

The Mythology of the Israeli Occupation

On 4 June, President Barack Obama spoke at Cairo University of a new beginning in the United States' relationship with Muslims worldwide and of the need for peace between the Palestinian and Israeli people. In addition to acknowledging that the Israeli occupation was creating "intolerable" humanitarian conditions, he stated that the United State would not accept "the legitimacy of continued Israeli settlements" in the regions that ostensibly remain Palestinian and that it would attempt to implement a two-state settlement. The mainstream media did little more than summarize the issues raised by Obama and "official" reactions from the Israeli, Palestinian, and former U.S. leaders, as well as from Zionist settlers and organizations. While it succeeded in portraying Washington's stated position on the conflict between the Palestinian people and the Israeli government, the media failed to go beyond the official statements and examine the assumptions upon which Obama's speech were based. This halfhearted commitment to thorough journalism—which seems to characterize the corporate press across the political spectrum—failed to offer any insight into why the Israeli government continues to expand its settlements and oppress the Palestinian people, or how this oppression feeds into a sense of despair and angry resentment that sometimes culminates in violent attacks on Israelis. As a result, many people still believe that the conflict in Palestine is a religious one, or that Israel is bravely defending itself from attacks by "Muslim extremists." To fill in the gap left by the popular media, this article examines seven myths that occur frequently in the media and in Zionist rhetoric.

Myth 1: Israel was a barren desert before the Jewish people arrived

This myth also occurs in a more popular phrase: "A land without a people for a people without a land," or in claims that the Jewish people "caused the desert to bloom." While the former phrase originated with a group of professing Christians, the idea that Palestine was largely unoccupied before Israel's official formation in 1948 is a key component of the colonial Zionist and Christian Zionist movements in the United States. The Israeli government also promotes this myth, both internationally and among its own people. Schoolchildren are frequently told that the Jewish people turned a barren desert into a modern state,

much like the way that U.S. schoolchildren are told that Columbus was the first person to discover the Americas. This belief in a barren land is useful to Zionism, as it portrays the Israeli settlers as an industrious peoples who turned a stretch of desert into a modern nation, and Palestinian people as fanatical aggressors determined to exterminate the besieged state. The reality is that most of what is now Israel was built on land that was stolen from the people of Palestine.

After Saladin captured Palestine from the Kingdom of Jerusalem in 1187, Islam became the dominant religion in the region, although it was also inhabited by many Christians. World War I brought the collapse of the Ottoman Empire, and "official" authority over Iraq and Palestine (including what is now Jordan) passed to the British government, while Syria and Lebanon passed to the French government. In 1917, the British government issued the Balfour Declaration, which declared that a "national home for the Jewish people" would be established in Palestine. The World Zionist Organization initially proposed that their home extend from the Mediterranean to well beyond the Jordan River, while various Arab rulers envisioned an empire that united the millions of Arabian people already inhabiting the region. The British government openly supported the Zionist movement and, beyond severing Transjordan from the terms of the declaration in 1922, generally supported Jewish immigration and settlement in Palestine. According to the numbers cited in Flapan's (1987) account, the Jewish population in the region grew from roughly 86,000 in 1922 to 400,000 in 1936 (11% and 30% of the total population respectively, with much of the growth occurring after 1933 in response to holocaust in Europe). It wasn't until the general strike in 1936 ushered in the three-year Arab Revolt that British authorities took notice of the Palestinians' opposition to having their land forcibly resettled and proposed a compromise that would temporarily restrict immigration while the land was partitioned into two separate states and a British Mandate in and around Jerusalem. This proposal, offered by the Peel commission, was rejected by the Twentieth Zionist Congress on the grounds that Jews had an inherent right to settle wherever they pleased, including Transjordan. While British forces managed to subdue the Arab Revolt, they attempted to pacify the people by offering to limit Jewish

immigration and eventually requiring Arab consent. They also retreated from the partition plan, and stated that they would consider establishing a unified state in 1949. In response to this proposal, Ben-Gurion and other Zionists drafted the Biltmore Program, which demanded that all of Palestine be declared a Jewish state. The British government rejected this demand, and continued to restrict Jewish immigration into Palestine. The Zionists began resorting to terrorism in their efforts to force British capitulation, further escalating conflicts between the British authorities and the Zionist leaders. Eventually, the United Nations established the Special Committee on Palestine, which reintroduced the option of partition, but with a much larger Jewish state than that proposed by the Peel Commission. As several of his statements indicate, Ben-Gurion and other Zionist leaders accepted the UN partition with the understanding that the Jewish state could then slowly and quietly expand its borders to encompass all of Palestine. Arab leaders, on the other hand, recognized that the vast majority of Palestine was already inhabited, and rejected the partition as an imperialist attempt to divide the Arabian people.

