliefs and foreign policy, three themes emerge with various amounts of evidence and theory to support them. First, scholars find that other things have the capacity to influence foreign policy to a greater extent than religious beliefs. Strategic, economic, and political interests weigh more heavily in the decisions of policymakers than an adherence to religious beliefs. Second, some find that religious beliefs can influence foreign policy, but they are never the sole impetus in any policy creation. Instead, religious beliefs often have an indirect effect by shaping the morality of people and the culture and society in general, so that foreign policies address strategic, political, and economic interests within an accepted moral framework. Third, others see that religious belief can create a strong, unwavering support for a certain side of an issue and for any policies that support that side. Such support may cause a person to act as an idealist in one circumstance and a realist in another, all in the context of a single religious belief. The justification that unites the apparent contradictions stems from faith placed in causes that religious beliefs substantiate.

Looking at the first of the themes, many find that other things, such as strategic, economic, or political interests, have the capacity to influence foreign policy far more than religious beliefs. Despite the role religion played in the American Revolution and

---

[4] Ezra Kopelowitz and Yael Israel-Shamsian, "Why Has a Sociology of Religion Not Developed in Israel? A Look at the Influence of Socio-Political Environment on the Study of Religion: A Research Note," *Sociology of Religion* 66 (2005): 73-77.

formation of the United States, Leo Ribuffo states that the U.S. could have risen to its place of power without the influence of the Reformation. Its revolution would simply have been more similar to that of France. Religion was not the cause of its success.[5] Charles Krauthammer sees no place for religion or the Scriptures of the Bible to lead to collective action in policy. It is not meant to guide in such ways.[6] Though J. Bryan Hehir disagrees with Krauthammer's complete dismissal of religion from the equation, he agrees with Ribuffo's judgment that "no major diplomatic decision has turned on religious issues alone,"[7] stating "no tradition nor any representative of a tradition, has the capacity to translate religious convictions or even moral principles directly into the policy process."[8]

Vaughn Shannon states that domestic religion is one of many factors that will define U.S. policy towards the Israel-Palestine conflict. The strategic nature of the regional environment of the Middle East will often outweigh any religious concerns for leaders.[9] Constanza Musu identifies a similar pattern among the EU member states, observing that economic and security needs are the primary cause for their policies and

---

[5] Leo Ribuffo, "Religion in the History of U.S. Foreign Policy," in *The Influence of Faith: Religious Groups and U.S. Foreign Policy*, ed. Elliott Abrams (Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers, Inc., 2001), 20.

[6] Charles Krauthammer, "When Unilateralism Is Right and Just," in *Liberty and Power: A Dialogue on Religion and U.S. Foreign Policy in an Unjust World*, eds. J. Bryan Hehir, Michael Walzer, and Charles Krauthammer (Washington, D.C.: Brookings Institute Press, 2003), 95-96.

[7] Ribuffo, 21.

[8] J. Bryan Hehir, "Religion, Realism, and Just Intervention," in *Liberty and Power: A Dialogue on Religion and U.S. Foreign Policy in an Unjust World*, eds. J. Bryan Hehir, Michael Walzer, and Charles Krauthammer (Washington, D.C.: Brookings Institute Press, 2003), 22.

[9] Vaughn Shannon, *Balancing Act: U.S. Foreign Policy and the Arab-Israeli Conflict* (Burlington, VT: Ashgate Publishing Company, 2003), 2.

involvement in the Middle East region.[10] In addition, Ribuffo states that President Truman chose to recognize Israel as a consequence of his political considerations of the Jewish voters, rather than being motivated by a religious conviction.[11] Though Abraham Ben-Zvi disagrees with Ribuffo and argues that Truman was acting based upon religious reasons, he still sees the basis of the U.S.-Israel alliance as based primarily on strategic regional interests. The developments during the second Eisenhower Administration and the Kennedy Administration reinforced this view, permanently creating an exclusively strategic vision of the region for the U.S.[12] Uri Bialer adds an example to this from Israel's side, discussing how in the early years of the country David Ben-Gurion discriminated against the Arab Christians because they were a threat as Arabs rather than because of their religion. The security interests of his new nation drove his policy.[13] Bialer also notes a significant warming of relations between Israel and the Catholic Church in the aftermath of the 1967 war. Accordingly, in the wake of such a geostrategic victory, the Israeli government felt more secure and capable of allowing more Christian pilgrims to come to the holy sites.[14] Even when religion seems to be involved, scholars find a political or strategic core at the heart of the policy.

---

[10] Costanza Musu, *European Union Policy Towards the Arab-Israeli Peace Process: The Quicksands of Policy* (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2010), 3.

[11] Ribuffo, 21.

[12] Abraham Ben-Zvi, *Decade of Transition: Eisenhower, Kennedy, and the Origin of American-Israeli Alliance* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1998), 4.

[13] Uri Bialer, *Cross on the Star of David: The Christian World in Israel's Foreign Policy, 1948-1967* (Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Press, 2005), 188.

[14] Ibid., 191.

If policymakers have strategic, economic, and political considerations in mind when making policy, one must still account for the fact that at times such policies do seem to reflect the particular religious beliefs of certain groups. Stephen Sizer accounts for this potential contradiction in that politicians tend to reflect the views of their electorate or of lobby groups because of the power they hold.[15] Political considerations rather than the actual beliefs being advanced by a group can cause politicians to support policies. Indeed, Paul Burstein states that interest groups or party activists can prevail against the public opinion on issues because of the power they wield within the governmental system.[16] Sizer observes that politicians may be unwilling to voice public criticism in certain foreign policy circumstances because of the strength of an advocacy group.[17] Stephen Spector substantiates Sizer's points by drawing upon research done by the Pew Research Center to demonstrate that within these groups that seem to promote religiously inspired policies multiple non-religious motivations or justifications for their support of such policies may still exist.[18] In nations such as France where governmental secularism is an absolute rule and religion remains a private affair, politicians may not justify policies on religious grounds, even if such connections may appear evident.

---

[15] Stephen Sizer, *Christian Zionism: Road-map to Armageddon?* (Leicester, England: Inter-Varsity Press, 2004), 89.

[16] Paul Burstein, "Why Estimates of the Impact of Public Opinion on Public Policy Are Too High: Empirical and Theoretical Implications," *Social Forces* 84 (2006): 2284.

[17] Sizer, *Christian Zionism*, 93.

[18] Stephen Spector, *Evangelicals and Israel: The Story of American Christian Zionism* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2009), 187.

Rather, politicians must rationalize every decision in accordance with reason and patriotism.[19]

Turning to the second theme, it is often proposed that religious beliefs can influence foreign policy, but they never solely influence policy. They often have an indirect effect by shaping the morality of people and society in general, so that foreign policies address strategic, political, and economic interests within an accepted moral framework. Unlike the first theme that focuses on the strategic, economic, or political considerations that lie behind policy decisions that could appear religiously influenced, this second theme acknowledges a role for religion to create a basic moral foundation, though it still guards against a one-to-one correlation between religious convictions and foreign policy decisions. In his introduction to *The Influence of Faith*, Elliott Abrams states that it is futile to search for a direct cause-and-effect relationship between religion and foreign policy. Rather, he sees religion's larger role being elsewhere, as ethical rather than political.[20] Mark Amstutz agrees with this position stating, "Although religious organizations may become involved in the political process, their main contribution to international affairs and U.S. foreign policy is not political but ethical. They help to develop and sustain political morality by promoting moral reasoning and by exemplifying values and behaviors that are conducive to human dignity."[21]

---

[19] Anne Sa'adah, *Contemporary France: A Democratic Education* (Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield Publishing, Inc., 2003), 92.

[20] Elliott Abrams, "Introduction," in *The Influence of Faith: Religious Groups and U.S. Foreign Policy*, ed. Elliott Abrams (Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers, Inc., 2001), x.

[21] Mark Amstutz, "Faith-Based NGOs and U.S. Foreign Policy," in *The Influence of Faith: Religious Groups and U.S. Foreign Policy*, ed. Elliott Abrams (Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers, Inc., 2001), 176.

Hehir sees religious institutions as a key factor in facilitating foreign policy debates, setting the foundational groundwork to bring issues up for debate.[22] This confirms Amstutz's view that religious values play an indirect rather than a direct role in the creation of foreign policy.[23] Paul Charles Merkley asserts that there can be no compelling proof that belief will cause anything, but our experience demonstrates that belief grounds action and so will grant meaning to the study of history. [24] Within such debates, Sizer sees religious institutions and beliefs contributing to that which is acceptable and meaningful in policy discussions. Pre-existing religious beliefs may validate or repudiate new sentiments and opinions based upon the compatibility of the new with the existing. For example, Sizer asserts that the pre-existing antipathy of some Evangelical Christians towards Islam confirmed the new anti-Arab and Islamophobia that arose in the wake of September 11th. Their religious beliefs lay the foundation to allow such antipathy to become acceptable within the general political debate about new policies in the post-September 11th world.[25] While research has documented increased negative stereotyping of Muslims after September 11th, Sizer's direct correlation between Christian antipathy to Islam and the recent anti-Arabism remains undocumented and

---

[22] Hehir, 15.

[23] Amstutz, 177.

[24] Paul Charles Merkley, *American Presidents, Religion, and Israel: The Heirs of Cyrus* (Westport, CT: Praeger Publishers, 2004), x.

[25] Sizer, *Christian Zionism*, 247.

implies an indiscriminate fear of Islam, which is not necessary to explain the treatment of Muslims after the terrorist attack.[26]

Though religious institutions may strongly influence their followers, they are still considered to be on the edge of the political sphere. Ezra Kopelowitz and Yael Israel-Shamsian observe that scholars evaluating the sociology of religion in the United States compared to that which has developed in Israel and Europe tend to limit their thinking about religion in the United States to private, individual contexts, with the general populace often embracing such thinking. In contrast, the sociology of religion in Israel and Europe has established religion in the public sphere where the state may legislate its place. Citizens participate in the rituals of the institutions based upon state sanctioned usages without reference to personal belief or morality.[27]

Kenneth Wald and Michael Martinez find that those from the same religion will act differently in a nation where religion is an acknowledged part of the government versus where it is thought to reside primarily in the private sphere. The privatization of religion within most democracies maintains an indirect relationship between religious beliefs and foreign policy.[28] Yet this privatization creates foreign policies that Habib Malik believes cannot address the religious effects of Islam in the world and will not be

---

[26] Eric Bleich, "What Is Islamophobia and How Much Is There? Theorizing and Measuring an Emerging Comparative Concept," *American Behavioral Scientist* 55 (2011): 1584.

[27] Kopelowitz and Israel-Shamsian, 73-74.

[28] Kenneth Wald and Michael Martinez, "Jewish Religiosity and Political Attitudes in the United States and Israel," *Political Behavior* 23 (2001): 381.

able to stop the violence perpetrated in its name.[29] In the context of the Israel-Palestine conflict, where Islamic beliefs frequently justify pro-Palestinian actions among civilians and leaders, one may not neglect this direct relation without limiting the effect of a nation's policy.

Turning to the final theme, some see that religious belief can create a strong, unwavering support for a certain side of an issue and for any policies that support that side. This can cause a person to act as an idealist in one circumstance and a realist in another, all in the context of a single religious belief. Idealism emphasizes how people ought to behave in the international sphere. Idealists stress "international legal rights and obligations, the natural harmony of national interests…as a regulator for the preservation of international peace, a heavy reliance upon reason in human affairs, and confidence in the peace-building function of the 'world court of public opinion.'"[30] In contrast to this,

> Realists…stress power and interest, rather than ideals in international relations. Realism is basically conservative, empirical, prudent, suspicious of idealistic principles, and respectful of the lessons of history….Realists regard power as the fundamental concept in the social sciences, although they admit that power relationships are often cloaked in moral and legal terms."[31]

Within the Middle East one finds a combination of these two competing philosophies in the U.S. approach to the Iraq War in 2003 where President George W. Bush sent military forces to protect against perceived threats to national security and

---

[29] Habib Malik, "Political Islam and the Roots of Violence," in *The Influence of Faith: Religious Groups and U.S. Foreign Policy*, ed. Elliott Abrams (Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers, Inc., 2001), 139.

[30] James Dougherty and Robert Pfaltzgraff, Jr., *Contending Theories of International Relations, A Comprehensive Survey* (New York: Harper & Row Publishing, 1981), 5.

[31] Ibid.

regional balance while also promoting the idealism of freedom, democracy, and compliance to international law.[32] In his 2003 State of the Union Address, he attributed America's mission of spreading freedom as God-ordained. He stated, "The liberty we prize is not America's gift to the world, it is God's gift to humanity."[33] For Bush, God gave America the mission to spread liberty in the Middle East.[34]

Alternatively, in the midst of starvation in Somalia in 1992, President George H.W. Bush drew together U.S. forces to lead a coalition that would stabilize the situation and bring the food supplies to the people. In his address on Somalia, Bush was explicit that this was meant as a humanitarian effort to restore the basic human right to food, but it was also "doing God's work." Within these idealistic justifications, Bush still expected the coalition forces to address the original physical causes of the problem and remove the threat they posed to the nation of Somalia.[35]

Various scholars note religiously motivated decisions leaders have made. Malcolm Magee points to President Wilson, demonstrating that one cannot understand Wilson's foreign policy without having an awareness of the religious convictions that

---

[32] Spector, 51.

[33] George W. Bush, Address before a Joint Session of Congress on the State of the Union, January 28, 2003. *Weekly Compilation of Presidential Documents*, 2003 Presidential Documents Online, http://frwebgate.access.gpo.gov/cgi-bin/getdoc.cgi?dbname=2003_presidential_documents&docid=pd03fe03_txt-6.pdf.

[34] Jillinda Weaver, "Civil Religion, George W. Bush's Divine Mission, and an Ethics of Mission," *Political Theology* 9 (2008): 13.

[35] George H.W. Bush, "Address on Somalia," http://millercenter.org/president/speeches/detail/3984 (accessed November 22, 2011).

informed his worldview and his ideas of progress and reform.[36] Wilson worked towards the Covenant of Nations or League of Nations because he believed that bringing the world into a covenantal pattern was the purpose that directed all of human history.[37] His theological mindset infused his ideals with what the world should look like and what America's role should be in that world.[38]

Ben-Zvi adds Truman's decision to recognize and support the new nation of Israel as an example supporting this point. Ribuffo disagrees with Ben-Zvi and attributes Truman's decision to support the UN partition plan of 1947 and Israel's nationhood in 1948 to political considerations of gaining the Jewish vote in the upcoming 1948 election.[39] Ben-Zvi discards the argument that Truman made such a decision for the sake of political advancement among Jewish voters because it is clear Truman acted based upon moral, cultural, and religious premises. His religious beliefs compelled him to take the side of the Israeli state.[40] Paul Charles Merkley examines Truman's religious beliefs in the biblical promise of the restoration of the Jews to Israel and his acceptance of the role as the modern Cyrus in Truman's personal papers and recorded comments to Jewish leaders. Merkley asserts an unambiguous connection between religious faith and public

---

[36] Malcolm Magee, *What the World Should Be: Woodrow Wilson and the Crafting of a Faith-Based Foreign Policy* (Waco, TX: Baylor University Press, 2008), 9.

[37] Ibid., 18, 33.

[38] Ibid., 35.

[39] Ribuffo, 21.

[40] Ben-Zvi, 6.

action.[41] Truman saw the great characters that filled the pages of history, including him, as instruments of the purposes of God.[42] He believed he was God's instrument to bring Israel's rebirth as a nation, fulfilling what the prophets had foretold.[43] While Truman reveled in his role as a fulfiller of biblical prophecy, he was also an American politician who wished to remain in office. Therefore, while there appears to be an association between his biblical belief system and his actions towards the Jewish people, his political aspirations are not irrelevant.

Wilson and Truman made key decisions that set a particular policy direction in U.S. dealings in the Middle East. Their compelling religious beliefs existed alongside the concerns of remaining faithful to an ally, in Wilson's case, and of helping a downtrodden people and gaining favor from a key voting group, in Truman's case. This co-existence points to the fact that religious beliefs do not remain in the background but can influence how one creates and supports certain policy. In response to Ribuffo's statement that "no major diplomatic decision has turned on religious issues alone,"[44] Nathan Tarcov contends that "the mere fact that there is no observable correlation between the religious convictions of American Christians and their foreign policy positions does not

---

[41] Merkley, x.

[42] Ibid., 6.

[43] Ibid., viii.

[44] Ribuffo, 21.

necessarily mean that those religious convictions are unimportant to their thinking about foreign policy."[45]

Religious beliefs may motivate leaders within the government to sustain certain policies, but religious beliefs of the general populace also create strong support for certain policies. Colin Chapman states that politics have come to be bound up with religion today and cannot be easily separated.[46] Sizer points to the specific convictions of Christian Zionism, which he defines as a political form of philo-Semitism held by Christians who support the Jewish Zionists' goals for the sovereign State of Israel. He observes that their beliefs based upon certain biblical texts regarding the importance of Israel as God's eternal people drives Christian Zionists to throw all their support behind the Israeli cause.[47] James Jordan points to Jerry Falwell as one with strong convictions that lead him to support a particular side. Falwell states that the theological, historical, and legal rights of Jews make the State of Israel the most important political question there is. These rights compel all who believe in the Bible to support Israel politically.[48] Jody Baumgartner, Peter Francia, and Jonathan Morris find that such biblical interpretation shapes political attitudes, thus allowing religion to be a significant factor in

---

[45] Nathan Tarcov, "Comment on Chapter 1," in *The Influence of Faith: Religious Groups and U.S. Foreign Policy*, ed. Elliott Abrams (Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers, Inc., 2001), 31.

[46] Colin Chapman, *Whose Promised Land, Israel or Palestine?* (Oxford: Lion, 2002), 304.

[47] Sizer, *Christian Zionism*, 20. While the Christian Zionists believe their actions are biblical, Sizer presents alternative explanations for these passages. He lays out the contrasting points of the Christian Zionists' dispensationalist theology with those of covenant theology. While the dispensational view asserts that the modern State of Israel remains God's chosen people, covenant theology understands the Church as the fulfillment of God's promises to Israel in the Old Testament and as His only people in modern times.

[48] James Jordan, "Appendix B, Christian Zionism and Messianic Judaism," in David Chilton, *The Days of Vengeance: An Exposition of the Book of Revelation* (Ft. Worth, TX: Dominion Press, 1987), 618.

predicting the support of certain religious groups for particular policies, especially those focused within the region of the Middle East.[49]

In Israel, members of the Gush Emunim settlers' movement see the land as a means to redemption and endeavor to transform their nation's national dialogue from one about political strategy to one about religious covenants. These convictions have driven their continuous efforts over the past forty years to settle the territories occupied after the War of 1967.[50] They believe all Jews remain God's chosen people and that the land remains God's promised redemption to them. Chaim Waxman believes that every Jew retains this promise. In his view, Judaism is not just a religion but defines its adherents from their birth. In this way, every Jew is born into the chosen people and should claim this salvation. [51] Those who embrace this view of *Eretz Yisrael* ("Land of Israel") see Israeli domestic and foreign policy as a tool of Jewish redemption. Within the United States, Jews are one step removed from this direct struggle to solidify Jewish redemption through the land. However, Wald and Martinez assert that their identity as a single people creates a religious imperative for American Jews, which requires their support for the political State of Israel as a part of their identity.[52]

---

[49] Jody Baumgartner, Peter Francia, and Jonathan Morris, "A Clash of Civilizations? The Influence of Religion on Public Opinion of U.S. Foreign Policy in the Middle East," *Political Research Quarterly* 61 (2008): 172.

[50] Jefferis, 157.

[51] Chaim Waxman, "Messianism, Zionism, and the State of Israel," *Modern Judaism* 7 (1987): 182.

[52] Wald and Martinez, 385.

This worldwide identity among Jews reaches back into history. Despite the Diaspora that scattered the Jews, the historical alienation and suffering the Jews have endured in Christian societies drew Jewish communities together to retain their religious identity. Their initial religious unity grew into a social and cultural identity, which frequently isolated them from the Christian societies in which they lived. With the rise of Zionism in the late nineteenth century, their enduring separateness as a people brought them together in the political realm to advocate a single policy to fulfill their religious, political, and cultural need for a homeland.[53]

Religious belief and identity can influence the way a person thinks and what that person values. Beliefs may generate a strong support for one side and a strong antipathy for all those who oppose that side, creating a clearly defined conflict between the "right" and the "wrong" side, the light and the darkness.[54] Christian Zionists rely on biblical texts to validate the need to support modern Israel, while Jewish identity as a people group compels them to offer support.

These three themes present positives and negatives when considering the use of religion in foreign policy making. Each takes a different approach to the same facts and circumstances. The first minimizes the role of religious belief within the political process by attributing policymaking to strategic, economic, or political interests. Even when religion appears to influence politicians, this theme presents an alternative explanation in the form of political interests. However, excluding religion as a factor within the policy

---

[53] Jordan, 612.

[54] Spector, 51, 62.

process produces the possibility to miss a significant motivation behind policy. Simply because political interests may explain a policy decision, such policy decisions do not preclude additional explanations. Both Wilson and Truman expressed religious motivations underlying decisions that were strategically justified, thus intertwining religion and strategy.

The second theme makes similar arguments to the first, but approaches the issue from a different angle. Rather than seeking to devalue the role that religious beliefs may play in the policy process, it speaks of the tendency of many to segregate religion into a distinct sphere. Religion is granted the domain of ethics and morality and should teach such things to hold back the moral decay of society. Religious beliefs therefore can still influence politics, but only as people choose to carry those teachings from religious institutions into the political sphere. As a consequence, such separation may downplay the effects of ethics and morality within the political sphere, for it becomes a private and individual matter. Though this theme rightly acknowledges the need for religious institutions to teach ethics and morality, it neglects the fact that religious organizations can play a part in the political process through lobbies and interest groups. It also overlooks the various leaders who state that they made major decisions based upon their religious beliefs.

The third theme takes a different approach from the other two, identifying religion as a key reason leaders make certain decisions and people support certain foreign policies. Religious convictions can create solidarity among groups and cement joint ventures around common goals. This approach demonstrates a general predictable correspondence between certain religious beliefs and certain foreign policies. Overall, it

balances the other two, as it accounts for observable influences in the political sphere that the other two themes downplay or dismiss. Yet it is good to consider this theme in the context of the other two, for not all groups that act with strength of conviction are driven by religious beliefs. Within a secular or culturally religious society, citizens may still support or oppose a policy with the same conviction found among religious groups. Even within religious groups, there may still be a large minority that is motivated by other things or may have mixed motivations, marrying religious beliefs with strategic interests.[55] Therefore, this thesis study will examine the influential beliefs among the polities of the United States, the European Union, and Israel without any preconceived restrictions on the spheres in which they do or do not belong. In order to do so, the definition of religious beliefs will be established to allow a greater variety of situations and practices to fall within the scope of the study.

Chapter One of this thesis defines key terms, such as religious belief, democracy, and foreign policy. Chapter Two reviews the historical context of the conflict to be examined, representing both Israeli and Palestinian perspectives to attempt to balance the grievances and purported faults of both sides. Chapter Three focuses specifically on the key democratic actors in the conflict to determine the reasons to focus on Israel, the European Union, and the United States. This chapter will explain the decision to examine these three actors to the exclusion of others such as Russia and the Arab states. Chapter Four draws out the religious influences in their societies that may impact their policies towards the conflict. Chapter Five surveys their past policy positions towards the Arab-

[55] Ibid., 50.

Israeli conflict in regard to the creation of the State of Israel, the 1967 and 1973 Wars, and the 1978 and 1993 peace processes. Chapter Six draws conclusions from the varied national situations described in Chapters Three through Five to draw out observable patterns of association between belief and foreign policy. The conclusions will highlight key points and explore the appropriate consideration scholars should give to the religious beliefs of leaders and civilians when evaluating a nation's foreign policy towards the Israeli-Palestinian conflict.

CHAPTER ONE

DEFINING KEY TERMS

Religious Belief

When looking at religious beliefs in general, it is important to define what they are and why they have the potential to influence the way a person would look at and act within the political sphere. Within this study, religious beliefs refer to the ideas and convictions people hold based upon a defined system of thought and theology. Though belief is inherently individualistic as each person believes for himself, particular religious systems will allow for some measure of generalization of applications,[56] creating a wider net of influence for all those who may find themselves united around the same belief. The communally systematic nature of such beliefs creates a general predictability of action. As an example, those who believe the Bible is the literal Word of God will act based upon what it says, believing and depending upon its definition of right and wrong. Stephen Sizer offers the following example based upon Christian Zionist and dispensationalist theology:

[56] Spector, 37.

> If you believe the Bible predicts an imminent war of Armageddon, with Israel and the United States on one side and the Islamic and communist world on the other, then you will not lose any sleep over the stalled peace process. And when you read about yet more bloodshed and suffering in the Middle East, it will confirm what you already think is going to happen.[57]

Those who believe the Bible has set the battle lines of the Arab-Israeli conflict will pick their side accordingly. As such, the Bible shapes the believer's thoughts and view of reality regarding the conflict. In addition, those who believe their salvation is based upon strict law-keeping, as prescribed in sacred texts, will define right and wrong based upon the letter of the law and will support a society structured to facilitate conformance. One example of this is found in the policies Islamists promote across the Muslim world. The *shari'a* law based upon the Qur'an, Hadith, and Sunna defines how Muslims live in the righteous way Allah requires. Islamists believe the ubiquitous authority of the *shari'a* law necessitates political systems based upon it, for Allah is the ultimate Lawgiver.[58] Within the Jewish religion, where law-keeping based upon the Torah and Halacha – Jewish religious law – is also a key element, conformity to certain laws becomes a means of identity within Jewry. In the State of Israel today, a survey found that a large number of Israeli citizens who refused the self-identity of "religious," as referring to the Ultra-Orthodox, or "secular" still sought to retain their Jewish identity through observing a distinct lifestyle.[59]

---

[57] Stephen Sizer, *Zionist Christian Soldiers? The Bible, Israel and the Church* (Downers Grove, IL: Inter-Varsity Press, 2007), 12.

[58] Majid Khadduri and Herbert J. Liebesny, eds., *Law in the Middle East: Volume 1, Origin and Development of Islamic Law* (Washington, D.C.: The Middle East Institute, 2009), 3.

[59] Yaacov Yadgar, *Secularism and Religion in Jewish-Israeli Politics: Traditionists and Modernity* (New York: Routledge, 2011), 6.

This study looks particularly at the influence of religious beliefs that are based upon a belief in God and the theology that flows from such a belief. In this context, God refers to the Supreme Being of the Judeo-Christian tradition that exists separately from men, a God who is able authoritatively to decree how people should live and who acts within history to bring about His purposes. He speaks to mankind that they may know His decrees, and people record those words for others to hear. As people encounter the recorded words of God in sacred books, the words and decrees bring them into relationship with God and into communion with others who know God. Knowing God in His revealed words is not a rationalistic or empiricist assembling of facts but is a theological search for meaning to know what God has revealed and requires.[60]

Though this may exclude some beliefs from the scope of the study, the constraint is crucial because a belief motivated by something outside the individual will have a different influence upon action. When evaluating the likelihood religious beliefs will lead to action, Jennifer Jefferis states,

> when individuals believe themselves to be acting at the bequest of a divine being, their entire structure of rational choice shifts. Traditionally, rational choice is measured based on the gains (or potential gains) made by an individual within his or her life time. Thus, to understand the actions of religiously motivated individuals, it is imperative to extend one's analysis to account for the potential gains achieved after (or in) death.[61]

Due to the transcendent nature of God in the Judeo-Christian tradition, religious belief depends on supernatural standards that will supersede human laws and will demand a

---

[60] Alan Sell, "The Bible and Epistemology," *The Journal of Reformed Theology* 3 (2009): 221.

[61] Jefferis, 113.

greater level of obedience from adherents. Grigoriana Preduca asserts that religions are inherently powerful sources of morality.[62] John Teehan explains:

> Religion comes into play with the integration of one or more minimally counterintuitive concepts (e.g., gods) into the moral matrix. God comes to represent the moral bonds that hold a community together and functions as both legislator and enforcer of the group's moral code. This gives that moral code a heightened sense of significance and obligation. Commitment to that god can then function socially and psychologically as a signal of commitment to the group.[63]

In the political sphere, religious absolutes preclude followers from compromising in areas they believe are evil or a lie.[64] Religious values produce a certain level of rigidity and dogmatism in believers that puts them at odds with non-believers and obliges them to advocate only one side of a policy debate as legitimate. Kenneth Wald offers the example of abortion in American politics. One side believes it is murder while the other side views it as a medical procedure that ensures the rights of women. There is no policy that both sides will validate, for the absolute nature of the beliefs bars a middle ground.[65]

The eternality of God invests actions with undying significance for those who know Him and seek to follow His decrees. President Truman believed he fulfilled God's eternal plan for history when he acted particularly to support the creation of the nation of

---

[62] Grigoriana Preduca, "Democracy, Religious Ethics, and Human Rights," *Contemporary Readings in Law and Social Justice* 3, no. 1 (2011): 129.

[63] John Teehan, *In the Name of God: The Evolutionary Origins of Religious Ethics and Violence* (Oxford: Wiley-Blackwell, 2010), 174.

[64] Marie Eisenstein, "Religious Motivation vs. Traditional Religiousness: Bridging the Gap between Religion and Politics and the Psychology of Religion," *Interdisciplinary Journal of Research on Religion* 2, no. 2 (2006): 3.

[65] Kenneth Wald, *Religion and Politics in the United States,* 4th ed. (Lanham: Rowman & Littlefield, 2003), 321.

Israel.[66] In Israel, religious Zionist groups—who believe God is redeeming the Jewish people through the holy land He promised to Abraham—saw clear historical signs confirming their beliefs in the sequence of events in the twentieth century in the Zionist mass immigration, the founding of the State of Israel in 1948, and the "liberation" of the heartland of Jewish civilization in the 1967 war. This perceived historical confirmation of God's work on their behalf drove many actively to oppose the Oslo Peace Accords and to prevent a "land for peace" agreement that would reverse the redemptive process.[67]

The belief that God has declared certain things as truth and certain actions as right has the potential to inspire greater dedication and action. Jefferis states, "We know that individuals will rarely become involved in contentious action when they believe that such actions are condemned by their religion. Conversely, when religious approval is offered in support of contentious tactics, believers are far more likely to engage in protest."[68] Wald adds that such commitment can create intolerance toward alternative views, which he deems potentially inconsistent with a democratic governmental structure.[69] This latter concern encompasses the argument among traditional democratic theorists for the separation of church and state.[70] The dogmatic nature of religious commitments and their

---

[66] Merkley, viii.

[67] Claudia Baumgart-Ochse, "Democratization in Israel, Politicized Religion and the Failure of the Oslo Peace Process," *Democratization* 16, no. 6 (2009): 1121.

[68] Jefferis, 112.

[69] Wald, 321.

[70] Eisenstein, 3.

apparent irrationality cause some within academia to disallow the concepts of faith into the realm of policy.[71]

In the midst of a world steeped in Enlightenment thought, which elevated the dependability of rationality over religious conviction, religion is a consideration for the private life, not for government policy. For much of the last century, one might explore the relationship between religion and policy but only under a religious auspice or in certain academic centers.[72] The relationship was never a practical one, giving most intellectuals little practice handling religion within the context of scholarly arguments. E.J. Dionne Jr., Kayla Drogosz, and Jean Bethke Elshtain identify two root fears that lie behind the unease many feel in introducing religion into policy. First, many scholars believe it can be an impediment to the free exchange of ideas and will retard rather than advance an honest discussion of morality, for when it turns to dogma and certainties, it can override rationality. Second, the bloody history of wars over religion in past centuries and today's acts of terrorism that justify themselves in religious terms drive many from the use of religion outside the private sphere.[73] Nevertheless, J. Bryan Hehir asserts that "like it or not, it is now almost impossible to isolate or insulate foreign policy and world

---

[71] E.J. Dionne, Kayla Drogosz, and Jean Bethke Elshtain, "The Paradoxes of Religion and Foreign Policy, An Introduction," in *One Electorate Under God? A Dialogue on Religion and American Politics*, eds., E.J. Dionne, Kayla Drogosz, and Jean Bethke Elshtain (Washington, D.C.: Brookings Institute Press, 2004), 2.

[72] Hehir, 11.

[73] Dionne, 1-2.

politics from the normative convictions and categories embodied in the phrase 'faith and morals.'"[74]

Epistemologists Cornelius VanTil and Herman Dooyeveerd assert that belief is unavoidable. VanTil asserts that as men seek to understand the world in which they live "every human being must necessarily begin with a 'bias'" and no system of thought is free from prejudice as it evaluates a given situation. In any discussion each "presupposes his own starting point, when he uses [a] term, and that fact gives [the] term a different meaning in each case" for each person.[75] Though all belief may not be termed "religious," every person interprets his life based upon a set of accepted ideas. Every person acts and forms opinions based upon what he thinks is best, right, or fair. Conflict arises when people do not hold the same belief of what is best, right, or fair.[76] To avoid the study of religious beliefs with foreign policy is simply to neglect one type of belief because of the potential it holds to confuse an issue. However, in democracies where governmental policy reflects the will of the people, one must evaluate the influence the beliefs of religious groups have on policy.

The democratic actors in the Israel-Palestine conflict analyzed in this study each exemplify a unique religious culture, consisting of shared and varying beliefs and norms. The United States and the European Union comprise greater degrees of plurality of

---

[74] Hehir, 11.

[75] Cornelius VanTil, *In Defense of the Faith: A Survey of Christian Epistemology*, 2nd ed. (Phillipsburg, NJ: Presbyterian and Reformed Publishing, 1980), 6.

