

Facts & Figures Series — No. 6

UNITED STATES AND WEST  
GERMAN AID TO ISRAEL

*by*

*Asa'd Abdul-Rahman*

*tr. by*

*Leila S. Kadi, M.A.*

**Research Centre-Palestine Liberation Organisation**

Beirut — Lebanon

October 1966



# CONTENTS

## Foreword

### I. Introduction.

### II. United States Aid to Israel.

- A. Historical Background.
- B. The Zionist Organisations in the United States.
- C. United States Pressure Upon Other Governments and Institutions to Help Israel.
- D. Aid Offered to Israel Directly by the United States Government.
- E. United States Military Aid to Israel.
- F. Guiding Figures Concerning United States Aid to Israel.
- G. United States Nuclear Aid to Israel.

### III. West German Aid to Israel.

- A. Historical Background.
- B. The 1962 — 1965 Reparations Agreement in Figures.
- C. Other West German Economic Aid.
- D. West German Military Aid to Israel.
- E. West German Aid to Israel in Figures.

### IV. Israel An Agent of Imperialism.



## FOREWORD

The following study is an attempt to survey the close relationships existing between Israel on the one hand and the governments of the United States of America and West Germany on the other. It deals primarily with massive aid given by these two countries to Israel. The survey is carried out in terms of facts and figures. These depict the nature of the relationships existing between Israel and the Governments of the United States and West Germany. They also define accurately the amount and significance of the aid they have presented to Israel. We have limited ourselves, in presenting these facts and figures, to economic and military aid since they form the best expression of the nature of the support supplied by the two major western powers to Israel, and of the nature of their political co-operation. In fact economic and military aid are the two fields in which the suspicious relationships between Israel and the governments of the United States and West Germany find their concrete expression.

The purpose of this pamphlet (which is the sixth in the «Facts & Figures Series», published by the Research Centre of the Palestine Liberation Organisation), is to clarify the present status of Israel in the field of international relations, and the extent of its dependence upon the governments of the two mentioned nations. The thoroughness of this dependence is manifest in the economic, military

and political ties of Israel with the United States and West Germany.

We have depended, in this study, upon official sources and documents, as far as possible. We shall leave it to the facts and figures presented to speak in favour of our conclusions and judgements concerning the dangers implicit in the constant support supplied by the governments of the United States and West Germany to Israel.

**Anis Sayegh,**  
Director General,  
Research Centre.

# INTRODUCTION

The period following world war II witnessed basic changes in the field of international relations. The war resulted not only in the destruction of the fascist regimes in Germany, Italy and Japan, but also in intensifying the struggle of the colonised people for liberation and self-determination. This struggle derived a great deal of additional strength from the emergence of the Peoples' Republic of China.

The reaction of the imperial powers to this new development was three fold:

1 — Refusal to consent to the idea of liberation or self-determination.

2 — Consenting to give the colonised countries superficial political independence, by setting up «puppet governments» in some of the colonised territories. Such a measure would enable the imperial powers to continue their hold upon the ex-colonies by controlling their economies. Thus, the governments formed after the attainment of formal independence were subservient to the imperial powers, and served their interests, at the expense of the national aspirations of their peoples.

3 — The colonial powers began to adopt a policy of co-ordination of efforts among themselves, aimed at the

encirclement of the revolutionary movements. They agreed that certain «new» colonial powers should replace the «old» ones on account of the military strength and supposed «good international reputation» of the former. The «new» powers will play the old colonial role under a new guise and by means of revised procedures. This was one of the main reasons which prompted the U.S. Government to actively join the imperialist camp. The role that the U.S. Government has been playing, and is still playing in South East Asia (after the defeat of France in Indo-China), and in the Middle East (after the defeat of Britain) presents us with the best example of the imperialist policies of that country. This line of policy manifested itself most plainly in the Eisenhower Doctrine desperately calling for the filling of «a supposed vacuum in the M.E.» and the false slogan of « containing communism ». (1) Another good example of the imperialist policies of the U.S. Government is the Palestine question.

The situation in Palestine after World War II could be described in the following manner:

A — The British Mandate over Palestine was about to be terminated, after Britain had created the necessary conditions for the establishment of the State of Israel.

Nadav Safran, a Zionist author, points out this fact by stating :

«While Zionism provided the leadership and drive and mobilised the resources for the total Jewish endeavour



in Palestine, the whole under-taking would have been impossible had not Britain sponsored the Zionist movement at the end of the first World War and given it the opportunity to establish a secure base in the country through the Balfour Declaration and the Mandate». (2)

B — The World Zionist Movement, after Britain had secured for it all the necessary conditions for the establishment of their state, used in the Biltmore Programme of 1942, the term «state» instead of «home» to describe the nature of their projected presence in Palestine. (3) The Zionist programme also recognised that the centre of gravity in world politics has shifted from Britain to the U.S. Thus, the Zionist leaders transferred much of their activities from London to New York and Washington. «The full force of political Zionism had come to be concentrated in the U.S. since Britain had proved intractable. It was evident that only the militant leadership of American Zionism could weight the scales in favour of the Zionists once more.» (4)

C — In order to secure the establishment of the State of Israel, the U.S. Government manouvered to fill the «vacuum» resulting from the British withdrawal from Palestine at the termination of the Mandate. N. Safran states that Zionist efforts and favourable circumstances helped the World Zionist Movement «to gain friends and supporters elsewhere who helped to bring about the termination of Britain's rule in Palestine and the establishment of Israel. One of these friends was the United States. American pressure on Britain immediately after the end of

the second World War was crucial in compelling her to bring the whole Palestine question before the U.N. in 1947, and American support was decisive in winning the decision of their organisation in favour of partitioning Palestine between a Jewish and an Arab State.» (5)

John Campbell agrees with Safran's analysis when he says: «after 1945,... the British Government found that its traditional policies and methods could not meet the threats to British interests from both inside and outside the region.. The crucial decision came in 1947, on Greece and Turkey and on Palestine. In the first case, the British were able to hand over the responsibility to the U.S. In the second, they deposited it in the lap of the United Nations.» (6) At the time when the U.S. acting through the U.N. was under the influence of the Zionist leaders.

The coincidence of British and American interests on the one hand with those of the World Zionist Movement on the other, was the major factor contributing to the establishment of the State of Israel in Palestine. The common goal of all three parties was thus attained. This coincidence of their vital interests could be traced back to 1907, when the colonial powers of the day, (namely, Britain, France, Belgium, Holland, Portugal, Italy and Spain) held a conference in which they formulated their long-range aims and set up the «Imperialist Unified Front». The purpose of the front was to serve the common interests of those colonial powers in their respective colonies. The conferees agreed to the necessity of setting up «an intruder state»

in the Near East composed of foreign and strong people in order to separate its African from its Asian part. (7)

By that time, the World Zionist Movement had completed a quarter of a century of its political activities, aimed at the establishment of a Jewish state in Palestine. As indicated above, Zionist aims corresponded closely to the interests of the colonial powers. Herzl pointed to this meeting of interest in a letter sent to Lord Salisbury, Prime Minister of Britain at that time, in which he said: «with the present situation of the world, one dominated by the Russo-French entente, a partition of Turkey would put England at a serious disadvantage. For England such a partition would be a loss now, therefore she must desire the status quo. It can be preserved only if Turkey's finances are straightened out.

«Now, there is a method of straightening out Turkish finances and thus preserving the status quo for a while longer and **at the same time of creating a new route to India, the shortest one for England.** And all this without England's having to layout a penny or committing herself visibly any where.

«This method is the creation of an autonomous Jewish vassal in Palestine under the suzerainty of the Sultan... England's advantages would be that a rail road would immediately be built across Palestine from the Mediterranean to the Persian Gulf, or connecting with the railroad, soon made necessary by communication needs, through Persia and Bluchistan (possibly Afghanistan) to India. Eng-

land would have these benefits sans bourse délier (without expense) and without the world's learning of her participation.» (8)

From that time on Britain began to work for the establishment of the Jewish state. When the U.S. took over the task of protecting and promoting the imperialist interests in the area, it was at the same time serving its own interests which were growing in the early part of the 20th Century. «Non-involvement in the politics of the Middle East did not mean that the U.S. Government was uninterested in the cultural and commercial enterprises of American citizens in that part of the world... The task of American diplomats and consuls was to protect and foster the endeavours of American interest groups.» (9) World War II left Britain in a nearly prostrated financial condition. Yet the demands of imperial and commonwealth defence and the dependence on Near and Middle East oil and markets required Britain to maintain at great cost, its interests and presence in the region. American financial and military aid was predicated on the assumption that the U.S. Government would shore up and supplement Britain's Near and Middle East defence arrangements. In this spirit the Truman Doctrine was announced in March 1947, under the pretext that the U.S. policy aimed at «containing communism.» (10)

UNITED STATES AID  
TO ISRAEL



## **HISTORICAL BACKGROUND**

The aid dispensed by the U.S. Government to Israel is of a very special kind, since it does not fit into any of the known categories of aid exchange between states. The fact that the state of Israel was established by the support of the U.S. Government, and the fact that the former cannot survive without the economic and military aid of the latter, explain why the U.S. Government looks upon Israel and treats it as an instrument in the execution of its foreign policy.