When he declared Israel a state in 1948, Ben-Gurion knew that he would be forcing the Arab states into a conflict that they could not hope to win. Instead, the Zionist leaders used the war to forcibly expel 760,000 Palestinians from (70 percent of the population) and seize their property (Said 2003, Flapan 1987). As reports of violence and massacres committed by Israeli forces prompted the Palestinian people to flee for their lives, the Israeli government seized their homes and property, eventually claiming over 100,000 Palestinian homes and 10,000 businesses. Jewish immigrants quickly began claiming these homes and businesses while the people who built them suffered and died in massive numbers in appallingly overcrowded refugee camps (Bickerton and Klausner 2007). For some, these camps became symbols of defiance to the Israeli government's attempts to erase their history, and they refused to leave them unless it was to return to their homes in Palestine. The Israeli government has yet to offer these or any other Palestinian refugees compensation or hope of return, and on numerous occasions--such as in Sabra and Shatila--has attempted to demoralize the refugees by terrorizing the camps and massacring their inhabitants.

Myth 2: Israel is surrounded by hostile and powerful adversaries

The Israeli government's treatment of the Palestinian people, both in the occupied territories and within its own borders, has contributed to a great deal of animosity between Israel and the Arabian people native to the region. The Zionist government's apparent disregard for international borders has also alienated neighboring rulers who do not wish to appear weak to their people. Despite their public blustering, however, many of these rulers have actively sought compromises and peace agreements with the Israeli government. It has been the Zionists and their backers in the US government, rather than the Arab rulers or people, who have been instrumental in blocking the development of any regional peace agreements.

Despite their people's opposition (see Myth 3), various Arab leaders have sought to make peace with Israel for two very pragmatic reasons. The first is that Israel, as a junior partner to the United States' economic empire, brings a significant amount of economic and technological resources into the region. Many of Israel's neighbors would like to see the fruits of the remarkable efforts that Israeli capitalists, aided largely by massive US government subsidies and private investments, invested into turning Israel into a "modern" capitalist state flow into their nations as well. The second factor is the strength of the Israeli military and the threat it poses to its neighbor's ruling regimes. Even if Syria, Lebanon, Jordan, and Egypt managed to set aside their individual conflicts and assemble a united coalition, they wouldn't pose even a minor threat to the Israel's US-backed military forces. Knowing that they possess a far superior military, Israeli rulers have repeatedly rejected various peace offers, violated the terms of existing agreements, and have unilaterally initiated or forced their opponents into military conflicts. The US government's unconditional backing of the Israeli military in these instances has only served to further embolden the Zionists, resulting in atrocities like the January 2009 massacre in Gaza. Israel is also the region's only nuclear power, thanks to the US government's failure to discourage the development of more than 80 active warheads¹. Given this military reality, most Arab governments have concluded that a peace agreement with the Israeli government is in their own best interests.

Even Iraq and Iran, often identified in Zionist propaganda as threats to Israeli security, have been

unable to oppose regional Israeli hegemony. Iraq no longer exists as a regional power, thanks largely to the brutal US-led sanction regime and the recent military conquest. Even before its destruction, the Iraqi government never posed a significant threat to Israel, as evidenced by the impunity with which the IDF entered Iraq illegally and bombed its Osiraq reactor in 1981, killing 10 Iraqi soldiers and one French scientist. Although both the Iraqi government and the United Nations Security Council (including even the US) condemned this attack, no action was taken to restrain further unilateral aggression by Israeli forces. Similarly, Iran, even with its nuclear program, does not pose a credible threat to Israeli security. Israel's history of unilateral intervention significantly weakens the claim that Iran plans to produce weapons in addition to electricity. Even if it were to begin developing warheads, an act that would be nothing less than suicidal given the circumstances, the Iranian government could never hope to match Israel's US-supplied arsenal, making such weapons at most a deterrent to Israeli or US aggression. While its conventional forces may be able to repel an Israeli invasion, Iran could not hope to threaten Israel with an offensive attack, and the Persian nation is unlikely to act as a rallying point for the various Arabian forces of its neighbors. In short, no state in the Middle East poses even a minor threat to Israeli security, both in the present and into the foreseeable future.