[76] For further explanation of the universality of belief systems and presuppositions, see also Herman Dooyeweerd, *In the Twilight of Western Thought*: *Studies in the Pretended Autonomy of Philosophical Thought* (Nutley, NJ: The Craig Press, 1975), 1-6 and Rousas John Rushdoony, *The World of Flux: Modern Man and the Problem of Knowledge* (Fairfax, VA: Thoburn Press, 1975), 21-29.

religions and beliefs than Israel, though all three support the democratic ideal of the freedom of religion. Despite this pluralism of religions and the varied groups within each religion, the U.S. is frequently identified in some measure with Christianity. "By a conceivable measure, Americans are a highly religious people, and for 87 percent of them that religion is Christianity" while Jews make up slightly more than 2 percent and Muslims about 1.5 percent.[77] This statistic of Christian self-identification does not equate to unity of belief or agreement regarding how such a label affects actions. However, it does seem to impact voting behavior, for according to Stephen Monsma those politicians who use "God talk" in U.S. elections are able to gather large numbers of votes. He sees the pluralistic nature of the American system creating a state of affairs where candidates should speak of how their religious or philosophical beliefs inform their political philosophies and policy positions so that the public may understand their motivations.[78] While the debate continues in academic circles as to whether one may call America a "Christian nation," the "Christian" foundational self-conception of many Americans drives public opinion and gives a foothold to religiously justified policies.

While the United States has been called "the melting pot" and has no established church or religion, Israel has been a Jewish state from its creation in 1948. Though other minorities continue to live in the nation, "The Basic Laws describe Israel as a 'Jewish and democratic state'... in the national-Zionist sense rather than in the religious sense. At the

---

[77] Samuel Huntington, "Religious Persecution and Religious Relevance in Today's World," in *The Influence of Faith: Religious Groups and U.S. Foreign Policy*, ed. Elliott Abrams (Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers, Inc., 2001), 59.

[78] Stephen Monsma, "Particularist Religion in a Pluralist Political Arena" in *One Electorate under God? A Dialogue on Religion and American Politics*, eds. E.J. Dionne, Kayla Drogosz, and Jean Bethke Elshtain (Washington, D.C.: Brookings Institute Press, 2004), 154.

same time, traditional Jewish religious holidays serve as state holidays and the national symbols of the state are religious in origin."[79] Jewish identity does not directly equate to religious belief or devotion for Israelis; however, having a self-identity rooted in a religious system precludes an overtly secular national system and reinforces national unity based upon religious traditions and symbols. "As a consequence, even though only 17 percent of Israeli Jews define themselves as religious, there is a much wider support and legitimacy for a role for the Jewish religious tradition in public life."[80] Therefore, the Israeli public will be more likely to support political action promoted in Jewish religious terms.

Unlike the United States that has gathered people from nations, cultures, and religions across the world and Israel that was established particularly for the Jewish people worldwide, the European Union is made up of twenty-seven nations with varied cultural and religious backgrounds, which existed first as independent nations with citizens whose loyalty lay with their government and nation. This divergence cannot be overlooked and creates a society unlike that of the United States or Israel; however, the treaties and agreements that hold the Union together draw upon a certain level of commonality, including shared norms and values. The draft EU Reform Treaty of 2007, which failed to pass but would have amended the Treaty on the European Union and the Treaty Establishing the European Community, states that it draws "inspiration from the cultural, religious, and humanist inheritance of Europeans, from which have developed

---

[79] Fox and Rynhold, 509.

[80] Ibid.

the universal values of the inviolable and unalienable rights of the human person, freedom, democracy, equality, and the rule of law."[81] An EU directive holds its member states to a broad definition of religion:

> The concept of religion shall in particular include the holding of theistic, non-theistic and atheistic beliefs, the participation in, or abstention from, formal worship in private or public, either alone or in community with others, other religious acts or expressions of view, or forms of personal or communal conduct based on or mandated by any religious belief.[82]

By its official definition, belief of any kind is protected as a religion in the EU. This offers religious freedom and protection to the one who believes in the Christian God along with the one who denies there is any god. The holistic nature of the statement allows any belief system to garner the label "religion."

Democracy

Democracy has multiple meanings and has been applied to different contexts over time, some of which appear at odds with others. The complications of defining democracy theoretically and evaluating it empirically call for either a nuanced definition that embraces multiplicity, or a minimalist one that covers most cases. In democratic nations, such as those examined in this thesis, citizens grant legitimacy to governments that have been chosen by a majority in elections. Hossein Razi adds to this that regime legitimacy "refers to a set of norms and values relating to politics that are sufficiently

---

[81] Norman Doe, "Towards a 'Common Law' on Religion in the European Union," *Religion, State & Society* 37, no. 1/2 (2009): 148.

[82] Ibid.

shared to make a political system possible [known as] the moral basis of authority." [83] Regarding the regime in power, Razi states that legitimacy "refers to the extent the relevant portion of the population perceives that the regime is behaving according to or violating the above norms."[84] Therefore, it is the population's shared norms and values that determine their designation of legitimate or illegitimate for the regime under which they live. Opposition arises when a general belief of illegitimacy gains strength. Given the fact that legitimacy or illegitimacy is partially a moral designation, it is crucial to investigate the beliefs that make up the norms and values of the populace as they create a philosophy of politics.

Paul Spicker divides the core meaning of democracy into three categories: normative, procedural, and institutional. Normatively, "…democracy is a principle, norm or ideal. The ideal of democracy typically expresses in some sense the idea that people are responsible for their own government…." These normative principles may have a wide range of foundations, such as the sovereignty of the people, popular will, and individual consent. [85] As a normative standard, Klaus Dingwerth asserts that the notions of personal autonomy and the intrinsic equality of all persons justify the democratic system. Achievement of desirable ends such as freedom, welfare, or human development

---

[83] G. Hossein Razi, "Legitimacy, Religion, and Nationalism in the Middle East," *The American Political Science Review* 84, no. 1 (1990): 70.

[84] Ibid.

[85] Paul Spicker, "Government for the People: The Substantive Elements of Democracy," *International Journal of Social Welfare* 17 (2008): 251.

also justifies a democracy.[86] Dingwerth sees the term democracy with a common core of three conceptual dimensions, namely inclusiveness, democratic control, and discursive quality. He would thus grant the term "democratic" to a decision-making process,

> if it allows affected communities to adequately participate in the decision-making process; if the decision-making is sufficiently transparent and the rule-makers can be held accountable by the rule-takers; and if decision-making is institutionally tied to deliberative arenas that allow for the sincere exchange of arguments among adherents to different social discourses that relate to the issue of decision-making.[87]

Without the presence of these basic ideals, normatively speaking a governmental decision-making process would fail to be a democracy.

Within accepted democratic theory, the idea of the separation of church and state is often considered the preferable norm in order to protect religious freedom. However, as Jonathan Fox and Jonathan Rynhold point out in their discussion of the government's involvement in religion in Israel,

> Strictly speaking, democracy means majority rule, which can include the decision to violate separation of religion and state, and this presumption that democracies should have separation is part of the liberal democratic tradition….Yet this argument is not universal. Many argue that religion can and should be an element of democracies. Normative considerations aside, in practice many democracies do not have separation of religion and state and even establish official religions. [88]

Though Western tradition has typically joined the ideas of democracy with the separation of church and state, the very nature of a democratic system as it is rooted in the rule of

---

[86] Klaus Dingwerth, "Global Democracy without Global Justice? Why a Procedural Account Is Flawed" (Paper presented at the ECPR Standing Group on International Relations' 8th Pan-European Conference on International Relations, Section 34: Democratic Governance and International Institutions, Stockholm, September 9-11, 2010).

[87] Dingwerth, 3-4.

[88] Fox and Rynhold, 507-508.

the people allows it to adapt to the desires of the polity. Therefore, one need not establish a national religion to have religion act as a guide for the direction of those within the governmental system.

To reconcile the divide between religious freedom and a public recognition of religion, Alfred Stepan suggests the principle of "twin tolerations." This includes a guarantee that democratic institutions will be free to generate policies within the boundaries of the constitution and human rights. There should be no constitutionally guaranteed privileges for religious communities to prescribe or prevent certain policies created by democratically elected governments. In addition, the democratic state must uphold the free exercise of religion in the private realm and retain opportunities for religious communities to promote their beliefs in the public realm. [89] The free exercise of religion would find its limits when it collides with fundamental democratic rights.[90] Within these principles, religion acts as one societal check on the exercise of power within a democratic system, but at the same time the laws and norms of the system balance the effects religious communities may have on policy to prevent the compromise of guaranteed citizen rights.

When approached procedurally, Spicker states that democracy deals "with prescriptions for governance, such as accountability, participation, negotiation and discussion, the representation of interests or the legitimization of dissent….Application of

---

[89] Alfred Stepan, "Religion, Democracy, and the 'Twin Tolerations,'" *Journal of Democracy* 11, no. 4 (2000): 39.

[90] Michael Minkenburg, "Democracy and Religion: Theoretical and Empirical Observations on the Relationship between Christianity, Islam and Liberal Democracy," *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies* 33, no. 6 (2007): 891.

the characteristic approach would be considered necessary for the system of government to qualify as democratic."[91] Rather than judging the democratic nature of a nation in terms of the ideas which bring such a system into being, a procedural approach focuses on the typical systematic methods of the rule of law, citizen participation, governmental organization, and representation of the citizens' interests. David Estlund defines "procedural democracy" as "the view that what makes democratic decisions legitimate is that they were produced by the fair procedure of majority rule."[92] In this approach, the practical execution of democratic ideals in governmental forms and procedures demonstrates the reality of the system.

A primary, identifiable trait rests in the citizenry's right to select its leadership and hold that leadership accountable. Paul Burstein defines democracy as "a set of procedures and institutions intended to make the holders of political power responsible to a broadly inclusive electorate."[93] Ernest Barker characterizes democracy as "government by discussion."[94] Stanley Benn and Richard Peters suggest that democracy means that "every claim should be given a hearing."[95] Thus centering on procedures, Spicker characterizes a democracy by "the process of election, the establishment of systems of accountability and the rule of law. Participative models of democracy describe a system

---

[91] Spicker, 251.

[92] David Estlund, "Beyond Fairness and Deliberation: The Epistemic Dimension of Democratic Authority," in *Deliberative Democracy: Essays on Reason and Politics*, eds., James Bohman and William Rehg (Cambridge, MA: Massachusetts Institute of Technology Press, 1997), 170.

[93] Burstein, 2273.

[94] Spicker, 251.

[95] Ibid.

of government in which people are able directly to engage in decision making. The key concepts include voice, empowerment and community organization."[96] When a governmental system contains the fundamental processes such as elections, ruler accountability, rule of law, and representation of interests, the procedural approach considers that system a democracy.

Spicker also identifies multiple social scientists who describe democracy as institutional. Democracy is thus a system of government, defined by its institutional arrangement:

> Schumpeter famously describes democracy in terms of a competition for the popular vote. Bobbio defines a minimal democracy as characterised by a set of rule about who is eligible to vote, the rights of political parties and free frequent elections; and a set of rules which establish who is authorized to rule and which procedures should be applied.[97]

While an institutional definition of democracy is similar to the procedural approach in its concentration on the outward expression of ideas, in this case the emphasis rests on the institutional mechanisms that must ensure all are eligible to participate in elections and to gather in political parties. The system's structures create an environment that combines the ideal democratic norms along with the necessary prescriptive means to create a reliable democratic system. Each approach—normative, procedural, and institutional—emphasizes key elements of the nature of the democratic system but also may be combined in various permutations to create a recognizable democratic nation.

---

[96] Ibid., 252.

[97] Ibid., 251-252.

Democracy as a governmental system originally referred to a direct form of majority rule but as democratic ideas spread to larger nations representative forms of democracy became more prevalent. Within these systems, citizens choose officials to represent their interests in the decision-making process, creating an indirect rule of the people. To allow officials to rule in the stead of the people, Peter Biegelbauer and Janus Hansen assert:

> The representative tradition assumes that citizens have relatively stable, pre-defined interests. Politics is therefore an arena where different groups struggle to have their interests recognised. For this struggle to play out in a fair manner, it is essential that decisions are made in a transparent fashion and that the decision-makers can be held accountable for their decisions.[98]

In such a system, the established procedures and institutions work incorrectly if the opinions or beliefs of the citizens disproportionately impact policy decisions.[99]

Interest groups may be one source of such malfunction, using their power to manipulate the system. The divided government of the United States offers interest groups various ways to shape policy, including lobbying elected representatives and members of the Executive Branch, making campaign contributions, voting in elections, and molding public opinion.[100] Representative democracies gather groups of people with similar interests together to organize methods to influence the governmental

---

[98] Peter Biegelbauer and Janus Hansen, "Democratic Theory and Citizen Participation: Democracy Models in the Evaluation of Public Participation in Science and Technology," *Science and Public Policy* 38, no. 8 (2011): 592.

[99] Burstein, 2273.

[100] John Mearsheimer and Stephen Walt, "The Israel Lobby and U.S. Foreign Policy," *Middle East Policy* 13, no. 3 (2006): 41.

representatives.[101] The strength and size of these associations can create what the authors of *The Federalist Papers* identified as a tyranny of the majority:

> When a majority is included in a faction, the form of popular government, on the other hand, enables it to sacrifice to its ruling passion or interest both the public good and the rights of other citizens. To secure the public good and private rights against the danger of such a faction, and at the same time to preserve the spirit and the form of popular government, is then the great object to which our inquiries are directed.[102]

This possible breakdown in the democratic system is significant within the context of the Israel-Palestine conflict. Sizer points to the American Israel Public Affairs Committee (AIPAC) and the pro-Israel lobby in general as representing one of the most powerful lobbies in the U.S. today.[103] John Mearsheimer and Stephen Walt state that this power comes from the lobby's unmatched ability to play the interest group politics game. The make-up of the lobby is no different from many other U.S. lobbies, but their extraordinary effectiveness sets them apart. Mearsheimer and Walt reject any claims of conspiracy to explain this success. Rather, they observe that "the individuals and groups that comprise the lobby are doing what other special-interest groups do, just much better."[104] The lobby has strong influence in the U.S. Congress, where Israel is rarely criticized. Mearsheimer and Walt attribute this success partly to the fact that some key

---

[101] On the role of interest groups in American politics, see David Truman, *The Governmental Process: Political Interests and Public Opinion* (New York: Alfred Knopf, 1951); James Wilson, *Political Organization* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1995); Frank Baumgartner and Beth Leech, *Basic Interests: The Importance of Groups in Politics and in Political Science* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1998).

[102] James Madison, "The Federalist No. 10: The Utility of the Union as a Safeguard Against Domestic Factions and Insurrection (Continued)," in *The Federalist Papers*, eds., Alexander Hamilton, James Madison, and John Jay (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2009).

[103] Sizer, *Christian Zionism*, 89.

[104] Mearsheimer and Walt, 41-42.

members of Congress are Christian Zionists. [105] In addition, the significance of the Jewish vote and their larger campaign donations in presidential elections give them influence within the Executive Branch.[106]

As such, the strength of their lobby may provide a disproportionately high level of success in promoting their interests and agenda to policymakers. AIPAC has the following mission:

> To strengthen the ties between the United States and its ally Israel. As America's leading pro-Israel lobby, AIPAC works with Democrats, Republicans and Independents to enact public policy that enhances the U.S.-Israel relationship. AIPAC's staff and citizen activists to educate decision makers about the bonds that unite the United States and Israel and how it is in America's best interest to help ensure that the Jewish state is safe, strong and secure.[107]

AIPAC promotes the interests of the United States in Israeli affairs and policies, ensuring that the alliance is maintained and those American policymakers consider the needs of Israel in their decisions regarding the situation in the Middle East. AIPAC supports the Israeli government because their friendship and survival benefit the United States. Regardless of whether AIPAC's assertion is correct that it is in the best interest of the United States to help Israel, the lobby promotes the interests of a foreign nation and people, which could have the potential to compromise domestic policy. Elected officials may concern themselves more with the affairs of a foreign nation than with those of the people they represent.

---

[105] Ibid., 42. Mearsheimer and Walt specifically referenced Dick Armey and his statement in September 2002, in which he said, "My number-one priority in foreign policy is to protect Israel."

[106] Ibid., 43.

[107] The American Israeli Public Affairs Committee, "Our Mission," http://www.aipac.org/en/about-aipac/our-mission (Accessed November 25, 2011).

Nonetheless, within a democracy there can be room for interest groups to influence policy without harming the people. James Madison illustrates in "Federalist No. 10" that the larger the population of a nation the greater the diversity of interests and the increased difficulty for a faction or interest group to subject the rights of the people.[108] In addition, when interest groups represent the view of the majority, they may work to see those beliefs and opinions become policy without compromising the rights guaranteed to all.[109] Therefore, to assess the effect of the Israeli lobby on U.S. policy towards the Israel-Palestine issue, this study will examine the proportion of Americans who support the pro-Israel cause and will evaluate whether the lobby precludes other views from being heard.

Foreign Policy

Governmental policy generally refers to the actions and laws a nation's leaders choose to pursue. Policy may refer to the overall goal an administration seeks or to the particular programs it strives to enact. Foreign policy is a nation's face to the world. It determines how a nation's leaders deal with other nations and leaders as well as non-governmental organizations. Foreign policy may guard a nation's interests as well as promote worldwide good. As an idealist, President Wilson sought to use foreign policy to bring nations together for the sake of mutual protection and progress.[110] Wilson had hoped to accomplish this in the League of Nations after World War I. However, the

---

[108] Madison, "The Federalist No. 10."

[109] Burstein, 2286. For instances where interest groups prevail over the general public, see Benjamin Page, "The Semi-Sovereign Public," in *Navigating Public Opinion*, eds., Jeff Manza, Fay Lomax Cook, and Benjamin Page (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2002).

[110] Magee, 33.

League of Nations failed to create the desired collective security system and to stop the rise of Hitler's Germany and the next World War. Only after the Second World War shattered the "classic system" of international politics under European hegemony did Wilson's global system emerge in which decisions of actors anywhere had consequences elsewhere.[111] The emergence of the United Nations in the aftermath of World War II created a new international system that sought to establish a governmental system outside the nation-state to institute universal laws and rights to deal with inter-state grievances with the hope of preserving the world from another great war. This new system altered the previous mode of national foreign policies in that nation-states now were accountable to a universal set of principles and rules. International collaboration as a means to solve problems became the *modus operandi*.

The European Union has the same foundational ideas as those of the United Nations, and foreign policy often remains primarily the domain of the nation-states. The Common Foreign and Security Policy (CFSP) intergovernmental process requires those divergent policies to be balanced to create a single policy.[112] The member states do not always share a single policy direction in their relations with the Israelis and Arabs of the Middle East. Since World War II, public opinion in Germany and the Netherlands has been generally pro-Israel.[113] However, in the name of "community discipline" to create

---

[111] Michael Brecher, *The Foreign Policy System of Israel: Settings, Images, Process* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1972), vii.

[112] Musu, 13.

[113] Francesco Cavatorta and Ben Tonra, "Normative Foundations in EU Foreign, Security and Defence Policy: The Case of the Middle East Peace Process—A View from the Field," *Comparative Politics* 13, no. 4 (2007): 361.

greater unity among the member states and to join their nations politically, leaders of these pro-Israel nations shifted their national policy from a position of clear support for Israel to a more pro-Arab stance.[114]

In contrast, due to their challenging experiences with the Jewish military groups during the mandate period, the events of World War II had less effect on the British policies towards Israel. From the beginning of the mandate, Britain struggled under the effects of the conflicting promises they made to both sides during World War I and sought to balance both sides. The British 1939 White Papers that sought to pacify the Arabs in response to the Arab Revolt enraged the Jewish community, as the policy restricted immigration and land sales.[115] After the war, as the Jews grew increasingly discontent with British rule, the Jewish Irgun and Stern groups and the British military traded attacks back and forth, which cost the British twenty soldiers, one hundred wounded, and around £4 million in damages.[116] In turn, the British Foreign Secretary Ernest Bevin advocated an Arab state in Palestine and restricted Jewish immigration.[117]

Within Israel, the strategic threat of hostile Arab nations surrounding them has driven much of the nation's foreign policy and their interactions with other nations

---

[114] Musu, 43. Musu notes that as the EC nations sought to unify after the terrorist attack at the 1972 Munich Olympics and to gain favor with the Arab nations in the midst of the oil embargo Germany made use of the excuse of "community discipline" as an explanation to Israel and its own citizens why it followed a pro-Arab policy path. The desired benefits of the new union required the Germans to set aside their national preferences.

[115] Ian Bickerton and Carla Klausner, *A History of the Arab-Israeli Conflict*, 6th ed. (Upper Saddle River, NJ: Pearson Education, Inc. 2007), 54.

[116] Ibid., 79.

[117] Michael Oren, *Power, Faith, and Fantasy: America in the Middle East 1776 to the Present* (New York: W.W. Norton & Company, 2007), 483.

regarding the Palestinians and Arab states. Clive Jones states that all Israeli governments have ensured that their foreign policy is shaped for national security, "ensuring in the process that a premium is placed upon continuing and maintaining the 'special relationship' with the United States."[118] Despite the changes over time, Efraim Inbar argues:

> It is still a region where the use of force is widely considered a policy option and one which receives popular support. The negative effects of the systemic changes on the international arena and on the Middle East have been similarly overlooked. Israel's [security] predicament has hardly changed. It is still a small state facing various challenges from powerful regional foes.[119]

However, as Israel proved its strength and ability to survive in the Middle Eastern environment, particularly in the wake of the Israeli military victory in the June 1967 War, the ideological debates within Zionism regarding the territory the nation should claim reemerged within public opinion. Jones states:

> Israel's foreign policy is as much about defining the political boundaries of Zionism as it is about determining the future physical borders of the Jewish state. While still wrapped and presented in the language of national security, pressure groups and public opinion…have informed the formulation and implementation of foreign policy.[120]

The aims of the Zionists must be balanced with the perpetual concern for national security within the region, which do not always coincide.

---

[118] Clive Jones, "The Foreign Policy of Israel" in *The Foreign Policies of Middle East States*, eds., Raymond Hinnebusch and Anoushiravan Ehteshami (Boulder, CO: Lynne Rienner Publishers, 2002), 117.

[119] Efraim Inbar, "Israel's Predicament in a New Strategic Environment" in *The National Security of Small States in a Changing World*, eds., Efraim Inbar and Gabriel Sheffer (London: Frank Cass, 1997), 156.

[120] Jones, 116.

In dealing with foreign policy as it relates to religious beliefs, it is essential to define what correlation there is between certain policies and beliefs to seek out identifiable patterns or trends. This study focuses on how the beliefs of those who make up the citizenry of a country influence foreign policy. Given the fact the United States, the European Union, and Israel all have representative governments, policymakers are an integral part of this study as they represent the opinions and beliefs of the populace, while also acting as individuals with personal beliefs and convictions. As such, the following chapter and portions of Chapter Five will evaluate the ways the religious beliefs of those within the government interact with and affect foreign policy.

CHAPTER TWO

HISTORICAL CONTEXT OF THE CONFLICT

As one considers the modern conflict between the Israelis and Palestinians over the land that lies between the Jordan River and the Mediterranean Sea, one must examine the complex history that created the present conditions. Some look back to the initial struggle between the biblical ancestors of the two groups, Isaac and Ishmael, thus seeing it as a millennia-old sibling rivalry battling for the primogeniture blessing from Abraham. Others limit the scope of relevance to the groups' interactions over the last century, characterizing it as a political struggle for land and sovereignty. Wherever one begins the story, historical events construct the modern perceptions each group has of the other. A group's collective memory of an incident defines the heroes and villains in the conflict and justifies present actions. In addition, the sacred significance of the land area for both the Jewish and Islamic religions imbues the conflict with potential religious importance and justification.

One may trace the interactions of the two groups as far back as Abraham; however, this study will briefly discuss the historical background of the area under the Ottoman Empire and then will concentrate on events following the meeting of the Zionist

Organization's First Zionist Congress in 1897. This beginning point in 1897 is appropriate as it marked the initiation of increased levels of interaction between the Jews and Palestinians over the area of Palestine. Jewish immigration to the land rose dramatically as a result of the Zionist Organization's objective to create a new homeland for the Jews in the Ottoman-controlled area of Palestine.[121] Therefore, this chapter will consider the early Jewish immigrants to Palestine, the events surrounding World War I and its peace agreements, the events surrounding World War II and the Holocaust, the birth of the new State of Israel and the first Arab-Israeli War, and the 1967 War. The survey concludes with the 1967 War because Israel's victory and territorial gains in that conflict solidified Israel's status as an enduring nation in the Middle East. The war also created the territorial lines and control that nations and officials have questioned or defended over the past forty-five years. Negotiators and advocates for both sides have focused heavily on the legitimacy of pre- or post-1967 lines.

These historical events stand as the foundation of the current relationship between Israel and the Palestinians and define the key elements of conflict. In order to examine how each group understands the crucial events that have created the current situation, this chapter attempts to survey the historical facts of each event in conjunction with the Israeli perspective on the history of each event in the conflict coupled with a review of the Palestinian perspective. In order to demonstrate the varied perspectives of the two sides, the review of the historical events will highlight contested facts and events and represent

[121] For more information on Ottoman policies on Jewish immigration to Palestine, see Michelle Ursula Campso, *Ottoman Brothers: Muslims, Christians, and Jews in Early Twentieth Century Palestine* (Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 2011) and Suraiya Faroqhi et al., *An Economic and Social History of the Ottoman Empire: Volume 2, 1600-1914* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994).

the accepted history of each side. This overview will also highlight the impact the European and American powers had on these events and the evenhandedness or partiality they demonstrated in key decisions. The sides each actor took and the issues they championed historically create their part in the conflict. With the key past events in hand, this thesis will then examine the policy choices in light of their association with the beliefs and opinions of their corresponding citizenry.

Early Jewish Immigration

From 1516-1918, Palestine was under the rule of the Ottoman Empire, but its inhabitants never formed as a political administrative unit. The Ottomans divided the area into several districts (*sanjaks*) within larger provinces or administrative units (*vilayets*).[122] The Arab population that lived in the districts of Palestine at the end of the nineteen century numbered around 446,000 and was fairly heterogeneous and divided along urban, rural, and nomadic lines. The state owned much of the land, but whether state or privately owned, the local peasants worked the land. This gave them a sense of communal ownership of it though it lacked any legal formality.[123] The Arab Muslims rarely expressed Western ideas of nationalism; however, European missionaries' influence and teachings sparked nationalistic sentiments among Arab Christians.[124]

---

[122] Bickerton and Klausner, 17.

[123] Ibid., 19.

[124] Ibid., 20. For more details on American missionary work and the educational facility they founded that supported this growing nationalism, see Michael Oren, *Power, Faith, and Fantasy: America in the Middle East 1776 to the Present* (New York: W.W. Norton & Company, 2007).

Similar to the Arabs, Jewish nationalism remained a cultural and religious idea until the nineteenth century, when the idea of a Jewish state developed as a political ideology. European rationalism, secular nationalism, and imperialism combined with the anti-Semitism of the nineteenth century laid the foundation for the ideas of Theodor Herzl and political Zionism.[125] The term "Zionism" originated in an article by Nathan Birnbaum in 1886 and came to refer to the movement to reestablish a Jewish nation in Palestine. Though not original to him, Herzl's ideas of Zionism became the draw for the growing number of Zionist supporters.

The Zionist First Congress that met in 1897 was the catalyst for the Zionist movement of the twentieth century. The delegates defined the objective of Zionism as "to create for the Jewish people a home in Palestine secured by public law." To achieve this goal, the delegates resolved to promote a systematic settlement of Palestine by Jewish farmers, craftsmen, and artisans with the approval of the necessary governments. In 1901, the Jewish National Fund was established for the purchase of land; in 1908, the Palestine Land Development Company was created to assist in developing the land.[126] With the assistance of wealthy men like Baron Edmond de Rothschild and Baron Maurice de Hirsch, the Jews bought land from the Arab landowners. After multiple waves of immigrants, the Jewish population numbered around 60,000, or slightly less than 10 percent of the population of Palestine, on the eve of World War I.[127]

---

[125] Ibid., 21, 23.

[126] Ibid., 25.

[127] Ibid., 26, 28.

World War I

World War I centered on the concerns of the European powers; however, due to the breadth of the European empires, the conflict affected many nations around the world. In the Middle East, the war was a time of varying promises the European powers made to encourage support for their side in the war. For the Arabs, the Hussein-McMahon Correspondence offered the Hashemite ruler Sherif Hussein independence for the Arabs in return for Arab uprisings against the Ottomans, which the Arabs accomplished in 1916 with the Arab Revolts. For the Jews, the Balfour Declaration from British Foreign Secretary Sir Arthur Balfour to Lord Rothschild within the British Zionist Organization stated that the British government would view "with favour the establishment in Palestine of a national home for the Jewish people, and will use their best endeavours to facilitate the achievement of this object."[128] Each side offered support for the British in response to these promises, and Britain disappointed both after it won the war.

Britain honored a different wartime agreement, for alongside these competing British promises the British and French had created the Sykes-Picot Agreement. This contained a postwar vision to divide the Levant and Iraq into spheres of influence between the two powers. Britain and France put the Sykes-Picot Agreement into effect at the San Remo Conference and incorporated it into the Treaty of Sevres in 1920. The newly formed League of Nations ratified the treaty, creating zones called mandates for the European powers to administer in order to guide the people along the path to self-government and independence. These mandates married the Wilsonian idea of self-

[128] Shannon, 16-17.

determination from his Fourteen Points with the continuing desires of the imperial powers.[129] The British received the Mandate of Palestine. The mandate's goal of eventual local self-government fueled the drive for nationalism among the Arabs and the Jews in that area. "Each side would resort to diplomatic pressure, violence, and even terrorism to press their claims against the increasingly weary British and world community."[130] Neither side received the fulfillment of what the British had promised during the war, and both resented the British Third Party rule and its attempts at imperial governing.[131] The League of Nations included the Balfour Declaration in the obligations for the mandatory power in Palestine at San Remo. This bound Britain to establish conditions to assist the incoming Jewish population along their path toward dominance in Palestine.[132] From the beginning of the mandate, the Jews saw it as in their best interest to work with the British. The World Zionist Organization, which came to be known as the Jewish Agency, stationed its president Chaim Weizmann in London to work closely with the British.[133]

The Arabs opposed the mandate and the Balfour Declaration as encouraging the Jews to establish a politically sovereign state in Palestine, which the Arabs were determined to resist. The Arab's lack of organization hampered their efforts of resistance throughout the mandate period. The British proposed an Arab agency, but because the

---

[129] Bickerton and Klausner, 44.

[130] Shannon, 17.

[131] Ibid., 18.

[132] Charles Smith, *Palestine and the Arab-Israeli Conflict*, 6th ed. (Boston: Bedford/St. Martin's, 2007), 87.

[133] Bickerton and Klausner, 46.

mandate directive specifically referenced a Jewish agency to work with the British to facilitate Zionist objectives, the Arab believed cooperating with the British in any way would show acquiescence to the Balfour Declaration and the Zionist cause. Because of this as well as political divisions among the Arabs as to who should rule and represent them, the Arabs formed no representative body to promote their interests.[134]

World War II and the Holocaust

The economic depression and outbreaks of anti-Semitism in Europe in 1929 increased the level of immigration to Palestine. This renewed fear and anger among the Arabs, which had begun to subside with the corresponding decreases in Jewish immigration in the 1920s.[135] Jewish immigration generated a cycle of violent outbreaks followed by British attempts to halt or decrease Jewish immigration levels, followed by repeals of British restrictions that led to increased immigration. As anti-Semitism rose in Europe, particularly once Hitler came to power in Germany, the Jewish desire to emigrate from Europe grew, increasing pressure on the British to allow greater levels of immigration to Palestine. Many Jews also sought to immigrate to the United States or Britain; however, both nations restricted immigration based upon established quotas for people groups, which limited the number of Jews they would accept. British increases in Jewish immigration to Palestine protected the immigration restrictions the United States and Britain had in place.

---

[134] Ibid., 47-48.

[135] Ibid., 52.

When World War II began, the Jews had no land of their own or nation to depend on to give them shelter. The British 1939 White Papers declared that Palestine would become an independent state within the next ten years. This was meant to be an Arab state since the Papers restricted Jewish immigration to 75,000 people over the next five years with Arab consent being necessary thereafter. These White Papers essentially repudiated the Balfour Declaration. The imminence of another world war spurred this shift in British policy, for they were concerned about having reliable bases in the Middle East and wanted to ensure the Arab and Muslim communities were on their side.[136]

The Jewish Holocaust altered the course of history and particularly the great powers' dealings with the Mandate of Palestine. This attempt at complete annihilation of the Jews as a people bore a new sense of urgency and necessity to create a secure homeland for all Jews. It also created a belief among the world's Jews that something should be done in Palestine to atone for the Holocaust and to recompense the remnant of European Jews. More than the Holocaust itself, the question of what to do with the survivors directed the post-war dealings with Palestine.[137] Despite this outcry to assist the surviving Jews, the British immigration policy of the 1939 White Papers remained in effect in Palestine.[138] Twenty-five years of struggling with the conflict in the mandate territory weighed more heavily in British policy decisions than the moral atrocities of the Holocaust.

---

[136] Ibid., 56.

[137] Ibid., 70-71.

[138] Ibid., 69.

Establishment of the State of Israel and the First Arab-Israeli War of 1948

The establishment of the State of Israel and the War of 1948-1949 that followed are rooted in the preceding history but also encapsulate the core issues of the modern conflict between the Israelis and Palestinians. Both tell the stories of these events differently and contest certain details; therefore, the two versions will be distinguished for these events, following a summary of the general historical context.