Israel receives aid from the U.S. in two ways:

1 — Aid offered to Israel directly by the U.S. Government or its affiliated organisations. Such aid is official and usually announced. (See p. 15).

2 — Indirect aid offered to Israel which takes two forms :

a — Aid emanating from Zionist American institutions and organisations, and from American citizens who participate in campaigns for donation, and the selling of Israeli bonds.

b — Aid emanating from other governments and institutions under the pressure of the U.S. Government. This is how Israel manages to get most of its political, military and economic aid.

We can draw a general picture of Israel's economy by referring to studies made by Israeli or Zionist experts in the economic field:

Halford Hoskins states: «Economically speaking, Israel is a highly artificial state. Despite phenomenal achievements and monetary investment on a relatively considerable scale, Israel is farther from earning its own living than any other contemporary state. It cannot continue indefinitely to plan for the future on the basis of adequate support from public and private sources in the U.S. and elsewhere abroad». (11)

Harlan Cleveland states: «Israel is the only country of the world (unless postwar Nationalist China be counted as another) where the amount of aid from all sources has been so great as to bring into question the capacity of the recipient to absorb it efficiently». (12)

An official Israeli source states: «Israel's import surplus has been financed by continued foreign borrowings, as well as by unilateral transfers. As a result, Israel's foreign debt has grown to roughly half a billion dollars» (13) during the period 1950-1958.

The remaining two points which need clarification pertain to the indirect aid received by Israel. The first point revolves around the American Zionist institutions and organisations operating in the U.S. on the political, economic and propogandistic levels in favour of Israel. The second point is related to the pressure exerted by the U.S. Government on other West European Governments to offer Israel different forms of aid.



## **The Zionist Organisations in the U.S.**

There are a number of Zionist Organisations, associated with the State of Israel, operating in the U.S. Their operations are carried out under the pretense of presenting themselves as «philanthropic organisations». Harry Ellis illustrates their role in connection with the aid offered to Israel: «By far the most substantial amount of help came from the United States. Consistently, from the State's inception, private American Jewry has contributed at least \$ 60,000,000 a year through the United Jewish Appeal and another \$ 50,000,000 through purchase of state of Israel bonds. In crisis years these private contributions have soared higher. They form the bedrock of Jewish support on which the Israeli economy depends» (14). The most important of these organisations are the following :

- 1 — United Jewish Appeal.
- 2 — American Zionist Council.
- 3 — Jewish Agency for Israel.
- 4 — Hadassah.
- 5 — Zionist Organisation of America
- 6 — Poalei Zion.
- 7 — Mizrahi and Hapoel Hamizrahi.
- 8 — Hashomer Hatzair.
- 9 — Achdut Ha'avoda-Poalei Zion.
- 10 — Herut-Hatzohar.
- 11 — The American League for Israel. (15)

All these organisations are sub-divisions of the World Zionist Organisation (16).

The U.S. Government considers the above-mentioned organisations as «private voluntary organisations of free Americans», although they have been registered as «foreign agents» for nearly 20 years. (17) According to the Law of the U.S., contributions for philanthropic purposes are deductible from the taxable income of the contributor. This Law prompted many American Zionist Jews to contribute to these so-called «American Organisations». (18)

### **UNITED STATES PRESSURE UPON OTHER GOVERNMENTS AND INSTITUTIONS TO HELP ISRAEL**

In order to serve its interests in the Arab world, the U.S. Government constantly declares its neutrality in the Arab-Israeli conflict. Such declarations are obviously untrue, since the U.S. Government has been using its leading position in the Western camp to induce other countries to aid Israel directly. The case of the Federal Republic of Germany is the best example.

On 2 March, 1956, Moshé Sharett, Minister of Foreign Affairs at that time, asked for a definite answer regarding his request for military aid from the U.S. The American answer was given on 3 April by J.F. Dulles, Secretary of State at that time, who stated that the U.S. Government maintained a policy of neutrality and non-involvement in the «arms race» between Israel and the Arab States. Dulles

added that such an attitude on the part of the U.S. Government does not imply that the Israeli request had been rejected, or that the U.S. had any «objection to the sale of arms to Israel by other western countries». Geoffrey Barraclough and Rachel Wall commented on this answer in the following words: «This statement appears to have determined the Western line, and as a consequence deliveries of Mystère fighters ordered for use by NATO (from France) were postponed in favour of Israel». (19)

This took place in 1956. In 1965, when the crisis between the Arab States and the Federal Republic of Germany was at its highest pitch regarding the secret supply of West German arms to Israel, the State Department spokesman, Mr. Robert McCloskey, disclosed on 17 February, 1965, that the U.S. had been consulted in advance about the West German arms supplied to Israel, and had approved the transfer of American built M-48 tanks from the Federal Republic of Germany to Israel. (20)

### **AID OFFERED TO ISRAEL DIRECTLY BY UNITED STATES GOVERNMENT**

The U.S. Government recognised Israel **eleven minutes** after its official proclamation. This step expressed the U.S. attitude of setting up itself as the protector who will ensure the safety and existence of Israel in the M.E. In order to attain this goal the U.S. Government immediately began its direct aid programme to Israel. A «Few days» after the establishment of the State of Israel, official nego-

tiations between the U.S. Government and Israel began resulting in an offer of 100 million dollars to the provisional government for development projects, mostly of an industrial nature. Truman announced his approval of the loan in a letter dated 29 November, 1948, which he sent to Chaim Weismann, President of the World Zionist Movement. In 1950 Israel received an American loan amounting to 35 million dollars (21). During the first five years of the nation's existence, gifts and investments from overseas sources totalled well over a billion dollars». (22)

In 1952, Israel offered the U.S. Government guarantees and immunities for American capital exploited on its land. The U.S. Government was the first to be granted such a concession by Israel. (23)

The point which should attract the attention of the reader is the gap existing in the foreign aid programme of the U.S. Government between the allocations to Israel on the one hand, and the allocations to the Arab States on the other. The official figures demonstrate that Israel (whose area makes up 0.001 of the Arab home-land), (24) receives much greater amount of economic aid than all the Arab States put together as evidenced by the following table:

**Table No. 1\* (25)**

|              | <b>U.S. Government<br/>Economic Aid to Israel<br/>since May, 1948</b> | <b>U.S. Government<br/>Economic Aid to Arab<br/>States since May, 1948</b> |
|--------------|---|--|
| Fiscal Year: |   |  |
| 1948         | none  | 7.3  |
| 1949         | none  | none   |
| 1950         | 135.0   | none   |
| 1951         | none  | 4.8  |
| 1952         | 63.5  | 9.5  |
| 1955         | 73.7  | 20.1   |
| 1954         | 54.0  | 25.8   |
| 1955         | 54.6  | 56.2   |
| 1956         | 54.4  | 39.9   |
| 1957         | 37.5  | 37.68  |
| 1958         | 89.2  | 70.9   |
| 1959         | 52.4  | 114.5  |
| Grand total: | <u>\$614,300,000</u>  | <u>\$386,680,000</u>   |

This table demonstrates clearly that Israel has received double the amount that was given to the Arab States.

(\*) These figures supplied by the United States Government exclude American donations to Palestine refugee relief, which have ranged between \$20,000,000 and \$30,000,000 a year from 1949 to the present.

Table No. 2 (26)

U.S. NONMILITARY AID TO THE MIDDLE EAST

July 1945 — June 1957<sup>1</sup>

(millions of dollars)

|              | Grants   |                              |  |                 | Loans<br>(net)<br>(from<br>1940) |
|--------------|--|------------------------------|--|-----------------|----------------------------------|
|              | Mutual<br>Security<br>Program<br>(Economic &<br>Technical) | Extra-<br>ordinary<br>Relief | Agricul-<br>tural<br>Surplus<br>Through<br>Private<br>Agencies | Total<br>Grants |                                  |
| Turkey       | 400.2  | 12.2                         | 0.9  | 413.3           | 205.3                            |
| Iran         | 232.4  | 2.8                          | 2.1  | 237.3           | 153.6                            |
| Pakistan     | 150.3  | 108.0                        | 17.5   | 275.8           | 103.1                            |
| Afghanistan  | 8.1  | —                            | 0.1  | 8.2             | 51.7                             |
| Iraq         | 11.0   | —                            | 0.5  | 11.5            | 1.4                              |
| Saudi Arabia | 2.7  | —                            | —  | 2.7             | 31.8                             |
| Syria        | 0.1  | 0.2                          | 0.8  | 1.1             | 0.1                              |
| Lebanon      | 19.8   | 0.3                          | 1.9  | 22.0            | 1.6                              |
| Jordan       | 33.9   | 1.1                          | 2.9  | 37.9            | —                                |
| Egypt        | 33.9   | 1.0                          | 28.5   | 63.4            | 25.5                             |
| Libya        | 26.3   | 9.7                          | 1.5  | 37.5*           | 3.5                              |
| Israel       | 226.8  | —                            | 39.0   | 265.8           | 206.3                            |
|              | <u>1,145.5</u>   | <u>135.3</u>                 | <u>95.7</u>  | <u>1,376.5</u>  | <u>783.9</u>                     |

\* Includes \$13 million «special purpose funds».