Myth 3: The Palestinian people are responsible for continuing the conflict

Blaming the Palestinian people for the ongoing violence is akin to European colonists blaming American Indians for the mass genocide that accompanied their efforts to achieve their "Manifest Destiny." In fact, the similarities between the extermination of the indigenous populations in North America and Palestine, while not complete, are striking. For instance, just as the European colonists used various treaties and agreements to slowly expand their claims over indigenous lands, the Israeli government used the Oslo accords primarily to legitimize its occupation of the Palestinian territories and ensure that it retains control over their inhabitants. The similarity between the ways in which European colonists would attempt to turn American Indian tribes against each other, and the way that the Israeli government has attempted to encourage conflict between different factions and parties among the

Palestinians is another interesting parallel. The power disparity between Hamas militants with their homemade rockets and the Israeli Defense Force with its arsenal of US-supplied munitions, artillery, and advanced weaponry is also vaguely reminiscent of the disparity between the American Indians' hunting arsenals and the Europeans' weapons of war.

That the Palestinian people are willing to undertake any resistance in the face of such an overwhelmingly superior military opponent alone should raise some serious doubts about the claim that the Palestinians want the violence to continue. However, the fundamental assumption that Palestinian terrorism is responsible for ongoing violence remains unchallenged in the majority of the mainstream media, and even the more progressive elements portray Israeli violence as a counter to Palestinian aggression. The real reason why violence continues to consume the region, which is Israel's attempt to emulate European colonialism in Palestine, is completely excluded from the public forum. While some claim that assigning blame for past atrocities is rarely a constructive exercise, Zionist spokespersons in the media do not hesitate to recall the horrors of the German Holocaust whenever the legitimacy of their colonial agenda is raised. More importantly, an accurate understanding of the historical context in which a conflict exists is critical to resolving the conflict and preventing its re-emergence. Consequently, one can rather definitively assert that the conflict between Israel and the Palestinian people will not be resolved until the root issue--the Zionist colonization of Palestine--is recognized and addressed. The solution favored by the Israeli government, which is to silence the Palestinian people until it manages to exterminate or evict them, is unlikely to succeed given the growing international recognition of the injustices being perpetrated.

Even if it did manage to completely colonize the Occupied Territories, the presence of hundreds of thousands of Palestinians inside neighboring refugee camps continues to mobilize opposition to Zionist expansionism. While the Arabian rulers have exhibited little concern for the plight of the refugees within their borders, the Arabian people continue to express their solidarity with the Palestinian refugees and to oppose Israel's colonization of Palestine as another imperial assault by the United States and its European allies. This popular support for the Palestinians is also many of the Arabian rulers have

attempted to keep their negotiations with Israel discreetly and to employ harsh rhetoric in their public statements. While the notion of a corrupt regime trying to balance its fear of the rage of its people with that of a more powerful enemy may seem amusing, the suffering that has been inflicted on the people as a result is most certainly not. Rocket and other attacks on civilians are reprehensible, but it is important to recognize that they represent acts of desperation by a frustrated people, and not attempts to inflict another holocaust on the Jewish people. When the Israeli government ignores the reasons for this desperation and retaliates with even more violence, it simply escalates the cycle of violence and encourages the growth of the hatred, resentment, and hopelessness that leads to even more support for militant groups like Hamas. The United States government helps to perpetuate the cycle of violence by arming the Israeli government with the resources to expand its settlements and the military supplies to oppress the Palestinian people. Ultimately, this cycle of violence will continue to escalate until the Zionist mission to colonize all of Palestine is either completed in an unfathomable bloodbath or abandoned for a peaceful settlement that recognizes that the Palestinian people also deserve the right to live in peace and security.

Myth 4: The Palestinian people and their Arab allies want to exterminate the Jewish people

The reality of the conflict between Israel and the Palestinian people described in the discussion of the previous myth also helps to elucidate the falsehoods that underlie this one. While the Israeli government certainly hasn't done much to endear the Jewish people to the Palestinians, very few Palestinians, Muslim or otherwise, honestly advocate the destruction of Israel, let alone of the Jewish people. Some organizations, the most prominent among them being the Palestine Liberation Organization, officially recognized Israel's right to exist "in peace and security" in 1993, and even Hamas has indicated that it would be willing to negotiate a Palestinian state alongside Israel. While the right of the Jewish people who already live in Palestine to continue to do so is a legitimate demand, such a recognition is quite different from what the Israeli government expects when it demands that organizations like Hamas recognize Israel's right to exist *as a Jewish state*. When they demand that the Palestinian people and the rulers of other nations

recognize Israel's right to exist as a Jewish state, the Zionists are actually demanding two things: 1) that all Palestinian people presently inhabiting refugee camps or scattered throughout the world forever forfeit their right to return to their homes and their families in what is now the state of Israel, and 2) that they recognize the legitimacy of Israel as an apartheid state that openly discriminates against its Arabian citizens or other people of non-Jewish descent. Given these two rather weighty conditions, the legitimacy of continued US support for Israel as a Jewish state becomes questionable at best.