Historical Context

Following the devastation of World War II, Britain's domestic economic crises and challenges in maintaining imperial obligations forced its government in 1947 to acknowledge it could no longer sustain its commitments in Palestine and to turn the matter over to the newly formed United Nations.[139] Once in the hands of the UN, the General Assembly formed a Special Committee on Palestine (UNSCOP) of eleven neutral nations to examine the issue and draw up recommendations. The committee went to the Middle East to gather information from the various groups involved. The Jewish Agency met with the committee, but the newly formed Palestinian Arab High Committee boycotted any meetings because they believed the Arab rights were self-evident. In August 1947, the committee presented its findings to the General Assembly with the majority recommending a partition plan for a Jewish and Arab state with Britain administering the mandate for a two year interim period. Despite the report's shortcomings according to the Jews, the Jewish Agency accepted the majority land

[139] Smith, 185.

partition, while the Arabs rejected all partition recommendations.[140] After thirty-four meetings of a UN ad hoc committee to evaluate UNSCOP's recommendations, the committee presented an amended version of the partition plan to the General Assembly that gave roughly forty-five percent of the land of Palestine to an Arab state and fifty-five percent of the land to a Jewish state, with Jerusalem designated as an international zone under UN administration. On November 29, 1947 the UN General Assembly in UN Resolution 181 voted in favor of partition.[141]

Although significant, the UN vote in favor of partition did not guarantee the creation of a Jewish state. Six months lay between the vote for partition and the scheduled end of the British mandate on May 15, 1948.[142] The vote did provide the Jewish community with a legal framework for establishing a state and gave the Haganah, the Jewish defense force, a specific goal to pursue in terms of territory.[143] The Arab nations surrounding Palestine rejected the partition plan and the Jews' claim to the land. The approval vote prompted the Arab states to send forces to fight for the Arab claims to the Palestinian territory and to prevent the Jews from attaining the state the partition plan promised. The Arab Liberation Army (ALA), consisting of citizens from a number of Arab countries and commanded by Arab military officers, invaded Palestine in late 1947. They sought to "nullify the UN partition resolution, to eliminate any remains of

---

[140] Bickerton and Klausner, 84-85.

[141] Ibid., 87.

[142] Smith, 199.

[143] Bickerton and Klausner, 87.

Zionism…and to secure the Arabness of Palestine."[144] As the ALA invaded, Palestinian militiamen waged armed attacks against Jewish towns, villages, and inter-city traffic. The Jewish Haganah and Irgun retaliated.[145] In the major cities a war of terror reigned that spilled out into the countryside. A cycle of attacks and retaliations ensued, with each side justifying their actions as responses to the other side's attacks. "Terror and atrocities were committed by both sides, with little regard for noncombatants or women and children when avenging an attack."[146] By May 15, 300,000 Arabs had fled their homes and towns.[147]

In April 1948, each side committed an atrocity that historians remember for their brutality: the Jewish Irgun and Stern Gang's attack on Arabs in Deir Yassin and the Arabs' retaliation against a group of Jewish doctors and nurses on Mount Scopus. Deir Yassin lay outside designated partition borders for the new Jewish state, but it was a key village on the way to Jerusalem. On April 9, a group of 132 Irgun and Stern Gang men entered the village of Deir Yassin, captured the village, killed approximately 254 men, women, and children, raping many of the women and mutilating the dead bodies before throwing them in a well. The Haganah high command condemned the massacre, though they never charged the officers in charge of the attack. In response to this, the Arabs retaliated on April 13, besieging a convoy of mainly Jewish doctors and nurses on their

---

[144] Moshe Ma'oz, *Syria and Israel: From War to Peacemaking* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1995), 18.

[145] Moshe Ma'oz, "The UN Partition Resolution of 1947: Why Was It Not Implemented?" *Palestinian-Israeli Journal of Politics, Economics and Culture* 9, no. 4 (2002): 19.

[146] Smith, 200-201.

[147] Ibid., 203.

way to Hadassah Hospital just outside Jerusalem on Mount Scopus. They killed seventy-seven of them. [148]

On May 14, 1948, as the Jewish forces gained some measure of military advantage over the Palestinians, David Ben Gurion proclaimed the State of Israel to exist within the borders awarded in the UNSCOP partition plan minus the Negev and received an immediate de facto recognition from President Truman on behalf of the United States. On the following day, armies from the surrounding Arab states under the auspice of the Arab League invaded Arab Palestine and the new State of Israel, sparking a new round of fighting.[149] The UN-commissioned mediator, Count Folke Bernadotte, arranged a month-long truce in mid-June, but both sides violated the terms. The Arabs reinforced their lines with fresh units, prevented supplies from reaching isolated Israeli settlements, and occasionally opened fire along the lines. The Israelis also moved more troops to their fronts. In addition, they violated the arms embargos and bought weapons from Czechoslovakia.[150]

Fighting resumed when Egypt and Syria refused to extend the treaty in the hope of increasing their resistance to drive the Jews back. However, their plans were unsuccessful, and the Israelis secured key areas, including the sea port of Haifa, while working towards Jerusalem. Israel took over much of western Galilee, which included portions of the Arab partition zone, until the UN enforced another truce. In September,

---

[148] Bickerton and Klausner, 103-104.

[149] Smith, 203-204.

[150] Benny Morris, *1948: A History of the First Arab-Israeli War* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2008), 267.

Bernadotte recommended an updated territory settlement that would allocate the Negev to the Arabs and Galilee to Israel and make Jerusalem an international city. The following day members of the Israeli Stern Gang assassinated the UN mediator. Ben-Gurion disbanded the Stern Gang in light of this and arrested over 200 people, but he did not prosecute anyone for the assassination. This act revived the fighting, which continued until King Abdullah of Transjordan agreed to a ceasefire in December.[151]

Egypt, followed by Lebanon, Syria, and Transjordan, signed an armistice with Israel in early 1949. Israel increased its land area by approximately twenty percent in these agreements, which the new UN mediator Ralph Bunche of the United States negotiated. As a result of the war, the new State of Israel now covered eighty percent of the land that previously made up the mandate of Palestine. Transjordan occupied and later annexed the areas of Judea and Samaria as well as East Jerusalem.[152] "The agreed-upon armistice lines defined Israel's boundaries until the 1967 war, but in principle a state of war still existed; only a cessation of hostilities had been achieved."[153] The Palestinians who had fled or been expelled during the fighting remained as refugees in the surrounding Arab states. The UN General Assembly passed Resolution 194 that established a Palestinian Conciliation Commission as recommended by the late and current UN mediators to facilitate the repatriation or compensation of the refugees.[154] Three member states sat on the commission: France, Turkey, and the United States.

---

[151] Bickerton and Klausner, 100.

[152] Ibid.

[153] Smith, 207.

[154] Bickerton and Klausner, 106.

When this group failed to address the refugee problem, Bunche acknowledged he and Bernadotte had naively assumed the representatives to the commission would act independently and had failed to realize the influence of the representatives' governments.[155]

Israeli Perspective

The effect of the Holocaust on the European survivors and those of the Jewish community in Palestine cannot be overemphasized in the struggle for a Jewish state after World War II. It created a determination of "Never Again." Never again would Jews be victims, never again would Jews be unable to defend themselves, never again would they lack a place of safety. Israeli security and defense policies in dealing with the Arabs and Palestinians represent this staunch determination.[156] Given the British continuation of pre-World War II immigration policies in spite of the Holocaust, the Jews found they fought against both the British and the Palestinians to gain a place of safety for the survivors. Jewish animosity towards the British grew and was demonstrated during the UNSCOP committee's visit to the mandate in July 1947. During this visit, the two sides exchanged retaliatory violence back and forth.[157]

In the wake of World War II, the Jewish community in Palestine looked for a state of their own. Their success depended upon their ability to create a situation that forced

---

[155] Michael Fischbach, *Records of Dispossession: Palestinian Refugee Property and the Arab-Israeli Conflict* (New York: Columbia University Press, 2003), 83-84. For further information about the UNPCC's dealings, see Fischbach's chapter "UNPCC's Early Activity on the Refugee Property Question" and Norma Spungen "Deadlock at Lausanne: Six Months of Lost Opportunities for Peace in the Middle East," *Jewish Social Studies* 49, 3/4 (1987): 265-274.

[156] Bickerton and Klausner, 71.

[157] Smith, 196.

the British to take the issue to the UN.[158] Once the issue reached the UN General Assembly, the Jews still had no guarantee the nations of the UN would approve partition. The non-European nations sympathized with the Arabs. In addition, the Jews expected the Soviets and their allies to oppose the U.S. and the Jewish state they supported. Senior U.S. officials debated the direction of their vote, with some favoring the Jews and other the Arabs.[159] As the vote approached, Zionists in the U.S. observed the need for extensive lobbying with certain UN delegates. In the end, Truman's willingness to break with the State Department and approve added lobbying of foreign nations may have saved the vote for the Israelis. Also, the unexpected Soviet support added the necessary two-thirds majority needed to break a filibuster. The international community legitimized the Jews' claim to self-rule.[160]

With this UN approval, the Jewish community had to determine a way to achieve its goals for statehood and to acquire the territory the partition plan allotted them, particularly those areas outside the central and coastal plains where much of the Jewish population lived. Compared to the Palestinians, the Zionists had superior leadership and organization as well as many soldiers who had training and experience from World War II. The militaristic groups of the Irgun and the Stern Gang coordinated activities with the Haganah on multiple occasions to strengthen their efforts. When the Haganah went on the offensive in April 1948 with a new supply of Czechoslovakian weapons, they established

---

[158] Bickerton and Klausner, 76.

[159] For more discussion of the conflict over the U.S. vote, see Evan Wilson, *A Calculated Risk: The U.S. Decision to Recognize Israel* (Cincinnati: Clerisy Press, 2008).

[160] Smith, 198.

control over the area granted the Jewish state and pushed to expand to the areas that included Jewish settlements outside the partition lines. These successes exposed the Arab forces' lack of coordination.[161]

The Jews and the Arabs engaged in the fiercest fighting during this time. The Arab nations had gathered a large force that greatly outnumbered the Jewish forces. The Jews believed guerrilla warfare tactics were the only way they could defeat the larger Arab force and launched a number of guerrilla attacks in the months leading up to the events at Deir Yassin to check Arab advances and to respond to Arab guerrilla attacks. While the Haganah did not condone what the Irgun and Stern Gang did at Deir Yassin, both sides made use of these guerrilla warfare tactics. In addition, Iraqi and Palestinian troops had been using Deir Yassin as a base for snipers against Jewish occupants of Jerusalem.[162]

After Ben-Gurion announced the establishment of the State of Israel on May 14, Israelis began to fight their War for Independence. When the UN mediator Bernadotte established a truce in mid-June, the Israelis used the time to build up necessary weaponry from Czechoslovakia. The Stern Gang assassinated Bernadotte in response to his proposal of a peace agreement that gave more territory to the Palestinians, and the two sides resumed fighting. In this final phase of the war, the Israelis expanded their territory claims and drove back the armies of the surrounding Arab nations.[163]

---

[161] Ibid., 199-200, 202.

[162] Bickerton and Klausner, 104.

[163] Smith, 207.

The Israelis insisted they had no legal or moral obligation to restore the land to the Palestinians who fled during the war or to recompense them for their losses. The Israelis claimed that Arab propagandists, who promised an easy return once the Arabs defeated the Jews, encouraged the Palestinians to leave. Therefore, the Israelis did not consider the Palestinians as refugees with a right to return after the end of hostilities.[164] The Israelis would only negotiate the terms within the framework of direct peace negotiations, which the Arabs refused as this would require recognition of the new State of Israel.[165] More recently, some Israeli historians have questioned the earlier claims that the Palestinians left because their leadership told them to do so, and these historians admit that the Haganah deliberately destroyed Arab villages and broadcasted false stories of disease spreading and impending terror to encourage flight.[166]

The Jewish community fought the War of 1948 to secure a homeland and state for worldwide Jewry. The Arab nations surrounded them territorially and surpassed them in military numbers. Despite the UN approval of partition, the Western nations offered the Jews very limited practical support. The Haganah organized the Jewish community and implemented guerrilla and other alternative warfare methods to undermine the Arabs' strength of number. The Haganah's effective leadership won the war for the new Israeli state and allowed them to negotiate the armistice agreements from the victor's position.

---

[164] Ibid., 203.

[165] Bickerton and Klausner, 106.

[166] Ibid., 104.

Palestinian Perspective

The Holocaust created a sense of bitterness and resentment in the Palestinians, not against the Jews but against the Western European powers. The Palestinians did not initiate or participate in the Holocaust, but they believed they were paying the price for the Europeans' failure to intervene to lessen or prevent the Holocaust. Now, because the Europeans had determined that Palestine was the appropriate place for survivors, they would deprive the Arabs of their land and homes.[167] The Arabs remained staunch in their opposition to a Jewish state in the land where they had long waited and struggled for their own state.

After World War II, British Foreign Secretary Ernest Bevin declared he envisaged a Palestinian state, not a Jewish one, arising under a United Nations trusteeship awarded to Britain. This announcement coupled with British continuance of the immigration quotas of 1,500 Jews monthly displeased the Arabs, for they saw the extension of the quota beyond the original five years established in the 1939 White Papers as a violation of promises. The Arab leadership was divided on how to respond, which resulted in political immobilization and the leadership's rejection of any option other than an Arab Palestine. The Arab leadership had no room to compromise with the Zionists. "To give up any part of Arab Palestine would be wrong, they believed, constituting recognition of the Jewish right to have it as Ben-Gurion and others argued."[168]

---

[167] Ibid., 71.

[168] Smith, 187, 189.

When the British referred the issue to the UN, the Arabs were at a disadvantage due to their inexperience in the Western system of diplomacy as British colonial subjects, their unwillingness to plead their case, and their lack of organized leadership. The League of Nations initially established the mandate system to prepare the people of the Middle East for self-determination and statehood, but after more than twenty years under British rule the Arabs believed the British continued to move their goal of statehood farther into the future. The Arab Palestinians lacked the means or understanding of the international system to attain their goal. Worse still, the Arabs did not have advocates for their cause in the United States and Europe like the Jews did and used violence to pressure the British periodically. In addition, they were unwilling to advocate their side, as evidenced by their boycott of the UNSCOP tour. The Arabs did not promote their position until after UNSCOP had presented its report to the General Assembly.

The Arabs failed to accomplish their goals of statehood in 1947 and 1948 due in large part to the divisions and disorganization among the Arab leadership in Palestine and among the nations of the Middle East. With the mufti Hajj Amin al-Husseini banished from the mandate by the British, his cousin Jamal al-Husseini took control of the reconstituted Arab Higher Committee, but he failed to create a coalition between his followers and the other key parties. Tensions also rose between Jamal and the exiled mufti. Because of the mufti's action in the 1936-1939 Arab Revolt, he retained a persona among many as the leader of the resistance against the Zionists and British. Therefore, he continued to exert leadership influence from Egypt but was unable to take action directly. In addition, the mufti and the other Arab leaders understood the Palestinian question as a

crucial issue in the fulfillment of the Arab nationalist aspiration against the imperialism of Europe, which left little room for compromise.[169]

When the Arabs failed to stop the partition plan before the UN, they prepared themselves for a fight on the ground. The surrounding Arab nations prepared to assist, though often with alternative motives and goals other than what the Arab Palestinians sought, which bred more division and suspicion among the command group during the war. The mufti, who was still in Egypt when the UN approved partition, was determined to control the Palestinian resistance and any assistance from the Arab states. The mufti's fighting forces under the command of Abd al-Qadir mixed with non-Palestinian Arab volunteers, whom Fawzi al-Qawuqji led and the Arab League funded. The two leaders had fought together in the Arab Revolt, but they were also rivals and backed by leaders who distrusted one another.

Within the Arab League, Egypt agreed to help the mufti with the loans the Arab League refused him, for Egypt suspected King Abdullah of Transjordan's designs on Jerusalem and central Palestine. These suspicions were well-founded, for before the vote on partition Abdullah reached an agreement with the Jews on a division of Palestine. The Jewish Agency agreed not to oppose Transjordan's annexation of Arab Palestine, and Abdullah agreed not to attack the Jews or stand in the way of the establishment of a Jewish state. Not only did the Arab League nations distrust one another, the Arab Palestinians suspected their ulterior motives and plans as well. When the Arab Liberation Army (ALA) entered Palestine in January 1948, most Palestinians chose not to join them.

---

[169] Ibid., 187-188.

They feared the Arab states did not share their goal for the future of Palestine.[170] "The Palestinian resistance and the Arab League's support of it were thus part of a web of rivalries and intrigue that discouraged any chance of coordinated assaults, let alone agreement on objectives."[171] Therefore, despite superior numbers, the Arab forces struggled to hold back the Haganah's assaults on Palestinians.

As the tide turned in favor of the Jewish fighting forces, Palestinians began to leave their homes. Some left of their own free will, some fled out of terror of what the Haganah had done elsewhere, and some were expelled. By the end of the war, an estimated 600,000 to 760,000 Palestinians were homeless, refugees in the surrounding Arab nations. The Palestinians refer to this event as *al-Nakba*, "the catastrophe," due to the sense of helplessness and fear they felt. The savage attacks the victorious Jews carried out against them amplified these feelings.[172] The attacks at Deir Yassin are among the best known of these. After these attacks, the Palestinians reported the Irgun and Haganah using threats of similar attacks as a staple of their propaganda, proclaiming these threats over mobile loudspeaker units into Arab areas to encourage them to leave before

---

[170] Bickerton and Klausner, 89.

[171] Smith, 199.

[172] Bickerton and Klausner, 106.

something similar happened to them. Many point to this form of psychological warfare as a key reason so many Palestinian Arabs fled.[173]

Summary

The events surrounding the establishment of the State of Israel and the displacement of seventy percent of the Arab Palestinians generated many of the issues that continue to perpetuate the conflict in current times. The UN vote on partition demonstrated the power of the Jewish Zionist lobby and the available U.S. support for Israel. It also prefigured the influence the U.S. would exert to protect Israel in the world community. In contrast, the British animosity and frustration with the Jewish military groups in Palestine left them unwilling to promote the Jews' aspirations of statehood, in spite of the atrocities of the Holocaust. The new Jewish state won the war against all expectations and secured the land to create the state they had sought for many years. However, it was no utopia. They had Jewish immigrants coming in large numbers and acrimonious Arab nations surrounding them. Nation-building would not be easy. The Palestinian Arab to whom the UN had granted land for a state in the Palestinian Mandate now lived under the rule of other Arab nations and gathered in refugee camps wishing for the homes they left.

---

[173] Smith, 203. See also Michael Cohen, *Palestine and the Great Powers, 1945-1948* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1982); Christina Jones, *The Untempered Wind: Forty Years in Palestine* (London: Longman, 1975); J. Bowyer Bell, *Terror Out of Zion: Irgun Zvai Leumi, LEHI, and the Palestine Underground* (New York: St. Martin's Press, 1977); Arthur Koestler, *Promise and Fulfillment: Palestine, 1917-1949* (London: Macmillan, 1949); Menachem Begin, *The Revolt* (Los Angeles: Nash Publishing, 1972); and Nafez Nazzal, *The Palestinian Exodus from Galilee, 1948* (Beirut: Institute for Palestine Studies, 1978).

The War of 1967

The new boundaries created in the War of 1967 shaped the physical, political, economic, and cultural conditions in which the contemporary Arab-Israeli conflict has existed for the last forty-five years, changing the facts on the ground while preserving the existing grievances. In six days, the Israeli military decimated the armed forces of the Arab nations, tripled its territorial control, and assumed direct rule over a majority of Palestinians. The war redefined Israel's national image to the world. Israel was no longer a small, vulnerable David fighting a giant Goliath in the Arab states.[174] This war established Israel as the foremost regional military power. It also discredited the Arab states as possible liberators of the Palestinian people. After the war, Palestinian resistance movements grew internally, with the Palestinian Liberation Organization (PLO) gaining support in the early 1970s and Hamas gaining support in the late 1980s.[175]

With no major confrontations in the years between the Suez-Sinai conflict in 1956 and the war in 1967, Israel grew economically, militarily, politically, and culturally. Among the Arabs, Gamal Abdel Nasser of Egypt spent this time spreading the ideal of pan-Arabism throughout the Middle East to unite the Arabs around their common identity. However, the leadership of the Arab nations remained divided over the political ideologies of socialism and communism. Egypt and Syria embraced radical social and economic changes, rejected foreign commitments to the West, and received aid from the

---

[174] Ian Bickerton, *A History of the Arab-Israeli Conflict* (London: Reakftion Publishers, 2009), 109.

[175] Beverley Milton-Edwards, *Israeli-Palestinian Conflict: A People's War* (New York: Routledge, 2009), 120.

Soviet Union. In addition, Syria and Egypt united in a Unified Arab Republic in January 1958 in response to parliamentary calls for a federal union between the two regions to increase Syrian-Egyptian cooperation and strength in the region. This union laid certain obligations on each side and bound them together in the subsequent conflicts with Israel.[176] The conservative monarchical nations, such as Jordan and Saudi Arabia, approached change more cautiously and identified themselves with the West and the United States. The French and British diplomatic failure during the Suez Crisis left the Soviet Union and the United States as the two major superpowers with influence in the Middle East, fueling a bilateral rivalry that extended to the superpowers' allies during the years leading up to the 1967 War.[177]

The Suez Crisis in 1956 revolved around shipping rights in the Suez Canal and the Straits of Tiran. During this conflict, Israel captured the Sinai Peninsula but returned it in 1957 under pressure from President Eisenhower with the condition that Egypt maintain Israeli access to the Straits. Egypt violated this agreement when it closed the Straits to Israeli shipping with a naval blockade in May 1967. Leading up to this closure, Nasser requested the UN observers leave the demilitarized buffer zone established in Sinai after the Suez Crisis, and then he moved 100,000 soldiers and 1,000 tanks to the Sinai border near the Gulf of Aqaba and the Straits of Tiran. Israelis attribute Nasser's

---

[176] James Jankowski, *Nasser's Egypt, Arab Nationalism, and the United Arab Republic* (Boulder, CO: Lynne Riener Publisher, Inc., 2002), 106-110. For further information on the United Arab Republic, see Elie Podeh, *The Decline of Arab Unity: The Rise and Fall of the United Arab Republic* (Brighton: Sussex Academic Press, 1999); Malik Mufti, *Sovereign Creations: Pan-Arabism and Political Order in Syria and Iraq* (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1996); and United Arab Republic, Ministry of National Guidance, *Majmu'at Khutub wa Tasrihat wa Bayanat al-Ra'is Jamal 'Abd al-Nasir*, multivolume (Cairo, n.d.).

[177] Bickerton, 11.

militarization of the Sinai Peninsula and blockade of the Straits of Tiran as the catalyst of the war. However, while Nasser delivered a speech explaining these actions as a means to threaten Israel to desist its attacks on Syria in the Golan Heights, his deputy was in Washington to work out a diplomatic solution to the crisis. Nasser looked for a victory by forcing Israel to back down in the war of words. However, for Israel, Nasser's actions were acts of war. In addition to Egypt's actions, King Hussein of Jordan joined this rising conflict by declaring his support for Egypt and inviting Iraqi troops to take up positions along the Israeli borders.[178]

In the north of Israel in the time leading up to the war, Israel faced another struggle over water and borders from Syria. In 1966, the Ba'athist and radical leftist General Salah Jadid took over Syria in a military coup. He was openly hostile to the West and Israel. He supported Palestinian Fatah fighters' attacks on Israeli patrols north of the Sea of Galilee, while the Syrian army fired down on Israeli farmers from the Golan Heights. According to the armistice lines of 1949, Syria and Israel shared portions of the shores of the Sea of Galilee. Control of this sea was crucial in the water-starved lands of the region. In 1966, Syria built canals to divert the headwaters of the River Jordan, which lay in Syrian territory, but gave up the project after Nasser refused to support their actions due to anticipated Israeli reactions. Border skirmishes between Syrians and Israelis continued, and in April 1967 tanks and planes of both sides engaged in a major clash. After Israeli planes shot down six Syrian planes and flew low over the suburbs of

[178] Bickerton, 111-113. See also, Hasan Afif El-Hasan, *Is the Two-State Solution Already Dead? A Political and Military History of the Palestinian-Israeli Conflict* (New York: Algora Publishing, 2010), 121.

Damascus, General Jadid asked Nasser for help, which led to the Egyptian troop movements outlined above.[179]

In the face of these Egyptian military mobilizations in the Sinai Peninsula, Israel began hostilities with a surprise attack on June 5, destroying most of the Egyptian, Syrian, and Jordanian forces. The Israeli army captured the Gaza Strip and the Sinai Peninsula from Egypt, East Jerusalem and the West Bank from Jordan, the Golan Heights from Syria, and the Sheeba Farms from Lebanon.[180] Israel began the attack with an air strike against the Egyptian air forces on the ground, destroying 300 of Egypt's 450 aircraft. Later that same day, Israel attacked the Jordanian, Syrian, and Iraqi air forces. By the end of the day, Israel destroyed 416 Arab aircraft, ensuring air superiority for Israel during the war. This air superiority greatly assisted Israel's ground forces that followed the air attacks. In four days, Israeli ground forces, assisted by paratroopers, defeated Egypt's army in the Sinai and reached the Suez Canal.[181]

Israel had similar success in the West Bank. The events of the preceding months left King Hussein of Jordan with little choice but to join with Egypt and Syria and face the possible backlash from the Israelis rather than face a popular uprising at home that could take the throne from him. On May 30, he signed a mutual defense treaty with Egypt and put his forces under Egyptian command. On June 5, Jordanian troops instigated an attack against Israel, shelling targets in West Jerusalem, Netanya, and Tel Aviv after

---

[179] Bickerton, 116-117.

[180] El-Hasan, 121.

[181] Bickerton, 113, 118.

receiving false reports from Nasser of early Egyptian successes. When Jordanian troops occupied portions of West Jerusalem on the follow day, the Israeli forces attacked Jordanian units in the West Bank. By that evening, Israeli troops had surrounded Jerusalem but had not entered the city. During heavy fighting the following day, Israeli forces entered the Old City and captured the Western Wall and the Temple Mount. In the West Bank, Israeli forces also took Mount Scopus, Ramallah, Jenin, Judea, Gush Etzion, and Hebron. When King Hussein ordered his troops to retreat back across the Jordan River, Israeli Defense Minister General Moshe Dayan ordered Israeli forces to capture the rest of the West Bank.[182]

Despite being reluctant to join the hostilities given Israel's remarkable success, Syria still believed Nasser's early false reports of Egypt's success and initiated hostilities against Israel. In the four days leading up to the outbreak of fighting, the Israeli air force had bombed Syrian artillery positions in the Golan Heights. When the Israeli air force destroyed two-thirds of the Syrian air force, Syria refrained from a ground offensive and began a massive shelling of Israeli towns in the Hula Valley. However, with the support of the Israeli air force, ground forces broke through the Syrian defenses and reached the plateau of the Golan, causing the Syrian forces to flee.[183]

Hostilities ended on June 10 when Egypt, Syria, and Jordan agreed to the UN Security Council's call for a ceasefire. When the fighting ceased, Israel controlled the Sinai Peninsula to the point of the Suez Canal, the religiously significant area of East

---

[182] Ibid., 119.

[183] Ibid.

Jerusalem and the West Bank, and the strategic Golan Heights. This impressive demonstration of Israeli military power left the Arab states humiliated and with more than 21,000 Arab soldiers dead and 45,000 wounded. In contrast, Israel lost less than 1,000 soldiers with approximately 2,500 wounded.[184]

The Israelis believe the cause of the war rested on the continued antagonism and inability of the Arabs to recognize and accept the political sovereignty of the Jewish people in Israel and their desire to avenge the defeats and humiliation of the previous wars at the hands of the Israelis and European nations.[185] Israel overlooked the role their 1956 military response alongside France and Britain played in bringing Nasser to power and in fueling his pan-Arab ideology, which eventually led to Nasser's actions in 1967. As the Israelis looked at the Arab forces that surrounded their nation in 1967 under Nasser's control, they believed that in a full-scale war attacking first was the only strategy that stood a chance of victory.[186] Though the U.S. had warned Israel against initiating hostilities, when President Johnson heard the news of what had happened, he expressed his surprise and "'regret that Israel decided to move when it did,' but also

---

[184] Ibid., 120.

[185] Ibid., 109.

[186] Ibid., 117-118. The debate about preemptive vs. preventive Israeli action in 1967 lies outside the scope of this thesis. For the purposes of continuity, this thesis will use the reference "acted first" to maintain effective analytical boundaries regarding Israel's action in the 1967 War. For more information on the issue, see William Quandt, *Peace Process: American Diplomacy and the Arab-Israeli Conflict Since 1967* (Washington, D.C.: Brookings Institute Press, 2005); Ersun Kurtulus, "The Notion of 'Pre-emptive War:' The Six Day War Revisited," *Middle East Journal* 61, 2 (2007); Michael Walzer, *Just and Unjust Wars: A Moral Argument with Historical Illustration*, 4th ed. (New York: Basic Books, 2006); Eligar Sadeh, *Militarization and State Power in the Arab-Israeli Conflict: Case Study of Israel 1948-1982* (Jerusalem: The Hebrew University of Jerusalem, 1994); George Quester, *Preemption, Prevention, and Proliferation: The Threat and Use of Weapons in History* (New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction Publishers, 2009); and Michael Oren, *Six Days of War: June 1967 and the Making of the Modern Middle East* (New York: Presidio Press, 2003).

rejected 'the oversimplified charge of Israeli aggression' given the provocations by Egypt and Syria over the past weeks."[187] Johnson preferred Israel to avoid war but also saw merit in the strategy that justified such an action.

The Arabs believe the cause of the war lay in Israeli aggressiveness and expansionism, Israel's excessive retaliations, and Israeli "hawkishness" and determination to maintain military superiority. [188] Legally, Nasser had the right to ask the UN forces to leave the Sinai Peninsula, though its implications made it unadvisable. The closure of the Straits did not represent an immediate threat to Israel or to its economic situation as only about five percent of Israel's trade came to the country through the port of Eilat on the Straits. Though Nasser's actions in seeking diplomatic support from the U.S. may illustrate his desires to avoid war, given Israel's strong response to the Suez Crisis Nasser knew he was risking military engagement with his actions.[189]

When hostilities eventually ceased, Israel found itself controlling territory that held over one million Arabs. Israel had the means to negotiate with the Arab states if it so desired from a position of great strength. The first action the government took was to annex East Jerusalem and the surrounding area. Following this, the cabinet unanimously agreed to negotiate a peace settlement with Egypt in which Israel would return to the international boundaries that existed before the war in exchange for Egypt guaranteeing freedom of navigation in the Straits of Tiran, the Gulf of Aqaba, and the Suez Canal,

---

[187] Shannon, 62.

[188] Bickerton, 109.

[189] Ibid., 113.

demilitarizing the Sinai Peninsula, and permitting Israeli retention of the Gaza Strip. The cabinet also drew up a peace settlement for Syria in which Israel would return to the previous international borders if Syria agreed to the demilitarization of the Golan Heights and guaranteed the free flow of water from the sources of the Jordan to Israel. However, within a short period of time, the cabinet withdrew the offers to return the land to Egypt and Syria without passing them along to the Syrians and Egyptians.[190]

The cabinet deferred peace with Jordan and made no plans to relinquish control of the West Bank. Some in Israel called for immediate annexation of the West Bank and the Gaza Strip; however, the government was confronted with the possible demographic implication to the "Jewish" nation if they annexed areas containing approximately 1.3 million Arabs. The government postponed the issue to avoid risking international opposition or condemnation of their policy. Instead, many moved to establish "facts on the ground" and to garner Jewish footholds in the West Bank and Jerusalem that would eventually lead everyone to accept the Jordan River as Israel's eastern border.[191] Israelis moved to create settlements in the territories with the rationale of ensuring Israeli security, despite the fact that the settlements violated international and some of Israel's own laws.[192]

Underlying Israel's efforts to retain the new occupied territories was the fact that it did not consider the West Bank as occupied territory. Instead, they remain "contested"

---

[190] Ibid., 122.

[191] El-Hassan, 122.

[192] Bickerton, 108.

territory to which they have equal right to claim as the Palestinians do. After the war of 1967, Israel's military advocate general, Colonel Meir Shamgar, recommended the use of the term "disputed" rather than "occupied" to refer to the territory of the West Bank and Gaza to reject the applicability of the 1949 Fourth Geneva Convention relating to the occupation of conquered territory, under the assumption that the two areas were not previously a part of a sovereign state.[193]

As Israel gained territory, it also failed to assimilate the people living in those areas. The Palestinians were remarkably passive during the war, allowing the West Bank to be conquered in a few hours without firing a shot.[194] Soon after the end of the war, Palestinian leaders told senior Israeli intelligence officers they were ready to establish a demilitarized Palestinian state in the West Bank and to sign a peace agreement with Israel. However, this request never made it to the cabinet. They were likely to reject it though, for they dealt with the Palestinian people in indirect talks through the Arab nations.[195]

As the parties involved failed to create a peace agreement, U.S. President Johnson sought to mediate the peace after he brokered the ceasefires. However, the Arabs believed he showed a measure of partiality towards Israel during the conflict in his unwillingness to apply pressure to stop Israel and after in his statement outlining his view of a possible settlement, which placed the responsibility for the war on Egypt's "act of

---

[193] Ibid., 108-109.

[194] Ibid., 123.

[195] Ibid., 124

folly." Unlike Eisenhower's approach in 1956 that pressured Israel to withdrawal to pre-war borders, Johnson sought a final peace by granting Israel's gains as something to be bartered back in negotiations to force the Arab nations to the table in order to prevent losing their territory.[196]

At the UN, the U.S. was unwilling to approve international motions to condemn Israel's occupation and vetoed UN resolutions that told Israel not to create settlements in any of the newly acquired territory. Instead, Johnson created a UN resolution that embodied the U.S. points and placed demands on both sides of the conflict. UN Resolution 242 passed unanimously. The resolution required change and action on both sides. It called for the withdrawal of Israeli forces from territories occupied in the recent conflict and for Arab neighbors to recognize Israel's right to exist. Despite the unanimity among the Security Council members on these points, the practical execution of the terms was problematic as it was unclear if it meant some or all territory and, as it did not specify the order of events, whether Israel must withdraw before the Arab nations would recognize their state or vice versa.[197]

Neither side has embraced fully the terms of 242. Peace conferences since the 1970s focus on resolving the differences solidified in 1948 and intensified in 1967. With this foundational history in view, the following chapter will examine the actors within the conflict that are most relevant to this study.