Source: U.S. Department of Commerce, **Foreign Grants and Credits by the United States Government, June 1957 Quarter** (Washington, October 1957).

Table No. 2 emphasises the same point : the total amount of economic aid offered to Israel equals 265.8 million dollars, while the total amount offered by the U.S. Government to the Arab States equals 190.6 million dollars. Also if we calculate the loans offered by the U.S. Government to Israel between 1940 and 1957 the result would be the following: Israel has received tripple the amount of American economic aid received by all the Arab States (Israel received 206.3 million dollars, whereas the Arab States collectively received only 62.9 million dollars).

- 
- (1) The figures on different kinds of grants do not always add up precisely to those for total grants, owing to the inclusion in the totals of certain minor items (U.N.R.R.A. to Egypt and lend-lease to Saudi Arabia and Iran). The table does not include sales of agricultural surpluses for local currencies; where these currencies are returned to local governments as loans or grants, they are included under the general headings above. Agreements concluded by June 30, 1957, provided for sales of agricultural surplus with market value as follows: Turkey, \$111.6 million; Iran, \$12.9 million; Pakistan, \$120.5 million; Israel, \$52 million. See **Sixth Semiannual Report on Activities under Public Law 480** (83rd Cong., as amended), U.S. House Document no. 212, 85th Cong., 1st sess., July 22, 1957 (Washington: G.P.O., 1957), p. 25.

**U.S. ASSISTANCE IN THE NEAR EAST AND NORTH AFRICA**  
*(in millions of dollars — fiscal years)*

|                   | Loans | Grants | Surplus | Ex.-Imp. | Other | Total    |
|-------------------|-------|--------|---------|----------|-------|----------|
|                   |       |        | Foods   | Bank     | Eco-  |          |
|                   |       |        | Loans   | Loans    | nomic | Military |
|                   |       |        |         |          |       |          |
| Algeria           |       |        |         |          |       |          |
| 1965              | —     | 0.6    | 113.9   | —        | —     | 14.5     |
| 1946-65           | —     | 3.9    | 158.0   | —        | —     | 161.9    |
| Iraq              |       |        |         |          |       |          |
| 1965 <sup>1</sup> | —     | 0.1    | 6.4     | —        | —     | 0.2      |
| 1946-65           | —     | 19.0   | 25.1    | 7.6      | 0.9   | 46.4     |
| 99.0              |       |        |         |          |       |          |
| Israel            |       |        |         |          |       |          |
| 1965              | 20.0  | —      | 33.9    | 4.0      | —     | 17.7     |
| 75.6              |       |        |         |          |       |          |
| 1946-65           | 226.0 | 277.9  | 320.8   | 221.0    | 0.1   | 27.6     |
| 1,073.4           |       |        |         |          |       |          |
| Jordan            |       |        |         |          |       |          |
| 1965              | 1.6   | 38.0   | 2.5     | —        | —     | 4.6      |
| 46.7              |       |        |         |          |       |          |
| 1946-65           | 4.1   | 389.8  | 76.8    | 1.6      | 1.3   | 37.0     |
| 510.6             |       |        |         |          |       |          |
| Lebanon           |       |        |         |          |       |          |
| 1965              | —     | —      | 0.7     | —        | —     | 0.1      |
| 0.8               |       |        |         |          |       |          |
| 1946-65           | 5.4   | 52.6   | 17.5    | 2.4      | 1.8   | 8.7      |
| 88.4              |       |        |         |          |       |          |
| Libya             |       |        |         |          |       |          |
| 1965              | —     | —      | —       | —        | —     | —        |



|              |       |         |         |       |      |       |         |
|--------------|-------|---------|---------|-------|------|-------|---------|
| 1965         | 9.9   | 0.8     | 22.4    | —     | 0.9  | 2.3   | 36.4    |
| 1946-65      | 270.1 | 19.4    | 192.1   | —     | 2.6  | 31.9  | 516.1   |
| Saudi Arabia |       |         |         |       |      |       |         |
| 1965         | —     | —       | 0.8     | —     | —    | 6.9   | 7.7     |
| 1946-65      | —     | 27.4    | 0.8     | 14.8  | 4.4  | 88.7  | 136.1   |
| Sudan        |       |         |         |       |      |       |         |
| 1965         | —     | 2.7     | 4.7     | —     | —    | —     | 7.4     |
| 1946-65      | 15.8  | 55.2    | 18.4    | —     | —    | 0.4   | 89.8    |
| Syria        |       |         |         |       |      |       |         |
| 1965         | 0.2   | —       | 1.3     | —     | —    | —     | 1.1     |
| 1946-65      | 18.2  | 1.6     | 63.2    | —     | —    | —     | 83.0    |
| Tunisia      |       |         |         |       |      |       |         |
| 1965         | 16.8  | 1.1     | 34.2    | —     | 1.2  | 0.9   | 54.1    |
| 1946-65      | 118.2 | 110.2   | 213.0   | 4.8   | 3.1  | 19.4  | 468.7   |
| UAR          |       |         |         |       |      |       |         |
| 1965         | —     | 2.2     | 145.6   | —     | —    | —     | 147.8   |
| 1946-65      | 103.2 | 68.1    | 850.7   | 47.8  | 11.1 | —     | 1,080.9 |
| Yemen        |       |         |         |       |      |       |         |
| 1965         | —     | 4.5     | 0.3     | —     | —    | —     | 4.8     |
| 1946-65      | —     | 29.0    | 10.1    | —     | —    | —     | 39.1    |
| TOTAL        |       |         |         |       |      |       |         |
| 1965         | 48.1  | 49.8    | 266.7   | 4.0   | 3.1  | 34.9  | 406.6   |
| 1946-65      | 768.1 | 1,184.7 | 1,981.8 | 300.0 | 58.7 | 270.7 | 4,564.0 |

Table No. 3 is another official report, covering the period 1946-1965, it shows that the total amount of U.S. Government aid to Israel (excluding military aid) equals 1045.8 million dollars, whereas the total amount of aid received by the thirteen Arab States equals 3219.9 million dollars. From these figures we can deduce that Israel receives  $\frac{1}{3}$  of the total amount of economic aid offered to the Arabs. In order to have a more complete picture of the situation we should compare the population of Israel with that of the Arab states (See Table No. 4). This table shows clearly that the population of Israel in 1964 numbered 2,510,000, while the total population of the 13 Arab States numbered 99,680,258. Thus, the inhabitants of the Arab States are 40 times more than those of Israel.

If we refer back to table No. 3 and compare the total amount of aid offered to Israel on the one hand and to the Arab States on the other (after taking into account the difference in population), we can conclude that the **Israeli citizen receives 13.5 times more than an Arab citizen.**

Besides this, table No. 3 points out that the economic aid offered to Israel is of a vital nature since it is directed towards the development of the country concerned. This cannot be said about most of the aid received by the Arab countries. For example, the aid in surplus food (an unproductive form of aid) covers more than 50% of the economic aid offered to the Arab States, whereas this kind of support covers less than 33% of the total amount of aid received by Israel. The disproportionate allocations of aid to Israel and the Arab States was recognised in a

study made by the American assembly which stated that «until 1959 Israel had received each year from the U.S. more aid than all the Arab States put together». (28)

**Table No. 4 (29)**

| <b>Country</b> | <b>Population</b> | <b>Year</b> |
|----------------|-------------------|-------------|
| Israel         | 02,510,000        | (64)        |
| Jordan         | 01,860,493        |             |
| Lebanon        | 02,152,000        |             |
| Libya          | 01,569,339        | (64)        |
| Morocco        | 13,055,000        | (64)        |
| Arabia         | 06,000,000        | (63)        |
| Sudan          | 13,200,000        | (64)        |
| Syria          | 05,399,000        | (63)        |
| Tunisia        | 04,386,000        | (64)        |
| U.A.R.         | 28,721,000        | (64)        |
| Yemen          | 05,000,000        |             |
| Iraq           | 06,937,426        | (63)        |
| Algeria        | 11,400,000        | (64)        |
|                | <hr/> 99,680,258  |             |

### **UNITED STATES MILITARY AID TO ISRAEL**

Since the establishment of the State of Israel, its officials have been trying to obtain arms from the U.S. However, until 1962 the U.S. Government had refused to sell arms to Israel directly. It preferred to :

- 1 — Offer Israel military equipment. (On 23 July,

1952, the U.S. Government agreed to supply Israel with military equipment which Israel had been unable to get except from private American sources.) (30)

2 — Secure, indirectly, the delivery of arms to Israel through England, France and West Germany. This line of policy was made clear in 1956, by J.F. Dulles when he declared that the U.S. had «no objection to the sale of arms to Israel by other Western countries». (31) This attitude on the part of the U.S. Government was based on its desire to preserve a «balance of power» in the area, and a pretention to the effect that it did not want to be directly involved in the «arms race» between Israel and the Arab States.