By attempting to equivocate the right of Jews to inhabit the region with the right to oppress the indigenous Arabian people, the Israeli government has attempted to cloak contemporary Zionism's racist ideology in the language of a post-Holocaust people struggling to protect their very lives. Repeated atrocities by Israeli forces, however, have slowly begun to unravel this rhetorical construct and to reveal the unacceptable situation into which the Palestinian people have been placed. While it most certainly should renounce the use of violence against innocent civilians, Hamas has a right to refuse to acknowledge Israel's right to exist in its present form, as its government has brutalized and murdered many Palestinians, seized their property and livelihoods, and driven them from their homes. These people are entitled to reparations, and until the Israeli government acknowledges what it has done to the Palestinian people and renounces racism as an official policy, no individual or organization should be compelled to acknowledge its legitimacy.

Myth 5: Hamas is a terrorist organization

The above statement is not technically a myth, insofar as Hamas does employ tactics that deliberately injure or kill civilians. At face value, many of its tactics are consistent with the official definition of terrorism, which, according to the United States Federal Emergency Management Agency, is "the use of force or violence against persons or property in violation of the criminal laws of the United States for purposes of intimidation, coercion, or ransom." With the exception perhaps of replacing "criminal laws of the United States" with something like "international law," most people would probably agree that this is an accurate definition of terrorism, and that it implicates Hamas as a terrorist organization. The FEMA website² even offers some examples of terrorism, which include assassinations, kidnappings, bombings, and the use

of nuclear weapons. If this definition of terrorism is accepted as the standard, however, then Hamas is not the only terrorist organization involved in the conflict. In its recent attack on Gaza, the Israeli Defense Force most certainly used extreme forms of violence, in violation of both international law and the terms under which the US government is allowed to supply arms to other nations. The Israeli government has also been responsible for numerous assassinations--including elected officials and academics--without regard for national sovereignty (e.g. the famous incident in Britain). It has also kidnapped countless Palestinians, some of whom simply disappeared. As the only government to ever use nuclear weapons against a civilian population, the US government doesn't fare much better than its Israeli counterpart, particularly in light of the information about the more recent kidnappings and abductions committed by official US operatives. These considerations are in addition to the previously mentioned fact (see Myth 1) that Zionists frequently employed terrorist actions while under the British Mandate. While terrorism is indeed reprehensible and should always be condemned, Hamas isn't officially considered a "terrorist organization" because it actually engages in acts of terror, but because it offers an effective means to marginalize and discredit the organization publicly. As with both the Israeli and US governments, Hamas is a "democratically" elected organization that employs terrorist tactics to achieve its objectives.

Interestingly, this myth seems to surface frequently when the issue of Palestine is raised, as though Hamas is somehow the embodiment of the unified will of Palestinians everywhere. This is an odd assumption, given that very few people would contend that former president Bush represented the united will of the US population, or that Netanyahu represents that of Israel. While the Israeli government's relentless occupation has fostered strong resentments and generated support for organizations that employ more extreme tactics, reciprocal violence against the Palestinian people is no more a legitimate response to Hamas than the 11 September attack in New York was a legitimate response to the US government's foreign policy.

Myth 6: Israel is the only fellow democracy in the Middle East

The word "democracy" comes from two Greek words: *demos*, which means "people", and *archos*,

which means "ruler" or "leader." Hence, the commonly accepted English definition of democracy is some form of rule by the people. Applying such a label to the Israeli government, however, is even more inappropriate than applying it to the two-party travesty we have here in the United States. The very definition of Israel as a "Jewish state" belies its claims to equal representation for persons of all races, of which there exists a substantial minority within its borders, and this racist foundation has guided every state official since Ben-Gurion. Although the mainstream media in the United States habitually suppresses this reality, the Israeli government makes no secret of its fanaticism and ingrained racism. Some of Israel's highest-ranking officials have, in their official capacity, referred to the Palestinian people in Israel as cockroaches (Rafael Eitan), a cancer (Moshe Ya'alon), and "beasts walking on two legs" (Menachem Begin) openly and without political repercussions.