---

[196] Shannon, 64.

[197] Ibid., 65.

CHAPTER THREE

RELEVANT ACTORS – ISRAEL, THE EUROPEAN UNION, AND THE UNITED STATES

This thesis examines Israel, the European Union, and the United States as case studies to analyze the relationship between the religious beliefs among a nation's population and the foreign policies of that nation towards the Israeli-Palestinian conflict. It is necessary to lay out the criteria for this selection to the exclusion of many other actors in the conflict. The conditions rely on the definitions of the key terms and the historical involvement of the actors in the conflict. The chapter will lay out the criteria and then discuss why each of the selected actors best fits the required conditions.

Required Criteria

This thesis assumes the opinions of a nation's population in a democracy are significant and may affect a nation's structure and policies. Philippe Schmitter and Terry Lynn Karl define democracy as "a system of governance in which rulers are held accountable for their actions in the public realm by citizens, acting indirectly through the

competition and cooperation of their elected representatives."[198] Gerald Alexander adds that a regime may not be termed "a democracy in any sense, Western or otherwise, unless it effectively makes officeholders accountable to the citizenry."[199] He determines that elections are a primary mechanism to hold decision-makers accountable, but elections without other mechanisms to ensure accountability become hollow and may offer false legitimacy for authoritarian regimes.[200] Robert Dahl in his study of the systematic mechanisms necessary for a democracy lists a number of institutional guarantees that allow a system to function democratically. He lists free and fair elections as one guarantee, but he stipulates that for elections to be free and fair citizens must have freedom of expression, which allows their vote to represent their beliefs. Other pertinent guarantees Dahl identifies include the people's freedom to form and join organizations, the freedom of leaders to compete for political support, and the presence of institutions that make governments dependent upon votes and other expressions of preference.[201] This study will identify actors whose systems contain these essential elements that allow for the association between beliefs and voting to exist.

The use of the term democracy reflects both normative and procedural elements as discussed in Chapter One. An actor's primary qualification is a democratic form of government that fits those normative and procedural elements. The democratic idea that

---

[198] Philippe Schmitter and Terry Lynn Karl, "What Democracy Is…And Is Not," *Journal of Democracy* 2/3 (1991): 76.

[199] Gerald Alexander, "There Are No Alternatives to the 'Western' Model of Democracy," *The Brown Journal of World Affairs* 12, no. 1 (2005): 156.

[200] Ibid., 157.

[201] Robert Dahl, *Polyarchy* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1971), 3.

the people are responsible for their own government should be well-established in the nation's culture, based upon the principles of the sovereignty of the people, the popular will, the individual consent, and the freedom of religion. Tim Stanley identifies these ideas with Western liberalism:

> What the contemporary westerner really means when he or she says "democracy" is invariably "liberalism". Liberalism is interested in the guarantee and realisation of private liberty in faith, sexuality, business, speech and thought. It flourishes best when a country has divided powers, elected representatives and a maximum of self-government. Liberalism was the product of historical circumstances unique to the West: these include the anti-clericalism of the Reformation; the individualism of the French Revolution; the emergence of a politicised bourgeoisie during the Industrial Revolution; the rights-based language of feminism.[202]

This liberalism forms a normative foundation for the mechanisms that establish systems of accountability in democratic societies in the West.

Thomas Koelble and Edward Limupa discuss various studies regarding the measurements of the freedom and democratic nature of nations and conclude newly formed democratic systems will lag behind established North American and European nations.[203] As these systems mature, the details of the systems vary given the alternative cultural foundations; however, Koelble and Limupa assert they may be judged as democratic,

> to the extent to which governance conforms to the visions of democracy worked out by the governed. Thus, measuring a democracy necessarily entails the appreciation of the creation of those visions of democratic governance by the

---

[202] Tim Stanley, "The Democratic Delusion," *History Today* 61, no. 4 (2011): 40.

[203] Thomas Koelble and Edward Limupa, "Democratizing Democracy: A Postcolonial Critique of Conventional Approaches to the 'Measurement of Democracy,'" *Democratization* 15, no. 1 (2008), 2.

> governed, which, in turn, necessitates an appreciation of the processes and conditions under which these are produced.[204]

The non-Western nations possess alternative histories and cultures that do not explicitly preclude them from developing a democratic system but that require continued integration of and interactions with the normative and procedural principles of democracy. Given the varied expressions of democratic ideas worldwide, this study will narrow its examination to actors that share common cultural traditions and similar liberal democratic systems.

Procedurally, the nation's systems should countenance accountability, participation, negotiation and discussion, representation of interests, and legitimization of dissent. The presence of these democratic values is necessary, for it establishes the significance of the public's voice and drives a discussion of the influence of their beliefs on policy. Scholars point to various conditions that support the creation of an accountable, democratic system, which include economic equality, the structure of socioeconomic conflict, the presence of a robust civil society, and the need for a complex and deep-rooted legal tradition and system to protect the other elements of a democratic system. When reviewing these various proposed conditions, Alexander concludes that the litmus test rests in what conditions allow a democracy to endure through time. Time reveals whether a system embodied democratic accountability and was properly tied to the people's vote and expressions of preference.[205]

---

[204] Ibid., 3.

[205] Alexander, 160.

Systems with high levels of accountability to the citizenry are an outward manifestation of a respect for individual freedom, the value of human life, and the need for a government to restrain its citizens and to be restrained from a misuse of its power. This democratic standard has its foundation in Western philosophical ideas and Judeo-Christian religious beliefs and invariably precludes nations that have not had this influence from this current study. Joshua Mitchell argues that the modern idea within democracies of the equality of all men can be traced to the Christian notion of the equality of all men before God. He argues for a logical link from Martin Luther's Christology to Jean-Jacques Rousseau's radical view of the sovereignty of the people and the modern idea of equality.[206] Zachary Calo asserts that human rights norms rest on the sacredly tinged language of human dignity. The idea of human rights feeds off the inherited moral capital of its Christian religious roots, for Calo sees religion as the foundation of human rights and the liberal democratic order.[207] George Newlands points to the centrality of Jesus' incarnation as God and man, which manifests God's love to mankind, the image of God in man, and the imperative to Christians to respect their fellow man and to show practical kindness.[208] This Christian ethic sees the evil and abuses people continue to commit against one another and seeks "to diminish man's inhumanity to man, to discourage the torture, genocide and other manifest evils which

---

[206] Joshua Mitchell, "The Equality of All Under the One in Luther and Rousseau: Thoughts on Christianity and Political Theory," *The Journal of Religion* 72, no. 3 (1992): 351.

[207] Zachary Calo, "Religion, Human Rights and Post-Secular Legal Theory," *St. John's Law Review* 86 (2012): 495-520.

[208] George Newlands, *Christ and Human Rights: The Transformative Engagement* (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2006), 4, 48, 69.

remain a continuing and endemic feature of human society."[209] Democratic governmental systems grow out of these ideas as a means of restraining evil and protecting mankind from one another.

Given the primary assumption that people act upon their beliefs in all spheres of their lives, this study examines nations with governmental systems that are the product of beliefs that value the rule of law and freedom of thought. This does not require a religiously homogeneous national population but an overarching acceptance of the foundational ideas of the society. Religious freedom allows for alternative beliefs, but the rule of law requires everyone to abide by the same overarching legal requirements. Calo explains that religious pluralism is an essential expression of authentic religious freedom, for it reveals the capacity of a social order to permit the flourishing of alternative and completing loci of meaning. This shapes a legal order that maintains no partiality for a single religious group and equality for all before the law.[210] Such societies create the political space for belief to impact policy through established protocols and statutes, which all may access.

As will be discussed, Israel, the EU, and the U.S. meet these criteria and have the historical involvement necessary to designate them as key actors. This study will examine the possible influences that lead to the side each actor typically takes in the conflict. It will study the reasons the EU as a group of nations has typically stood with the

---

[209] Ibid., 4.

[210] Zachary Calo, "Islamic Headscarves, Religious Pluralism, and Secular Human Rights" (Paper presented at the conference of the International Consortium for Law and Religion Studies, Santiago, Chile, September 2011).

Palestinians, whereas the U.S. has allied itself with Israel. Israel may serve as a control group, for as one of the two primary actors in the conflict it will seek the best policies to defend the security and sovereignty of its state. However, this does not preclude internal debate over which policies best exemplify this goal and does not imply a lack of divisions within Israeli society. By examining the varied religious influences and policies within Israel, one may better understand what motivates its policy decisions in the conflict, which draw some to Israel's side and deter others.

Omitted Actors

The Palestinians and the PLO, the Arab states, and Russia are three key actors omitted from this study. While the Palestinians and the PLO leadership lay at the heart of the conflict and may not be dismissed, their indeterminate nationhood and continued structural struggles within the Palestinian Authority prevent one from drawing conclusions that may be substantiated with an established system or a historical record of action. While the PLO will not be analyzed as a main policy actor in this study, it is useful for future discussion of policy briefly to summarize the history, ideology, and relationship of the PLO with the other actors analyzed.

The Palestine Liberation Organization (PLO) rose out of the first summit of the Arab League in January 1964. This organization was tasked with challenging Israel to liberate the Palestinian people and remove such responsibility from the Arab nations directly. King Hussein of Jordan convened a Palestinian National Council to form the group and create the Palestinian Liberation Army (PLA). Though Palestinians filled the ranks of this organization, the Arab nations continued to control much of what it did in

the early years.[211] In 1967, the Palestinian National Council (PNC) elected Yasser Arafat as the chairman of the executive committee of the PLO, a position he retained until his death in 2004. The initial PLO charter and its amendments in 1968 negated Israel's right to exist and supported armed struggle to liberate the Palestinian people. Due to these tenets, Israel refused to deal with the PLO until it changed its charter.[212]

After the 1967 War, the PLO underwent a radical transformation from an instrument in the hand of the Arab nations to a Palestinian national organization that pursued the Palestinian nationalist desires according to the terms of its charter. This transformation corresponded with a growing identity among Palestinians as a single people and boosted their identity with the land they lost. While the emerging PLO embraced its unity with the Arab world through pan-Arabism, it refused the Arab nations' attempts to move it away from armed struggle towards an internationally recognized national movement.[213]

Early in its existence the PLO claimed all the territory of Mandate Palestine as necessary for a sovereign Palestinian state. Today most expect only the territories of the West Bank and the Gaza Strip, though the details of the creation of a Palestinian state within those boundaries are still disputed. The Arab states made multiple attempts to get the PLO to a place where they might negotiate with Israel in the 1970s and 1980s, but the organization's uncompromising ideology and use of violence against Israel stalled any

---

[211] Bickerton and Klausner, 140.

[212] Ibid., 156.

[213] Avraham Sela, "Introduction," in *The PLO and Israel: From Armed Conflict to Political Settlement, 1964-1994*, eds., Avraham Sela and Moshe Ma'oz (New York: St. Martin's Press, 1997), ix.

attempts. The PLO accepted the possibility of a two-state solution in the territories and Resolutions 242 and 338 in November 1988 when it adopted a declaration of independence with objectives for its movement. Leading up to this, the PLO leadership began to center its work in the territories and began to consider political reconciliation as a future bargaining chip with Israel. The major shift in PLO policy came in 1992 at the Madrid Conference, where it shifted its political discourse to pragmatic arguments on political accommodation rather than staunch ideology. These shifts prepared the way for the 1993 Oslo Peace Accords and the new Palestinian Authority that rose out of it.[214]

Because of its charter's stated denial of Israel's right to exist and the organization's association with terrorism, Israel and the U.S. did not recognize the PLO as the representative of a nationalist Palestinian movement until 1991. The UN recognized PLO as the "sole legitimate representative of the Palestinian people" and has given it observer status since 1974.[215] Peace negotiations went through Arab nations until the Madrid Conference. The Oslo Peace Accords were significant in that they offered recognition to Israel from the PLO and to the PLO as the representative of a Palestinian people from Israel. In letters in conjunction with the Peace Accords, Arafat agreed to remove the controversial clauses of the PLO charter.[216]

---

[214] Manual Hassassian, "Policy and Attitude Changes in the Palestine Liberation Organization, 1965-1994: A Democracy in the Making," in *The PLO and Israel: From Armed Conflict to Political Settlement, 1964-1994*, eds., Avraham Sela and Moshe Ma'oz (New York: St. Martin's Press, 1997), 73-74, 84.

[215] Madiha Rashid al Madfai, *Jordan, the United States and the Middle East Peace Process, 1974–1991* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1993), 21.

[216] Sean McMahon, *The Discourse of Palestinian-Israeli Relations: Persistent Analytics and Practices* (New York: Routledge, 2010), 91-92.

As the PLO and the Palestinian Authority fail to qualify as actors for this study, the Arab states lack a sustained democratic experience and faithful implementation of its norms. The so-called "Arab Spring" in the beginning of 2011 gave many in the Arab states a taste of democracy; however, the progression towards established and functioning democracies in the region remains ongoing. In its *Freedom in the World 2012* survey, Freedom House observed a positive trend in political rights and civil liberties in Egypt, Tunisia, and Libya, though Egypt retained the designation "Not Free" while Tunisia and Libya moved to "Partially Free."[217] Freedom House observed that determined and violent attempts to overthrow autocrats in other countries offset the gains in the region of these few. It documented a decline in civil liberties of a number of states as the authoritarian regimes in Syria, Saudi Arabia, Bahrain, and Yemen responded to the Arab Spring with repression to secure their power. [218] As such, Freedom House continues to list the majority of the Arab states as "Not Free" in 2012 based on the lack of political and civil rights among the populace.[219]

Public opinion is likely to have a greater impact on policy in systems with electoral accountability, whereas in personalized authoritarian regimes, like those in many parts of the Middle East, public opinion and beliefs may only have an indirect impact on policy when leaders attempt to shore up legitimacy against rival attacks or

---

[217] Arch Puddington, "Freedom in the World 2012, The Arab Uprising and Their Global Repercussions," http://www.freedomhouse.org/sites/default/files/inline_images/FIW%202012%20Booklet--Final.pdf (Accessed February 14, 2012): 15, 16, 18.

[218] Ibid., 1.

[219] Ibid., 14-18.

when a crisis arouses the general public.[220] In many cases, as has happened in response to the Arab Spring, authoritarian regimes suppress public opinion to retain their control of the country. Without governmental systems that are responsive and accountable to their people and without the normative foundations to build such systems, the potential correlation between the citizens' beliefs and the actions of the government grows feebler.

With the fall of the Soviet Union, most expected Russia to follow the path toward democracy. However, in the past two decades, Russian democratization has encountered an array of obstacles extending from the nation's autocratic past. Alongside the debate over the absence or existence of a democratic political culture and civil society in Russia, Christopher Marsh adds survey results that find devout Orthodox Christians favoring the form of democracy but slow to translate that into political involvement.[221]

Nikolai Petrov defines the system of state administration that developed under President Vladimir Putin as a "highly managed democracy." In this context, Petrov uses the term democracy not to imply the system has a democratic foundation but rather to refer to the protodemocracy of the Yeltsin period.[222] Petrov defines this highly managed democratic style that Putin erected as "A complex, multilevel political construction that enables the authorities to escape public oversight and accountability while preserving the

---

[220] Raymond Hinnebusch, "Introduction: The Analytical Framework," in *The Foreign Policies of Middle East States*, eds., Raymond Hinnebusch and Anoushiravan Ehteshami, (Boulder, CO: Lynne Rienner Publishers, 2002), 17.

[221] Christopher Marsh, "Orthodox Christianity, Civil Society, and Russian Democracy," *Demokratizatsiya* 13, no. 3 (2005): 459.

[222] Nikolai Petrov, "The Political Mechanics of the Russian Regime," *Russian Politics and Law* 49, no. 2 (2011): 35.

appearance of democratic procedures. It incorporates three levels of control: (1) control over actors; (2) control over institutions; and (3) control over rules of the game."[223] Petrov sees intrinsic contradictions in the system that will either cause it to continue to slide into authoritarianism or to turn back toward democracy.[224]

Regardless of the direction it goes, Freedom House also marks the conditions within Russia's political sphere as "Not Free."[225] Though Russia has a history of participation in Middle East affairs and in the Arab-Israeli conflict, the apparent lack of cultural democratic foundations coupled with the current system's centralized and authoritarian elements create a gap in the potential link necessary for this thesis analysis. Those within the government hold power without any effective accountability from the people, which divests the citizenry of its power to affect policy.

Israel

The State of Israel was founded as a democratic and Jewish nation. According to Benjamin Neuberger, the nation conforms generally to the Western liberal democratic standards. Though the religion-state relations in Israel have raised a number of questions, Neuberger asserts that the system is still democratic in that it results from agreements reached and laws enacted by a democratically elected parliament.[226] Looking back to the

---

[223] Ibid., 36.

[224] Ibid., 35.

[225] Puddington, 17.

[226] Benjamin Neuberger, "Religion and State in Europe and Israel," in *Parties, Elections & Cleavages: Israel in Comparative Perspective*, eds., Reuven Hazan and Moshe Maor (London: Cass, 1999), 65–84.

state's beginnings at the UN vote for partition, Bickerton and Klausner assert that partition was most likely successful because in a United Nations made up predominately of Western European nations, at the time the Jews were perceived as Western as opposed to the Eastern Arabs.[227] Israel fits the qualifications for this study in that it has maintained a fairly stable democratic system since its establishment. The ideological foundations of this system rely in part on its citizens' European backgrounds. The Jewish character of the state creates a degree of particularism in the society that could favor Jewish ideas and minimize the influence of other groups within the nation. While this concern is valid and will be addressed later in the chapter, a macro view of Israel's society and government establishes it as a nation that supports the Western ideals and procedures of the democratic system and that may be analyzed alongside other democratic nations.

The European Union

The European Union is unique in its basic structure, uniting twenty-seven individual member states under one government, economy, and set of laws. The member states remain nations in their own right with internal governmental system, economies, and laws, but in joining the Union the norms and values of the whole impact the national actions of the parts. The combination of nations with varied histories and cultural values has the potential either to create confusion and struggle or to impose a single rule to which all must conform. The question arises whether there is sufficient unity among the

[227] Bickerton and Klausner, 87.

national populaces of the member states to study the Union as a single actor with generalizable aspects.

The EU structures are based on and promote the key norms and procedures of the Western democratic tradition. EU politics increasingly depend upon citizens' support through referenda and European elections.[228] Nations applying for accession to the Union must accede to the treaties and must meet the Copenhagen criteria established at the 1993 Copenhagen European Council. For the European Council to begin negotiations with a nation, the following must be true:

> Stability of institutions guaranteeing democracy, the rule of law, human rights and respect for and protection of minorities; A functioning market economy as well as the ability to cope with the pressure of competition and the market forces at work inside the Union; The ability to assume the obligations of membership, in particular adherence to the objectives of political, economic and monetary union.[229]

These collective criteria allow for sufficient generalization to study the member states of the Union as a single democratic actor. At a minimum, they allow for the potential influence of religious views without necessarily permitting their actual influence.

The following sections will evaluate whether these initial common denominators carry over into the Union's and the member states' policies towards the Israeli-Palestinian conflict, or whether in this instance member states are more likely to act alone. Within the Union's general democratic character, it designated a freedom for religions to exist and influence society, though the following sections will also examine

---

[228] Claes H. De Vreese et al., "Introduction: Religion and the European Union," *Western European Politics* 32, no. 6 (2009): 1183.

[229] European Commission, "Conditions for Enlargement," http://ec.europa.eu/enlargement/the-policy/conditions-for-enlargement/index_en.htm (Accessed December 3, 2011).

whether the space given to religion in the EU is consistent with that given to religion in Israel and the United States and whether the plurality of religious traditions among the citizens of the EU nations affects the Union's joint policy towards the conflict.

The United States

The United States rose out of a unique revolution, guided by those who stood on the shoulders of Reformers, Puritans, Empiricists, and Common Law Theorists. The governmental system they created embodied the ideals of accountability, direct and indirect representation, rule of law, and personal freedom. Scholars often attribute the system the Founders created to the principles Jefferson stated in the Declaration of Independence of all having equal rights to freedom. The Framers of the Constitution fragmented the governmental power to protect these rights.[230] While the Founders relied heavily on natural law in their formation of the new nation, Alexis de Tocqueville observed that the Puritans were the initial founders of American society and imparted their character and morals to the nation's future development. As some of the first settlers in the colonies, they first brought the ideas of equal freedom to American, which shaped its national character in ways that have sustained this principle throughout its history.[231] James Madison expressed the enduring influence of the Puritan doctrine of the total

---

[230] For examples of these arguments, see James Ceasar et al., *American Government: Origins, Institutions, and Public Policy* (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1984) and Robert Kraynak, "Tocqueville's Constitutionalism," *American Political Science Review* 81 (1987): 1175-95.

[231] Alexis de Tocqueville, *Democracy in America* (Vol. 1 originally published, 1835; Vol. 2 originally published 1840). Ed. and trans. Harvey Mansfield and Debla Winthrop (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2000), 32-39.

depravity of man in "The Federalist No. 51" in his discussion of the rightful division of power within the new government.

> [Government] may be a reflection on human nature, that such devices should be necessary to control the abuses of government. But what is government itself, but the greatest of all reflections on human nature? If men were angels, no government would be necessary….In framing a government which is to be administered by men over men, the great difficulty lies in this: you must first enable the government to control the governed; and in the next place oblige it to control itself. A dependence on the people is, no doubt, the primary control on the government; but experience has taught mankind the necessity of auxiliary precautions.[232]

The Founders rejected the idea of the innate goodness of mankind and structured a government that would balance ambition against ambition, checking the power of the government with the people and the will of the people with the government.

In the First Amendment, the Founders respected the freedom of religion and refrained from institutionalizing a particular church or set of beliefs in the government. Disestablishment did not equate to an absolute separation of the church from the state, for the "vast majority of Americans assumed theirs was a Christian, i.e. Protestant, country, and they automatically expected that government would uphold the commonly agreed upon Protestant ethos and morality."[233] From these beginnings as a nation grounded in

---

[232] James Madison, "The Federalist No. 51, The Structure of the Government Must Furnish the Proper Checks and Balances Between the Different Departments," in *The Federalist Papers*, eds., Alexander Hamilton, James Madison, and John Jay (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2009).

[233] Thomas J. Curry, *The First Freedoms: Church and State in America to the Passage of the First Amendment* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1986), 219. See also Thomas E. Buckley, "After Disestablishment: Thomas Jefferson's Wall of Separation in Antebellum Virginia," *Journal of Southern History* 61 (August 1995): 445–80; John Wilson, *Public Religion in American Culture* (Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 1979), 8–9; John West, *The Politics of Revelation and Reason: Religion and Civic Life in the New Nation* (Lawrence, KS: University Press of Kansas, 1996); Daniel Dreisbach, *Thomas Jefferson and the Wall of Separation between Church and State* (New York: New York University Press, 2002); and Philip Hamburger, *Separation of Church and State: A Theologically Liberal, Anti-Catholic, and American Principle* (Chicago: University of Chicago Law School, 2002).

many biblical ideas, the nation has grown, expanded, and changed. For over two hundred years, the system and rights it guarantees have remained mostly stable.

In the twentieth century, U.S. presidents represented America as an emblem of freedom and democracy, beginning with Wilson's crusade to make the world safe for democracy, which subsequent presidents continued with assaults on fascism and communism. In the wake of World War II, the U.S. buttressed the recovering democracies of Western Europe and helped to fashion new systems for the defeated Axis Powers. Recovery after the war and the fight against communism joined the U.S. ideas and system with the new European collaboration. Today, the U.S. continues to rank on Freedom House's index as a fully free nation politically.[234]

The United States along with Israel and the nations of the European Union have established methods of government accountability. The regular change of leadership and the variation of parties that gain power demonstrate systems that respond to the will of their people. Therefore, as societies that value the opinions of the people, the following chapter will examine the religious influences within those societies that affect the populace and that may be associated with their foreign policies.

[234] Puddington, 18.

CHAPTER FOUR

RELIGIOUS INFLUENCES

This study centers on religious beliefs and their effects on actions. Within democratic societies, such as those found in Israel, the European Union, and the United States, the principles of religious freedom and of the rule of the people counterbalance one another to grant space in policymaking for religious influences. In order to evaluate the extent of the impact of the religious cultures of the three actors on their policy in the Israeli-Palestinian conflict, this section will outline the major religious contingents within each country or group of countries.

Israel

Michael Brecher grounds the foundation of Israel's society in its Jewishness: "For Israel's high policy elite as for the entire society, there is a primordial and pre-eminent aspect of the political culture – its Jewishness: this pervades thought, feeling, belief and behaviour in the political realm."[235] The Jewish nature of the State of Israel has created a continuous struggle over the relationship between religion and the state in the democratic

[235] Brecher, 229.

nation. As'ad Ganim observes: "Since Israel's establishment, religion has established political parties and coalitions, caused governments to collapse, played a central role in all public discourse and constituted the essence of the state's cultural as well as religious identity."[236] While the nation's founders were nationalist and secular Zionists, certain groups of the religious Zionists represent a significant contingent of religiously motivated groups within Israel and seek to use politics to achieve its religious goals. They have sought key positions in administrative government agencies to give them influence over housing for settlements and education to spread their ideological views to the broader public.[237] Their religious influence appears predominant in Israel, but this section will discuss it in the context of the other competing ideologies within the culture and government.

Zionism refers to the desire for the Jewish people to return to the land of Palestine and establish a nation. Israel's founders generally ascribed to a nationalist and secular Zionism that sought to establish a homeland for the Jewish people for the sake of security and freedom from victimization. However, the ideas of *Eretz Yisrael* ("Land of Israel") and a return to the land from exile reverberated deeply in the Jewish tradition, religiously and culturally. Any return to the land between the Mediterranean and the Jordan River invariably awakened strong religious fervor. Throughout their history, the majority of Jews saw *Eretz Yisrael* as the cradle of the Jewish people's existence. It occupied a special status in Jewish religious doctrine. Longing for the land had deep religious

---

[236] Ganim, 79.

[237] Baumgart-Ochse, 1132.

meaning, for Jewish prayers, festivals, and coffins were directed to the Holy Land.[238] The mingling of this historical religious fervor for the land with the modern nationalist aspirations of the twentieth century created a unique religious and societal culture in Israel with competing beliefs.

The secular Zionism that Theodor Herzl popularized at the end of the nineteenth century grew out of a deeply pessimistic prognosis for Jewish existence in Europe. This pessimism rejected the prevailing wisdom from the time of the Enlightenment. Enlightenment philosophy proposed that Jews could become normal, free, equal, and assimilated citizens in Gentile societies and that Jews were no longer a people or separate nation but were equal citizens in their countries.[239] The symbolism of the trial of Alfred Dreyfus for treason in France led Herzl to reconsider these assumptions and to conclude that the modern Jew could not hide behind philosophical abstractions, civic reforms, or assimilation. The Jew could become a naturalized citizen, but his Jewish nature would always separate him from the Gentiles around him.[240] Rejecting the Enlightenment philosophies that attempted to turn individual Jews into normal, free, and equal citizens, Herzl, along with Moses Hess and Leon Pinsker, sought to make the Jews normal, free, and equal as a collective. They believed that only within the framework of a Jewish state

---

[238] Ganim, 80.

[239] Ofira Seliktar, *New Zionism and the Foreign Policy System of Israel* (Carbondale, IL: Southern Illinois University Press, 1986), 46, 48.

[240] Ibid., 50.

would the Jews become equal among the peoples of the world, a "nation like all other nations."[241]

When Zionism emerged in Europe in the late nineteenth century, traditional rabbinical authorities rejected its overtly secular national tenets. Though the Jewish religious community maintained a longing for Zion and *Eretz Yisrael*, they adopted a passive stance in realizing the desire, prohibiting any action by Jews to try to force an end of their exile. They believed God had imposed this exile, and only He could redeem His people and bring them back to the land. The way to hasten this redemption was through prayer and strict observation of Jewish law. As such, the rabbinical authorities in Europe condemned the early *aliyahs* (waves of immigration) as false messianism.[242]

Rabbi Abraham Isaac HaCohen Kook bridged the expanse between the religious Jews and the secular Zionists. Claudia Baumgart-Ochse explains:

> While traditional rabbinic theology believed that the holiness of the Land of Israel was conditioned on the observation of the commandments, Kook conceived of holiness as a quality inherent to the land because of God's presence. He therefore concluded that "the real and organic holiness of Jewry can become manifest only by the return of the people to its land, the only path that can lead to its renascence." Only in the Land of Israel could the Jewish people be a vessel for God's eternal light. Combining mystical and kabbalistic thought with European dialectical philosophy, Kook argued that the secular Zionists were in fact fulfilling God's plan without being aware of it.[243]

As the first Chief Rabbi of the Jewish community in Palestine, Kook's theology sanctified the secular nationalists' vision and allowed the religious and secular to work

---

[241] Ibid., 51.

[242] Baumgart-Ochse, 1121.

[243] Ibid.

towards a similar goal. However, the secular-socialist leadership of the Labor Party marginalized this approach during the decades of the establishment of the State of Israel and the subsequence process of nation-building. With the Israeli victory and acquisition of the Arab territories in 1967, Kook's theology re-emerged. The return of cherished religious landmarks and a reconnection with the land created a renewed theological-messianic reading of the events among many Jews. They invested all their energies into the "liberation" and settlement of the territories, seeing themselves as the *avant garde* pioneers of a religious version of Zionism.[244]

In the modern Israeli state, the mission and nature of the state still creates conflicts among the secularists, the traditional religious Orthodox, and the groups such as Gush Emunim that embrace Kookist theology and see the land as the means of their redemption. Secular Jewish identity among the citizens is slowly moving away from traditional Jewish culture and drawing its main inspiration from universal values. In the early stages of nation-building, secular Jews permitted restrictions on individual rights in the form of legislated Jewish cultural elements such as the pig-related prohibitions and Shabbat laws for the sake of the communal good. Today, however, more Israelis are less inclined to support limits on individual freedom.[245] Secular leaders in the Labor Party beginning with Yitzhak Rabin in the 1990s demonstrated their dedication to the principles of peace and security in "land for peace" negotiations.[246] Rabin looked back to

---

[244] Ibid., 1122.

[245] Barak-Erez, 12-13.

[246] Jefferis, 153.

the civil and secular heritage of Zionism's roots and argued that if Israel was to be a liberal democracy instead of an isolated, ethno-nationalist warrior state, it would have to abandon its undemocratic rule over the occupied territories.[247]

Such dealings diametrically opposed all that settlement groups like Gush Emunim sought to achieve. Every part of the land the Labor leaders were willing to trade for peace was a means of redemption in the eyes of Gush Emunim, for they believed every piece of the land was holy. While very successful in creating and maintaining settlements in the occupied territories, Gush Emunim also endeavored to forge a stronger ideological foundation for the settlements by transforming the national dialogue regarding the settlements and the territory from one about political strategy and security to one about religious covenants.[248] The religious Zionists designated the Land of Israel as a constitutive element of the Jewish identity of the state. To maintain the "Jewishness" of the state, security issues and religious beliefs merged together into one new dimension, viewing defense issues and policies from a Jewish perspective.[249] The settlers' zeal for the land and dissatisfaction with the Labor Party's choices in the peace process manifested themselves in the assassination of Prime Minister Rabin in 1995.

---

[247] Baumgart-Ochse, 1228.

[248] Jefferis, 157.

[249] Baumgart-Ochse, 1129.

The European Union

The European Union has often been called a club of Christian nations, particularly in reference to the potential for Turkey's accession. However, before the Treaty of Amsterdam in 1997, the EU documents and organizations rarely concerned themselves with religious communities. The EU addressed religious issues through the European Convention for the Protection of Human Rights and Fundamental Freedoms of 1950. Omission of statements regarding religion created apparent neutrality for the Union.[250] The new so-called "religious clause" of the Treaty of Amsterdam contained only a statement on the status of churches and religious organizations. It stated that the "European Union respects and does not prejudice the status under national law of churches and religious associations or communities in the Member States. The European Union equally respected the status of philosophical and non-confessional organizations." Though religious groups have criticized the formal aspect of this statement, churches have welcomed the distinct identity they now enjoy within the Union.[251]

Studies of religion in Europe differ in their approach and understanding of religiosity from those focused on groups in the United States or Israel. The Union as an institution has avoided the religious question until recently and has remained closer to the French idea of *laïcité*, which denotes the active intellectual affirmation of secular values and secular forms of reasoning, argument, and explanation.[252] The accession of a number

---

[250] Krystian Complak, "Will Poland Be the Most Confessional State of the European Union?" *Jurisprudence* 1, no. 119 (2010): 89-90.

[251] Ibid., 90.

[252] Sa'adah, 92.

of the former Soviet states to the Union in 2004 and 2007 changed the religious demographic slightly of the Union, for most of the nations had very small Muslim communities and higher Catholic and lower Protestant members than the EU averages.[253] Therefore, to retain unity among the increasing diversity of the member states, the EU based the substance of membership in a commitment to the so-called "shared values" of the EU as expressed in its constituent documents. This creates a European identity distinct from national or religious identities, which is based on common principles and rights.[254] The shared core norms the EU treaties, foreign policy declarations, policies, and practices identify center around peace, liberty, democracy, rule of law, and human rights.[255] While such principles found their naissance in conjunction with Christian religious beliefs, they have been secularized in the modern uses, and multilateralism and international law, norms, rules, co-operation, and integration have become the foundation of integration and humanistic concerns.[256]

Religiosity as a measure of conviction and dedication to a religious system of beliefs does not necessarily correlate directly to a person's religious label. Despite the acknowledged secularism of many European countries, citizens still apply religious self-identifying labels when surveyed. As an example, the Catholic Church has shaped the history and culture of modern France, even as many fought to eliminate the Catholic

---

[253] Balázs Schanda, "Religion and State in the Candidate Countries to the European Union – Issues Concerning Religion and State in Hungary," *Sociology of Religion* 64, no. 3 (2003): 333.

[254] Sonia Morano-Foadi, "EU Citizenship and Religious Liberty in an Enlarged Europe," *European Law Journal* 16, no. 4 (2010): 418.