In this connection three observations are in order :

1 — The concept of a «balance of power» in the M.E. was not the guiding line of Western policy in the area during the period lying between 1948-1955, (ie., the period before the United Arab Republic, then Egypt, broke the Western monopoly of arms supply to the area). At that time Israel was always pointing to its military superiority over the Arabs. Thus, the attitude of neutrality expressed by J.F. Dulles and the concept of a «balance of power» in the M.E. became active policies of the Western countries in the area only after the military strength of the Arabs started increasing markedly.

2 — The Western countries in effect understood the concept of the «balance of power» to mean a balance between Israel on the one hand, and all the Arab States on the

other. This meant that the delivery of arms to Israel always exceeded that of any one Arab State.

3 — The refusal of a country to enter in an «arms race» policy, implies that it should also abstain from indirect promotion and involvement in that «arms race». The U.S. policy, certainly, did not conform to this principle.

In spite of all the western declarations, the year 1962 witnessed the adoption of a new line of policy by the U.S. Government. On 26 September of that year, it was announced in Washington that the U.S. had agreed to sell short-range «Hawk» missiles to Israel. The sale of these missiles constituted a reversal of the previous policy of the U.S., viz., that it will not be a source of arms supply to any nation in the M.E. (32)

The years 1962-1966 witnessed the delivery of large amounts of military aid to Israel. On 26 September, 1962, the U.S. Government declared that it will supply Israel with «Hawk» missiles, (defensive guided missiles developed for the U.S. army and described as a 17-foot, 1,275-lb., solid fuel supersonic weapon able to hit targets as high as 38,000 feet).(33)

On 5 February, 1966, the U.S. State Department confirmed that the U.S. Government had sold «patton» tanks to Israel «over the year». (34)

On 20 May, 1966, Israel announced that an agreement had been reached with the U.S. Government to sell Israel «tactical Jet bombers», later it was discovered that the

U.S. Government had sold Israel «Skyhawk», a lightweight attack bomber. (35)

Thus, the arms deal agreements between the U.S. and the Israeli Governments show that the military aid offered to the latter has undergone a qualitative change since 1962. It began with **military equipment** (in 1952), then **defensive military weapons** (Hawk missiles), and culminated in **offensive weapons** (Skyhawk bombers).

According to **Janes Yearbook** the Skyhawk could be described as follows:

1 — It carries nuclear bombs (Israel is trying to manufacture atomic bombs).

2 — It carries missiles and the necessary artillery for ground attack.

3 — It carries regular weapons of different weights, the maximum load being approximately two tons.

4 — It carries chemical weapons for germ warfare.

5 — It carries torpidos used for naval attack. (36)

On 18 May, 1966, McNamara, U.S. defence minister, delivered a speech in Montreal, (few days before announcing the Skyhawk deal), in which he declared that «it is the policy of the U.S. to encourage and achieve a more effective partnership with those nations who can, and should, share international peace-keeping responsibilities». (37) Implied in this statement is the State of Israel.

James Verone, Correspondent of the New York Times in Jerusalem (Israeli sector) pointed out that the U.S. could

not be the global gendarme. It should depend on the defensive force of its friends in the area to ensure the avoidance of U.S. direct interference.

Israel does not depend solely on the U.S. Government for military aid, It has been receiving such aid from the Western European countries as well, especially France. Commenting on the «Skyhawk» deal Abba Eban, Israeli Foreign Minister, stated: «When I discussed aircraft procurement in Washington last February with leading members of the U.S. Administration, they made it plain that they hoped Israel would still look to Europe as her main source of defence equipment. The U.S. regards its sales to Israel as supplementary to Israel's main effort. The transaction concluded with the U.S. has no effect whatever on our freedom to seek equipment from our traditional non-American sources». (38)

The contradiction in the theoretical and practical implications of the U.S. aid policy is expressed best by **Davar**, Histadrut newspaper, when it stated:

«In principle, the U.S. has not changed its policy of not serving one of the principal suppliers of arms to the countries of the Middle East. In practice, though, she has departed from this principle. (39)

## **GUIDING FIGURES CONCERNING UNITED STATES AID TO ISRAEL**

The **Near East Report** presents specific figures of the U.S. aid including military aid to the Arab States on

the one hand, and to Israel on the other, covering the years 1965-1966 (See Table No. 5) (40). The figures point out that Israel has received, in those two years, aid from the U.S. Government amounting to 20.1 million dollars, whereas the Arab States, collectively, have received 31.2 million dollars. This means that the Arab States received two thirds of the amount Israel received alone. If we take the Arab States surrounding Israel, namely, Jordan, Syria, Lebanon and the U.A.R. we can conclude that the amount received by Israel is triple the amount received by these States. If we exclude the two Arab States adopting fully pro-American policies, we see that the remaining Arab States have received less than two thirds of the amount offered to Israel.

**Table No. 5**

**U.S. ASSISTANCE TO ISRAEL  
AND THE ARAB STATES**

(in millions of dollars — fiscal years)

|                | <b>Grants</b> | <b>Loans</b> | <b>Surplus<br/>Foods</b> | <b>Military</b> | <b>Total</b> |
|----------------|---------------|--------------|--------------------------|-----------------|--------------|
| <b>Israel</b>  |               |              |                          |                 |              |
| 1965           | —             | 20.0         | 33.9                     | 17.7            | 71.6         |
| 1966           | —             | 10.0         | 26.9                     | 2.4             | 39.3         |
| <b>Algeria</b> |               |              |                          |                 |              |
| 1965           | 0.7           | —            | 13.9                     | —               | 14.6         |
| 1966           | 0.2           | —            | 25.2                     | —               | 25.4         |
| <b>Iraq</b>    |               |              |                          |                 |              |
| 1965           | 0.1           | —            | 6.4                      | 0.2             | 6.5          |
| 1966           | —             | —            | 0.2                      | 0.2             | 0.4          |



|                     |      |      |       |      |       |  |
|---------------------|------|------|-------|------|-------|--|
| <b>Jordan</b>       |      |      |       |      |       |  |
| 1965                | 39.0 | 1.6  | 2.5   | 4.6  | 47.7  |  |
| 1966                | 35.6 | 7.9  | 2.4   | 2.1  | 48.0  |  |
| <b>Lebanon</b>      |      |      |       |      |       |  |
| 1965                | —    | —    | 0.7   | 0.1  | 0.8   |  |
| 1966                | —    | —    | —     | 0.1  | 0.1   |  |
| <b>Libya</b>        |      |      |       |      |       |  |
| 1965                | 0.3  | —    | —     | 2.2  | 2.5   |  |
| 1966                | —    | —    | —     | 2.2  | 2.2   |  |
| <b>Morocco</b>      |      |      |       |      |       |  |
| 1965                | 11.1 | —    | 22.4  | 2.3  | 35.8  |  |
| 1966                | 0.7  | 2.6  | 34.0  | 3.0  | 40.3  |  |
| <b>Saudi Arabia</b> |      |      |       |      |       |  |
| 1965                | —    | —    | 0.8   | 6.9  | 7.7   |  |
| 1966                | —    | —    | —     | 4.3  | 4.3   |  |
| <b>Sudan</b>        |      |      |       |      |       |  |
| 1965                | 3.1  | —    | 4.7   | —    | 7.8   |  |
| 1966                | 3.2  | 10.5 | 3.4   | 0.3  | 17.4  |  |
| <b>Syria</b>        |      |      |       |      |       |  |
| 1965                | —    | -0.2 | 1.3   | —    | 1.1   |  |
| 1966                | —    | —    | 2.7   | 0.9  | 20.9  |  |
| <b>Tunisia</b>      |      |      |       |      |       |  |
| 1965                | 1.7  | 16.8 | 34.2  | 0.9  | 53.6  |  |
| 1966                | 2.3  | 15.0 | 0.7   | 0.9  | 18.9  |  |
| <b>UAR</b>          |      |      |       |      |       |  |
| 1965                | 2.3  | —    | 145.6 | —    | 147.9 |  |
| 1966                | 1.5  | —    | 59.0  | —    | 60.5  |  |
| <b>Yemen</b>        |      |      |       |      |       |  |
| 1965                | 4.5  | —    | 0.3   | —    | 4.8   |  |
| 1966                | 2.8  | —    | —     | —    | 2.8   |  |
| <b>Total</b>        |      |      |       |      |       |  |
| 1965                | 62.6 | 38.2 | 266.7 | 34.9 | 402.4 |  |
| 1966                | 46.3 | 46.0 | 154.5 | 15.5 | 262.3 |  |

## **UNITED STATES NUCLEAR AID TO ISRAEL**

Although Israel receives most of its assistance in the development of its nuclear projects from France, still the U.S. Government has played an important role in the field also.

