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most of the information and recommendations of this analysis. But an effort, properly conceived in advance, provided with respectable resources, could rather quickly surface and mobilize a constituency in support of liberal, democratic specifics for coping with the problems that uninformed support of or acquiescence in Zionist propaganda programs have produced in the past for anti-Zionist (or even non-Zionist) Jews and Arabs, particularly Palestinians.
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I

Historical Introduction

It is difficult to blueprint the organizational structure of the Zionist movement in the United States – or anywhere else. The difficulty derives from the fact that the movement – despite its protestations claiming to be a voluntary, indigenous free association in any country where it operates – is a supranational foreign entity, ("public body"). It was so "recognized" in Article 40 of the Mandate. The same article put down the condition that "the Zionists organization" could play this role "subject always to the control of the Administration" and "so long as its organization and constitution are in the opinion of the Mandatory appropriate...".(emphasis supplied).

Except for a brief period in the middle 1920's however, the British Government appears to have paid little attention to the appropriateness of either the organization or its constitution. Nor was the Mandatory government consistent about the "control" exercised over the Zionist organization. Students of the history have often argued that "control" was often exercised the other way around.

Motivated more by political than legal or moral considerations, later British governments began to doubt the wisdom of this pro-Zionist commitment. In the mid 1920's the British half heartedly questioned the authenticity of the Zionist organization's capacity to enlist “all Jews... willing to assist in the establishment of the Jewish national home”, which is also language from Article 4 of the Mandate. These inquiries, together with clear indications the British were favoring improved relations with "the Arabs", stimulated Weizmann and his colleagues to create a structure which at least appeared to be more representative of "the Jewish people" than the formal Zionist organization.

II

Building the Machinery

The ultimate authority for the Zionist movement was the World Zionist Congress. Then – as now – it was a fairly democratic body. It was composed of delegates elected by its own procedures from all Zionist parties.

*Rabbi Dr Elmer Berger, President of American Jewish Alternatives to Zionism Inc, USA; member of EAPORTA's Executive Council.
from all countries in which recognized Zionist movements had been established. The Congress is the supreme authority of the Zionist movement. It regulates the activities of a number of “Departments”, most of which were organized to fulfill social, economic and educational functions in the process of building “the national home”. There is, for example, a Department of Education, a Department of Agriculture, a Department of Settlement and Immigration. The Congress’ Executive determines the budget and allocates funds. Theoretically, the funds are derived from what amounts to a tax, called the “shekel”. Payment of the shekel is mandatory for voting representation in the Congress. In reality the shekel produced only nominal sums and the homeland-building activities of the Zionist movement are financed by substantial sums collected throughout the “Diaspora” by fiscal agencies of which The Palestine Foundation Fund and The Jewish National Fund are the largest.1

In the mid-1920’s, when British doubts began to rise, Chaim Weizmann was the President of the Congress and Zionism’s principal liaison with the Mandatory government. It therefore became essentially Weizmann’s responsibility to persuade the Congress that it was necessary to provide a satisfactory answer to the Mandatory inquiry about the capability of the movement to represent “the Jewish people”. In addition to this political consideration, it was becoming increasingly clear that the Zionist movement, on its own, was incapable of financing the building of the National Home. At least funds of that dimension could not be raised with sufficient rapidity to offer conclusive proof to the “dissuading British that “the Jewish people” was prepared to mobilize sufficient resources to exploit to full advantage the “promise” of the Balfour Declaration. Weizmann’s access to British authority provided him with insights into that authority which enabled him to anticipate a British reversal of policy, given any plausible pretext.2

The dilemma for the Congress — or at least for its ideological purists — was that to satisfy the Mandatory’s implied doubts it would be necessary to recruit Jews who were not “shekel” paying (not Zionists) into the work of building the National Home. Weizmann was always capable of temporarily sublimating his ideology to pragmatism. He finally won a bitter fight in the Congress to “negotiate” with Jews, many of whom as individuals were not only not Zionists, but who were publicly devoted active opponents of the whole concept of “Jewish” nationalism and therefore opposed to the idea of a Jewish “national home”.3