[255] Cavatorta and Tonra, 353.

[256] Ibid., 352.

Church's power and relevance. French people, no matter how distant personally from the Church, will be familiar with its positions and teaching.[257] Indeed, a 2007 survey found that 78.8 percent of French people called themselves Catholic;[258] however, a study done by the Pew Research Center found that when the French were asked if they believed religion was very important, thirteen percent responded "yes." Only fifteen percent of those French surveyed agreed that belief in God was necessary to have good morals and values.[259]

Surveys show that the largest contingent of people in the EU overall identify themselves as Catholic, the second largest group as Protestant, and the third as Muslim.[260] With increasing levels of immigration and higher birth rates among immigrant groups, the plurality of the once homogenous European nations is growing significantly. When examining the relationship between religion and EU politics, Claes De Vreese, Hajo Boomgaarden, Michael Minkenberg, and Rens Vliegenthart documented that in the years from 1980 to 2000 religious pluralism increased in all surveyed nations, with the exception of Sweden.[261] They determined from the data collected that the religious pluralism of nations with longer histories of immigration and/or biconfessionalism, such as the Netherlands, the United Kingdom, and Germany, has increased from already high

---

[257] Sa'adah, 92.

[258] De Vreese et al., 1184.

[259] Pew Research Center's Global Attitudes Project, "American Exceptionalism Subsides: The American-Western European Value Gap," Released November 17, 2011. Available at www.pewglobal.org.

[260] Ibid.

[261] Nations surveyed with religious pluralism increases: Austria, Belgium, Denmark, Finland, France, Germany, Ireland, Italy, the Netherlands, Spain, and the United Kingdom.

levels. Among the Western European countries that are traditionally more Catholic, with the exception of Denmark which is predominantly Protestant, the increases in pluralism started from comparatively lower levels and have been more pronounced. All these changes amount to a significant shift in the religious composition of European societies, which may have implications for the role religion plays in EU politics.[262]

The European Union *acquis* committed the community to the protection of religious freedom worldwide and to fighting against discrimination on the grounds of race, ethnicity, faith, and political belief. Within its own domains, many have questioned the religiosity of its citizens. In 1992, the then President of the European Commission Jacques Delors said: "If in the next ten years we haven't managed to give a Soul to Europe, to give it spirituality and meaning the game will be up."[263] In response to this, President Delors set up the Forward Studies Unit (FSU) to establish channels of dialogue between the EU and faith communities and other belief groups. In order to facilitate exchanges between the EU and religious and philosophical groups and to bypass the institutional constraint of religious neutrality, the Commission gathered a group of individuals to form the *Comité de Sélection* ("Selection Committee") of the "Soul of Europe," which it entrusted to reflect on the contribution of faith communities to the establishment of peace in Europe. While many welcomed the opportunity for religious and other belief organizations to come to the fore and engage in the politics of Europe, the name given the group brought with it a lot of criticism. Intellectually, the idea of

---

[262] De Vreese et al., 1184.

[263] Sara Silvestri, "Islam and Religion in the EU Political System," *West European Politics* 32, no. 6 (2009): 1217.

"giving a soul" to Europe implied it did not already have one. Many pointed to the courage and determination necessary for the unification of Europe as a clear example that Europe had a soul. Hans-Georg Gadamer spoke of a "spiritual unity" among Europeans as a "reality" and "duty" that was underlying human activities and emotions in Europe.[264] Therefore, though the terminology was ill-chosen, the Committee both demonstrated a desire to see religion play a part in European politics as well as a lack of observable influence before that time.

The FSU also focused its studies on the integration of Muslims into European culture.[265] Immigration of Muslims has been a reality in Europe since the end of World War II. Europeans face the question of how best to accommodate and naturalize Islam, how Muslims can become "European" without ceasing to be Muslim.[266] Muslims emigrated from their countries of origin for a number of reasons, including the end of colonialism, turmoil and civil wars in Muslim countries, and European nations allowing former colonial citizens the rights of immigration.[267] The European nations invited Turkish, Algerian, Moroccan, Tunisian, and Pakistani immigrants in the postwar labor shortage of the 1950s and 1960s to help spur Europe's economic recovery. No host country expected these laborers to stay, particularly once the recession hit in the 1970s.

---

[264] Ibid., 1217-1218.

[265] Ibid., 1219.

[266] Shireen Hunter and Simon Serfaty, "Introduction," in *Islam: Europe's Second Religion*, ed., Shireen Hunter (Westport, CT: Praeger Publishers, 2002), xv.

[267] Ibid., xi, xiii.

However, their families joined them, and a new generation of European Turks, Algerians, Moroccans, Tunisians, and Pakistanis was born.[268]

As Muslims began to settle in European countries, Europeans saw the traditions they brought including dietary restrictions, head scarves, beards, and prayers as challenges to the European secular or religious cultural identity and values.[269] In addition to the Muslim traditions they brought, the immigrants also retained links to their countries of origin. These countries' concerns influenced the new immigrants through official imams and provisions the countries of origin made for financial assistance to various European mosques and institutions, which included salaries for imams.[270] The Muslim community added a strong pro-Palestinian dedication, which they grounded in their sense of the *umma* (Muslim worldwide community) that obliged them to defend the cause of their Muslim brethren. The Islamic sacredness of Jerusalem and various other sites in the West Bank added fervor to their support of the Palestinian side of the conflict. With modern opportunities for increased citizenship among Muslims and with their higher birth rates, the Muslim community in Europe is slowly gaining ground as a vocal foreign policy lobby.[271]

---

[268] Omar Taspinar, "Europe's Muslim Street," *Foreign Policy* 135 (2003): 76.

[269] Hunter and Serfaty, xiv.

[270] Remy Leveau and Shireen Hunter, "Islam in France," in *Islam: Europe's Second Religion*, ed., Shireen Hunter (Westport, CT: Praeger Publishers, 2002), 14-15.

[271] Taspinar, 76.

The United States

A number of different Christian religious groups originally settled the American colonies. This Christian foundation has remained prominent in varying ways throughout the country's history. While exploring the influence religion has on American foreign policy, Walter Mead focuses primarily on American Evangelicals, because "Protestantism has shaped much of the country's identity and remains today the majority faith in the United States…. Catholicism…present[s] a more mixed picture with fewer foreign policy implications. And finally, the remaining religious groups in the United States are significantly less influential when it comes to the country's politics."[272] In a survey done in 2003 for the *Encyclopedia of Christianity*, 52.3 percent of respondents in the U.S. identified themselves as Protestant and 20.8 percent identified themselves as Catholic. [273] Of the 28 percent that identified themselves as nondenominational Protestants, 80 percent were Evangelical Christians.[274] In evaluating a study done by the Pew Research Center, Baumgartner, Francia, and Morris found that "evangelical affiliation is the only religious indicator that consistently influences public opinion on foreign policy."[275] Mead points out that the Evangelical influence in government stems from the rising power of the conservative Christian Right at the end of the twentieth century. Evangelicals often join their influence with other groups in the political realm.

---

[272] Walter Russell Mead, "God's Country?" *Foreign Affairs* 85, no. 5 (2006): 5.

[273] John Bowden, ed., *Encyclopedia of Christianity* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2005), 32, 94, 404.

[274] Wald, 161.

[275] Ibid., 177.

They work with the Jewish lobby on matters pertaining to Israel. They find common cause with American Muslims on many moral issues, such as the global poverty in Africa, the disrespect among the media for religious figures and values, and the growing influence of secularization in public and international discourse.[276]

In matters pertaining to the Arab-Israeli conflict, one would expect the American Jews and Muslims to exert substantial influence. While their influence is not inconsequential, their respective people group size within the context of the overall American population may limit their impact. In addition, a comparison of the National Jewish Population Surveys of 1990 and 2000/2001 found an overall pattern of decreasing emotional attachment among American Jews to Israel. In the decade between the surveys, membership in major American Jewish organizations decreased by 20%. The survey found that younger American Jews were less likely than their elders to agree with statements regarding the unity of all Jews worldwide, the responsibility to rescue Jews rather than non-Jews, and their responsibility to care for Jews in need around the world. Though their political support for Israel remains, the declining emotional attachment illustrated in the survey appears to correlate with a decreased amount of political activism for Israel.[277]

Unlike the American Jews, American Muslims have only recently begun to enter the political sphere. In his history of Islam in America, Kambiz GhaneaBassiri found that Muslim political activist groups did not attempt to join into the American political realm

---

[276] Mead, 14-15.

[277] Chaim Waxman, "Beyond Distancing: Jewish Identity, Identification, and America's Young Jews," *Contemporary Jewry* 30, no. 2/3 (2010): 229.

until the 1980s, but they struggled to define how to represent all Muslims in the country in a united and accurate manner. American Muslim leaders called for the community to unite and overcome their lack of effectiveness, but this proved difficult because foreign issues concerned the Muslim people more than any domestic trouble. Overall, the Muslim population that chose to vote was small in the late 1980s and early 1990s. The Muslim community has begun to find its place in politics, but the strength of its influence is still growing slowly. The first Muslim Congressman came into office only a few years ago.[278]

While both Jewish and Muslim groups advocate within the American political sphere, this review of the religious influences within the United States will focus on the large contingent of Evangelical Christians. Their combination of size with their strong political activism makes them a potentially significant religious influence within the U.S. and on policy. In the context of the Arab-Israeli conflict, the scope of examination will be narrowed further to those Christians among the Evangelicals who espouse the views of the Christian Zionists. This focus does not signify that all Christian Evangelicals are Christian Zionists, but that generally Christian Zionists are self-professed Evangelicals.

Stephen Spector states: "Evangelical Christians are so individualistic and diverse that it's hard to identify and count them, much less to define their theology or measure their political convictions definitively."[279] He dates the beginning of the modern evangelical movement from the spiritual renewals that occurred in the eighteenth century

---

[278] Kambiz GhaneaBassiri, *A History of Islam in America: From the New World to the New World Order* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2010), 313, 317.

[279] Spector, 36.

during the Great Awakening in the U.S. and Britain.[280] The foundational ideas of Christian Zionism emerged within Evangelical circles in the late nineteenth century with William Blackstone's book *Jesus Is Coming* and the Scofield Reference Bible. It also relied on the teachings of William Hechler who said that the destiny of Christians was simply to help restore Jews to Palestine rather than to evangelize them.[281] His teaching coincided with Theodor Herzl's calls for a political Jewish state[282] and fit with the teaching of other Zionists of the day such as Rabbi Yehuda Alkalai who said that "there is no greater [repentance] than for us to accept upon ourselves His Godliness, that is, to return to His land…That is to say, when God will be our God, which is, when we return to His land."[283] Therefore, in the twentieth century the Christian Zionist movement continued to develop alongside the political Zionist movement.

Christian Zionism grew out of a conviction that God has a continuing special relationship with and covenantal purpose for the Jewish people apart from the Church and that the Jewish people have a divine right to possess the land of Palestine.[284] These beliefs rest upon the ideas of premillennial dispensationalist eschatology Blackstone and Scofield taught and focus on the political elements of dispensationalism that call for the

---

[280] Ibid., 37.

[281] Ibid., 61.

[282] Victoria Clark, *Allies for Armageddon: The Rise of Christian Zionism* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2007), 99.

[283] Waxman, "Messianism, Zionism," 180.

[284] Sizer, *Christian Zionism*, 20.

defense and blessing of the Jewish people.[285] According to Colin Chapman, this premillennial dispensationalism taught:

> Although Jesus as the Messiah is the fulfillment of all the promises and prophecies of the Old Testament, the promises and prophecies about the land and about biblical Israel remain the same even after his coming and need to be interpreted literally. Because of the promise to Abraham, therefore, the Jewish people have a special, divine right to the land for all times.[286]

From this belief that the promises to Abraham still apply to the Jewish people as his descendants, Christian Zionist teaching interprets God's promise in Genesis 12:3 that He will bless those who bless Abraham and will curse those who curse him, thus requiring Christians to continue to bless all Jews.[287] With the establishment of the State of Israel, this conviction took on greater political ramifications.

Christian Zionists continue to teach that God has blessed the U.S. because it has blessed the State of Israel and the Jewish people in general.[288] By implication, if the U.S. turns its back on Israel, God will turn His back on the U.S. Key Evangelical leaders who embrace Christian Zionism have expressed this belief. In 1980, Jerry Falwell invoked Genesis 12:3, saying, "God has blessed America because America has blessed the Jews. If this nation wants her fields to remain white with grain, her scientific achievements to remain notable, and her freedom to remain intact, America must continue to stand with

---

[285] Ibid., 107.

[286] Colin Chapman, "Premillennial Theology, Christian Zionism, and Christian Mission," *International Bulletin of Missionary Research* 33, no. 3 (2009): 137.

[287] Spector, 23.

[288] Ibid., 24.

Israel."[289] In 2005, Richard Land, the president of the Southern Baptist Convention's Ethics and Religious Liberty Commission and former consultant to the Bush administration, expressed, "I want God to bless America, not curse America. I firmly believe that God blesses those who bless the Jews and curses those who curse them."[290] These and other Christian Zionists continue to apply this cause and effect relationship of God's promise in Genesis to modern dealings with the nation of Israel.[291]

Christian Zionist beliefs have sought to sanctify the U.S. relationship with Israel, while demonizing the Arabs and Islam.[292] Believing they follow a clear biblical command, Christians labor to support Israel materially and to lobby on its behalf in the media and the government. In addition, their eschatology predicts a coming apocalyptic war with Islam and the Arab world. Therefore, Christian Zionism teaches that advocating any compromise with the Palestinians in a "land for peace" deal demonstrates a lack of faith in God's promises.[293] As such, Christian Zionists' antipathy to the Arabs appears inversely proportionate to their empathy for the Jews.[294] They manifest this antipathy in

---

[289] Jerry Falwell, *Listen, America!* (Toronto: Bantam Books, 1980), 98.

[290] Interview with Richard Land, September 27, 2005 in Spector, 24.

[291] For further examples of these claims, see John Eidsmore, *God and Caesar: Biblical Faith and Political Action* (Westchester, IL: Crossway Books, 1984); Michael Lienesch, *Redeeming America* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1993); "Pastor John Hagee AIPAC Policy Conference, March 11, 2007" (www.aipac.org/Publications/SpeechesByPolicymakers/Hagee/PC-2007.pdf); Stan Goodenough, "Hagee: Giant of Christian Zionism Has Awakened," *Jerusalem Newswire*, March 15, 2007; and Jan Markell, "Are There Consequences When Harming Israel?" *Understanding the Times* (Olive Tree Ministries, 2007).

[292] Sizer, *Christian Zionism*, 251.

[293] William Dyrness et al., eds., *Global Dictionary of Theology: A Resource for the Worldwide Church* (Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity Press, 2008), 958.

[294] Sizer, *Christian Zionism*, 241.

racist-type hostility they hold towards the Palestinians, equating modern day Palestinians with Israel's ancient enemies the Philistines and Amalekites.[295] They also cast the conflict with modern-day Iran in the biblical terms of the story of Esther with Iran represented as ancient Persia and Haman, which seeks to destroy the Jewish people even as Haman did. In this modern struggle, Christian Zionists read Esther's story as an imperative to deliver the Jews from those who seek to harm them. Their beliefs compel them to use their power to support good against this great evil. Christian Zionist leaders now ascribe to Islamists the same theological status they attributed to the Soviet Union, casting the conflict in the terms of light versus darkness.[296] The potency of this divinely sanctioned struggle for the sake of Israel may prove a strong influence on civilian actions and on their perseverance to ensure the U.S. policy aligns with their beliefs.

With these teachings as a basis for what one may consider Christian Zionism, the question remains how many American Evangelicals embrace these views and may be termed Christian Zionists in their political activism. Various surveys account for the general percentage of American Evangelicals but do not separate out Christian Zionists. As such, to assess the prevalence of this movement, this study will rely on surveys that ask questions that may reveal an agreement with Christian Zionist teaching. In 2006, the Pew Forum on Religion and Public Life surveyed the American people. When asked whether they believed God gave the land that is now Israel to the Jewish people, forty-two percent agreed, while thirty-seven percent did not believe God literally gave the

---

[295] Ibid., 244-245.

[296] Ibid., 57, 62.

Jewish people the land and twenty-one percent did not know.[297] In 2011, the Pew Research Center's Forum on Religion & Public Life conducted a survey of participants in the Third Lausanne Congress of World Evangelization. With answers from over 2,000 Evangelical leaders worldwide, "by a margin of more than three-to-one, most…[said] that God's covenant with the Jewish people continues today (73%) rather than that the biblical covenant with the Jewish people no longer applies (22%)." In addition, forty-eight percent said that the State of Israel is the fulfillment of biblical prophecy, while forty-two percent said it is not. When asked which side they support in the Israeli-Palestinian conflict, "Among evangelical leaders from the United States, three-in-ten (30%) sympathize more with Israel, 13% sympathize more with the Palestinians and nearly half (49%) say they sympathize with both sides equally."[298] Such statistics demonstrate that generally Christian Zionist teaching is not in the majority among Americans. A large number of Evangelical leaders still believe God's covenant continues with the Jewish people. However, this does not absolutely point to a Christian Zionist understanding among all given the lower levels of support for Israel and the view of Israel as a fulfillment of prophecy. Overall, these results illustrate that Christian Zionist ideas of Israel and God's covenant with the Jewish people exist within the Evangelical world and within the United States and at least account for a significant minority. The

---

[297] Pew Forum on Religion & Public Life, Pew Research Center for the People & the Press, Survey July 2006, http://www.pewforum.org/iPoll.aspx?ipoll-keywords=Israel (Accessed February 19, 2012).

[298] Pew Forum on Religion & Public Life, Pew Research Center for the People & the Press, "Global Survey of Evangelical Protestant Leaders," June 22, 2011, http://www.pewforum.org/uploadedFiles/Topics/Religious_Affiliation/Christian/Evangelical_Protestant_Churches/Global%20Survey%20of%20Evan.%20Prot.%20Leaders.pdf (Accessed February 19, 2012).

continuing existence of these beliefs and the divinely commanded need for action establish Christian Zionists as a possible religious influence within American politics and specifically within foreign policy towards the Israeli-Palestinian conflict.

CHAPTER FIVE

PAST POLICY POSITIONS

This section will deal with the policy decisions and initiatives of the three actors in regard to the Arab-Israeli conflict. It examines the policy positions the actors adopted in regard to the creation of the State of Israel in 1947 and 1948, in response to the 1967 and 1973 wars, and in the midst of the peace talks of 1978 and 1993. It will first summarize the events and then give an overview of the policy positions of each actor and the rationale for those actions. This examination will also evaluate any demonstrable preference for one side in an actor's decisions and will highlight documented cases of religious belief or ideology affecting decisions. In the case of Israel, it may be expected that its bias will be towards its side of the conflict; however, studying its policies will also demonstrate the battle lines of the two sides and illustrate the significance of supporting a given side.

The Creation of the State of Israel: 1947-1948

UN Partition Vote

As outlined in Chapter Two, in 1947 the British appealed to the newly formed United Nations to resolve the troubles in the Palestinian Mandate between the Jews and

Arabs. After the UNSCOP investigations, the General Assembly decided a partition of the land area between the two parties was the best means of resolving the struggle. Though the UN partition plan did not give the Jews everything they desired, the Jewish Agency supported it as it offered two essential requirements: sovereignty and uninterrupted immigration.[299] Approval of the Partition Plan did not come easily and would likely have failed without the efforts of key American government officials and Zionist businessmen who put pressure on the representatives of other nations to vote in favor of the plan. In the end, the United States stood with the Soviet bloc and the majority of the European nations in favor of the partition. Among European powers, only Greece and Turkey voted against partition, and Great Britain abstained from a vote: Turkey because of its Muslim association with the Arab world, Greece because of its desire to protect the Greek Orthodox Christians in the region, and Great Britain to avoid the displeasure of either side. All the Arab nations voted against partition.[300]

Since the Britain Peel Commission's partition proposal in 1937, the Jews had been divided over the validity of that option. Some opposed it on tactical grounds, believing the British would not give the Jews sufficient land. Others had strong religious and political ideologies that dictated where the boundaries of the future state should be, and they were unwilling to compromise those in partition. However, by 1945, in the wake of the Holocaust, a growing number was willing to accept partition of the land as the

---

[299] Bickerton and Klausner, 81. For further discussion of the vote, see Moshe Ma'oz, "The UN Partition Resolution of 1947: Why Was It Not Implemented?" *Palestinian-Israeli Journal of Politics, Economics and Culture* 9, no. 4 (2002): 15-21.

[300] Ibid., 83.

most realistic solution to remedy the problem facing the Jews of Europe and as the only solution the Great Powers would support.[301] Chaim Weizmann encouraged a slower, more methodical approach in line with modern liberal ideals that would bring about a state in the next five to ten years with no need for the violence of the Irgun. Nevertheless, the tragedies of the Holocaust shortened the patience of many, who supported David Ben Gurion's views and his application of pressure on the British. He willingly applied greater amounts of pressure to the British, and though he opposed partition he discussed it when the British suggested it to harmonize their shared interests and to mollify British criticisms of partition.[302]

The ideology of the religious Zionists gave many an uncompromising view of the type of state they should build for the Jewish people. Begin was most articulate in propounding his group's strong animosity for the British colonial power in the mandate, accusing them of betraying the Jews in the land and seeking to maintain their power in the region. The idea of partitioning the West Bank was anathema in their belief system. Begin and the Irgun wrote to UNSCOP, arguing for the historical unity of the land and the Jews' connection to all *Eretz Yisrael*. Throughout 1947, they rejected any notion of partition, regarding any idea of it as treasonous to the Jewish people. Over time, as this group developed politically and eventually became the modern party of Likud, Begin became less explicit as to his meaning of seeking the full homeland of the Jews.[303]

---

[301] Colin Schindler, "Opposing Partition: The Zionist Predicaments after the Shoah," *Israel Studies* 14, no. 2 (2009): 89.

[302] Ibid., 94.

[303] Ibid., 99-102.

The Arab Palestinians generally shared Begin's abhorrence for partition. Moshe Ma'oz points to some moderate Palestinian groups that existed in the mandate, cooperated with the Jewish population, and acknowledged their nationalistic aspirations for a small state in the mandate area. However, this group was disorganized and lacked sufficient influence with the younger generation. In contrast, the Husseini family led by the Grand Mufti of Jerusalem possessed a strong reputation from the Arab Revolt of 1936-1939 that legitimized their place as the leader of the Palestinian people.[304] The Husseini family denied the right of the Jewish community to national self-determination in any part of Palestine and periodically used violence and terror against them as well as the moderate Arabs. "The uncompromising Palestinian-Arab and all-Arab positions towards the Zionist aspirations and the partition of Palestine predominantly derived from fundamental Arab nationalist and Islamic religious concepts, namely, rejection of a Jewish national/political presence in Islamic and Arab Palestine."[305] Their desire to guard the Arab and Islamic nature of Palestine fueled their disapproval and reactions against the UN Partition Plan for the mandate territory.

The Jews embarked on the quest for a national homeland with the desire that the appropriate governmental authorities legitimize their efforts. The referral of the matter of the Palestinian Mandate to the United Nations created the opportunity the Jews needed to press their claim for a state in Palestine and to gain international recognition of their

---

[304] Ma'oz, "The UN Partition Resolution," 15-16.

[305] Ibid., 16.

actions. The two-thirds majority vote solidified their aspirations and created greater unity among the competing ideologies among the Zionists.[306]

The First Arab-Israeli War

The physical struggle that followed, as described in Chapter Two, on the one side sought to defend the Jews of Palestine against the attacks of the Arabs and to carve out a state for the Jews of the world. On the other, the Arabs sought to defend the Palestinian Arabs against the Jewish attacks and to claim the national rights of the Palestinians in the mandate. From the end of 1947 through March 1948, the Arabs held the initiative in the fighting, while the Haganah was on the defensive. The Arab armed bands attacked Jewish settlements, and the Haganah retaliated. The fighting was formless in that there were no front lines, no conquest of territory, and no pitched battles.[307] In April 1948 the tide turned and by early May the Haganah had gained the land roughly equivalent to the one the UN resolution for partition approved. The Arab leadership initially refused the UN attempts to secure a truce despite the Israeli victories, for they avoided any act that could appear weak to their citizens. However, by mid-June both sides needed a respite.[308] The Arab side ended the truce in July and increased their resistance. With the aid of weapons from Czechoslovakia and strategic military planning and leadership, the new Jewish state retained the advantage over the Arabs and ended the war with a much larger state than originally designated in the partition plan.[309]

---

[306] Ibid., 95.

[307] Morris, 77-78.

[308] Ibid., 266.

[309] Bickerton and Klausner, 86.

In the months between the vote and the declaration of statehood on May 14, the United States remained committed to the partition plan and evaluated various means within the UN to ensure the success of partition. With the British determination to leave the area at the end of the mandate, in March 1948 President Truman and the State Department sought a UN trusteeship of the area to enforce law and order. On May 14, as the British made final preparations to depart from Haifa and as David Ben Gurion proclaimed the State of Israel, the General Assembly commissioned a mediator for Palestine, Count Folke Bernadotte, to work with the Truce Commission that the Security Council had set up to seek a peaceful settlement of the conflict.[310]

Israeli Policy

The Armistice Agreements ended the fighting of the war but did not create a state of peace. The Arabs called for the Israelis to return to the partition lines, but Israel refused to negotiate with them except in direct bilateral talks that would require recognition of Israel. Israel refused to return land taken in the war and argued that the Arab invasion and the war rendered the Partition Plan irrelevant. Having gained West Jerusalem in the war, Israel was unwilling to support UN Resolutions 181 and 194 that called for Jerusalem to be an international zone. In addition to land issues, in June 1948 the Israelis decided that they would not allow Arab refugees of the war to return to Israeli territory. Israel was only willing to discuss such a matter in the midst of final peace agreements with the Arab states. Israel sought to trade "peace for peace."[311]

---

[310] Ibid., 97.

[311] Galia Golan, "The Evolution of Israeli Policy on the Israeli-Palestinian Conflict," *Palestine-Israel Journal of Politics, Economics and Culture* 15, no. 1/2 (2008): 32.

Pre-European Community Policy

The nations that would make up the European Community were still rebuilding and recovering from the effects of the Second World War in 1947 and 1948 when the issue of the Palestinian Mandate came before the UN. After the war, Germany split into East and West, and neither side would join the UN until 1973. The other European nations joined the UN in 1945 as founding members and generally supported the Jewish plight. Great Britain oversaw the Palestinian mandate and dealt with the turmoil and troubles that grew between the Jews and Arabs. As the primary European power involved within the territory, Britain's policy had the most direct impact on the events during the mandate period, and this study of the 1948 War will focus principally on its involvement as a key actor.

Britain administered the area since the San Remo Conference divided up the region and struggled to work with both sides, alternatively increasing and decreasing Jewish immigration levels and managing violence while attempting to implement the Balfour Declaration promises as well as provide for Arab self-determination. Throughout the 1930s, Britain's commitment to the Zionist program began to erode as it labored under the responsibility for the mandate, even as the U.S. became more solidly pro-Zionist. "As the British became more acutely aware of the problems involved in ignoring the Arab position in Palestine, they began to back away from the kind of political surety that the U.S., in its relative ignorance, had come to feel."[312] Coping with the demands and displeasure of both sides left the British less willing to commit to a particular solution. In

[312] Kathleen Christison, *Perceptions of Palestine: Their Influence on U.S. Middle East Policy* (Berkeley, CA: University of California Press, 2000), 49.

favoring neither side consistently, both the Jews and Arabs opposed and condemned Britain.

In the wake of the Holocaust, as many Western nations called for something to be done for the Jews, British Foreign Secretary Ernest Bevin continued the pre-war immigration policies, opposed the idea of partition, and proposed an Arab state in the Mandate. Even pro-Zionists such as Prime Minister Winston Churchill were unwilling to risk inciting millions of Muslims by lifting the 1939 White Papers' immigration policy.[313] Bevin believed the aftermath of the Holocaust should not be intertwined with the Palestine problem, for he believed it was a solitary historical phenomenon that would never be repeated in Europe. There was, therefore, no need for the Jews to leave Europe. British policy attempted to maintain this separation, while increasing troop levels in the Mandate to secure the area against the increasing amount of violence from both sides.[314]

The League of Nations' mandate system gave Britain oversight in the territories of Iraq, Transjordan, and Palestine. This gave Britain access to the oil fields of Iraq and routes to transport it out to the sea through Haifa. In addition, the Suez Canal in Egypt was a tactical and economic asset for the British that they defended against the Ottomans in World War I and continued to guard after World War II. As elements of British influence in the Middle East seemed to wane after World War II, Britain supplied arms and training to the Arab Legion in Transjordan and to national armies in Iraq and Egypt, believing that assisting allies in treaty relations with them would maintain their political

---

[313] Oren, 483.

[314] Schindler, 93.

influence and better allow the British to defend their interests in the region.[315] Initially, British efforts focused on Transjordan, for they were economically dependent on the British, setting aside two million pounds a year to subsidize the Jordanian government's arms purchases. Egypt supported its own army, though the nation and the Suez Canal lay at the heart of the British defense strategy. Britain pledged to modernize the Egyptian and Iraqi armies, but their actual capacities never rose above mediocre due to lack of funds, an inefficient government defense policy, and a high degree of inertia and ignorance within the military establishments.[316]

The British arms sales to and presence in these Arab states put them in a precarious position in reference to the Palestinian Mandate. Britain wanted to retain good relations with its Arab allies but also felt pressure from the rising American superpower to assist the Jewish people. Bearing the effects of World War II on its economy, Britain found it increasingly difficult to sustain its far-reaching imperial system and was forced to accept increasing American influence in the Middle East and to rely on American economic aid.[317] It was the only Western nation to abstain from the Partition Plan vote, attempting to avoid the displeasure of either side. Nevertheless, as the U.S. imposed an arms embargo in 1947 after the partition vote on both sides in the conflict, the British continued to build the Arab Legion and to supply arms to their treaty allies.[318] However,

---

[315] Tancred Bradshaw, "Arms and Influence: British Arms Policy and the Decline of the British Influence in the Middle East, 1948-49," *British Scholar* 3, no. 1 (2010): 84.

[316] Ibid., 83.

[317] Ibid., 91.

[318] Ibid., 90.

in an attempt to curtail Soviet arms supplies to Israel and to shorten the conflict, in May 1948 the U.S. and Britain supported a UN arms embargo against the region. In response to the embargo, the British ended all their support to the Arab states when the initial truce took effect in June 1948. The Arab states had no means of manufacturing their own weapons or of obtaining them from alternative sources. In contrast, the CIA reported that Israel possessed local manufacturing facilities and sufficient monetary sources to obtain more weapons covertly from Czechoslovakia.[319] This left the Arabs at a sizable disadvantage when fighting resumed and created a great deal of bitterness as the Arabs felt betrayed.[320] When the UN finally lifted the embargo in August 1949, Egypt and the other Arab states sought to rid themselves of the British presence rather than to gain the promised British weaponry.[321]

U.S. Policy

The United States was the newest player in the Middle Eastern affairs in the 1940s. With Congress's refusal to approve the U.S. membership in the League of Nations, the Americans had been shut out of the mandate system between the wars. In 1917, President Wilson had supported the British Balfour Declaration as a means of retaining solidarity with a war ally.[322] In the 1930s, American companies discovered oil reserves in the Saudi desert. At the close of World War II, Vice President Truman was

---

[319] Ibid., 93. See also Amitzur Ilan, *The Origin of the Arab-Israeli Arms Race: Arm, Embargo, Military Power and Decision in 1948 Palestine War* (New York: NYU Press, 1996).

[320] Bradshaw, 92-94.

[321] Ibid., 99.

[322] Christison, 27-28.

unexpectedly thrust into the presidency to guide the nation as it took on a new prominent role among the nations of the world. Leading up to and during the war, the U.S. had been no more sympathetic to Jewish immigrants than other Western nations. After the war, American Jewry and Christians arose to plead for their government's assistance to safeguard the Jewish people in the Palestinian Mandate and to assist the many Jewish displaced persons (DPs) in Europe.

Immediately following the war, President Truman wished to help the Jews, but he refused to send American troops to Palestine to address an outbreak of hostilities. Before the UN acceptance of partition, he was reticent to move too many Jewish DPs to Palestine, for he believed the Arabs would easily defeat or massacre the Jews.[323] When the Jewish Agency announced in 1946 that it would accept partition, Truman embraced this as the best possible solution, which might also not necessitate the assistance of American troops to maintain. With oil fields and American bases in Saudi Arabia, troop involvement in the conflict would likely compromise American oil access.[324]

As the vote for partition approached in 1947, the Zionists in the U.S. applied high levels of pressure to Truman. The Zionist Organization of American under the leadership of Rabbi Abbi Hillel Silver and Christian Zionist organizations such as the American Christian Palestine Committee constantly sent letters of advice, comment, and threats of political retaliation to Truman. Jewish leaders also met repeatedly with the president. However, in his time in office, Truman proved himself to be a man who did not give way

---

[323] Bickerton and Klausner, 76.

[324] Ibid., 79.

to threats but rather was an independent thinker. Indeed, at times, the pressure exerted proved counterproductive, for it angered Truman. He already felt strongly that something ought to be done for the Jewish refugees. Bickerton and Klauser conclude he relied on his strong fundamentalist Protestant background and believed the Jews should be allowed to return to their ancient homeland. More than any domestic political pressure, Truman relied on his knowledge of the Bible's account of the Jewish people and listened to the advice of his White House political consultants, David Niles and Clark Clifford.[325]

President Truman's support for the Jews and the Zionist cause is often attributed to the Democratic Party's desire to gain the Jewish vote in the 1948 domestic elections. While such electoral concerns are valid and invariably affect leaders at different times, a caveat should be noted. Despite Truman's faithful support of the Jews' cause and his quick recognition of the new nation in the face of State Department reservations, he still lost the heavily Jewish state of New York in the 1948 election, likely because that was the state from which his opponent Thomas Dewey came.[326] Of the other states with heavy Jewish populations—New Jersey, Pennsylvania, Illinois, and California—Truman lost half in the election, while Dewey gained his greatest number of electoral votes from New York and Pennsylvania.[327] Though Truman won a landslide victory, American Jewry did not significantly contribute to his success. This fact does not remove political strategy as

[325] Ibid., 82.