The declared policy of the U.S. Government is that it will not co-operate with anyone in spreading nuclear weapons. In spite of this theoretical stand we find that in practice it has been helping in the spread of these weapons.

Co-operation between the U.S. Government and Israel could be characterised as follows:

In the summer of 1955, a bilateral agreement concerning co-operation in the use of atomic energy for peaceful purposes was signed between the U.S. Government and Israel. (41)

During the latter half of 1955 and January 1956, the U.S. Government offered to Israel as a gift a collection of non-classified writing (42) dealing with nuclear and atomic subjects.

On 9 December, 1959, an agreement was signed for the formation of a joint U.S. Israeli company to convert sea water into fresh water through the use of energy. (43)

In January, 1964, the desalination plant at Filat started fullscale production. (44).

On 6 February, 1964, President Johnson announced that the U.S. had offered to co-operate with Israel in

using nuclear power for the desalination of sea water on a large scale. (45)

On 3 June, 1964, Mr. Eshkol, Israeli Prime Minister, announced that the «U.S. Israeli agreement on water desalination involved advance studies and plans for a nuclear plant and distillator with a capacity of 25 million cubic meters of water a year, a project which would cost, many tens of millions of dollars.» (46)

On 11 June, 1964, a joint communiqué was issued at the end of Eshkol's visit to Washington, in which it was agreed to set up, immediately, a joint U.S. Israeli technical team to conduct surveys to define the scope and requirements of the desalination water programme. (47)

On 28 July, 1964, the first meeting of the U.S. - Israeli technical team on the desalination of sea water was held at the office of the Israeli Prime Minister.

On 26 October, 1965, the team of American and Israeli experts presented its report to the two Governments. It recommended that the two Governments should, without delay, engage a firm of consultants to prepare detailed studies for alternative nuclear dual - purpose plants providing 175-200 megawatts of electricity and 125-150 million cubic metres of fresh water per year. (49)

The following five remarks could be made on the basis of the above - mentioned survey.

1 — Israel was the prime beneficiary from the programme of nuclear co-operation between the U.S. Government

and other countries for supposedly peaceful purposes.

- 2—The U.S. - Israeli co-operation is of a very special kind, since it is more of the nature of direct aid than of co-operation.
- 3—Nuclear aid could be easily transformed from serving peaceful purposes to serving military ones.
- 4—The survey presented shows clearly the increase in the U.S. nuclear aid to Israel since its inception.
- 5—The U.S. aid in the fields of water desalination and generating electricity has far reaching effects if we consider Israel's plans for the irrigation of the Negev in order to create a new settlement area.

WEST GERMAN AID  
TO ISRAEL

## HISTORICAL BACKGROUND

The foreign policy of West Germany is in effect formulated under the supervision of the U.S. Government. According to **Time Magazine** «West Germany is the world's second largest trader after the U.S. Yet German political influence is not remotely equal to its economic-power. In foreign affairs Bonn is subservient not only to Washington, but often to London and Paris.» (50)

The policy of paying «reparations» to Israel on account of Nazi persecution of the Jews is quite illogical in addition to being a thin disguise for pouring economic aid into Israel. The «Nazi regime», which was responsible for the extermination of the Jews, had already accounted for its crimes in the Nuremberg trials. And if the «present» regime in West Germany has nothing to do with Nazism, then on what basis do they hold the people of Germany responsible for crimes committed by a prior regime?

On 12 March, 1965, the Israeli Government announced that the State of Israel, which had borne the brunt of absorbing and rehabilitating the victims of Nazism, was the only country which could speak on behalf of the whole Jewish people, and therefore, should receive from West Germany the sum of 1,500 million dollars as a «minimum claim on behalf of the sufferers of the Nazi regime». The payment should spread over a period of years and transferred in the form of goods. (51)

The official German reply to the mentioned request was sent to Israel in December 1951, when Adenauer asked Nahum Goldmann, (the Chairman of the Conference on Material Jewish Claims against Germany), to convey to Israel an invitation to enter into negotiations. (52)

In spite of the fact that the Israeli Government had initiated the demands for compensation, yet, at the beginning, it refused to deal directly with any German authority. On 7 January, 1952, the Knesset debated the issue. The debate was accompanied by tension and excitement both within and outside the assembly hall. Street battles were organised by Menachem Beigin, the former leader of the Irgun Zvai Leumi Gang. (53) Bengurion told the Knesset that Adenauer had agreed to negotiate on the basis of the Israeli claim to 1,500 million dollars to be paid by West Germany. On 9 January, the Knesset approved of the principle of negotiation and resolved to refer the matter to its Foreign Affairs Committee. (54)

On 21 March, 1952, The West German Government started negotiations with the Israeli Government and the Conference on Material Jewish claims (representing 27 Jewish organisations in 67 countries), simultaneously. (55) The distinction between Israel and the Conference of Material Jewish Claims served to show that Israel was not the sole representative of the «Jewish people».

The discussions reached a deadlock and were suspended. On 6 May the Knesset resolved that negotiations would not be resumed until a clear and binding German offer on

the amount and schedule of payments was received. (56)

Negotiations were resumed and it was informally agreed to pay the sum of 714 million dollars to Israel by West Germany in 12 to 14 years. And to pay the Conference on Material Jewish Claims the sum of 107.1 million dollars, and to pay the Central Jewish Council in Germany approximately 12 million dollars. On 5 September the Foreign Affairs Committee of the Knesset approved the agreement. On 10 September it was signed at Luxembourg by Adenauer and Moshe Sharett, the Israeli foreign minister. (57)

After the signing ceremony Sharett declared in a press statement that the German - Israeli agreement was «unique in the annals of international relations.... as it was the first time that a great people has spontaneously accepted the obligation to contribute to the reparation of crimes committed under a previous regime». (58)

The period between 18 and 22 March, 1953, witnessed the ratification of the agreement by the Bundestag and the Knesset. It became effective on 27 March, 1953, when the documents of ratification were exchanged at the U.N. Headquarters in New York. (59)

## **THE 1952-1965 REPARATIONS AGREEMENT IN FIGURES**

The reparations agreement covering the period 10 September, 1952-16 March, 1965, specified the following figures:



**Table No. 6**

| <u>Amount in<br/>Million D.M.</u> | <u>From</u>  | <u>To</u>                               |
|-----------------------------------|--------------|---|
| 3000                              | West Germany | Israel                                  |
| 450                               | West Germany | Conference on Material<br>Jewish Claims |
| 50                                | West Germany | Central Jewish Council<br>in Germany    |
| <hr/>                             |              |   |
| 3500.                             |              |   |

In the special protocol referring to the completion of the reparations programme it was pointed out that Israel had actually received:

**Table No. 7 (60)**

| <b>Amount in Million dollars</b> | <b>In the form of</b> |
|----------------------------------|-----------------------|
| 600                              | goods & services      |
| 250                              | oil deliveries        |
| <hr/>                            |                       |
| 850                              |                       |

In a report on the implementation of the 1952 agreements, issued by the West German Foreign Office at the time of its expiration, stated that West Germany had paid a total of 3,450,000,000 D.M. which is equivalent to 862.500,000 dollars to Israel between 1952 and 1965. (61)

## PROPERTY AND PERSONAL REPARATIONS

**Der spiegel** pointed out in its issue of April 1965, that the total amount of reparations paid by West Germany to Israel would reach 32 thousand million marks, which is equivalent to 8,000 million dollars, of which Israel had already received **more than** 20 thousand million marks, which is equivalent to 5,000 million dollars distributed in the following manner:

| <u>Amount</u> | <u>Currency</u> | <u>Aim</u>                  |
|---------------|-----------------|-----------------------------|
| 3450          | Million D.M.    | Reparations Agreement       |
| 3400          | Million D.M.    | Reparation on lost property |
| 23500         | Million D.M.    | Personal reparations        |
| 240           | Million D.M.    | Arms                        |

Thus, the sum pertaining to reparations on lost property and personal damage amounted to 27,900 million marks, or 6725 million dollars (actually paid to Israel).

On 28 May, 1965, Gunther announced that Israel had already received 6,787,500,000 from Germany out of 11,287,000,000 million dollars of the reparations agreement.

Jacob Balustein, president of the «American Jewish Agency», and Vice-President of the Conference on Jewish Material Claims», declared that the reparations agreement amounts to 10,000 million dollars. He added that Germany has paid Israel 6,500 million dollars in the last 11 years.