III

“Synthetic” Zionism and the Jewish Agency

Reluctantly the Congress gave its consent. Weizmann proceeded to lay plans for enlisting the support and participation of the leadership of essentially anti-Zionist American Jews. To bridge the gap Weizmann coined the term “non-Zionist”. The nomenclature was intended to identify on the whole, counter-productive. A good example of the importance of this proposition is the fairly recent altercation over the report on Israeli torture of Arabs made by the former United States diplomat, Ms. Alexandra Johnson. The argument which ensued in the United States revolved not so much about Ms. Johnson’s stated facts as about her assertion that the practice of torture seemed to reveal a pattern attributable to Israeli government policies. Official efforts to water down Ms. Johnson’s findings questioned the asserted “pattern”. Her report could have been strengthened had she prefaced it with a brief inventory of Israel’s “basic” Zionism legislation such as “The Law of Return”, the “Nationality Law” and the “Statut Law”. The Zionist bias in those laws makes the “practice” of torture of non-Jewish people more credible to a world long brain-washed to believe Zionism is a liberal, humanitarian movement which could not possibly torture political dissidents.

Two other observations, briefly stated, may add practical value to this analysis.

1. There is definitely a tide of change rising now in American opinion. Most analysts of public opinion believe the change is more accurately described as a diminution of enthusiasm for Israel than as any positive, supportive position for “the Arabs”. This suggests — or adds emphasis to — the necessity for anti-Zionist information to provide credible alternatives stated in the context of American interests and values.

2. Regardless of what knowledgeable experts may know about Zionism, there is a strong vestige of popular belief it is a well-meaning humanitarian, constructive movement. That mythology is sustained by the very extensive Zionist network which is expertly structured to spread “the Zionist word” throughout the country at a “women’s” notice and on any issue on which the Zionist managers decide such an “orchestrated effort” is in order.

To meet this apparatus with any degree of success now requires — in addition to good substance in the offered information — sufficient resources for mobilizing and coordinating the now rather significant numbers of American individuals and some organizations who seek justice for “the Arabs” and providing guidance for them to respond on every level where Zionist propaganda is activated.

This, in turn, requires easy accessibility to authoritative and where possible, official documentation of Arab policies and actions. It requires also, greatly increased numbers of personnel who, by training and experience, know how to relate to the average American. The efficacy of these assets would undoubtedly be enhanced if, in addition, there were a central address to which interested Americans could turn for promptly delivered information. Such an agency, loosely coordinating the information effort, could also eliminate much present duplication of effort, some of which is of less than acceptable quality.

No miracles will result from any campaign even if it is based upon all, or
least in the United States— to be recognized as full and accepted parts of the American people. This is why Zionist propaganda in the United States stresses that Israel is “the bulwark of democracy” in the Middle East, “the defender of American interests against communism,” “America’s only reliable ally in the Middle East.” Without these propaganda themes— using only narrow, chauvinistic appeals to Zionist loyalty and its segregationist ideology— support among American Jews would diminish because support among Americans generally would decline.

3. A corollary to these strategic/personnel suggestions concerns the substance of any contemplated information programs. As a general rule, substance should be put in the context of broad, American interests. Such interests can be in two broad categories. One is perceived national, material interests. Oil, of course, tops the list at the moment. Markets for American products are another. Strategic, geopolitical interests also enlist interest among Americans. Without exploiting “cold war” mentality, some affinity to the “west” in terms of mutual, material interests is also “saleable” to American audiences. These considerations may seem mundane to ideologues and people motivated sincerely by high principles. But they ought not be dismissed cavalierly or contemptuously by any seeking a hearing for the commendable objective of winning American comprehension of the humanity of Arabs (or any other non-Americans) and for justice and equity in the deployment of American power, of all kinds. These are commendable, lofty purposes. The use by information-planners of such earthly but not unpalatable means for achieving them is entirely justifiable.