[326] Ibid., 83.

[327] Ibid., 71.

a motivation for Truman's decision, but it indicates that presidential support for Israel does not guarantee Jewish support for the president.

While the State Department opposed the Partition Plan, Truman supported it and instructed State officials to back it at the UN. As desk officer in charge of Palestine in the Near Eastern Division of the State Department from 1943 to 1947, Evan Wilson observes that Truman expressed personal concern for the Jewish refugees and pressed for U.S. support of their national aspirations. His biblical values prompted him to focus first on redressing the plight of the refugees. This then led him to advocate an implementation of the Balfour Declaration and to support the Zionist national aspirations in Palestine before the UN. Evan Wilson observes that Truman combined his biblical beliefs regarding the Jews with Woodrow Wilsonian idealism and humanitarianism when advocating U.S. backing for a Jewish homeland.[328]

As the debate over the UNSCOP Partition Plan proceeded in the General Assembly, American Zionists believed extensive lobbying would be necessary to gain the vote of certain delegates. Until the end, Truman remained on the side lines of these lobbying efforts, though Zionists lobbied him as well. "Congressmen and senators along with Supreme Court justices were drafted to send telegrams to heads of states and their representatives either cajoling them or, in some cases, threatening suspension of U.S. aid."[329] With Jews threatening a boycott of Firestone rubber, Harvey Firestone threatened to suspend the expansion of plant operations in Liberia if they voted against partition. In

[328] Evan Wilson, 124-125.

[329] Ibid.

the last days, as a filibuster prolonged the official vote, Truman finally approved added lobbying efforts, breaking his previous policy agreement with the State Department that the U.S. would vote for partition but would not lobby or threaten other members. The U.S. won the victory for the Zionists in the UN on November 29, 1947.[330]

With a strong Arab reaction to the partition vote and impending violence in Palestine, the U.S. attempted to safeguard itself from committing soldiers to conflict. Secretary of the Army Kenneth Royall began an initiative to assess the impact of this policy on U.S. security and asked the National Security Council (NSC) to review the consequences of U.S. policy. The first draft of this review in mid-December 1947 reported that support for partition only damaged U.S. prestige in the Arab world, but it warned of grave danger to U.S. security should America actively participate in enforcing the partition plan.[331] The dangers it foresaw included:

> American education and religious institutions in the Middle East might be closed. Air base rights and economic concessions might be cancelled. Plans for increased oil supplies to Europe were in jeopardy. Moderate Arab leaders "will be swept out of power by irresponsible elements." And a golden opportunity would be created for Soviet subversion and mischief.[332]

In December 1947, the U.S. imposed an arms embargo on the area of Palestine and the Arab states to ensure no U.S. weapons could be used to prolong the conflict. As the conflict did continue, Jews in Palestine and the U.S. frequently criticized the lack of American assistance. Despite Truman's beliefs that favored the Jewish cause, the

---

[330] Smith, 198.

[331] Zvi Ganin, "The Limits of American Jewish Political Power: America's Retreat from Partition, November 1947-March 1948," *Jewish Social Studies* 39, no. 1/2 (1977): 1.

[332] Ibid., 2.

negative implications of U.S. involvement that the NSC and a subsequent CIA analysis established prevented Truman from proceeding with any pro-Zionist policies.[333] When the UN Security Council discussed sending an international police force to reign in the chaos of early 1948, the U.S. stated it was not prepared to impose partition by force and would only join UN efforts to safeguard international peace and security.

As violence continued in March, Truman acquiesced to Secretary of State Marshall's suggestion that Palestine be placed under a temporary UN trusteeship. Alarmed by this shift, Chaim Weizmann came to the U.S. and met with Truman to stress that abandonment of partition would be disastrous and to remind him that the Arabs were likely to reject such a proposal.[334] Truman returned to partition, though the State Department continued to promote trusteeship. Truman's support for the new state remained strong throughout the rest of the war, with his personal instruction to extend de facto recognition of Israel. [335] By 1949 Truman believed he had fulfilled his obligation to provide a home for the remnant of European Jewry in the new State of Israel and turned oversight of the peace process to the State Department.[336] As Ralph Bunche brought the parties to a point of armistice, the U.S. representative to the Palestinian Conciliation Committee Mark Ethridge represented the State Department policy that sought to stabilize the area to secure its oil resources and its strategic location in the growing conflict with the Soviets. To resolve the problem on both sides and to bring peace,

---

[333] Ibid., 6-7.

[334] Bickerton and Klausner, 86-87.

[335] Smith, 202, 204.

[336] Spungen, 265.

Ethridge pressed Israel on the Palestinian refugee issue and promised U.S. aid to Israel and to the Palestinian refugees as a part of the Truman Four Point Plan.[337] This plan Truman proposed in Congress in 1949 set the course for American foreign policy. The first three points supported the UN, the Marshall Plan, and the NATO allies. The fourth point added a new idea of offering technical assistance to developing nations.[338] Despite these attempts at evenhanded mediation, the peace process failed.[339]

The 1967 and 1973 Conflicts

The 1956 Suez Conflict discredited Britain and France in the Middle East, which left the United States as the primary power defending Western interests. The actions of Britain and France, which they pursued without consulting the U.S. and were seen to violate the UN Charter, left the U.S. embarrassed and compromised by their allies. To exhibit its continued friendship with its European allies and its disdain for Nasser, the U.S. adhered to a Western economic boycott of Egypt, refusing to sell surplus wheat and oil. In the context of the Cold War, the U.S. not only sought to defend Western interests but also to defend against Soviet influence and infiltration, which were prevalent in Egypt and Syria. When Israel began the war on June 5, 1967, it attacked two of the Soviet Union's strongest client states in the Middle East. After the end of the conflict in 1956, the Soviet Union had poured economic and technical assistance into Egypt with Soviet

---

[337] Ibid., 267-268.

[338] U.S. Congress, *Congressional Record*, 106th Congress, 1st session, 1999, 145, pt. 9: 5803.

[339] Shannon, 44.

arms totaling around $2 billion. A few years later, the Soviets began supporting the regimes of Syria and Iraq as well. Subsequently, Nasser's involvement in the Yemen civil war and his employment of German technicians to develop surface-to-surface missiles and jet fighters finally induced the U.S. to sell its first arms to Israel. President Kennedy approved U.S. sales of missiles and tanks to Israel, with other arms going to Saudi Arabia and Jordan.[340] When Israel fought Nasser and Anwar al-Sadat along with its other Arab neighbors in 1967 and 1973, the two Cold War superpowers were pitted against each other as well.[341]

Israeli Policy

Chapter Two discussed the events and actions that offered Israel sufficient cause to act first in 1967, which included Nasser's troop movements in the Sinai and the closure of the Gulf of Aqaba, Syria's attempts to cut off the Jordan headwaters and its attacks on Israel from the Golan Heights, and Jordan's treaty with Egypt. This victory established the Israeli army as the preeminent fighting force in the region and gave some an exaggerated sense of confidence and security.[342] While the hostilities lasted only for a short time, their effects continue today, and many Israeli and American decisions from that time remain.

---

[340] Bickerton and Klausner, 136-137.

[341] Ibid., 146.

[342] Ibid., 144.

Leading up to the initiation of fighting, U.S. intelligence had discredited Israeli assertions that an Egyptian and Syrian attack was imminent.[343] Because of this and because Congress and the American public disapproved any American unilateral action in light of the ongoing American presence in Vietnam, Johnson refused to guarantee Israel its military assistance outside the context of a multilateral force.[344] Despite Johnson's warning against Israel acting first against the Arabs in a meeting with Israeli Foreign Minister Abba Eban in late May, as the month came to a close Israel received reports that U.S. officials would understand if Israel chose to act.[345] When Jordan's King Hussein signed a mutual-defense pact with Nasser, the situation escalated. Israel chose to act first to gain the upper hand against foes that surrounded it on all sides.[346]

The results gave Israel greater "strategic depth" overall and presumably more defensible borders. However, the territorial expansion in the Sinai created strategic vulnerabilities rather than securities as it required Israel to guard a great land mass. The occupation of the new territories brought its own problems for Israel, particularly with Jewish settlements in the West Bank and Gaza. In the years between Israel's establishment and the 1967 War, the Palestinians as a people group had been largely ignored, being subsumed by the surrounding Arab nations and dealt with under the

---

[343] William Quandt, *Peace Process: American Diplomacy and the Arab-Israeli Conflict Since 1967* (Washington, D.C.: Brookings Institute Press, 2005), 32.

[344] Ibid., 35.

[345] Ibid., 38-39.

[346] Ibid., 37.

auspice of those nations. With the capture of territories that contained over one million Palestinians, the Palestinian problem became the Israeli problem.[347]

Israel now had the means to negotiate with the Arab states, if it so desired, from a position of great strength. The first action the cabinet took was to annex East Jerusalem and the surrounding area. Though the West Bank was not annexed, no plans were made to negotiate a peace with Jordan that would return the territory. Initially, the cabinet unanimously agreed to negotiate a peace settlement with Egypt, in which Israel would return to the international borders that existed before the war in exchange for Egypt guaranteeing freedom of navigation in the Straits of Tiran, the Gulf of Aqaba, and the Suez Canal, demilitarizing the Sinai Peninsula, while permitting Israeli retention of the Gaza Strip. The cabinet also drew up a peace settlement for Syria, in which Israel would return to the previous international borders if Syria agreed to the demilitarization of the Golan Heights and guaranteed the free flow of water from the sources of the Jordan to Israel. However, these settlements were never offered directly to Egypt and Syria, for after a short period of time the cabinet chose to follow an alternative policy path.[348] Israel held the territory as bargaining pieces for peace, waiting for the Arab states to ask for negotiations. However,

> as time passed, it became clear that Israel was unwilling to relinquish Jerusalem and perhaps other parts of the West Bank, and the Arab position seemed to harden against negotiations and recognition of Israel. Without any clear decision, American policy shifted from its long-standing emphasis on maintaining the

---

[347] Bickerton and Klausner, 145.

[348] Bickerton,122.

> territorial integrity of each state to a more nuanced stance, emphasizing a negotiated settlement.[349]

The U.S. supported the UN Resolution 242 that called for the changes each side needed to make. However, neither side responded, for the resolution was not explicit enough in the methods of implementation. Instead, each read 242 as requiring the other side to make concessions first. From Israel's perspective, they saw the new territories in terms of the promise of 242 that each state in the region may live in peace within secure and recognized borders. The resolution instigated the idea of "land for peace;" however, Israel only considered certain pieces of land as negotiable for return in such transactions and would surrender them when peace was certain.[350] Israel did not accept the idea of partial peace as a viable interim step.

Underlying Israel's efforts to retain the new occupied territories was also the fact that it did not consider the West Bank and Gaza as occupied territory. Unlike the Sinai Peninsula and the Golan Heights that had been taken from other nations and could be returned for a negotiated peace, the West Bank and the Gaza Strip were included in the Palestinian Mandate and remained "contested" territory to which they believed they had equal right to claim as the Palestinians did. This view discarded the internationally recognized division of the mandate territory in the UN Partition Plan under the premise that the 1948 war nullified the territorial rights granted in the UN resolution. To solidify Israel's right to retain the land, the military advocate general, Colonel Meir Shamgar, recommended the use of the term "disputed" rather than "occupied" to refer to the

---

[349] Quandt, 44.

[350] Bickerton, 148.

territory of the West Bank and Gaza to reject the applicability of the 1949 Fourth Geneva Convention relating to the occupation of conquered territory, under the assumption that the two areas had not previously been a part of a sovereign state.[351] While the Palestinians had an internationally recognized right to create a state in part of the mandate territory, their inability to form a state and govern the areas granted them invalidated their claim in the Israeli arguments.

Between the end of the 1967 conflict and the 1973 War, hostilities never truly ended. Unofficially war continued between Egypt and Israel, with various Palestinian groups also creating their own "facts on the ground" through guerrilla warfare, airplane hijackings, and other terrorist acts, which included the 1972 attacks on tourists at the Israeli Lod airport and on the Israeli Olympic team in Munich.[352] However, the war that broke out in October 1973 was not focused on the Palestinians but was fought to regain the Sinai Peninsula for Egypt. Nasser had died of a heart attack in September 1970, and his vice president Anwar al-Sadat assumed leadership of Egypt. He downplayed Nasser's pan-Arabist goals and sought to strengthen Egypt's position in the Middle East. In 1971 he attempted to regain operation of the Suez Canal for his country through the UN mediator Gunnar Jarring. In order to regain this asset to Egypt's economy, he agreed to Jarring's proposal that would recognize Israel if it withdrew its armed forces from Sinai and the Gaza Strip. However, Israeli Prime Minister Golda Meir refused the offer, stating that Israel would not withdraw to pre-June 5, 1967 lines. Meir opposed the Jarring

---

[351] Ibid., 108-109.

[352] Bickerton and Klausner, 164.

proposal because it did not offer an answer to Israel's basic security needs or its demand that the first issue to discuss was the essence of the peace itself. All other questions such as borders should be discussed at a later point in the process.[353] Sadat expelled 20,000 Soviet military and political advisors in response to Israeli intelligence regarding Soviet intentions to subsume Egypt.[354] Sadat also hoped to gain favor with the U.S., but when this failed Sadat began to contemplate war with Israel as the best option. With the Egyptian economy in a depression and knowing that economic reform would be highly unpopular, Sadat believed a military victory would give him the popularity he needed to make internal changes.[355]

In early 1973, Israeli and American intelligence analysts observed the signs that Sadat and the Syrians were preparing for war on the Sinai and the Golan fronts. By mid-1973, they were highly aware of the Arab war plans to cross the Suez Canal into the Israeli side of the Sinai. However, Israeli analysts and American politicians did not believe the Arabs were serious about going to war. Even with many signs that indicated war was imminent, they continued to believe the Arabs would not act first to launch an attack. Quandt grounds these assumptions in the prevailing American and Israeli belief that the Arabs would never start a war they were sure to lose and that Israel would win any conflict given their qualitative advantages in the military realm since American

---

[353] Yaacov Ro'i, *From Encroachment to Involvement: A Documentary Study of Soviet Policy in the Middle East, 1945-1973* (Jerusalem: Israel Universities Press, 1974), 544.

[354] Dan Hofstadter, *Egypt and Nasser, Volume 3, 1967-1972* (New York: Facts on File, 1973), 276-279.

[355] Bickerton, 130-131.

began selling arms to Israel in 1970.[356] After their victory in the 1967 war, the Israeli military felt confident the Arabs would not be able to overcome them for a considerable period of time. In addition, Ahron Bergman points out that Sadat repeatedly declared the Arabs were preparing to attack Israel, but with no action to follow his claims. He had called 1971 "the Year of Decision," but the year passed with no attacks. The following year he made threats of his aggressive intentions towards Israel but took no action. By 1973, the credibility of his threats in the intelligence world was low.[357] When King Hussein secretly flew to Tel Aviv ten days before the attack to warn Meir, she did not take the possible threat seriously, for the military continued to insist that war was not an Arab option.[358]

In contrast to the 1967 War, it was the Israelis that were unprepared for the decisive and quick actions of the Egyptians on October 6, 1973. The Egyptians gained a bridgehead in the Sinai within six hours of the initiation of fighting. The Syrian attack in the Golan was less successful, with their initial near-defeat of the Israelis being turned back in a day. By October 7, Israel had recaptured almost all of the Golan. The following day Israeli troops were able to drive back Syrian advances on the northern Sea of Galilee area and over the next few days pushed farther into Syria, conquering a twenty-square-mile box of territory in the Bashan. With these Israeli successes in the north, Egypt increased pressure on Israel in the Sinai, launching a large mechanized offensive on

---

[356] Quandt, 105.

[357] Ahron Bergman, *Israel's War, 1947-93* (London: Routledge, 2000), 102-103.

[358] Abraham Rabinovich, *The Yom Kippur War: The Epic Encounter That Transformed the Middle East* (New York: Schocken Books, 2003), 39.

October 14. Israeli air forces were able to turn the tide of this offensive so that Israeli forces could drive Egyptians back. In response to this, the Soviet Union rearmed its Arab allies, mobilizing its Mediterranean fleet. The U.S., in turn, began ferrying shipments of weapons to Tel Aviv to replace those the Israelis had lost earlier in the fighting. As the conflict moved towards a battle of superpowers, the UN Security Council passed Resolution 338, which called for a ceasefire with all parties terminating military activity immediately.[359]

The day hostilities commenced, Prime Minister Meir still rejected the idea that Israel should again act first against possible Arab hostilities. By 1973, the European nations were under threat of an oil embargo and trade boycott from the Arab states and had stopped supplying Israel with munitions. Israel was totally dependent upon the U.S. to resupply its army and therefore more cautious to do anything that might endanger that relationship. To confirm Meir's decision, Secretary of State Henry Kissinger sent a message that said simply "don't pre-empt."[360] This war demonstrated the growing separation of sides in the Arab-Israeli conflict as Israel was left with no allies other than the U.S. Israel did turn the tide of the war for itself but with great loss and would not likely have survived the Soviet resupply of the Egyptians without a U.S. resupply. The losses Israel suffered as well as the subsequent Arab oil embargo and increased energy

[359] Bickerton, 133-134.

[360] Ibid., 132.

prices left it more and more dependent upon the U.S. not only for military items but also for economic aid.[361]

The 1973 War discredited the Labor Party that had been in power since the establishment of the state. The failure of military intelligence to assess the situation correctly and the overconfidence of the Israeli government had exposed the people to a possible defeat at the hands of the Arabs. As Labor leaders began to negotiate disengagement agreements after the war for the Sinai, Israeli hard-liners who supported the Land of Israel movement, which believed in the retention of the West Bank on religious-historical grounds because they had been a part of biblical and historical Israel, became stalwart on retaining the West Bank. In the face of many political challenges after the war and growing popularity of the Land of Israel movement's beliefs about the land, the Labor government gave the first authorizations for civilian, as opposed to military or security, settlements in the West Bank.[362]

Settlers of the West Bank established Gush Emunim, which provided a moral explanation based upon Kookist doctrine for the near-defeat in the 1973 War. Rabbi Kook considered the war a consequence of Israel's moral decline since its establishment. The loss of territory in the war was a test from God that required the Jewish people to act to claim the land God had promised them. Kook cast the 1967 War as a confirmation of this doctrine, which stated that secular governments could do God's holy work to redeem His people. The secular Labor government recaptured territory key to Jewish redemption.

---

[361] Bickerton and Klausner, 169.

[362] Ibid., 164, 169.

Now the people needed to remember the importance of the land for their promised redemption and those who would secure the land to gain God's favor for their nation.[363] The election of the Likud Party and Menachem Begin as Prime Minister in 1977 brought many of these ideas into the government, allowing settlements in the West Bank and Gaza to increase rapidly, backed by government consent and military protection.[364] Though the Labor Party's failures in the 1973 contributed to its fall from power, the rise specifically of the Likud Party in its place demonstrates a significant public support for the ideas the Party represented.

The European Community Policy

In 1956, France and Britain had attempted to collaborate with Israel to secure their power in the region. With the failure of that initiative, both nations lost their historical influence over matters in the region, and nations either looked to the U.S. or the Soviet Union for patronage. As such, the European policies had less direct impact on the 1967 and 1973 conflicts. Over the decade leading up to the 1967 War, the policies of the founding members of the 1970 European Political Cooperation (EPC) towards Israel and the Arabs progressively diverged. The 1967 War broke out a month after a European Economic Community summit had failed to reconcile the positions of the Six Heads of State. Each of the Six expressed a different position on the war, thus following their

---

[363] Jefferis, 149-150. For further information on Kookist ideas and their impact in groups such as Gush Emunim, see Abraham Isaac Kook, *Abraham Isaac Kook : The Lights of Penitence, The Moral Principles, Lights of Holiness, Essays, Letters, and Poems*, trans. Ben Zion Bokser (New York: Paulist Press, 1978); E. Don-Yehiya, "Jewish Messianism, Religious Zionism and Israeli Politics: The Impact and Origins of Gush Emunim," *Middle Eastern Studies* 23, no. 2 (1987): 225-227; and Robert Friedman, *Zealots for Zion: Inside Israel's West Bank Settlement* (New York: Random House, 1992).

[364] Bickerton and Klausner, 169.

traditional national policy and privileging what they perceived to be in their national interest. The spectrum of positions ranged from France's strong condemnation of Israel and support for the Arabs to Germany's support of Israel, though it was disguised behind formal neutrality.[365] Subsequent to the 1967 War, in an attempt to recoup good will in the Arab world and to oppose the U.S. as a superpower, President De Gaulle declined to supply Israel's military needs any longer. Britain also began to withdraw from its installations east of Suez, removing support for Israel's presence in the Peninsula.[366]

It has been argued that the European powers' failure to face adequately the Middle East crisis in 1967 was one of the main triggers for the Six, and France in particular, to advocate for an enhanced political role for Europe in the world. The Heads of State and Government worked together until the Davignon Report was issued on October 27, 1970, which in conjunction with the Hague Summit Declaration the year before sanctioned the official birth of the European Political Cooperation (EPC) and defined its structure. The nations joined to create a united Europe that could assume its responsibilities in the world and could make contributions commensurate with its traditions and mission.[367]

The 1967 War consolidated American leadership in the Middle East and strengthened the U.S.-Israel special relationship that had been growing. Furthermore, the Middle East had become a crucial field of confrontation between the U.S. and the Soviet

---

[365] Musu, 23.

[366] Bickerton and Klausner, 146.

[367] Musu, 24-25.

Union in the framework of the Cold War as the two superpowers sought to spread their own influence faster than their competitor around the world. Each built alliances and supported client states to extend its power farther than the other. These facts made it more difficult for the European Community (EC) to be an influential actor in the region. After their disjointed response to the 1967 War, the Six worked to harmonize their policy and eventually created a joint policy statement in 1971, known as the Schuman Papers, based largely on UN 242. The papers remained unpublished due to a German and Dutch request, but the content was leaked to the German press and caused considerable opposition among the German public because it appeared too supportive of the Arabs. Due to domestic pressure in favor of Israel, the German Foreign Minister Scheel asserted that the paper was only a working paper and constituted a basis for further discussions among the Six, which caused great irritation in Paris. The European powers were still struggling to unite their positions on the conflict, yet over the next two years leading up to the 1973 War there was a gradual tread among the nine countries of the EC (the Nine) to develop a positive reassessment of the Arab demands while relations with Israel continued to deteriorate. States that had previously been most supportive were reconsidering their position towards the Arab world. Joseph Luns of Holland visited Saudi Arabia and Kuwait while Belgium toughened its policy on the status of Jerusalem.[368]

Despite temporary cooperation in 1972 to combat rising levels of terrorism, when the 1973 War began the Nine's reactions were similar to that of the 1967 War. Each

[368] Ibid., 31.

adopted a separate position that was in line with their traditional policy in the conflict. The subsequent Arab oil embargo further exposed the lack of solidarity among the EC members, as each state competed individually to win Arab favor. Countries that the Arabs considered "hostile" had a ban on oil exports imposed; this was applied to the Netherlands and the United States. Countries they considered "neutral" received a five percent cutback; these included Belgium, Denmark, Germany, Ireland, Italy, and Luxembourg. Only France and Britain gained the status of "friendly or most favored nations" and received no embargo sanctions.[369]

In response to the embargo, the EC members issued a Joint Declaration that marked a clear shift towards a more distinctly pro-Arab position, mentioning the "legitimate rights of the Palestinians" and "the need for Israel to end the territorial occupation which it has maintained since the conflict of 1967."[370] The French inspired much of this shift towards a united pro-Arab stance, which embodied their national position.[371] The desire for unity among the community members coupled with the two wars gradually moved the member states along the continuum towards the pro-Arab and pro-Palestinian end.

U.S. Policy

While the European powers had limited direct involvement in the two wars, the U.S. was prominently enveloped in both. In May 1967 the U.S. condemned Nasser's

---

[369] Ibid., 32.

[370] Declaration of the Nine Foreign Ministers on the Situation in the Middle East, Brussels, November 6, 1973, Paragraph 3.

[371] Musu, 33.

closure of the Straits and was willing to send U.S. ships as part of a multi-national force to test the blockade. Johnson assured the Israeli Foreign Minister that the U.S. remained Israel's friend and every effort would be taken to open the Straits again. Johnson hoped to delay the conflict long enough that it might be presented to the UN for a Security Council resolution, thus creating a multilateral approach that would minimize the appearance of the U.S. being overtly pro-Israel in order to avoid alienating the Arab world.[372] Privately, President Johnson warned Israel against preemptive action.[373] The U.S. failed to deliver a multilateral solution because it was divided internally about how to handle the pre-war crisis. With troops already deployed in Vietnam, the Pentagon opposed any military forces being deployed to support Israel. The apparent U.S. stalemate and inability to act added to Israel's desire for unilateral action.[374] While the U.S. may not have preferred Israel to attack, they did not apply real pressure to stop them. In addition, when the U.S. called for peace on June 9, Israel proceeded with its invasion of Syria to secure its desired water rights and strategic advantage on the Golan Heights, reaffirming to many the American inability or unwillingness to stop Israel. When Israel acted, the Arab states blamed the U.S. for its acquiescence or impotence to prevent the Israeli attack, and most states severed diplomatic relations with the U.S.[375]

Upon securing a ceasefire, the U.S. made no immediate attempts to begin a peace process and seemed pleased with the humiliation their ally had dealt one of the key

---

[372] Shannon, 58.

[373] Bickerton and Klausner, 143.

[374] Shannon, 59.

[375] Ibid., 62-63.

Soviet client states.[376] In November, Johnson assisted in bringing some closure to the issue before the UN with Resolution 242. This resolution became official U.S. policy after the war. The resolution called for,

> withdrawal of Israeli forces from territories occupied in the recent conflict [and] termination of all claims of belligerency and respect for and acknowledgement of the sovereignty, territorial integrity, and political independence of every state in the area and their right to live in peace within secure and recognized boundaries free from threats or acts of force."[377]

Despite the ceasefire and the UN resolution, both Israel and the Arab states remained in a war-like state with high military expenditures and increasing inventories of destructive weapons. The years of 1969 and 1970 held what came to be known as the "War of Attrition" between the two sides. Using new Soviet military equipment, the Egyptians harassed the Israelis on the other side of the Suez.[378] In turn, the Israelis launched raids into Egypt, including striking an Egyptian factory that caused 150 casualties and drew U.S. condemnation and Soviet threats to increase arms and personnel to Egypt to counter Israel's successes. Frustrated by the trouble Israel seemed to bring the U.S., President Nixon chose to withdraw the plans for the sale of Phantom jets to Israel in 1969. By 1970, Nixon was willing to deliver the promised planes but also began to push strongly for a new ceasefire, which was finally accepted in July and went into effect the following month. [379]

---

[376] Bickerton, 125.

[377] Shannon, 65.

[378] Bickerton and Klausner, 155.

[379] Shannon, 67.

Previously Kennedy and Johnson had developed a "special relationship" with Israel based on benefits from domestic politics and personal sentiment regarding the plight of the Jewish people. With fewer personal feelings regarding the conflict and Israel, Nixon was the first to establish Israel as a strategic asset for the U.S. in the Cold War. He gave a new reason to embrace the Israeli cause that was not based upon moral or spiritual reasoning. However, this purely strategic justification laid the groundwork for anti-Israel thinking when the Cold War ended. Paul Charles Merkley asserts that this inability to retain support for Israel after the political priorities changed indicates that "Israel's long-term security requires a deeply rooted public commitment of a moral and spiritual sort—of a kind Nixon could never have brought himself to articulate."[380] For Nixon, who Merkley asserts preferred to keep his religious beliefs separate from his policy, Israel was solely a valuable strategic ally in the Cold War environment that divided up the Middle East. Britain's decision to leave the region altogether in 1970 left the U.S. as the sole guarantor of the Anglo-American interests in oil and regional stability. Given the political sensitivity regarding a military presence, the U.S. chose rather to build up friendly nations as "surrogates." Nixon asserted that "by providing Israel absolute military superiority, the American interests of containing Soviet expansionism, promoting regional stability, and preventing war…would be maximized." To support this idea, Nixon increased aid to Israel to $500 million in 1972.[381]

---

[380] Merkley, 78.

[381] Shannon, 67-68.

At the initiation of fighting in October 1973, the Nixon administration remained optimistic that the Israelis would prevail. Nixon saw this new round of fighting with the potential of bringing both sides to a place from which a lasting peace might be built. He hoped for a "battlefield stalemate" that would make a lasting settlement more likely in that Israel would feel less secure and more desirous of peace and the Arabs would retain some of their pride and be more willing to cooperate. [382] In addition, Nixon and Kissinger were conscious of the increased U.S. dependence on Arab oil and sought to downplay any assistance they gave to the Israeli side. As Israeli victories came at a greater cost than expected, Kissinger initiated moderate arms resupply efforts for Israel but withheld full scale commitment of American resources in the hope that their ceasefire initiatives would end the conflict. [383] Despite promises to support the ceasefire, the Soviets began a full-scale rearmament, and Egypt continued the fight. The intensity of the fighting required more than the simple resupply the U.S. had underway. However, Kissinger sought to uphold the principle of avoiding direct American involvement in arms sales to Israel and sought civilian methods of delivering the necessary arms. After waiting multiple days for the promised arms through civilian means, Israel accepted the ceasefire agreement on October 12. However, Sadat was not willing to submit to a ceasefire until the peace agreement included a plan for Israel to withdraw to pre-1967 lines. On the following day when Nixon received Golda Meir's requests for help and questions about the civilian delivery of arms, he overrode Kissinger's apprehensions and ordered a full-scale air lift

[382] Bickerton and Klausner, 168.

[383] Quandt, 109-110.

of the promised military equipment. [384] The UN approved the Soviet-American ceasefire proposal on October 22, yet neither side stopped fighting, which resulted in the continuation of hostilities and the Israeli surrounding and trapping of the Egyptian Third Army in the western Sinai.[385] In the end, Moscow and Washington collaborated to stop their allies from continuing the fighting, for neither wanted to see its side humiliated in a defeat.[386]

The 1978 and 1993 Peace Agreements

In 1978 and 1993 a U.S. president oversaw peace negotiations between Israel and Egypt and then the Palestinians. The first negotiations at Camp David gave Israel its first recognition as a state from an Arab nation in exchange for the return of the Sinai Peninsula territory that Israel gained in the 1967 War. This peace agreement ostracized Egypt from the rest of the Arab world and eventually cost President Sadat his life, but it granted Israel a new measure of security, a "cold peace" with at least one of its Arab neighbors. Neither side acted as strong allies nor did they return to a state of war. Over thirty years later, this peace still holds, mostly uncompromised. The second peace negotiations finally brought the Palestinian people directly into the process in the wake of the first *intifada*. With the end of the Cold War, Israel was less certain of its allies and could no longer afford to ignore the "Palestinian Problem" in its disputed territories. In

---

[384] Ibid., 110, 113.

[385] Bickerton and Klausner, 168.

[386] Shannon, 70-71.

addition, the Palestinians' support for Saddam Hussein during the first Gulf War left them estranged from their Arab allies and confronted with the truth that they needed to act for themselves rather than relying on any Arab state. Though the Oslo Peace Accords held promise and achieved unprecedented advancements, domestic beliefs of both groups eroded the perpetuation of the results. A Zionist radical assassinated Prime Minister Rabin and Palestinian terrorist activities rose. This section will review the key catalysts of each peace process, the agreements reached, and the policies the Israelis, the United States, and the European Union members pursued.

The 1978 Peace: Catalysts

With his so-called "shuttle diplomacy," Kissinger laid the groundwork for a peace agreement. Jimmy Carter continued this pattern as president in 1976. The following year the political situation changed in Israel as well with the election of the Likud Party and Menachem Begin. Begin and his party represented a shift from the Labor Party's secular-socialist rule to a "messianic nationalism" that combined Jewish fundamentalism and right-wing nationalism. Such changes had the potential to reverse the previous progress.

With increasing cooperation from the Arab side and assertions from Sadat that he believed relations with Israel could be normalized, in 1977 President Carter began to work towards a Geneva Peace Conference to bring the Arab states and representatives for the PLO together with the Israelis. In order to strengthen the impact of the conference, Carter collaborated with a Soviet diplomat Mikhail Sytenko to create a joint communiqué to lay out what they hoped to achieve at the conference. However, the communiqué's call for the guarantee of the rights of the Palestinian people and the eventual military withdrawal from the 1967 occupied territories created a firestorm of opposition from the

Israelis as well as the American public.[387] While Sadat approved of this communiqué, he also wanted a free hand in negotiations that might not be available to him in an international peace conference. In addition, by October 1977 Sadat and Assad were deadlocked in their United Arab Republic federal alliance, which motivated Sadat to make his first trip to Jerusalem in November 1977 to create a direct channel of communication with the Israelis.[388] Over the next few months, Carter and Sadat attempted to create a joint strategy for peace but without success. Through the spring and summer of 1978, the Egyptian and Israeli leaders made little substantive progress in a series of contacts. Carter grew impatient with the slow pace of the diplomacy and created a U.S. proposal to hold a summit meeting at Camp David, believing a summit would be the right environment, away from the press and the burden of everyday governing, to commit the leaders to find a solution. [389] Carter trusted his own skills as a mediator, but he sought,

> to frame a theological context for the deliberations—one which would inspire the principals to think of themselves as standing under a possibility of not merely human but divine reward or judgment. Accordingly, on the first day of their meetings, the three leaders agreed to the text of a request to the people of the world for prayer for the success of their deliberations….As well, the president provided for each contingent to hold religious services at their customary times: Muslims on Friday, Jews on Saturday, and Christians on Sunday, all to be held in the same small room.[390]

---

[387] Bickerton and Klausner, 189.