The Zionist Movement has been exerting much pressure on the West German Government to amend the laws

pertaining to reparations. The best example on this point is the pressure exerted on the Bundestag to amend the proposal for winding up the compensation programme for Jews who were let out, or came out, of the communist countries of Eastern Europe after October 1953. The pressure exerted was aimed at increasing the sum of the so-called «compassionate fund» pertaining to this kind of reparations. On 26 May, 1965, the Bundestag approved to amend the law in order to cover the Jews coming from Eastern Europe after 1953, and to increase the sum allocated for such purposes from 175 million dollars to 300 million dollars. (62)

In spite of what Israel has received it still asks for more. On 18 April, 1966, Nahum Goldmann declared: that «West Germany has to pay 12,000 million marks (3000 million dollars) as reparations for personal damage». (63)

### **OTHER WEST GERMAN ECONOMIC AID**

The termination of the 1952 reparations agreement prompted Israel to negotiate for new agreements. On 14 March, 1960, Ben-Gurion met Adenauer, (then Chancellor of West Germany) in New York for two hours. Ha'aretz reported that Ben-Gurion had requested a loan for 500 million dollars. Adenauer's reply had been neither negative nor expressly affirmative. The Israeli newspapers reported that Adenauer had approved to give Israel the above-mentioned loan. Such a report prompted the West German Foreign Ministry to announce that such an aid offer did not exist. Then Ha'aretz reported that there had been

apparently a calculated Israeli leak intended to commit Adenauer publicly to his promise. (64)

As a result of the pressure exerted by the Israeli Government West Germany was forced to enter into direct negotiations with Israel in 1966. At first the negotiations reached a deadlock since Israel insisted that it should be treated like any other country of the «third camp». After two rounds of talks, lasting respectively from 24 February to 3 March, 1966, and from 27 April to 12 May, 1966, an agreement was signed to the effect that West Germany would offer Israel yearly economic aid. It was agreed that the aid to be offered during 1966, should fall within the scope of a long-range loan totalling 40 million dollars, to be repaid by Israel in 20 years with an interest ranging from 0-3%. (65) The Jewish Observer reported that it was understood that West Germany would offer Israel yearly similar amounts for the coming ten years. (66)

## **WEST GERMAN MILITARY AID TO ISRAEL**

On 24 December, 1957, Ben-Gurion (then Prime Minister) informed the Knesset, that an Israeli mission of «a high-ranking personality» would be sent to West Germany for the purpose of obtaining arms which are not available elsewhere. (67)

On 27 December, 1957, the West German Government issued a statement in which it expressed surprise at Ben-Gurion's declaration and emphasized that it was «its policy not to allow any delivery of arms to areas where an acute

conflict existed. Moreover, no private German firm would be allowed to export arms or military equipment to Israel». (68)

In spite of this assurance given by West Germany, less than three years later, (i.e. in 1960), Adenauer and Ben-Gurion met in New York and reached a secret agreement for the sale of arms by West Germany to Israel for 80 million dollars. (69) The agreement was reached after the consent of the U.S. Government, since West Germany could not re-sell any arms (already bought from the U.S.) without its consent. Robert McClousky announced that the agreement between West Germany and Israel was reached after prior consultations and the approval of the U.S.

As a result of collective Arab action (10 member states of the Arab league, i.e. with the exception of 3 namely, Tunisia, Morocco and Libya), the West German Government was forced to halt the delivery of arms to Israel. However, 80% of the merchandise had already been received by Israel. After taking this step the West German Government announced that «the outstanding supplies under earlier arrangements on arms deliveries to Israel had now been «converted» (into civilian supplies)». (70)

## **WEST GERMAN AID TO ISRAEL IN FIGURES**

In 1960 an agreement was reached between West Germany and Israel in which the former promised to deliver arms to Israel worth 80 million dollars. On 14

February, 1965, **Der Spiegel** reported that Israel has received the following amounts of arms and military equipment :

- 1 — 60 airplanes (Helicopter, Nord Atlas, Vokk Magistere, Communication Airplanes-27).
  - 2 — A number of ambulances.
  - 3 — 450 locomotives.
  - 4 — 450 trucks.
  - 5 — Anti-tank artillery, and anti-tank missiles.
  - 6 — More than 1,000 parachutes.
  - 7 — 60 tanks M 48 (a1 and a2).
- Der Spiegel** also pointed out that West Germany has still to deliver:
- 8 — 6 Torpidos.
  - 9 — 2 Submarines.
  - 10 — An unspecified number of small arms and munitions.
  - 11 — An unspecified number of communication airplanes.

Besides this, West German aid has been expressed in another form namely that of buying arms and munitions from Israel in a manner that would subsidise the Israeli economy.

## ISRAEL AN AGENT OF IMPERIALISM

We have already pointed out to the close connection between imperialism and the Zionist movement, and have shown that the concurrence of interest has led to close cooperation among them. Chaim Weizmann, in a letter sent to Mr. Scott, editor of the Manchester Guardian, made it very clear that Israel when established would serve the interests of the imperial powers in the area. «Don't you think that the chance for the Jewish people is now within the limits of discussion at least ? I realize, of course, that we cannot «claim», anything, we are much too atomized for it, but we can reasonably say that should Palestine fall within the British sphere of influence, and should Britain encourage a Jewish settlement there, as a British dependency, we could have in twenty to thirty years a million Jews out there, perhaps more, they would develop the country ,bring back civilisation to it and form a very effective guard for the Suez Canal». (72)

The establishment of the State of Israel had fulfilled the «1907 colonial dream» of separating the Asian from African part of the Near East area.

The strategic position of Israel has induced the imperial powers to utilise it as a spear-head against the Arab national revolutionary movements. McNamara pointed out to this fact when he announced that the U.S. should depend on its friends in the area, one of them is Israel.

Israel represents the new style of imperialist infiltra-

tion into Asia and Africa. It has been pointed out that Israel cannot survive without constant foreign support and aid. This has prompted the U.S., Germany, and other imperial countries to offer Israel enough aid to make it possible for Israel to develop its own aid programmes to Afro-Asian countries. In 1959 the Histadrut established the «Afro-Asian Institute» a college designed to train men and women from Africa and Asia in fields pertaining to labour. Thus, the Histadrut, by setting up the Institute «has moved into an exciting new kind of semi-diplomatic activity». (73) The Institute is clearly a tool in the hands of imperial powers, since a great part of its annual budget «is supplied by a generous scholarship contribution from the AFL-CIO. (74)

Israel's foreign policy has been committed to the West since its inception. This has been made manifest by Israel's excessively pro-western attitude in the United Nations regarding problems of the «third camp». Hoskins states that «no nation ever is entirely free to follow its own bent in foreign policy. **Israel, more than most,** has been under the necessity, in shaping its policies, of taking note of American attitudes, in so far as these have had any reference to the Middle East, and of being guided thereby. The result has been a kind of symbiotic relationship between a small and fundamentally poor state occupying a peculiarly strategic position and a great power, from which a life-giving fluid could be brought to flow into the former's economic views». (75)

The above-mentioned factors lead us to the conclu-



sion that Israel is unable to free itself from the gripp of the imperial countries, even if we overlook the fact that it is itself a neo-colonial state. Mordechai Kreinin, a Zionist author, states that «for a long time Israel abstained from voting on the anti-colonial declarations in the United Nations, and did not vote against South Africa on the racial question. And to top it all, Israeli sub-machine guns sold in Europe were alleged to have armed Portugese troops in Angola». (76)

As for the present attitude adopted by Israel towards liberation movements in Asia and Africa, the above-mentioned author states that the change in Israel's over-all policy to accommodate African views was a tactical step and did not affect the negative stand of the Casablanca group towards it. (77)

The best example of Israel's attitude towards the revolutionary and liberation movements in the world is its policy towards the admission of communist China into the U.N. The Israeli delegation at the U.N. has been practicing a long-standing policy of abstention on this crucial issue. However, in 1965, Israel decided to vote against the admission of Communist China to the world organisation. The reason behind this decision was the expected closeness of the vote, and as a result the U.S. canvassed Israel's vote in the hope of preventing a simple majority in favour of China's admission. (78) Thus Israel has fulfilled its role of agent and spear head for the U.S. Government and other imperial countries.

## FOOTNOTES

- 1 — Noble Frankland (ed.) **Document on international Affairs** (1957) (London : Oxford University Press; 1960) P. 233.
- 2 — Nadav Safran, **The United States and Israel** (Cambridge : Harvard University Press, 1963) P.3.
- 3 — J.C. Hurewitz, **Diplomacy in the Near and Middle East : A Documentary Record : 1914-1956** (New York : D. Van Nostrand Company, INC. 1958, V. II) P. 235.
- 4 — Richard P. Stevens, **American Zionism and the U.S. Foreign Policy** (New York : Pageant Press, 1962) P. VIII
- 5 — Safran, **Loc. cit.**
- 6 — John C. Campbell, **Defence of the Middle East** (New York : Council of Foreign Relations, 1958) PP. 12, 14.
- 7 — A study covering the conference would be published by the Research Centre in the Spring of 1967.
- 8 — Raphael Patal (ed.), **The Complete Diaries of Theodor Herzl** (New York: Herzl Press and Thomas Yoseloff V. II, 1960), PP. 500-501.
- 9 — John A. De Novo, **American Interest and Policies in the Middle East (1900-1939)** (Minneapolis : The The University of Minnesota Press, 1963) P. 384.