A second category of American interests which provides a context in which information programs should be conceived and implemented is the American people’s conception of itself (even if not always warranted) as a nation motivated by the best distillation of liberal, democratic ideals. Zionist-nationalism, in almost every respect is contrary to these same ideals. The opportunities to explore its true character are almost as extensive as the specifics of the Arab/Israel/Zionist conflict, on the one hand, together with the traditional aspiration of American Jews for acculturation, on the other hand. It is beyond the purview of this analysis to develop these categories in detail. But in deference to EAFORD’s declared, central purposes, contrasting Zionist nationalism’s values with the standards of a society in which race/religion neither enhances nor impairs any citizen’s full participation in that society’s system of rights and obligations should be a highly efficacious formula for offering an alternative to Zionism which can command general American support, including the support of American Jews. A caveat is again in order. Such an appeal should emphasize the historic, organic, functional racism/theocracy of Zionism, as codified in Israeli law. Exaggerations of isolated examples of discrimination which cannot be related to the Zionist/Israel legal/political system are probably, a Jew who was willing to contribute material aid to the building of the “national home” but was recognized as opposing the concept of “Jewish” nationalism. Weizmann’s own, cynical definition of the term is apt. In his autobiography, Trial and Error, he described the synthetic creation as

These wealthy Jews who could not wholly divorce themselves from a feeling of responsibility toward their people, but at the same time could not identify themselves with the hopes of the masses, were prepared with a sort of left-handed generosity, on condition that their right hand did not know what their left hand was doing... They would give— with disclaimers; we would accept— with reservations.5

The principle focus of Weizmann’s “diplomacy” were the leaders of the American Jewish Committee, in the mid-1920’s the most prestigious collection of American Jews, generous philanthropists, but anti-Zionist almost to a man. How this mesalliance was finally consummated is a story of naivete on the part of American Jews. They believed Weizmann’s tactically watered-down version of Zionist aspirations and relied upon the Mandatory to enforce the “safeguard” clauses of the Balfour Declaration, protecting both Palestinian Arabs and anti-Zionist Jews from any possible threats to their existing nationality status by any unrestricted Zionist aggressiveness. These “non-Zionist” Americans were also victimized by a sense of guilt at their own security in the United States, on the one hand, and the still precarious conditions under which Jews in eastern and middle Europe continued to live, on the other hand.

The wily Weizmann was equal to the challenge. Mixing deceit with trading upon the innocence (and idealistic impulses) of his American “negotiating partners”, the Enlarged Jewish Agency was established in 1929.

IV

The Enlarged Jewish Agency

In broad terms the Agency became the institution “cooperating” with the Mandatory in the national home project. In return for their prestige— and financial support— the “non-Zionists” were allocated 50% of the membership of the Enlarged Agency.6 But the Zionist organization was given the right to appoint members to the Agency from the middle where the American “non-Zionists” had no constituency and no means for creating one. From the beginning the structure was jerry-built. The 50% membership constitutionally allocated to the World Zionist Organization was a disciplined caucus. Its policy positions were determined by the Congress. The “non-Zionists”, on the other hand, had no real constituency. The American Jews had consistently resisted over-all umbrella structures which, in some prescribed, democratic procedure might have elected representatives to the Agency. Constantly frustrated by this lack of a
constituency, by the disciplined voting of the 50% Zionist membership, augmented by the Zionist organization’s selection to fill the “non-Zionist” seats from those countries where there was not even as definite a constituency (or recognized leadership) as among American Jews, the American “non-Zionists” early on lost influence and then interest in the Agency. By the middle 1930’s meaningful “non-Zionist” representation was non-existent. The Jewish Agency and the World Zionist Organization were, for all practical purposes, identical.

V
The United Jewish Appeal

The decline (or freeing out) of the “non-Zionist” created no problems of conscience for the Zionist organization. On the contrary, it simplified the Agency’s increasingly apparent and deliberate divergence from and defiance of the Mandate and the Mandatory’s policies. It facilitated the Agency’s organization of illegal immigration, for example, and when, in the closing years of World War II, the Agency concentrated its principal efforts on mobilizing the support of the United States Government for its territorial/statehood claims, it could do so without any visible and therefore politically effective opposition from “non-Zionists” within its own ranks. This necessitated the creation of independent anti-Zionist efforts, of which the American Council for Judaism was then the foremost, organized group.