Much of the Israeli government's hostility to the Palestinian people is implicitly expressed in various legislative and judicial initiatives designed to marginalize non-Jewish Israelis, drive them from their homes, and destroy their cultural identity. Israel's Basic Law on Human Dignity and Liberty, one of the nation's foundational legal statements, had a clause that would have mandated equal treatment for peoples of all races and religions removed by a Knesset committee before the legislation was passed. Subsequent policies and practices, such as the refusal to recognize and supply Arab villages with water and electricity, the use of the public education system to promote Zionism, the refusal to allow family reunification by excluding non-Jews from its "Law of Return," and the systemically inconsistent response to hate speech directed at Jewish and Arabian persons have been far more consistent with apartheid than they have been with any form of democracy³. A recent example of the government's assault on the cultural heritage of the Palestinian people is its decision to censor Arabian history books by prohibiting the use of the word "nakba" (Arabian for "catastrophe") in reference to the war that followed Israel's declaration of statehood⁴. This and other instances of institutionalized in the educational system merely encourages Israel's youth to view their neighbors with even more contempt and hostility than their parents, thereby perpetuating the violence and oppression into another generation. In its present form, the Israeli government more closely resembles

the racist regime that ruled South Africa or the one in the United States responsible for the extermination of countless Native Americans and the enslavement of the Black population. Even the most conservative US citizen would be hard pressed to defend Israel's model of government as "democratic" in any sort of open forum (i.e. someplace other than the mainstream media).

Myth 7: Israel and the United States are fighting side-by-side in a "Global War On Terror"

Since former president Bush redeclared the global "War On Terror" in 2001⁵, the Israel lobby and the Israeli government have tried to convince the people that Israel and the United States are (or in some cases "should be") fighting side-by-side against the same "Islamofacism" terrorists⁶. The Zionist propagandists have done an admirable job of walking a very fine line with this argument. On the one hand, they wish to imply that Israel is playing a key strategic role in the US government's military operations, and is therefore worthy of the billions of dollars in US military support bestowed on it annually. On the other hand, they must be careful to refute any arguments that unconditional backing for Israel's military adventures contributed in any way to the anger and resentment that fueled the 11 September attacks, lest the support begin to be considered a strategic liability⁷.

This rhetorical balancing act is, at best, a gross distortion of reality, if not an outright and intentional lie. While Osama bin Laden's statement regarding 11 September repeatedly mentioned Palestine, he mentions it as one of his organization's grievances against the United States. He has not, however, gone beyond this declaration by offering any form of military or material support to even the most extreme groups of Islamist militants who are fighting against the Israeli occupation. According to government officials, the militants that US military and intelligence forces are presently fighting consist primarily of Al-Qaeda and Taliban fighters (and many innocent civilians) who are attempting to expel US forces from Afghanistan and Iraq. The suicide bombings and rocket attacks that occasionally take place in Israel, on the other hand, are undertaken primarily by Hamas and Hezbollah militants in retaliation to the Israeli occupation of Palestinian lands. While the two conflicts are related in that they represent desperation and despair in the face of a brutal occupation by an aggressive and

racist imperial power, helping Israel eradicate the Palestinian people does nothing to advance US interests in the region or reduce the threat of future attacks against the US population.

Some Zionist advocates have attempted to gloss over the differences between the Iraqi and Afghani resistance movements and the Palestinian ones by labeling them all "Islamic barbarians." Even the less brazen form of this argument, that an ideological conflict is taking place between Western secular democracy and the provincial Islamic theocracy, is a malignant distortion of the conflict between an imperial power and an oppressed people. Just as many Christians abhorred the murder of Dr. George Tiller, many devout Muslims are shocked and saddened by acts of terror carried out in the name of their faith. On the other hand, the people of Iraq, Afghanistan, and Palestine do share some common attributes, the most obvious of which is that their land is being occupied by an unwelcome and violent imperial power. Also, all three conflicts share a common solution: withdraw the occupying forces and render all due (non-military) assistance and reparations--when requested--to the rebuilding process.

Even from the standpoint of the elites, backing the Israeli military provides few strategic benefits to the US government's military operations. The Israeli government's inability to stop antagonizing its neighbors severely restricts the nation's usefulness as a staging area for US operations, as basing operations there would alienate every other nation in the region, thereby undermining any possibility of a regional coalition. This is why Israel was told to wait quietly on the sidelines in 1991, even after Hussein's forces tried to draw it into the war with missile attacks. Thus, from a strictly utilitarian standpoint, support for Israeli aggression has been largely detrimental to US strategic interests, and eliminating such support would most likely improve the US government's reputation in the region, as it would eliminate a major source of resentment that many Muslim, Christian, and secular Arabian people feel toward the United States⁸.