- 10 — Hurewitz, **loc. Cit.**, P. 273. or Campbell, **loc. Cit** P. 34.
- 11 — Halford L. Hoskins, **The Middle East: Problem Area in World Politics** (New York: The Macmillan Company, 1958) PP. 115-116.
- 12 — Hailan Cleveland, «Commentary», as taken from **Tensions in the Middle East** by Philip Thayer (ed.) (Baltimore: The Johns Hoskins Press, 1958) PP. 233-234
- 13 — The falk Project for Economic Research in Israel, **A Ten Year Report** (Jerusalem: F.P.E.R.I, 1963) PP. 50-51.
- 14 — Harry B. Ellis, **Challenge in the Middle East** (New York: The Ronald Press Company, 1965) P. 95.
- 15 — Elmer Berger, **An Analysis of the Zionist-Israel-Jewish Agency Structure** (New York: American Council for Judaism, 1963 P. 34.
- 16 — **Ibid**, P. 30.
- 17 — **Ibid**, P. 38.
- 18 — **Ibid**, PP. 40-43.
- 19 — Georffrey Barraclough and Rachel F. Wall, **Survey of International Affairs 1955-1956** (London, Oxford University Press, 1960) P. 300.
- 20 — **Keesings Contemporary Archives**, V. 15. P. 20737, A.. col. 2.
- 21 — **The Jerusalem Post Newspaper**, Letter from Abba Eban (Nov. 1, 1961).
- 22 — Hoskins, **Loc Cit**, P. 115.

- 23 — **Keesings Contemporary Archives**, V. 9, P. 12468, B., Col. 2.
- 24 — Europa Publications limited, the **Middle East and North Africa (1965-1966)** (London: Staples printers Limited, 1965).
- 25 — As Cited by Ellis, **Loc. Cit.**, P. 24.
- 26 — Campbell, **loc. Cit.**, P. 24.
- 27 — **Near East Report**, 1965.
- 28 — The American Assembly (Columbia University) **The United States and the Middle East** (Prentice Hall, INC. Englenwood Cloffs, N.J. 1964) P. 118.
- 29 — **The Middle East and North Africa (1965-66)**, Euro-  
pe publications limited, London, 1965.)
- 30 — **Keesings contemporary Archives.**, V. 9, P. 12468, B., col. 7.
- 31 — R.I.I.A., **Survey of International Affairs**, (R.I.I.A., 1955-56) P. 300.
- 32 — **Keesings Contemporary Archives**, V. 13, P. 19017, A., col. 1.
- 33 — **Keesings Contemporary Archives**, V. 14, P. 19607, B., col. 6.
- 34 — **Keesings Contemperary Archives**, V. 15, P. 21321.
- 35 — Occupied Jerusalem — May 20 — (Agencies)
- 36 — **Janes All The World Air Craft (1965)**.
- 37 — **Keesings, Contemporary Archives 1956-66**, PP. 21459-21460.
- 38 — Interview with Abba Eban by Shalom Cohen as published in (**The Jerusalem Post**, 24 May 1966).
- 39 — As Cited by the «**Jerusalem Post**», 24 May 1966.

- 40 — I.L. Kenen (ed.), **Near East Report**, (Washington. vol. X., No. 18, Sept. 6, 1966.)
- 41 — **Keesings Contemporary Archives**, V. 10, P. 14361., A, col. 2.
- 42 — **Keesings Contemporary Archives**, V. 10, P. 14765., A, col. 2.
- 43 — **Keesings Contemporary Archives**, V. 12, P. 17290., A, col. 1.
- 44 — **Keesings Contemporary Archives**, V. 14, P. 19932., A, col. 2.
- 45 — **Keesings Contemporary Archives**, V. 14, P. 19932. A, col. 2.
- 46 — **Keesings Contemporary Archives**, V. 14, P. 20164., A, cols. 1-2.
- 47 — **Keesings Contemporary Archives**, V. 14 P. 20164., A, col. 1.
- 48 — **Keesings Contemporary Archives**, V. 14, P. 20240., C, col. 2.
- 49 — **Keesings Contemporary Archives**, V. 15, P. 20508., B, col. 1.
- 50 — **The Time**, 4th June 1965.
- 51 — **Keesings Contemporary Archives**, P. 11338., A., col. 1, V. 8.
- 52 — R.I.I.A., **Survey of International Affairs 1952**, P. 233.
- 53 — **Ibid.**
- 54 — **Ibid.**
- 55 — **Ibid.**, PP. 233-234.
- 56 — **Ibid.**, P. 234.
- 57 — **Ibid.**

- 58 — **Keesings Contemporary Archives**, V. 9, P. 12621, A, col. 2.
- 59 — **Keesings Contemporary Archives**, V. 9, P. 12849, B., col. 2.
- 60 — **Keesings Contemporary Archives**, V. 15, P. 20734., E, col. 1.
- 62 — **London Times**, 17 May 1965.
- 63 — **Jerusalem Post**, 19 April 1966.
- 64 — The Israel Oriental Society, **Middle East Record**, V. 1. 1960, P. 290.
- 65 — **Keesings Contemporary Archives**, Vol. 15, P. 21439., A, col. 1.
- 66 — **Jewish Observer Magazine**, V. XV, No. 20, 20 May 1966, P. 7.
- 67 — **Keesings Contemporary Archives**, V. II, P. 15990, A, col. 1.
- 68 — **Keesings Contemporary Archives**, V. II P. 15990 A. col. 1.
- 69 — **The New York Times**, Feb. 9, 1965.
- 70 — **Keesings Contemporary Archives**, V. 15. P. 20741. col. 1.
- 71 — **Keesings Contemporary Archives**, V. 13, P. 18507, A, col. 1, and **Middle East Record**, 1960, P. 297.
- 72 — **Chaim Weismann, Trial and Error** (New York: Harper and Brothers, 1949) P. 149.
- 73 — **Safran Loc. Cit.**, P. 136.
- 74 — Bernard Reich, «Israel's Policy in Africa» **Middle East Journal** (V.XVIII No, 1. Winter 1964) P. 16.
- 75 — **Hoskins, Loc Cit.**, P. 116.

- 76 — **Mordechai Kreinin, Israel and Africa : A Study In Technical Cooperation** (New York: Praeger, 1964)  
P. 136.
- 77 — **Ibid.**
- 78 — **The Jerusalem Post**, Vol. XXXVI, No. 11510.

## PALESTINE RESEARCH CENTER

606 Sadat St.

( Apt. 22 )

Ras Beirut, Beirut - Lebanon

Telephone 296803

Director General : Anis Sayegh

### PUBLICATIONS

#### I. "PALESTINE MONOGRAPHS":

1. Sayegh, Fayez: Zionist Colonialism in Palestine (A,E, F,G,D) (1 L.L.)
2. Jabara, Abdeen: The Armistice in International Law (E) (2 L.L.)
3. Kayyali, Abdul-Wahab: The Expansionist Aims of Israel (A) (2 L.L.)
4. Kayyali, Abdul-Wahab: The Kibbutz (A) (2 L.L.)  
Abu-Gazaleh, Passam: Terrorist Roots of the Herut Party of Israel (A) (2 L.L.)
6. Iskandar, Marwan: The Arab Boycott of Israel (A,E,G) (2 L.L.)
7. El-'Abed, Ibrahim: The Mapai Party (A) (2 L.L.)
8. Razzouk, Ass'ad: A Look at the Parties of Israel (A,G) (2 L.L.)



9. Kadi, Leila S.: The Histadrut (A) (2 L.L.)
10. El-'Abed, Ibrahim: Violence and Peace: A Study in Zionist Strategy (A) (2 L.L.)
11. Abdul-Rahman, Ass'ad: The Israeli Infiltration in Asia (A) (2 L.L.)
12. Sayegh, Anis: Military Balance (A) (2 L.L.)
13. Sayegh, Fayez: Zionist Diplomacy (A,E) (2 L.L.)
14. Jiryis, Sabri: The Arabs in Israel Vol. I (A,E) (2 L.L.)
15. Abdul-Rahman, Ass'ad: The World Zionist Organization (A) (2 L.L.)
16. El-Hejou, Angelina: Interaction of Political, Military, and Economic Factors in Israel (A,E) (2 L.L.)
17. Mrowa, Yusuf: Dangers of Israel's Scientific Progress (A) (2 L.L.)
18. Abu-Gazaleh, Bassam: High-Pressure Planning in Israel (A) (2 L.L.)
19. Moutlak, Rafik: Israel on the Eve of Aggression (A) (2 L.L.)
20. Tariki, Abdullah: Arab Oil and the Battle for Palestine (A) (2 L.L.)
21. Jiryis, Sabri: The Arabs in Israel Vol. II (A,E) (2 L.L.)
22. Kanafani, Ghassan: Zionist Literature (A) (2 L.L.)
23. Hashem, 'Akil and 'Azm, Sa'id: Israel in Western Europe (A) (2 L.L.)
24. Shukairy, Ahmad: Territorial and Historical Waters in International Law (E) (2 L.L.)