Two factors facilitated the transition of the Zionist movement in the United States from the artificial “partnership” with the “non-Zionists” to an independent, solo role uninhibited by even mild, internal, “non-Zionist” restraints.

The first were the genocidal policies of Hitler, coupled with the slow perception by the rest of the world of the dimensions of the tragedy. Whatever were the true dimensions, there was no effective international program for coping with it. Consequently, the portrayal of the problem and the activation of a program offering a perceived relief commensurate with Zionist definitions of the problem became the almost exclusive prerogative of the Zionist movement. The offered solution was recognition of the historical Zionist aspiration to Palestine to create a Jewish state in which all Jews – “the Jewish people” – would possess the nationality right of immigration and to which all Jews were, correspondingly, “obligated” to provide resources to support conventional institutions of statehood. The expertise of Zionist propagandists made the most of this consequence of developments. Opposition to Zionism was no longer diluted or diminished by simple ignorance of Zionism’s character and objectives, as Weissman had attractively packaged these to state “non-Zionists” into the Enlarged Jewish agency. Near-hysterical support for the “realism” of the Zionist solution to “the Jewish problem” practically foreclosed public, analytical debate or dialogue about Zionism. Palestinian and/or Arab interests and rights in a democratic, self-determination formula were simply blotted out.

VI
Some “Do’s”

1. Basic strategy for winning minds to non-racial, non-discriminatory, democratic alternatives to Zionism should be designed to separate the “garden-variety” uninformed or misinformed Jew (and other Americans) from slavish, uninformed following of Zionist leadership. This approach requires genuine alternatives. Positive and affirmative programs are needed rather than head-to-head, purely negative confrontations. The information-strategy employed must be targeted at a broad cross-section of the total American people rather than a frontal, one-dimensional appeal to, or attack on, Jews. The latter approach is often counter productive because it nourishes suspicion that Jews are being singled out as victims for holding opinions or engaging in activities which do – in part – obtain among others than Jews.

2. Despite the recommendation for broad-gauge campaigns it is important that Jews be visibly a part of the effort. In the first place, knowledgeable Jews have a sensitivity to actions or semantics which, justifiable or not, Jews traditionally find offensive. (Many an information effort has been rebuffed because an unfortunate and unnecessary word or phrase or allusion was employed). Terms like “international Jewry” or “Judaists”, allegations of “conspiracy” are examples of semantics which trigger suspicions about the motives of the one who employs them. Exaggerated analogies comparing Zionism’s rather subtle racism to “Hitlerism” open the door to polemics which draw attention from the real issues.

There are no intricate Zionist “conspiracies”. Zionism has employed one of the best propaganda mechanisms the world has ever known. It generally signals its intentions loudly and clearly. It has succeeded in furthering undemocratic programs and policies because all too few knew enough about Zionism to read and properly interpret its gaudy propaganda.

Visible participation by responsible Jews in any campaign to defeat Zionism is probably important also because it adds credibility to the substance of the campaign and to the decent intentions of the campaigners, as well. AJAZ is a working, practical example. It entices supporters from a cross-section of America despite – or perhaps because of – the fact it is known as American Jewish Alternatives to Zionism.

A third reason for an information campaign designed to appeal to the totality of Americans – including Jews but not setting them apart – is that identification with the American body politic is precisely what most American Jews want. Zionism calls this “assimilation”, using the term pejoratively and suggesting that “assimilation” in the United States (or any democratic state) means the disappearance of Jews. Something of this is perceived in the Israeli propaganda line that equates the Palestinian goal of a secular, democratic, unitary state as the “destruction” of the state and Israeli propagandists usually add, “the Jewish people”, as well. But Zionist propaganda itself trades on the fundamental aspiration of Jews – at
American policies by as craven and unimaginative a collection of political “leaders” and advisors as is to be found anywhere on planet earth.