[388] Quandt, 189, 191.

[389] Ibid., 196-197.

[390] Merkley, 121.

Carter structured the negotiations to acknowledge the religious beliefs involved and to call upon their authority as a means to lead them along the path towards peace and compromise.

The 1978 Peace: The Agreements Reached

When Carter proposed a summit to Begin and Sadat, both accepted the request despite their personal dislike for one another. They remained at Camp David from September 5 to September 17 struggling back and forth over possible terms for peace. The accords they reached at the end of their time together formed the basis for all subsequent peace negotiations. The first agreement was known as a Framework for Peace in the Middle East, which called for negotiations among Egypt, Jordan, Israel, and representatives of the Palestinian people to settle the question of the West Bank and the Gaza Strip. A self-governing Palestinian authority would replace the Israeli military forces for five years while negotiations took place on the final status of the two areas. The second agreement was known as a Framework for the Conclusion of a Peace Treaty Between Egypt and Israel." This was a draft proposal for a peace agreement between the two parties to be signed within three months. This proposal provided for a phased Israeli withdrawal from the Sinai Peninsula over three years and a full restoration of the area to Egypt. Israeli ships would be guaranteed free access through the Suez Canal. The UN was to oversee the implementation of these provisions. The conference completely ignored the troublesome issues of Jerusalem and the future of the Golan Heights.[391]

[391] Bickerton and Klausner, 190.

These accords required concessions from both sides. Despite being a strong proponent of settlements, Begin agreed to remove all Israeli settlements from the Sinai and to turn over the oil fields and Israeli air bases in the area. Begin continued to propound his view that there would be no future independent Palestinian state, but he was willing to compromise in the Sinai to achieve peace, because to him that area of land was negotiable in a way the West Bank and Gaza were not. For Begin, the ideological and nationalistic reasons for retaining the West Bank and Gaza did not apply in the case of the Sinai. For many Israelis, the occupied Sinai territories, rather than providing the anticipated strategic depth, had brought the opposite. In the peace agreement, Israel gained freedom from Egyptian attacks for three years, which also likely implied freedom from Syrian or Jordanian attacks as well, for they were unlikely to go to war without Egypt.[392]

Notwithstanding his role as the president of the leading nation of the Arab world, Sadat agreed to a separate peace with Israel without regard for the other Arab states or the Palestinian people. Sadat wanted the peace with Israel to free up the resources his country had devoted to waging war in order to reconstruct and widen the Suez Canal and to free the country from the Soviet influence that sought to envelop his country into the Union. Previously, the U.S. had miscalculated the possibility for a separate Israeli-Egyptian peace, given Sadat's repeated assertions that he could never afford to do so.[393] They did not recognize that Sadat was so determined to regain Egyptian sovereignty over all the

---

[392] Ibid., 190-191.

[393] Quandt, 188.

Sinai Peninsula that he would agree to overlook the demands for a Palestinian state in the West Bank. Begin traded this highly desired sovereignty for a free hand in the West Bank.[394] In the face of Pan-Arabism that sought to unite the Arab world as a single ethnical unit and solidarity with the Palestinians, Sadat chose to secure the strength of his nation.

The 1978 Peace: The Policies of the Actors

The 1973 War affected the self-image of Israel. The confidence gained in the 1967 War had been lost. The oil embargo that followed the war and Israel's increased dependence on the U.S. assistance made peace a more desirable attainment. The shift from Labor to Likud leadership would be expected to halt any prospects for peace, particularly when the price of peace would be in the form of surrendered territory. Begin came to the negotiating table partly to retain the benefits of the Israeli relationship with the U.S. Had the U.S. not pressured Begin to find a way to make peace and had Carter not taken a personal role in the process, the likelihood of a settlement would have been greatly reduced. The U.S. made the concessions more bearable for Israel by providing Israel with $800 million to assist in the relocation of Israel's two Sinai air bases to the Negev. This would come to Israel in addition of the regular U.S. foreign aid allocations.[395]

Begin remained staunchly committed to settlements in the West Bank and Gaza, agreeing only to temporary moratoriums while the peace agreement was settled. With

---

[394] Bickerton and Klausner, 188.

[395] Ibid., 191.

groups such as Gush Emunim supporting his party, ideology prevented him from committing to any promises of a Palestinian state or of land for them. While the Sinai did hold biblical significance for the Jews, as the place where God had given Moses the Ten Commandments and confirmed the covenant to the Israelites, its meaning was not comparable to the insecurity it perpetuated. In making this concession, Israel gained its first positive exposure to making conciliations with an Arab state. U.S. officials hoped Egypt would lead the rest of the Arab world along the same path. Instead, the Arab states responded to the peace settlement with hostility, for peace with Israel acknowledged their existence and discounted the Arab and Palestinian claims against Israel. The Arab states immediately expelled Egypt from the Arab League and increased their suspicion of Israel and the U.S.

Nixon and Kissinger laid the groundwork for a workable peace among the regional states, but Carter's initiative and attention from the beginning of his term solidified the desires and attempts for peace. Carter brought an optimistic, idealistic belief to his negotiations, assuming that if leaders would simply reason together and listen to the aspirations of their people, the problems could be resolved. His past experience as a governor of Georgia dealing with the civil rights movement and his personal beliefs as a born-again Christian kept him from being deterred by the difficulty or complexity of the challenges in the Middle East.[396] As the governor, he was famous for his assertion in his inaugural address that "the time for racial discrimination is over."[397] This declaration

---

[396] Quandt, 177.

[397] Jimmy Carter, "Inaugural Address," January 12, 1971, http://www.jimmycarterlibrary.gov/documents/inaugural_address.pdf (Accessed March 29, 2012).

followed by actions that brought the black population into the state's decision making showed Carter to be a man able to address deep-seated issues.[398] In his presidential campaign, he brought this reputation and a candor regarding his religious beliefs that was unusual for the time. He regularly told crowds "that the most important thing in my life is Jesus Christ."[399] When speaking to Jewish groups on matters of Israel, he drew on his biblical faith, stating, "I worship the same God you do. We [Baptists] study the same Bible you do….The survival of Israel is not a political issue. It is a moral imperative."[400] With this moral imperative in line with some of the ideas of Christian Zionists to improve matters in the Middle East and with his experience guiding hostile groups to compromise, Carter invested many hours and significant effort to help Sadat and Begin make peace and to fulfill his biblical imperative to the Jewish people.

Sadat initiated the events that eventually led Begin and him to Camp David, but Carter quickly joined and guided the progress. Carter watched for months as the committees Egypt and Israel formed in early 1978 went back and forth with proposed peace treaty terms. When little progress appeared, Carter took the initiative to form a plan for a summit to bring the two leaders together, inspired by his belief that progress could be made if leaders would sit down and talk. Carter described the Camp David summit as "one of the most frustrating experiences of my life," but his persistence and personal involvement resulted in two peace accords. Throughout the process, Carter cast the U.S.

---

[398] Merkley, 88.

[399] Ibid., 89.

[400] Ibid., 91.

as the impartial mediator who was there to guarantee the promises the two sides made to one another and to encourage concessions with promises of increased aid and monetary assistance to comply with the peace settlement terms. In the days leading up to the official signing of the peace agreement in 1979, disagreements continued over details. Only after Carter visited Cairo and Jerusalem and suggested compromises did the Israeli and Egyptian governments approve the agreement. Carter oversaw the signing of the peace treaty on March 26, 1979 at the White House.[401]

The Israeli-Egyptian peace agreement involved three parties: Israel, Egypt, and the U.S. The European Community members were on the sidelines. From 1975 to 1977 the EC's relations with Israel had deteriorate significantly in light of the increased number of Israeli government approved settlements in the occupied territories and the problem of the Palestinian people's rights. Even traditionally pro-Israeli countries such as the Netherlands, West Germany, Denmark, and Luxembourg started to shift their position towards a more pro-Arab stance. When Begin and Likud came to power in 1977, this deterioration accelerated. Begin and his government generally looked to the U.S. rather than to the European nations for support. He cultivated relationships and links to the Jewish communities in the U.S., while avoiding European Jewish communities who favored the socialist Labor Party and the more moderate Israeli politics.[402]

---

[401] Bickteron and Klausner, 189-191.

[402] Musu, 37.

In June 1977, the Nine issued a new joint statement, called the London Statement, which would become the distinctive European stance on the conflict. The statement placed the Palestinian question at the heart of the Middle East conflict:

> The idea of a homeland for the Palestinians took shape. At the time of the London Statement the concept of "homeland" was still undefined and did not necessarily imply the concept of a sovereign state, but soon afterwards the project of a Palestinian State was to take form and become central in EC policy. The EC claimed that the best approach to the resolution of the conflict was a comprehensive settlement rather than a process built on bilateral negotiations. [403]

These points contrasted sharply to Israel's view of the situation. Israel believed the main problem was the Arab world's refusal to recognize the State of Israel and not the Palestinian question. Therefore, Israel sought bilateral negotiations as a means of gaining the mutual recognition and rejected the EC's proposals of a multinational peace conference.

The Camp David peace process directly opposed the European position, largely ignoring the Palestinian question and making use of bilateral negotiations to the exclusion of many other important issues that could undermine the peace agreement. When the bilateral talks eventually led to the signing of the Camp David accords, the EC offered its support to the process, while underlining that it did so "as a first step in the direction of a comprehensive settlement."[404] The EC's policies distanced it from the Camp David process, believing it would not solve the Palestinian problem. Therefore, under pressure from France and Britain, the member states came together to create a new statement

---

[403] Ibid., 38.

[404] Statement of the Nine Foreign Ministers on the Egyptian-Israeli Peace Treaty, Paris, March 26, 1979.

aimed at launching an autonomous European peace initiative for the Middle East. The proposed project pleased the Arab states but met with strong opposition from Israel and the United States. With an Israeli diplomatic campaign to block the initiative and U.S. exertions of influence to make sure the EC declaration did not harm the Camp David process, the Heads of State and Government of the Nine issued the Venice Declaration on June 13, 1980. U.S. pressure had succeeded in "domesticating" the declaration substantially, though it still contained points referring to the Palestinians' right to self-determination and to the need to include the PLO in negotiations.[405]

The 1993 Peace: Catalysts

Since the 1967 War, the U.S. had supported the Israeli preference for direct bilateral negotiations between Israel and the Arab states, using UN Resolutions 242 and 338 as the basis for a peace settlement and separating issues from one another as much as possible to facilitate step-by-step progress that might lead to an eventual final peace. In these negotiations, it was assumed that Israel would be required to give up territory, but it was never explicit which would be relinquished. "The United States supported Israel's interpretation of Resolution 242—that the status of the West Bank and Gaza was not occupied territory but disputed territory and was therefore subject to negotiation."[406] This U.S. approach allowed Israel increased influence in setting the agenda of peace negotiations and in deciding what options would be available to the Arab participants of any negotiation. In the 1980s, President Reagan upgraded Israel as a strategic ally in

[405]Musu, 39.

[406] Bickerton and Klausner, 227.

furthering American Cold War goals in the Middle East. As such, the U.S. "accepted Israel's definition of the Palestinians as terrorists, supported Israel's response to the Intifada, and backed Israeli efforts to exclude the PLO from direct bilateral negotiations."[407] Leading up to the end of the Cold War, Israel was essential to the American ideological and strategic confrontation with the Soviet Union's communism and gained innumerable benefits from this status.

The new Bush administration brought a change to the U.S.-Israeli relationship. Secretary of State James Baker proposed the Baker Plan, which was a five-point proposal that called Israel to set aside its vision of a Greater Israel, required that the PLO amend its Covenant to formalize the end to its calls for Israel's destruction, and created a list of Palestinians to offer Israel as representatives for negotiations. The PLO rejected the plan because it did not permit the PLO to be the representative for the Palestinians and required the PLO to recognize Israel's right to exist. In Israel, the Labor Party accepted the plan, but the Likud Party rejected it, requiring further conditions and assurances. Eventually, the Israeli cabinet accepted it, contingent upon certain guarantees.

The Bush administration grew increasingly frustrated with Israel's obstructionism in refusing to meet all the demands of the plan. In order to place pressure on Israeli decision-makers, Baker announced that loan guarantees would be conditioned upon the cessation of Israeli settlement activities, which the administration had determined were illegal and problematic for the peace process. This policy provoked a great outcry among Jewish groups and pro-Israeli members of Congress. In addition, it created a great deal of

---

[407] Ibid.

division in the Israeli cabinet. On March 15, 1990, the Labor Party called for a no-confidence vote, but the end result was an ultra-nationalist coalition government that guaranteed no progress in the peace process in the near future.[408]

In the Gulf War, Saddam Hussein attacked Israel with scud missiles in the hope that this would unite the Arab world around their "common enemy" of the Zionists. However, given the U.S. success in preventing Israel from retaliating to the attacks and the outrage of certain Arab states over the invasion of Kuwait, the war did more to divide the Arab nations than to unite them. Only Jordan and the PLO sided with Saddam and Iraq. The PLO chose this side because of the perceived failure of the U.S. as well as its Arab "friends" to address the Palestinian plight.[409] In 1985, Jordan and the PLO had created an agreement to work towards peace with Israel together. However, the PLO's lack of confidence in Jordan's intentions as their peace negotiation representative and their unwillingness to accept Resolutions 242 and 338 unconditionally and renounce terrorism broke apart the peace process Jordan started and drove Jordan and the PLO apart.[410] In the first Gulf War, Saddam attempted to make the war into an Arab-Israeli fight and promised to remedy the Palestinian problem as Jordan had not once he succeeded in Kuwait. With Saddam's failure, the PLO was isolated from the rest of the Arab world that resented their support for Iraq.[411]

---

[408] Shannon, 86-87.

[409] Ibid., 89.

[410] Yehuda Lukacs, *Israel, Jordan, and the Peace Process* (Syracuse, NY: Syracuse University Press, 1997), 163.

[411] Musu, 38.

The end of the Cold War and the Gulf War altered the prospects for a peace settlement in the Arab-Israeli conflict. With the fall of the Soviet Union, Moscow was torn between retaining the support of internal conservatives and military leaders and needing Western goodwill and financial aid. To secure Western support, Gorbachev began to move the new Russian nation's support away from the more politically radical Arab regimes the Soviet Union assisted in the past while making overtures to the more politically moderate Arab states and Israel that were U.S. allies. In response, Saudi Arabia and the Gulf states offered Moscow several billion dollars in loans and financial aid. The patron had become a client financially. This left the U.S. as the only viable superpower player in the region.

With improved U.S.-Arab relations in the wake of the Gulf War, Israel hoped the U.S. would use this new position to pressure the Arab states to lessen hostilities towards Israel and offer it recognition. In turn, the Arab states hoped that the U.S. would reward their cooperation in the Gulf War by placing greater pressure on Israel to return land for peace and to allow the Palestinians an independent state. In the end, Secretary of State Baker used U.S. influence to pressure both parties to come together for an international peace conference in Madrid in October 1991. Israeli Prime Minister Yitzhak Shamir agreed to attend the conference because he believed "that will signify the recognition of Israel's existence by the Arab states."[412] Shamir was adamant that there be no PLO involvement in the negotiations at the conference. Given the PLO's weakened status after

[412] Bickerton and Klausner, 241-242.

the Gulf War and with the *intifada* continuing in the occupied territories, the PLO acquiesced to a formation of a joint Jordanian-Palestinian delegation.[413]

The Madrid Conference was a monumental event in that it was the first time in history that the parties of the conflict all sat down together, face to face, to discuss the issues on the basis of Resolutions 242 and 338. Despite the excitement and anticipation that surrounded the event, negotiations made little progress. The most to which the Likud delegation would commit was limited autonomy for the people within the territories with Israel retaining full control of security and foreign affairs over the land. Discussions over the issues between Syria and Israel and Lebanon and Israel found little success, impeded by continued arguing. Positions hardened, and the talks appeared to achieve no success.[414]

Further multilateral talks were held. The first were in Moscow in 1992, but the Palestinians boycotted them because the U.S. and Russia would not recognize their delegation that contained Palestinians living outside the occupied territories. Israel boycotted the second round of talks in May 1992 that dealt with economic cooperation and refugees because Palestinian refugees from outside the West Bank and Gaza insisted on being present. Syria and Lebanon said they would boycott all such talks until they saw more success in the bilateral negotiations. With such resistance among the key actors, it is not surprising no agreement was reached.[415]

---

[413] Ibid.

[414] Ibid., 244-245.

[415] Ibid., 245.

The 1993 Peace: The Agreements Reached

In June 1992, the tide shifted in Israel with Labor defeating Likud. Yitzhak Rabin formed the new coalition government as the prime minister. He pledged to halt all nonstrategic settlement activity and expressed his desire to move quickly towards the establishment of Palestinian autonomy. Though change within the government was slow, Rabin's election breathed new life into the peace process. To demonstrate his commitment to these ideas, he freed more than 800 political prisoners, halted most settlement activity, barred private Israeli building permits in the occupied territories, and reiterated the land for peace position.

The Palestinians were still wary of Rabin's sincerity and pushed for a Palestinian Interim Self-Governing Authority, which would be a legislative rather than simply an administrative body. Internally, the Palestinians were struggling over leadership, with some questioning Arafat's dedication to the issues and with extremist groups such as Hamas and Islamic Jihad inciting increased violence in response to the stagnation within the peace negotiations. All attempts at negotiations were put on hold at the end of 1992, waiting for the results of the American presidential elections.[416]

Despite the change in American leadership, the change in the Israeli government proved of greater consequence and propelled the peace process along. The "Oslo Channel" opened in December 1992, beginning with low-level Israeli and PLO contacts, thus overcoming the long-standing separation between the PLO and the Israeli government and granting the PLO a place at the negotiating table. During a subsequent

[416] Ibid., 246-247.

round of talks flowing from the Madrid Conference, Norwegian officials with officials from Israel and the PLO convinced Rabin and Arafat to pursue unofficial channels of dialogue using Oslo as a neutral facilitator. The U.S. did not oppose this, since they still distanced themselves from the PLO given their position in the Gulf War. The U.S. remained informed of the proceedings of the unofficial talks but was pessimistic as to the potential for results. For five months beginning in January 1993, two Israeli academics met with three senior PLO officials along with Norwegian mediators to create an informal declaration of principles to serve as the basis for the future peace between Israel and Palestine. By August, they had an agreeable plan, which when presented to Foreign Minister Shimon Peres, he signed. It was known as the Declaration of Principles on Interim Self-Government Arrangement:

> It called for a ten-month timetable for election of a Palestinian Council to run West Bank and Gaza for a five-year period, during which Israel and the Palestinians would reach a permanent status settlement of outstanding issues based on UN Resolutions 242 and 338. This agreement included the withdrawal and redeployment of an Israeli force to be replaced by a police force run by the Palestinian Authority in negotiated areas. The deal was predicated on mutual recognition: of Israel's right to exist by the PLO, and of the PLO as the representative of the Palestinians by the government of Israel.[417]

In this arrangement, both sides compromised but also gained. Israel received recognition as a nation from the PLO as the representative of the Palestinian people. The Palestinian people in the territories began the initial steps towards self-government and autonomy under their own elected officials. The Israelis and Palestinians took the declaration next to the U.S., who were surprised and pleased at the breakthrough the declaration represented. Conferring with President Clinton, Secretary of State Warren Christopher

---

[417] Shannon, 94.

and Mideast Envoy Dennis Ross immediately offered the U.S. approval of the plan and prepared to be a part of its presentation to the rest of the world. The Israeli government officially approved the Declaration of Principles on August 30, and the famous ceremonial handshake on the White House law occurred on September 13. President Clinton stood between Rabin and Arafat as they shook hands, signifying the U.S. role as a balanced mediator for the upcoming road to implementation of the Oslo Accords.[418]

The 1993 Peace: The Policies of the Actors

Rabin's ideological willingness to engage in land for peace agreements in contrast to his Likud predecessors significantly altered the Israeli capacity to move forward. Shamir had felt significant pressure from the Bush administration to pursue peace, but his inability to yield to compromise on key points, such as settlements and refugees, encumbered any attempt at negotiations. The end of the Cold War had put Israel in a difficult position with the U.S., for the primary strategic foundation for an alliance with Israel disappeared. As the apparent strategic nature of Israel diminished for the U.S., the Bush administration observed more of the liabilities that lay in supporting Israel and attempted to apply pressure to bring change. With the election of Clinton, the atmosphere of the White House became decidedly more pro-Israel with increased cooperation expected between the U.S. and Israel.[419] The new Vice President Al Gore brought a pro-Israel record from his time in Congress. Clinton's new Secretary of State Warren Christopher was a veteran of Carter's administration as his deputy secretary of state and a

[418] Ibid., 94-95.

[419] Bickerton and Klausner, 247.

part of Carter's inner circle of advisors, which offered him insight into developing balanced peace agreements that satisfied both sides.[420] Clinton was fairly new to the issues of the Middle East peace process and relied on his advisors for policy direction. With his primary focus on the Bosnian crisis in early 1993, Clinton supported Christopher's belief that the American role was to act as a mediator to help the Israelis and Palestinians reach agreements but not to do the bulk of the work.[421]

Rabin's strong desire for a successful peace process eased the changes the Clinton administration began to make. The peace process progress was sluggish at first because the parties approached the negotiations from different angles. The Israelis sought a time-buying interim agreement to mollify the unrest in the occupied territories and to allow a more moderate West Bank Palestinian leadership to emerge. They believed this could be done in the context of the five-year transitional agreement envisaged in the Camp David Accords from 1978. This type of agreement would postpone discussions of the so-called final status issues, which were the inflammatory and divisive points in any attempt at a peace agreement. In contrast, the Palestinians sought to gain recognition for the PLO as the sole representative of the Palestinian people and to force the issue of statehood as an imminent goal. To gain greater legitimacy, the PLO needed to demonstrate to the Palestinian population that it could end Israeli occupation and limit the building of new settlements and land confiscation. In the face of these competing goals, the U.S. sided with Israel, asserting that small practical steps needed to be taken first as confidence-

---

[420] Quandt, 322.

[421] Ibid., 324.

building measures, followed by an agreement for a transitional period that would culminate in negotiations on the final status issues that were most important to the Palestinians. As the weakest party in the negotiations, the PLO conceded to the Israeli-American approach.[422]

William Quandt observes that many credited the U.S. with wisdom in knowing when to step back from the negotiations and allow the parties to work things out directly, demonstrating their desire to act as a balanced mediator. The U.S. had attempted to facilitate talks in Washington, but with little success as each side continued to posture for its home audiences rather than committing to any serious give-and-take negotiations. Arafat refused to endow the Palestinian PLO representatives with maneuvering power to demonstrate that if the Americans and Israelis did not deal directly with him they would fail to advance the peace talks. The Israelis finally met this requirement in their talks with direct representatives of Arafat in the secret Norwegian negotiations, allowing these semiofficial channels of discussion to lead to a historical peace agreement.[423]

Though the U.S. served primarily as the confirmer of the peace accords the Israeli and Palestinians created, Clinton's presence at the final hand-shaking ceremony illustrated the continuing role for the U.S. as a confirmer and overseer of the process. In contrast to this continual role the U.S. played as an overseer in the 1980s and early 1990s, the EC lacked the instruments or willingness to implement the Venice Declaration's strategy for peace, with the limited intergovernmental cooperation of the EPC restricting

---

[422] Ibid., 326-327.

[423] Ibid., 327.

action. In 1991, the newly formed European Union remained primarily as an observer of the process. The Madrid Conference that year embodied the Union's decade-old claims that the solution for the Arab-Israeli conflict lay in a multilateral peace conference, but the American-initiated invitations for the event requested the Union member states' presence as only observers along with the Gulf Cooperation Council and the United Nations.[424]

The EC insisted upon being included in the Conference as a full participant but was rebuffed due to Israel's distrust of the European governments and lack of acceptance of the EC as a mediator. To Israel, the European powers were unacceptable mediators in the peace process because they had,

> demanded that Israel make concessions to the Palestinians in advance of direct peace negotiations between Israel and the Palestinians; made concessions to the Palestinians that prejudged Israeli interests in advance of direct peace negotiations; and insisted on the United Nations as the appropriate forum for negotiations towards a comprehensive peace settlement, knowing that this was totally unacceptable to Israel.[425]

Israel's unwillingness to negotiate through the EC preempted any attempt the new Union might make to balance the U.S. involvement in the Conference.

The Conference resulted in rounds of bilateral talks, in which neither the U.S. nor the EU were directly involved. Despite this official status as observers, the U.S. still bore an important role, meeting separately with the parties and setting forth proposals for discussion in the dialogues. The EU played a relevant role in being the gavel holder of the Regional Economic Development Working Group (REDWG) discussions, but this

---

[424] Musu, 48.

[425] Ibid., 49.

working group made no progress. As these multilateral negotiations stalled, the Israelis and Palestinians began separate bilateral talks in Oslo, away from both U.S. and EU direct oversight. The location of the signing of the Declaration of Principles on September 13, 1993 in Washington demonstrated the American role as the sole mediator and limited EU contributions to issuing statements of support.[426]

As the U.S. continued to be the primary mediator and overseer of the implementation of the Oslo Accords, the EU found an alternative means of involvement funding the peace process, in particular with large sums of financial support to the new Palestinian Authority. At a Donors' Conference in October 1993, the EU inaugurated a special program to donate 700 million European Currency Units (ECUs) by the end of 1997 to support and build the Palestinian economy in the West Bank and Gaza. At the signing of the Gaza-Jericho Agreement that gave the PA authority over those areas, the EU committed to donate another 10 million ECUs to fund a Palestinian police force. Underlying the EU's giving was the assumption based upon its own experience beginning as an economic union that a strong Palestinian economy was Israel's best long-term security guarantee and a precondition for maintaining the peace process.[427]

---

[426] Ibid., 53-54.

[427] Ibid., 55.

CHAPTER SIX

CONCLUSIONS

An evaluation of the historical record of the policy positions of the United States and the European nations shows a fairly consistent support from the U.S. for Israel and a declining European opinion of Israel coupled with a growing support for the Palestinians' side. The 1967 War seemed to accelerate both these propensities. The Israeli unilateral attacks and their subsequent avoidance of international law regarding occupied territories troubled nations such as France that looked to multilateralism and international organizations as key sources of legitimacy. By the 1973 War, most European nations preferred the Arab rather than the Israeli side. When the oil embargo began in the wake of the war, the Arab states considered the majority of EC members as either "neutral" or "most favored nations," thus limiting the impact of the embargo on their economies, compared to the complete embargo the U.S. and Israel experienced.

The U.S. had the opportunity to pressure Israel to return to the pre-war lines, as President Eisenhower did in the 1956 Suez Canal conflict, but President Johnson did not concentrate his efforts explicitly on that. The UN resolution he crafted dealt in ambiguities that offered ideals but no direction of the steps needed to traverse between reality and the ideal. President Nixon followed Johnson's efforts with his own declaration

of Israel as a key strategic asset to the U.S. in the Middle East in the midst of the Cold War with the Soviet Union. Israel became a surrogate presence for the U.S. in the region, justifying increased military arms sales and financial aid. After the 1979 peace agreement, Egypt gained U.S. support and has received an average of $2 billion a year for economic and military aid.[428] With the end of the Cold War, the weak points of Israel's associations with its neighbors and within the occupied territories became more apparent to the new Bush administration. Israel's participation in international peace conference talks with the Arabs and the PLO reduced the American frustration with many Israeli policies, but the rise of terrorism in response to the peace process from those who opposed it gave a new ideological enemy to unite the U.S. and Israel together to fight in the region.

In surveying the progression of support or disapproval, it appears that at the creation of the State of Israel the European nations offered their approval for the new state out of a sense of conscience due to the events of the Holocaust and out of a belief that Palestine was a better place for the many displaced Jews in Europe. As time moved everyone further from these events, one by one the EC members began to recreate their policies on the conflict based upon the actions of the Israeli government. In addition, through their histories as colonial powers, many of the founding members of the EC had stronger ties to the Arab states and to the economic benefits associated with being their

[428] Jeremy Sharp, "U.S. Foreign Assistance to the Middle East: Historical Background, Recent Trends, and the FY2011 Request," *Congressional Research Service*, June 15, 2010, 4. Available at http://www.fas.org/sgp/crs/mideast/RL32260.pdf.

allies. These historical links kept the European states connected to the Arab people and more willing to support their side.

In contrast to the evolution of European policy, U.S. policy has remained remarkably consistent in spite of Israel's swings between Labor and Likud policy positions. The stakes of the Cold War and the fervent belief that the evil of communism must be stopped at all costs could easily justify the U.S. backing of Israel's interpretation of 242 and its hesitance to force any steps towards its implementation. Nevertheless, the continuation of U.S. support for Israel after the Cold War demonstrates Paul Charles Merkley's point that the relationship must rest on more than mere strategy to endure that change.[429] Even as Bush's administration attempted to chastise Israel on the issue of settlements, the American people rose up in protest to this perceived anti-Israel action, supporting the continuation of the special relationship. The U.S. did not abandon the state but still took Israel's side at the Madrid Conference. In pressing the Israelis, the U.S. attempted to rehabilitate its own image to the Arabs with whom it had fought Saddam Hussein. However, in line with Israeli policy, the Bush administration avoided interactions with the PLO as a representative of the Palestinians due to the side they chose in the Gulf War.

In view of these divergent progressions of policy towards Israel and the Palestinians, one is redirected to the initial question of this thesis that seeks to understand why the sides hold these opposing policy positions. Much of this study has focused on the historical context and decisions of policymakers in the conflict. In certain cases, leaders

[429] Merkley, 78.

declared their reliance on their religious beliefs, such as Truman's dependence upon his childhood biblical training and ongoing biblical study to justify his desire to help the Jews settle in Palestine. Others divorced their religion from their policy, such as Nixon who was willing to discuss his faith in private but built the U.S-Israeli relationship purely on strategic Cold War grounds in line with realist ideology. He stated his refusal to rely upon any religious views in his decision-making.[430] It is necessary to overlay these decisions with existing domestic ideology of their citizens and compare it to the Israeli policy record.

Typically, U.S. domestic support for Israel is attributed primarily to the American Jewish constituency based on the strategic power of its vote in key states. Vaughn Shannon calls them "one of the largest veto groups in the country" [431] and asserts that the vast majority are pro-Israel in their sympathies.[432] From the time of President Roosevelt and the Great Depression, American Jews have generally landed in the Democratic Party. Despite this tendency, presidential candidates regardless of party have made the effort to establish their plans to assist Israel in large part to try to secure the Jewish vote.[433] With Truman's recognition of Israel, the Democratic Party became the pro-Israel party until the 1980s. In the 1980s, President Reagan's brought larger numbers of Christian conservatives into the Republican Party making it the Zionist and pro-Israel party. Carter's failures in 1980 to meet several challenges to American security drove the

---

[430] Richard Nixon, *Leaders* (New York: Touchstone, 1990), 280, 287-288.

[431] Shannon, 7.

[432] Ibid.

[433] Merkley, 21.

"patriotic conservatives" to the Republican Party as well. These supported Israel because they believed that those who hated Israel also hated the U.S. and democracy. In addition, at this time some Jews moved from the Democratic Party to the Republican Party, for they were now a part of the nation's establishment that conservatism seemed to protect. They had grown weary of the constant change of the Democratic liberalism.[434]

As these pro-Israel groups found homes in the Republican Party, the Democratic Party became progressively less pro-Israel, yet without losing the Jewish vote. Merkley asserts that this is because "support for Israel is not at the top of their lists. They align with Democrats because of social issues like abortion, prayer in schools, and gay rights,"[435] which are the same types of social policy issues that drew the Jews to Roosevelt in the 1930s. This shift in American Jewry illustrates that simple ethnic association may likely be a secondary factor in domestic politics. Laying the foundation of American pro-Israel policies solely on the grounds of retaining the Jewish vote is deficient in explaining the U.S. partiality to Israel, given the inconsistent correspondence between pro-Israel presidential actions and reception of Jewish votes.

As such, one is left with the other side of the Jewish lobby, the Christian Zionists. Jews make up approximately three percent of the American public, whereas over fifty percent of the population is Protestant and approximately half of those are Evangelical Christians.[436] A lack of substantial research data precludes any assertions to the exact size

---

[434] Herbert Solomon, "The Republican Party and the Jews," *Judaism* 37, no. 3 (1988): 280-281.

[435] Merkley, 230-231.

[436] Wald, 161.

and influence of the Christian Zionists within the Evangelical group. However, a significant minority appears to hold to some or all elements of the Christian Zionist doctrines, chiefly among which is the identity of Israel as God's chosen people throughout history, which affirms to them the right of the land in Palestine. These Christian Zionists are, therefore, motivated to ensure their nation recognizes God's relationship with Israel for the sake of blessing both nations.

Since the end of the Holocaust, the Christian Church has put greater emphasis on stamping out anti-Semitism as a moral evil, thus creating a moral foundation for policy. The Church's emphasis on tolerance may be linked to lower levels of anti-Semitic behavior. However, when one looks at the specific beliefs of the Christian Zionists, it is evident that such convictions cannot remain private and as simple moral guides. If the Bible tells them that the land of Palestine is given to the Jews by God's decree forever and that He promises to bless those that bless the Jews, there is no room for simple exhortations on moral and ethical precepts. Such beliefs based upon an authoritative word from God require particular, concerted action.