25. Abdul-Aziz, Mustafa: Voting and Political Blocks in the U.N. General Assembly (A) (2 L.L.)
26. El-'Abed, Ibrahim: The Moshav (A) (2 L.L.)
27. Hajjaj, Ahmad: The Israeli Population: Analysis and Predictions (A) (2 L.L.)
28. Moghayzel, Joseph: The Arab Boycott in International Law (A) (2 L.L.)
29. Kawar, Adib: The Jewish Woman in Occupied Palestine (A) (3 L.L.)
30. Dabbagh, Salah: The Soviet Union and the Palestine Question (A) (2 L.L.)
31. Anabtawi, Munzer: Israeli Propaganda (A) (2 L.L.)
32. Sa'd, Ilias: Tourism in Israel (A) (2 L.L.)
33. Al-'Abed Ibrahim: The Foreign Policy of Israel (A) (2 L.L.)
34. Deeb, George: The United Nations and the Israeli Aggression (A) (2 L.L.)
35. Abdul-Aziz, Mustafa: The Jewish Minority in the U.S.A. (A) (2 L.L.)
36. Shibl, Yusuf: Fiscal Policy in Israel (A) (2 L.L.)
37. Razzouk, Ass'ad: State and Religion in Israel (A) (2 L.L.)
38. Suleiman, Atif: Israel and Oil (A) (2 L.L.)
39. Sa'd, Elias: Unemployment in Israel (A) (2 L.L.)
40. El-Helou, Angelina: Israel and the Common Market (A) (2 L.L.)

41. Mouja'is, Lamia: Mapam (A) (2 L.L.)
42. Al-Haythami, M.F.: The Strategy of Israel (A) (2 L.L.)
43. Al-Kantar, Riad: The Israeli Infiltration in Africa (A) (2 L.L.)
44. Halasa, Tahani: David Ben Gurion (A) (2 L.L.)
45. Hashem, Akil: Planning for Arab Information (A) (2 L.L.)
46. Mroueh, Yusuf: Dangers of Israel's Industrial Planning (A) (2 L.L.)
47. Razzouk, Ass'ad: Zionism and Arab Human Rights, Vol. I (A,E,F) (2 L.L.)
48. Razzouk, Ass'ad: Zionism and Arab Human Rights, Vol. II (A,E,F) (2 L.L.)
49. Hanna, Elias W.: The Legal Status of the Arab Resistance in Occupied Territory (A,E,F) (2 L.L.)
50. Azmeh, Aziz: Left-Wing Zionism, From its Inception to the Declaration of the State of Israel (A) (2 L.L.)
51. Abdul-Rahman, Ass'ad: Memoirs of a Prisoner (A,E,F) (2 L.L.)
52. Foda, Ezzeddin: The Question of Jerusalem in International Relations (A) (2 L.L.)
53. Kadi, Leila S. (ed): Essays on the American Public Opinion and the Palestine Problem (E) (2 L.L.)
54. Foda, E., Razzouk, A., and Hanna, E.: Zionism and Arab Resistance (E) (2 L.L.)
55. The Arabs Under Israeli Occupation (E) (2 L.L.)

56. Kadi, Leila S.: A Survey of American-Israeli Relations  
(E) (2 L.L.)

## II. "PALESTINE BOOKS":

1. Sayegh, Yusuf: The Israeli Economy (A) (5 L.L.)
2. Al-Kassim, Anis: Arabs, the Vatican and Israel (A)  
(4 L.L.)
3. Shukairy, Ahmad: Liberation — Not Negotiation (E)  
(5 L.L.)
4. Kadi, Leila S.: Arab Summit Conferences and the Palestine Problem (E) (6 L.L.)
5. Al-Kassim, Anis: Revolutionary Preparation (A) (6 L.L.)
6. 'Aloush, Naji: Arab Resistance in Palestine (A) (4 L.L.)
7. Al-Sha'ir, Lt. Col. Mohammad: Guerilla Warfare in Palestine (A) (6 L.L.)
8. Darstellungen Zum Palästina Problem (G) (6 L.L.)
9. Sayegh, Anis: Urban and Rural Settlements of Palestine (A) (6 L.L.)
10. Sayegh, Anis (ed): Herzl's Diaries (A) (8 L.L.)
11. Contemporary Zionist Thought (A) (8 L.L.)
12. Sayegh, Anis (ed.): Essays on the Palestine Problem, Vol. I (A) (6 L.L.)
13. Razzouk, Ass'ad: Greater Israel (A) (10 L.L.)
14. Arnita, Yusra Jawharieh: The Folklore of Palestine (A) (8 L.L.)

15. Shibl, Yusuf : Essays on the Israeli Economy (E) (8 L.L.)
16. Khammar, Constantine: Geographical Sites of Palestine (A) (8 L.L.)
17. El-Abed, Ibrahim: The Palestine Question — A Handbook (A) (8 L.L.)

### III. "PALESTINE ESSAYS":

1. Sayegh, Fayez: The Concepts and Slogans of Bourguibism (A) (0.50 L.L.)
2. Sa'b, Hassan: Zionism and Racism (A,E,G) (0.50 L.L.)
3. Sayegh, Anis: Palestine and Arab Nationalism (A,G) (1 L.L.)
4. Sayegh, Fayez: Do Jews Have a Divine Right to Palestine (E) (0.50 L.L.)
5. Shukairy, Ahmad: Proposal for a Unified Arab State (A) (0.50 L.L.)
6. Anabtawi, Munzer: Inherent Elements in the Zionist Movement (A) (0.50 L.L.)
7. Hadawi, Sami: Palestine in Focus (A,E,F) (1 L.L.)

### IV. "PALESTINE CHRONOLOGY":

Editor: Anis Sayegh

1. Volume I: January 1 to June 30, 1965 (A) (10 L.L.)
2. Volume II: July 1 to December 31, 1965 (A) (10 L.L.)
3. Volume III: January 1 to June 30, 1966 (A) (10 L.L.)

4. Volume IV: July 1 to December 31, 1966 (A) (10 L.L.)
5. Volume V: January 1 to June 30, 1967 (A) (10 L.L.)
6. Volume VI: July 1 to December 31, 1967 (A) (10 L.L.)
7. Volume VII: January 1 to June 30, 1968 (A) (10 L.L.)

V. "FACTS AND FIGURES":

1. Sayegh, Fayez: Twenty Basic Facts About the Palestine Problem (A,E,F,S,G,R,D, Esp) (0.50 L.L.)
2. Sayegh, Fayez: The United Nations and the Palestine Problem (A,E,F,G,S) (0.50 L.L.)
3. Sayegh, Fayez: Discrimination in Education Against the Arabs in Israel (E,G) (0.50 L.L.)
4. Kadi, Leila S.: Israel in the International Arena (A) (0.50 L.L.)
5. Kadi, Leila S.: The Palestine Problem in Thirty-Three International Conferences (A) (0.50 L.L.)
6. Abdul-Rahman, Ass'ad: United States and West German Aid to Israel (A,E,G) (1 L.L.)
7. Darwazah, Hakam: A Short Survey of the Palestine Problem (A,E,F) (1 L.L.)
8. Habibi, Salwa: The Israeli Press (A) (1 L.L.)
9. Moutlak, Rafik: Political Life in Israel (A) (1 L.L.)
10. Sayegh, Fayez: The Afro-Asian Institute, Tel-Aviv (A) (1 L.L.)
11. Faris, Hani Ahmad: Arab Diplomatic Representation (A) (1 L.L.)

12. Mrowa, Yusuf and Dandan, Norma: Scientific and Cultural Institutes in Israel (A) (1 L.L.)
13. Mrowa, Yusuf: Israeli Scientists (A) (1 L.L.)
14. Husayni, Sharif: Israeli Student Activities (A) (1 L.L.)
15. Khouri, Yaqoub: Human Rights in Occupied Palestine (A) (1 L.L.)

VI. "PALESTINE MAPS":

1. A Six-Color Wall Map of Palestine, 140 x 100 cms (A) (6 L.L.)

N.B. — Letters in parentheses indicate language of publication  
A: Arabic, E: English, F: French, S: Spanish, G: German, R: Russian, D: Danish, Esp.: Esperanto.  
Prices are listed in Lebanese Currency.

# **P. L. O. RESEARCH CENTRE**

606 Sadat St., Beirut

---

**Established in February 1965**

---

## **P U B L I C A T I O N S**

- I — Palestine Chronology Series.**
- II — Facts & Figures Series.**
- III — Palestine Essays Series.**
- IV — Palestine Monographs Series.**
- V — Palestine Books Series.**
- VI — Palestine Maps Series.**
- VII — Special research Series.**