As Weizmann observed in the 1920's, when he was slily neutralizing anti-Zionists with the semantics of “non-Zionism”, it is still true that the right hand does not know what the left hand is doing. It may also be true that having been misled to make commitments of money, effort and emotion, many of these Jews do not even the right hand to know what the left is doing. Such knowledge could create intense, personal discomfort and unpleasant task of undoing what had been blindly done. And because “social” and economic status has so often been closely tied to financial support of Zionist endeavours such as “undoing”, in some situations, can result in rather revolutionary alterations of lifestyles.

XIV

Conclusions

This overview of the development of the Zionist structure and its method of operations suggests several conclusions for those attempting to replace Zionism’s exclusivist ideology and program with non-racial, non-discriminatory programs.

The conclusions may be relevant whether the desired objective of any activist is to democratize the life-patterns of Jews (or more precisely Jewish organizations) in the United States or, on the international scene, to eliminate Zionism’s divisive impact on the Middle East and to democratize Palestine. The conclusions may be relevant also to any prepared to settle for the shorter-term goal of containing Zionism by putting an end to Zionist/Israeli expansionism.

A. Some “Don’ts”

1. It is probably an exercise in futility simply to compile an inventory of “Zionist organizations”. At their inured best they authentically represent a mere fraction of the Jews of the world and particularly of Jews in the United States.

2. It is probably also a tactical mistake to challenge Zionism as a purely “Jewish” problem, largely restricted to the narrowest definitions of the Arab/Zionist conflict. The lack of efficacy of this approach is, in part at least, attributable to the inadequacy of Arab public relations over a long period of time. Given the effectiveness and sophistication of Zionist propaganda generally and the tardiness of “the Arabs” in mounting both the machinery and the information policies needed to counter this propaganda – in a head-to-head confrontation – the battle must remain uneven for a long time. Meanwhile, the Zionist war – with American indulgences – proceeds inexorably to consolidate its territorial gains in the Middle East and, by smooth propaganda, to anesthetize both Jews and others to its policies.

in the clamor for “refuge”. At best “the Arabs” became non-people. At worst they were inhuman, ignorant, backward, unworthy of consideration when compared to the “need” of “the Jewish people”. Enormous and well-orchestrated political, economic, social and emotional pressures swept virtually all Americans – including others than Jews – into almost uncritical trust in and support of the Zionist movement and its objectives. The absence of competent Arab information, responsibly demonstrating the inevitable deprivation of national rights for non-Jewish people” Palestinians, if the Zionist aspirations were realized, also contributed to the virtually unchallenged Zionist political achievements.

The second development which facilitated the efforts of the Zionist movement to capitalize on withering “non-Zionist” participation in the Jewish Agency was the merger in 1938 of the two, principle “charitable” funds sustained by American Jews to provide relief for the sufferings of European Jews. The Zionists initiated the merger. [13] The American Joint Distribution Committee for decades had been the major overseas relief instrument. The JDC had been founded and controlled by anti-Zionists. It was committed – on principle – to constructive projects for rebuilding and sustaining Jewish institutions in the countries to which the Jews had fled. Consistent with the ideology of the leaders of American Jews the JDC also worked in sophisticated ways to establish or to form up the application of equal citizenship rights and responsibilities for Jews in their native citizenship countries. The major Zionist fund was the Palestine Foundation Fund (Keren Hayesod). It was a “general revenue” source for the Jewish Agency. Its contributions were augmented by contributions from the Jewish National Fund which concentrated on the acquisition and development of land in Palestine for “the Jewish people”.