Christian Zionists' beliefs clearly identify the side that they must take in U.S. foreign policy towards Israel and the Palestinians. The conflicts of the Bible endure today, so they must rely upon God's commands in the Bible to determine the side He requires them to take. It is evident that U.S. policy generally chooses the same side as Christian Zionists, though politicians often select this side for more than one reason. U.S. presidents consistently follow a pattern that moves from a pro-Israel stance during their campaign and at the beginning of their term to a more frustrated view of Israel that leads them to attempt to pressure Israel to concede. However, these presidential pressures

rarely alter the relationship, for the U.S. Congress regularly reigns in the Executive to restore the pro-Israel stance. While it is necessary to recognize that the Christian Zionists beliefs are not the only influence on American foreign policy in regard to the conflict, the strong support the U.S. offers the one side while downplaying the other side over the first forty-five years of the conflict demonstrates that ideology and religious beliefs help to hold together the strategy of the relationship.[437]

Among the foreign policies of the European Union, the Palestinian Authority features more prominently. Rising numbers of immigrants and voting Muslim citizens may factor into this, for the doctrine of the *umma* as the universal community of Muslims impacts the thinking and identity of Islamic believers. However, given that Muslims account for less than twenty percent of European inhabitants, the core motivation for the EU policies begins within the traditional European communities. The European Union is a test of multilateral ideas and relies on the notions of Wilsonian idealism to trust the ideals of international organizations and of men willingly taking the right actions to protect peace and improve the lives of all men. In this environment the nation-state and national divisions and loyalties are meant to disappear.

While Israel supports the international system, it remains a single nation-state that seeks to defend its boundaries and people. For religious and security reasons, it also controls lands contested under international law. Most of what Israel does and supports is the antithesis of idealism to the EU: unilateral action, denial of rights to a large group of people, rejection of self-determination for a people group, retention of occupied

---

[437] Merkley, 232.

territories, and resistance to international laws and multilateral peace conferences. The U.S. appears linked to Israel with some type of religious bond that is absent for the Europeans. EU support is proportional to Israel's compliance with European ideals, which the Jewish state embodied for the Europeans at its creation but it has since fallen away from that perception as a result of the various conflicts in the second half of the twentieth century. The Palestinians receive European support not only because the Europeans see them as the victims of hawkish, realist policy, but also because European ideology dictates that any solution for peace requires both sides to practice the principles of democracy for all within a country and to be enjoying the benefits of self-determination.

The State of Israel stands between these two actors in the conflict, consistently fixed upon the goals of security, retaining the Jewishness of the state, and providing land and opportunity for its people. The two main parties, Labor and Likud, alternate as the key leaders of the government, each pursuing these goals with divergent approaches. The issue of settlements, as it is wrapped up in the religious nationalist ideas of the Greater Israel movement and Kookist theology, stands out a key ideological issue in regard to whom the Israeli people give the power of the state. The ideological significance of these ideas within Israel rests in the persistent efforts among believers to ensure the government conforms to its beliefs. While secularists like Rabin had temporary successes, the perpetuation of the settlements in the occupied territories and the reluctance of the government to relinquish any piece of the West Bank demonstrated the correlation between such religious beliefs and the government's policy towards the territories.

American Christian Zionists appreciate the religious nationalist theology of the settlers and support the movement because it aligns with their understanding of the land as given to the Jews by God and irrevocable. Even as the settlers' movements believe they must act to influence their government, Christian Zionists take to the political sphere and join the Israeli lobby to secure God's blessings for their country and to fulfill His commands. European beliefs remain at the philosophical and ideological level, focused on conformity to international laws and norms based in universal norms of human rights, democracy, and freedom. These ideals permeate their societies and priorities and shape elements of their policies. The values of each society appear to draw them to the side that represents the beliefs they hold to be most important. From the historical record, religious belief does not stand out as a consistent and dominant cause of policy for each actor towards the conflict, though it appears as a key support and complement to other policy foundations. Though actors within the Arab-Israeli conflict are likely not to rely solely on religious beliefs to justify policies, a study of the conflict's history demonstrates an underlying correlation between the societal beliefs of a national actor and its policies.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Abrams, Elliott, ed. *The Influence of Faith: Religious Groups and U.S. Foreign Policy*. Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers, Inc., 2001.

Alexander, Gerald. "There Are No Alternatives to the 'Western' Model of Democracy." *The Brown Journal of World Affairs* 12, no. 1 (2005): 155-163.

The American Israeli Public Affairs Committee. "Our Mission." http://www.aipac.org/en/about-aipac/our-mission (Accessed November 25, 2011).

Amstutz, Mark. "Faith-Based NGOs and U.S. Foreign Policy." In *The Influence of Faith: Religious Groups and U.S. Foreign Policy*, edited by Elliott Abrams, 175-188. Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers, Inc., 2001.

Barak-Erez, Daphne. *Outlawed Pigs: Law, Religion, and Culture in Israel*. Madison, WI: University of Wisconsin Press, 2007.

Baumgartner, Frank and Beth Leech. *Basic Interests: The Importance of Groups in Politics and in Political Science*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1998.

Baumgartner, Jody, Peter Francia, and Jonathan Morris. "A Clash of Civilizations? The Influence of Religion on Public Opinion of U.S. Foreign Policy in the Middle East." *Political Research Quarterly* 61 (2008): 171-179.

Baumgart-Ochse, Claudia. "Democratization in Israel, Politicized Religion and the Failure of the Oslo Peace Process." *Democratization* 16, no. 6 (2009): 1115-1142.

Begin, Menachem. *The Revolt*. Los Angeles: Nash Publishing, 1972.

Bell, J. Bowyer. *Terror Out of Zion: Irgun Zvai Leumi, LEHI, and the Palestine Underground*. New York: St. Martin's Press, 1977.

Ben-Zvi, Abraham. *Decade of Transition: Eisenhower, Kennedy, and the Origin of American-Israeli Alliance*. New York: Columbia University Press, 1998.

Bergman, Ahron. *Israel's War: 1947-93*. London: Routledge, 2000.

Bialer, Uri. *Cross on the Star of David: The Christian World in Israel's Foreign Policy, 1948-1967*. Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Press, 2005.

Bickerton, Ian. *A History of the Arab-Israeli Conflict.* London: Reakftion Publishers, 2009.

Bickerton, Ian and Carla Klausner. *A History of the Arab-Israeli Conflict*. 6th ed. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Pearson Education, Inc., 2007.

Biegelbauer, Peter and Janus Hansen. "Democratic Theory and Citizen Participation: Models in the Evaluation of Public Participation in Science and Technology." *Science and Public Policy* 38, no. 8 (2011): 589-597.

Bleich, Eric. "What Is Islamophobia and How Much Is There? Theorizing and Measuring an Emerging Comparative Concept." *American Behavioral Scientist* 55 (2011): 1581-1600.

Bohman, James and William Rehg, eds. *Deliberative Democracy: Essays on Reason and Politics*. Cambridge, MA: Massachusetts Institute of Technology Press, 1997.

Bowden, John, ed. *Encyclopedia of Christianity*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2005.

Bradshaw, Tancred. "Arms and Influence: British Arms Policy and the Decline of the British Influence in the Middle East, 1948-49." *British Scholar* 3, no. 1 (2010): 79-104.

Brecher, Michael. *The Foreign Policy System of Israel: Settings, Images, Process*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1972.

Buckley, Thomas E. "After Disestablishment: Thomas Jefferson's Wall of Separation in Antebellum Virginia." *Journal of Southern History* 61 (Aug. 1995): 445-480.

Burstein, Paul. "Why Estimates of the Impact of Public Opinion on Public Policy Are Too High: Empirical and Theoretical Implications." *Social Forces* 84 (2006): 2273-2289.

Bush, George H.W. "Address on Somalia." http://millercenter.org/president/speeches/detail/3984 (Accessed November 22, 2011).

Bush, George W. "Address Before a Joint Session of Congress on the State of the

Union." January 28, 2003. *Weekly Compilation of Presidential Documents*. 2003 Presidential Documents Online. http://frwebgate.access.gpo.gov/cgi-bin/getdoc.cgi?dbname=2003_presidential_documents&docid=pd03fe03_txt-6.pdf.

Calo, Zachary. "Islamic Headscarves, Religious Pluralism, and Secular Human Rights." Paper presented at the conference of the International Consortium for Law and Religion Studies, Santiago, Chile, September 2011.

_____. "Religion, Human Rights and Post-Secular Legal Theory." *St. John's Law Review* 86 (2012): 495-520.

Campso, Michelle Ursula. *Ottoman Brothers: Muslims, Christians, and Jews in Early Twentieth Century Palestine.* Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 2011.

Carter, Jimmy. "Inaugural Address." January 12, 1971. http://www.jimmycarterlibrary.gov/documents/inaugural_address.pdf (Accessed March 29, 2012).

Cavatorta, Francesco and Ben Tonra. "Normative Foundations in EU Foreign, Security and Defence Policy: The Case of the Middle East Peace Process—A View from the Field." *Comparative Politics* 13, no. 4 (2007): 349-363.

Ceasar, James, Laurence O'Toole, Joseph Bessette, and Glen Thurow. *American Government: Origins, Institutions, and Public Policy*. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1984.

Chapman, Colin. "Premillennial Theology, Christian Zionism, and Christian Mission." *International Bulletin of Missionary Research* 33, no. 3 (2009): 137-157.

_____. *Whose Promised Land, Israel or Palestine?* Oxford: Lion, 2002.

Chilton, David. *The Days of Vengeance: An Exposition of the Book of Revelation*. Ft. Worth, TX: Dominion Press, 1987.

Christison, Kathleen. *Perceptions of Palestine: Their Influence on U.S. Middle East Policy*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press, 2000.

Clark, Victoria. *Allies for Armageddon: The Rise of Christian Zionism*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 2007.

Cohen, Michael. *Palestine and the Great Powers: 1945-1948*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1982.

Complak, Krystian. "Will Poland Be the Most Confessional State of the European

Union?" *Jurisprudence* 1, no. 119 (2010): 85-95.

Curry, Thomas. *The First Freedoms: Church and State in America to the Passage of the First Amendment.* New York: Oxford University Press, 1986.

Dahl, Robert. *Democracy and Its Critics*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1989.

_____. *Polyarchy*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1971.

De Vreese, Claes H., Hajo G. Boomgaarden, Michael Minkenberg, and Rens Vliegenthart. "Introduction: Religion and the European Union." *Western European Politics* 32, no. 6 (2009): 1182-1189.

Declaration of the Nine Foreign Ministers on the Situation in the Middle East, Brussels, November 6, 1973.

Dingwerth, Klaus. "Global Democracy without Global Justice? Why a Procedural Account Is Flawed." Paper presented at the ECPR Standing Group on International Relations' 8th Pan-European Conference on International Relations, Section 34: Democratic Governance and International Institutions, Stockholm, September 9-11, 2010.

Dionne, E.J., Kayla Drogosz, and Jean Bethke Elshtain, eds. *One Electorate Under God? A Dialogue on Religion and American Politics*. Washington, D.C.: Brookings Institution Press, 2004.

Dionne, E.J., Kayla Drogosz, and Jean Bethke Elshtain. "The Paradoxes of Religion and Foreign Policy, An Introduction." In *One Electorate Under God? A Dialogue on Religion and American Politics*, edited by E.J. Dionne, Kayla Drogosz, and Jean Bethke Elshtain, 1-10. Washington, D.C.: Brookings Institute Press, 2004.

Doe, Norman. "Towards a 'Common Law' on Religion in the European Union." *Religion, State & Society* 37, no. 1/2 (2009): 147-166.

Don-Yehiya, E. "Jewish Messianism, Religious Zionism and Israeli Politics: The Impact and Origins of Gush Emunim." *Middle Eastern Studies* 23, no. 2 (1987): 225-227.

Dooyeweerd, Herman. *In the Twilight of Western Thought*: *Studies in the Pretended Autonomy of Philosophical Thought*. Nutley, NJ: The Craig Press, 1975.

Dougherty, James and Robert Pfaltzgraff, Jr. *Contending Theories of International Relations: A Comprehensive Survey.* New York: Harper & Row Publishing, 1981.

Dreisbach, Daniel. *Thomas Jefferson and the Wall of Separation Between Church and State.* New York: New York University Press, 2002.

Dyrness, William, Veli-Matti Karkkainen, Juan Martinez, and Simon Chan, eds. *Global Dictionary of Theology: A Resource for the Worldwide Church.* Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity Press, 2008.

Eidsmore, John. *God and Caesar: Biblical Faith and Political Action*. Westchester, IL: Crossway Books, 1984.

Eisenstein, Marie. "Religious Motivation vs. Traditional Religiousness: Bridging the Gap Between Religion and Politics and the Psychology of Religion." *Interdisciplinary Journal of Research on Religion* 2, no. 2 (2006): 1-30.

El-Hasan, Hasan Afif. *Is the Two-State Solution Already Dead? A Political and Military History of the Palestinian-Israeli Conflict.* New York: Algora Publishing, 2010.

Erikson, Erik Oddvar and John Erik Fossum. "Europe in Search of Legitimacy: Strategies of Legitimation Assessed." *International Political Science Review* 25 (2004): 435-459.

Estlund, David. "Beyond Fairness and Deliberation: The Epistemic Dimension of Democratic Authority." In *Deliberative Democracy: Essays on Reason and Politics*, edited by James Bohman and William Rehg, 170-202. Cambridge, MA: Massachusetts Institute of Technology Press, 1997.

European Commission. "Conditions for Enlargement." http://ec.europa.eu/enlargement/the-policy/conditions-for-enlargement/index_en.htm (Accessed December 3, 2011).

Falwell, Jerry. *Listen, America!* Toronto: Bantam Books, 1980.

Faroqhi, Suraiya, Bruce McGowan, Donald Quataert, and Sevket Pamuk. *An Economic and Social History of the Ottoman Empire: Volume 2, 1600-1914.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994.

Fischbach, Michael. *Records of Dispossession: Palestinian Refugee Property and the Arab-Israeli Conflict*. New York: Columbia University Press, 2003.

Fox, Jonathan and Jonathan Rynhold. "A Jewish and Democratic State? Comparing Government Involvement in Religion in Israel with other Democracies." *Totalitarian Movements and Political Religions* 9, no 4 (2008): 507-531.

Friedman, Robert. *Zealots for Zion: Inside Israel's West Bank Settlement.* New York: Random House, 1992.

Ganim, As'ad. *Ethnic Politics in Israel: The Margins and the Ashkenazi Center*. New

York: Routledge, 2010.

Ganin, Zvi. "The Limits of American Jewish Political Power: America's Retreat from Partition, November 1947-March 1948." *Jewish Social Studies* 39, no. 1/2 (1977): 1-36.

Geddes, Barbara. *Politician's Dilemma: Building State Capacity in Latin America*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1994.

GhaneaBassiri, Kambiz. *A History of Islam in America: From the New World to the New World Order*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2010.

Golan, Galia. "The Evolution of Israeli Policy on the Israeli-Palestinian Conflict." *Palestine-Israel Journal of Politics, Economics and Culture* 15, no. 1/2 (2008): 31-39.

Goodenough, Stan. "Hagee: Giant of Christian Zionism Has Awakened." *Jerusalem Newswire*, March 15, 2007.

Hamburger, Philip. *Separation of Church and State: A Theologically Liberal, Anti-Catholic, and American Principle*. Chicago: University of Chicago Law School, 2002.

Hamilton, Alexander, James Madison, and John Jay, eds. *The Federalist Papers*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 2009.

Hassassian, Manual. "Policy and Attitude Changes in the Palestine Liberation Organization, 1965-1994: A Democracy in the Making." In *The PLO and Israel: From Armed Conflict to Political Settlement, 1964-1994*, edited by Avraham Sela and Moshe Ma'oz, 73-96. New York: St. Martin's Press, 1997.

Hazan, Reuven and Moshe Maor, eds. *Parties, Elections & Cleavages: Israel in Comparative Perspective*. London: Cass, 1999.

Hehir, J. Bryan, Michael Walzer, and Charles Krauthammer, eds. *Liberty and Power: A Dialogue on Religion and U.S. Foreign Policy in an Unjust World*. Washington, D.C.: Brookings Institution Press, 2004.

Hinnebusch, Raymond. "Introduction: The Analytical Framework." In *The Foreign Policies of Middle East States*, edited by Raymond Hinnebusch and Anoushiravan Ehteshami, 1-28. Boulder, CO: Lynne Rienner Publishers, 2002.

Hinnebusch, Raymond and Anoushiravan Ehteshami, eds. *The Foreign Policies of Middle East States*. Boulder, CO: Lynne Rienner Publishers, 2002.

Hofstadter, Dan. *Egypt and Nasser: Volume 3, 1967-1972*. New York: Facts on File, 1973.

Hudson, Michael. *Arab Politics: The Search for Legitimacy*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1977.

Hunter, Shireen, ed. *Islam: Europe's Second Religion*. Westport, CT: Praeger Publishers, 2002.

Hunter, Shireen and Simon Serfaty. "Introduction." In *Islam: Europe's Second Religion*, edited by Shireen Hunter, xiii-xvii. Westport, CT: Praeger Publishers, 2002.

Huntington, Samuel. "Religious Persecution and Religious Relevance in Today's World." In *The Influence of Faith: Religious Groups and U.S. Foreign Policy*, edited by Elliott Abrams, 55-64. Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers, Inc., 2001.

Ilan, Amitzur. *The Origin of the Arab-Israeli Arms Race: Arm, Embargo, Military Power and Decision in 1948 Palestine War*. New York: NYU Press, 1996.

Inbar, Efraim. "Israel's Predicament in a New Strategic Environment." In *The National Security of Small States in a Changing World*, edited by Efraim Inbar and Gabriel Sheffer, 155-174. London: Frank Cass, 1997.

Inbar, Efraim and Gabriel Sheffer, eds. *The National Security of Small States in a Changing World*. London: Frank Cass, 1997.

Jankowski, James. *Nasser's Egypt, Arab Nationalism, and the United Arab Republic.* Boulder, CO: Lynne Riener Publisher, Inc., 2002.

Jefferis, Jennifer. *Religion and Political Violence: Sacred Protest in the Modern World*. New York: Routledge, 2010.

Jones, Christina. *The Untempered Wind: Forty Years in Palestine*. London: Longman, 1975.

Jones, Clive. "The Foreign Policy of Israel." In *The Foreign Policies of Middle East States*, edited by Raymond Hinnebusch and Anoushiravan Ehteshami, 115-140. Boulder, CO: Lynne Rienner Publishers, 2002.

Jordan, James. "Appendix B, Christian Zionism and Messianic Judaism." In *The Days of Vengeance: An Exposition of the Book of Revelation*, edited by David Chilton, 612-621. Ft. Worth, TX: Dominion Press, 1987.

Khadduri, Majid and Herbert J. Liebesny, eds. *Law in the Middle East: Volume 1, Origin*

and Development of Islamic Law. Washington, D.C.: The Middle East Institute, 2009.

Koelble, Thomas and Edward Limupa. "Democratizing Democracy: A Postcolonial Critique of Conventional Approaches to the 'Measurement of Democracy.'" *Democratization* 15, no. 1 (2008): 1-28.

Koestler, Arthur. *Promise and Fulfillment: Palestine, 1917-1949*. London: Macmillan, 1949.

Kook, Abraham Isaac. *Abraham Isaac Kook : The Lights of Penitence, the Moral Principles, Lights of Holiness, Essays, Letters, and Poems*. Trans. Ben Zion Bokser. New York: Paulist Press, 1978.

Kopelowitz, Ezra and Yael Israel-Shamsian. "Why Has a Sociology of Religion Not Developed in Israel? A Look at the Influence of Socio-Political Environment on the Study of Religion: A Research Note." *Sociology of Religion* 66 (2005): 71-84.

Krauthammer, Charles. "When Unilateralism Is Right and Just." In *Liberty and Power: A Dialogue on Religion and U.S. Foreign Policy in an Unjust World*, edited by J. Bryan Hehir, Michael Walzer, and Charles Krauthammer, 95-100. Washington, D.C.: Brookings Institute Press, 2004.

Kraynak, Robert. "Tocqueville's Constitutionalism." *American Political Science Review* 81 (1987): 1175-95.

Kurtulus, Ersun. "The Notion of 'Pre-emptive War:' The Six Day War Revisited." *Middle East Journal* 61, no. 2 (2007): 220-238.

Leveau, Remy and Shireen Hunter. "Islam in France." In *Islam: Europe's Second Religion*, edited by Shireen Hunter, 3-28. Westport, CT: Praeger Publishers, 2002.

Levi, Margaret. *Of Rules and Revenue*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1988.

Lienesch, Michael. *Redeeming America*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1993.

Lukacs, Yehuda. *Israel, Jordan, and the Peace Process.* Syracuse, NY: Syracuse University Press, 1997.

Madfai, Madiha Rashid al. *Jordan, the United States, and the Middle East Peace Process: 1974–1991*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1993.

Madison, James. "The Federalist No. 10: The Utility of the Union as a Safeguard Against

Domestic Factions and Insurrection (Continued).” In *The Federalist Papers*, edited by Alexander Hamilton, James Madison, and John Jay, 41-47. New Haven: Yale University Press, 2009.

_____. “The Federalist No. 51, The Structure of the Government Must Furnish the Proper Checks and Balances Between the Different Departments.” In *The Federalist Papers*, edited by Alexander Hamilton, James Madison, and John Jay. New Haven: Yale University Press, 2009.

Magee, Malcolm. *What the World Should Be: Woodrow Wilson and the Crafting of a Faith-Based Foreign Policy*. Waco, TX: Baylor University Press, 2008.

Malik, Habib. “Political Islam and the Roots of Violence.” In *The Influence of Faith: Religious Groups and U.S. Foreign Policy*, edited by Elliott Abrams, 113-148. Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers, Inc., 2001.

Manza, Jeff, Fay Lomax Cook, and Benjamin Page, eds. *Navigating Public Opinion*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2002.

Ma’oz, Moshe. *Syria and Israel: From War to Peacemaking*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1995.

_____. “The UN Partition Resolution of 1947: Why Was It Not Implemented?” *Palestinian-Israeli Journal of Politics, Economics and Culture* 9, no. 4 (2002): 15-21.

Markell, Jan. “Are There Consequences When Harming Israel?” *Understanding the Times*. Olive Tree Ministries, 2007.

Marsh, Christopher. “Orthodox Christianity, Civil Society, and Russian Democracy.” *Demokratizatsiya* 13, no. 3 (2005): 449-462.

McMahon,Sean. *The Discourse of Palestinian-Israeli Relations: Persistent Analytics and Practices.* New York: Routledge, 2010.

Mead, Walter Russell. “God's Country?” *Foreign Affairs* 85, no. 5 (2006): 5-15.

Mearsheimer, John and Stephen Walt. “The Israel Lobby and U.S. Foreign Policy.” *Middle East Policy* 13, no. 3 (2006): 29-87.

Merkley, Paul Charles. *American Presidents, Religion, and Israel: The Heirs of Cyrus*. Westport, CT: Praeger Publishers, 2004.

Milton-Edwards, Beverley. *Israeli-Palestinian Conflict: A People’s War.* New York: Routledge, 2009.

Minkenburg, Michael. "Democracy and Religion: Theoretical and Empirical Observations on the Relationship between Christianity, Islam and Liberal Democracy." *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies* 33, no. 6 (2007): 887-909.

Mitchell, Joshua. "The Equality of All Under the One in Luther and Rousseau: Thoughts on Christianity and Political Theory." *The Journal of Religion* 72, no. 3 (1992): 351-365.

Monsma, Stephen. "Particularist Religion in a Pluralist Political Arena." In *One Electorate Under God? A Dialogue on Religion and American Politics*, edited by E.J. Dionne, Kayla Drogosz, and Jean Bethke Elshtain, 150-154. Washington, D.C.: Brookings Institute Press, 2004.

Morano-Foadi, Sonia. "EU Citizenship and Religious Liberty in an Enlarged Europe." *European Law Journal* 16, no. 4 (2010): 417-438.

Morris, Benny. *1948: A History of the First Arab-Israeli War*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 2008.

Mufti, Malik. *Sovereign Creations: Pan-Arabism and Political Order in Syria and Iraq.* Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1996.

Musu, Costanza. *European Union Policy Towards the Arab-Israeli Peace Process: The Quicksands of Policy*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2010.

Nazzal, Nafez. *The Palestinian Exodus from Galilee: 1948*. Beirut: Institute for Palestine Studies, 1978.

Neuberger, Benjamin. "Religion and State in Europe and Israel." In *Parties, Elections & Cleavages: Israel in Comparative Perspective*, edited by Reuven Hazan and Moshe Maor, 65–84. London: Cass, 1999.

Newlands, George. *Christ and Human Rights: The Transformative Engagement.* Aldershot: Ashgate, 2006.

Nixon, Richard. *Leaders*. New York: Touchstone, 1990.

Oren, Michael. *Power, Faith, and Fantasy: America in the Middle East 1776 to the Present.* New York: W.W. Norton & Company, 2007.

Page, Benjamin. "The Semi-Sovereign Public." In *Navigating Public Opinion*, edited by Jeff Manza, Fay Lomax Cook, and Benjamin Page, 325-344. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2002.

"Pastor John Hagee AIPAC Policy Conference, March 11, 2007" www.aipac.org/Publications/SpeechesByPolicymakers/Hagee/PC-2007.pdf.

Petrov, Nikolai. "The Political Mechanics of the Russian Regime." *Russian Politics and Law* 49, no. 2 (2011): 34-69.

Pew Forum on Religion & Public Life, Pew Research Center for the People & the Press. Survey July 2006, http://www.pewforum.org/iPoll.aspx?ipoll-keywords=Israel (Accessed February 19, 2012).

Pew Forum on Religion & Public Life, Pew Research Center for the People & the Press. "Global Survey of Evangelical Protestant Leaders," June 22, 2011. http://www.pewforum.org/uploadedFiles/Topics/Religious_Affiliation/Christian/Evangelical_Protestant_Churches/Global%20Survey%20of%20Evan.%20Prot.%20Leaders.pdf (Accessed February 19, 2012).

Pew Research Center's Global Attitudes Project. "American Exceptionalism Subsides: The American-Western European Value Gap. Released November 17, 2011. Available at www.pewglobal.org.

Podeh, Elie. *The Decline of Arab Unity: The Rise and Fall of the United Arab Republic.* Brighton: Sussex Academic Press, 1999.

Preduca, Grigoriana. "Democracy, Religious Ethics, and Human Rights." *Contemporary Readings in Law and Social Justice* 3, no. 1 (2011): 128-133.

Puddington, Arch. "Freedom in the World 2012: The Arab Uprising and Their Global Repercussions." http://www.freedomhouse.org/sites/default/files/inline_images/FIW%202012%20Booklet--Final.pdf (Accessed February 14, 2012).

Quandt, William. *Peace Process: American Diplomacy and the Arab-Israeli Conflict Since 1967*. Washington, D.C.: Brookings Institute Press, 2005.

Rabinovich, Abraham. *The Yom Kippur War: The Epic Encounter That Transformed the Middle East*. New York : Schocken Books, 2003.

Razi. G. Hossein. "Legitimacy, Religion, and Nationalism in the Middle East." *The American Political Science Review* 84, no. 1 (1990): 69-91.

Reardon, Lawrence, Paul Christopher Manuel, and Clyde Wilcox. *Catholic Church and the Nation-State*. Washington, DC: Georgetown University Press, 2006.

Reimer, Kevin, Alvin Dueck, Garth Neufeld, Sherry Steenwyk, and Tracy Sidesinger.

"Varieties of Religious Cognition: A Computational Approach to Self-Understanding in Three Monotheist Contexts." *Psychology and Religion* 45, no. 1 (2010): 75-90.

Ribuffo, Leo. "Religion in the History of U.S. Foreign Policy." In *The Influence of Faith: Religious Groups and U.S. Foreign Policy*, edited by Elliott Abrams, 1-28. Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers, Inc., 2001.

Ro'i, Yaacov. *From Encroachment to Involvement: A Documentary Study of Soviet Policy in the Middle East, 1945-1973*. Jerusalem: Israel Universities Press, 1974.

Rushdoony, Rousas John. *The World of Flux: Modern Man and the Problem of Knowledge*. Fairfax, VA: Thoburn Press, 1975.

Sa'adah, Anne. *Contemporary France: A Democratic Education*. Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers, Inc., 2003.

Schanda, Balázs. "Religion and State in the Candidate Countries to the European Union – Issues Concerning Religion and State in Hungary." *Sociology of Religion* 64, no. 3 (2003): 333-348.

Schindler, Colin. "Opposing Partition: The Zionist Predicaments after the Shoah." *Israel Studies* 14, no. 2 (2009): 88-104.

Schmitter, Philippe and Terry Lynn Karl. "What Democracy Is…And Is Not." *Journal of Democracy* 2/3 (1991): 75-88.

Sela, Avraham. "Introduction." In *The PLO and Israel: From Armed Conflict to Political Settlement, 1964-1994,* edited by Avraham Sela and Moshe Ma'oz, vi-x. New York: St. Martin's Press, 1997.

Sela, Avraham and Moshe Ma'oz, eds. *The PLO and Israel: From Armed Conflict to Political Settlement, 1964-1994.* New York: St. Martin's Press, 1997.

Seliktar, Ofira. *New Zionism and the Foreign Policy System of Israel*. Carbondale, IL: Southern Illinois University Press, 1986.

Sell, Alan. "The Bible and Epistemology." *The Journal of Reformed Theology* 3 (2009): 219-226.

Shannon, Vaughn. *Balancing Act: U.S. Foreign Policy and the Arab-Israeli Conflict*. Burlington, VT: Ashgate Publishing Company, 2003.

Sharp, Jeremy. "U.S. Foreign Assistance to the Middle East: Historical Background,

Recent Trends, and the FY2011 Request." *Congressional Research Service*. June 15, 2010. Available at http://www.fas.org/sgp/crs/mideast/RL32260.pdf.

Silvestri, Sara. "Islam and Religion in the EU Political System." *West European Politics* 32, no. 6 (2009): 1212-1239.

Sizer, Stephen. *Christian Zionism: Road-map to Armageddon?* Leicester, England: Inter-Varsity Press, 2004.

_____. *Zion's Christian Soldiers? The Bible, Israel and the Church*. Downers Grove, IL: Inter-Varsity Press, 2007.

Smith, Charles. *Palestine and the Arab-Israeli Conflict*. 6th ed. Boston: Bedford/St. Martin's, 2007.

Solomon, Herbert. "The Republican Party and the Jews." *Judaism* 37, no. 3 (1988): 276-287.

Spector, Stephen. *Evangelicals and Israel: The Story of American Christian Zionism*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2009.

Spicker, Paul. "Government for the People: The Substantive Elements of Democracy." *International Journal of Social Welfare* 17 (2008): 251-259.

Spungen Norma. "Deadlock at Lausanne: Six Months of Lost Opportunities for Peace in the Middle East." *Jewish Social Studies* 49, 3/4 (1987): 265-274.

Stanley, Tim. "The Democratic Delusion." *History Today* 61, no. 4 (2011): 40-41.

Statement of the Nine Foreign Ministers on the Egyptian-Israeli Peace Treaty, Paris, March 26, 1979.

Stepan, Alfred. "Religion, Democracy, and the 'Twin Tolerations.'" *Journal of Democracy* 11, no. 4 (2000): 37-57.

Tarcov, Nathan. "Comment on Chapter 1." In *The Influence of Faith: Religious Groups and U.S. Foreign Policy*, edited by Elliott Abrams, 29-32. Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers, Inc., 2001.

Taspinar, Omar. "Europe's Muslim Street." *Foreign Policy* 135 (2003): 76-77.

Teehan, John. *In the Name of God: The Evolutionary Origins of Religious Ethics and Violence*. Oxford: Wiley-Blackwell, 2010.

Tocqueville, Alexis de. *Democracy in America*. Ed. and trans. Harvey Mansfield and

Debla Winthrop. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2000.

Truman, David. *The Governmental Process: Political Interests and Public Opinion*. New York: Alfred Knopf, 1951.

VanTil, Cornelius. *In Defense of the Faith: A Survey of Christian Epistemology*. 2nd ed. Phillipsburg, NJ: Presbyterian and Reformed Publishing, 1980.

Wald, Kenneth. *Religion and Politics in the United States*. 4th ed. Lanham: Rowman & Littlefield, 2003.

Wald, Kenneth and Michael Martinez. "Jewish Religiosity and Political Attitudes in the United States and Israel." *Political Behavior* 23 (2001): 377-397.

Walzer, Michael. *Just and Unjust Wars: A Moral Argument with Historical Illustration*. 4th ed. New York: Basic Books, 2006.

Waxman, Chaim. "Beyond Distancing: Jewish Identity, Identification, and America's Young Jews." *Contemporary Jewry* 30, no. 2/3 (2010): 227-232.

_____. "Messianism, Zionism, and the State of Israel." *Modern Judaism* 7 (1987): 175-192.

Weaver, Jillinda. "Civil Religion, George W. Bush's Divine Mission, and an Ethics of Mission." *Political Theology* 9 (2008): 9-26.

West, John. *The Politics of Revelation and Reason: Religion and Civic Life in the New Nation.* Lawrence, KS: University Press of Kansas, 1996.

Wilson, Evan. *A Calculated Risk: The U.S. Decision to Recognize Israel*. Cincinnati: Clerisy Press, 2008.

Wilson, James. *Political Organization*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1995.

Wilson, John. *Public Religion in American Culture.* Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 1979.

United Arab Republic, Ministry of National Guidance. *Majmu'at Khutub wa Tasrihat wa Bayanat al-Ra'is Jamal 'Abd al-Nasir*, multivolume. Cairo, n.d.

U.S. Congress. *Congressional Record*. 106th Congress, 1st session, 1999. Vol. 145, pt. 9.

Yadgar, Yaacov. *Secularism and Religion in Jewish-Israeli Politics: Traditionists and Modernity*. New York: Routledge, 2011.

VITA

Rachel Sarah Wills is a candidate for the degree of Master of Arts in Government with a certification in Mid-East Politics at Regent University's Robertson School of Government. Rachel was born in Roseville, California and currently resides in that city. Rachel graduated from Cornerstone Christian School as the class valedictorian in 2002. She then took a Bachelor of Arts in Political Science and in French from Grove City College in May 2006. Rachel graduated *Summa Cum Laude* and was a member of the Grove City College's local chapter of *Pi Sigma Alpha* (National Political Science Honor Society) and of *Alpha Mu Gamma* (National Foreign Language Honor Society). While at Grove City College, Rachel completed an internship with the U.S. State Department at its embassy in Paris, working in the Press Office.