Conclusion

Religious language is a prevalent part of the rhetoric of both Zionist and anti-Zionist terrorist groups, but religion is not the primary source of conflict. Rather than a protracted "Holy War" or "Jihad," the conflict between Israel and the Palestinian people is more akin to the European colonization and subsequent

extermination of North America's indigenous peoples. The unpleasant reality that the mainstream media fails to portray is that Israel's hostility toward and alienation from its Arabic neighbors and the Palestinian people is a direct response to the Israeli government's neocolonial expansionism. As Israel's primary supplier of military hardware and support, the U.S. government is largely responsible for the escalation of this violence into massacres that have claimed the lives of countless civilians. While it may be discouraging to some who expected better of our rulers, our government's responsibility for Israel's violent oppression also offers those of us in the United States an opportunity stop the violence from within our own nation. By acting in solidarity with the people of Palestine and those in Israel who

oppose its imperial oppression, the people can force the rulers to stop arming the Israeli military and to stop funding the expansion of illegal Israeli settlements. While the scale of militant activism required to bring about such a reversal in U.S. foreign policy would have to be extremely large, it is neither inconceivable nor unprecedented. The rising strength of the global movement for social justice offers a glimpse of the power available to the world's working and oppressed people when they unite under the banner of global solidarity. It is a power which no government or empire can long oppose.

Written by Brian Napoletano

Footnotes

1. Israel is intentionally ambiguous about the size of its arsenal, and while the Federation of American Scientists mentions estimates as large as 400 warheads, the researchers conclude that the likely total is not more than 100. Additionally, "region" in this case only refers to Israel and its more immediate neighbors. Pakistan also possesses a nuclear arsenal.
2. FEMA posts their definition of terror on their website, [General Information About Terrorism](#), which I accessed on 30 July 2009.
3. The Legal Center for Arab Minority Rights in Israel ([Adalah](#)) issued a 1998 report to the United Nations Committee on the Elimination of Racial Discrimination that cites multiple instances of Israeli non-compliance with the International Convention on the Elimination of all Forms of Racial Discrimination, including those listed above.
4. As in the Arabs referred to the war as the nakba, while the Jews called it the war of independence. See [Israel bans use of Palestinian term 'nakba' in textbooks](#). Haaretz. 2009-07-22
5. The people of Latin America may recall having a similar "War On Terror" inflicted upon them by the Reagan administration.
6. Here's a couple quick examples of Zionists equivocating Bush's "counter-terror" operations with Israel's:
 - [Israel Likely To Play Key, Quiet Role in Global War On Terrorism](#). Jewish Federations of North America
 - [ADL Leaders, in Tokyo, Praise Japan's Leadership in Global War Against Terrorism](#). Anti-Defamation League
 - [America the Betrayer](#). Arutz Sheva (Israel National News)
 - [The War on Terrorism -- America's War and Israel's War](#). US Department of Defense
7. Mearsheimer and Walt (2008) discuss in thorough detail the delicate balance between Zionist attempts to portray Israel as a strategic asset and avoid drawing attention to the strategic drawbacks of supporting Israeli aggression, as does Michael Scheuer in his book, [Imperial Hubris: Why the West is Losing the War on Terror](#).
8. Again, Mearsheimer and Walt (2008) discuss this issue in more detail and offer multiple examples.

References

Further discussion of and support for the above arguments is available in the following resources:

- Bickerton, I.J. and C.L. Klausner. 2007 [A History of the Arab-Israeli Conflict \(5th Edition\)](#). Prentice Hall, Upper Saddle River, NJ, United States.
- Carter, J. 2007 [Palestine: Peace Not Apartheid](#). Simon & Schuster, New York, NY, United States.

- Flapan, S. 1987 [**The Birth of Israel: Myths and Realities**](#). Pantheon, New York, NY, United States.
- Machover, M. 2009. Israelis and Palestinians: Conflict & resolution. *International Socialist Review*. 65 p. 32-44
- Mearsheimer, J.J. and S. Walt. 2008 [**The Israel Lobby and U.S. Foreign Policy**](#). Farrar, Straus, and Giroux, New York, NY, United States.
- Said, E.W. 2003 [**The End of the Peace Process: Oslo and After**](#). Vintage Books, New York, NY, United States.