The plausible rationale which the Zionists offered for merging the Palestine Foundation Fund and the JDC was “efficiency”, “reduction of fund-raising mechanisms”, “diminution of overhead”. Informed anti-Zionists opposed the merger. But the appeal to such efficiency, with greater amounts of money available to the needy recipients, together with the cultivated predictions to support the camouflaged Zionist program as the only available, “permanent” solution for Europe’s Jewish victims of Hitler, made the merger proposition irresistible. And so the United Jewish Appeal was born. The JDC was technically a full partner. But, as in the Jewish Agency, the more disciplined zealotry of the Zionist fund-raising machinery slowly eroded the influence of the JDC anti-Zionists, now diluted by Weizmann semantics to “non-Zionists”. Allocations to the JDC were gradually reduced. Those to the PPF increased. For the Zionists, it was a self-fulfilling arrangement. The less resources available to the JDC the less it could provide for restoration of acceptable conditions for Jews who might elect repatriation to their
European homes. This, in turn, enhanced Zionism's appeal to the survivors to elect Palestine as their haven for refuge. The more this "choice" became evident the greater were the Zionists claims upon the merged funds.

VI.

Great Power Declarations

This situation obtained in 1947 and 1948, at the time of the great debate about Palestine's political future. The establishment of the Zionist state forced the JDC into almost total eclipse. The "national/home" now existed. Its accessibility plus the coercive methods used by the Zionist apparatus in the D.P. camps, (many of the same are now employed on emigres from the Soviet Union) plus Zionist-stimulated fears among Jews in Arab countries (Iraq is a good example) produced a flood of immigration and created attendant economic and social problems. With their critical capacities still numbed by the European tragedy the "non-Zionist" gave unstintingly - and without any real control - to the new Zionist-dominated United Jewish Appeal. The JDC was forced, for the first time, to undertake some ("non-political") programs in the Zionist state.

It is crucially important that for all these years the Zionist organization was a recognized "public body". Nevertheless, all countries in which it operated local branches privileged it so function as if it had been a domestic, voluntary, free association of local citizens. United Jewish Appeal funds were employed to help build British - and later a joint British/American - investigating commissions identified as a "state within a state". It helped finance the Zionist organization's political activities (including the organization, transportation, food, clothing and housing for "immigrants"). But contributions to the UJA were accorded privileges usually limited to genuine philanthropic institutions. In Britain, while the Mandate was operative, this was perhaps understandable. The Mandate authorized "cooperation" between the Mandatory government and the Jewish Agency. In the United States, anti-Zionists regularly protested this "mingling" of "philanthropic" and national/political funds. They claimed a kind of taxation without representation. Many of them refused to contribute to the UJA under these circumstances.

But a majority of American Jews felt a demandiing moral obligation to help in the reconstruction of the lives of their fellow Jews who had survived Hitler. Traditional anti-Zionists objected to being coerced into support of the "Jewish state"-building process by the contractual relationship between the JDC and the PPF, together with the World Zionist Organization/Jewish Agency's role as recipient of the contractual percentage designated for "relief and reconstruction" in Palestine. Lower bureaucratic levels of the United States Government sometimes offered encouraging response to these anti-Zionist objections. But no corrective action was ever taken at the policy-making level. There was little doubt the reason was political.

The Government's refusal to enforce its own tax regulations complicated

Among those representing the so-called non-Zionist side of the expanded Agency... there are many people who are outright Zionists. (Emphasis supplied)

The most important alteration effectuated by the "reconstitution" is that the new Agency is now held out to be purely "philanthropic". That is, its claimed, actual functions are to supply the funds and supervise activities in the fields of "immigration, absorption, agricultural, settlement, education, health and welfare". To put it differently, the Reconstituted Jewish Agency will no longer engage in the kinds of political activities in which the old Agency was involved. If the plastic surgery can withstand close scrutiny of these new claimed services, the "new" Agency could be relieved of the obligation to register as a "Foreign Agent".

Political activities are now the responsibility of the World Zionist Organization. WZO is both a full partner in the Reconstituted Agency and also claims to be an "independent" institution committed to Israeli national interests including political action in countries in which the WZO has branches.

The WZO is assured that its budget, derived from Reconstituted Jewish Agency receipts, will remain more or less in the same proportion to the income of the Jewish Agency.

In 1972, the WZO was budgeted at $28 million from Jewish Agency funds. These are admittedly used for "activities in the diaspora of a political nature".

The former Coordination Board of the "Status" Law is now baptized the "Coordination Forum".

The "Reconstitution" was simply a moving around of the same pieces on the same old chess board. The cosmology however, has produced some new perceptions, favorable to the image of the Zionist movement. Ostensibly, through their "non-Zionist" delegates, all local Jewish fundraising organizations are participants in the Reconstituted Jewish Agency. But even with this inflated image the Reconstituted Agency claims to represent only 2.5 million Jews and the number of admitted, registered Zionists in 1972 was only 90,000, worldwide.

The historic pattern of Zionist arrogation of authority to represent Jews therefore, remains the same. Without derogating a natural - even if uninformed - sympathy for Israel (or at least its supposedly "deprived" and "threatened" people) the Zionist claim that "the majority of Jews" are committed genuinely and knowledgeably to Zionism and its racist/"Jewish people" nationalism is a propagandistically inflated facade. Maintenance of the facade is facilitated by a highly sophisticated "information" operation, on the one hand, and uninformed or even worse, misinformed Jews, on the other hand. And the facade is converted to substantive distortion of
questioned. And the record therefore, is probably the most complete and detailed exposure of the extent and intricacies of the Zionist network ever assembled. It is, in fact, probably a fair assumption that the record "knows" more about the extent of Zionist activity and its operators than even most officials of the Zionist organization, let alone either the average Zionist or even less, the average Jew.

A whole system of "conduits" existed to "launder" funds, or to appear to launder them. The perception made it possible for private foundations, Middle East study centers, Synagogue Councils and other institutions, presumably removed from Zionist discipline, to accept measurable contributions with either genuine or easily feigned innocence: the "Administrative expenses" of the "President's Conference", for example, were financed from "philanthropic" funds which had gone to the Jewish Agency and "returned" to the United States to subsidize political activities in support of Israeli interests.

Although the Foreign Agents Registration Act required coordination between the Department of Justice and the Department of State, neither Executive Department of the United States Government took any significant action. Congress did enact amendments to the Foreign Agents Registration Act however and these amendments - designed to close loopholes in the statute and to produce better enforcement - did not go unnoticed by the managers of the Zionist movement.

III
The Re-Organization of the Jewish Agency

In 1971, spearheaded by Jewish Agency officials in Israel and by "non-Zionists" "philanthropists" in the United States, the Jewish Agency was "re-organized". Mr Max Fisher, who was Mr Nixon's court Jew and President of the United Israel Appeal (The United Palestine Appeal, re-named to reflect the establishment of the State of Israel) was the leading participant from the United States. Mr Arne Pincus, who was Chairman of the old Jewish Agency Executive, was the leading Israeli.

It is beyond the scope of this analysis to detail the specifics of the "re-organization". It suffices to state that, in essence, the "re-organization" structurally, was nothing more than an effort to revive the perception of the Jewish Agency as a body representative of "the Jewish people" by co-opting again, as Weizmann had done in 1929, a roster of "non-Zionists" "philanthropists". Reflecting this objective the re-organized Agency is now called the "Reconstituted Jewish Agency". Special weighting was given to the dominant financial role which the American United Jewish Appeal played in assembling the Jewish Agency budget. The "non-Zionists" on the new executive all come from the United Israel Appeal. Dr Israel Goldstein, an American now residing in Israel and Chairman of the Keren Hayesod, the Hebrew name of the international structure whose American branch is United Israel Appeal, warmed up the "democratizing" of the New Agency.
VIII

"The Jewish People"

"The Jewish people", in other words, was a beneficiary of what Dr. W. T. Mallinson in his legal analyses of the situation, has described as a "functional second nationality", in addition to the legal, conventional nationality of Jews in the countries of their citizenship. To put it still another way - and in somewhat less legalistic terms - "the Jewish people" was considered part of the body-politic of the Zionist state. It was the recipient of "rights" and, via the ongoing operations of the Zionist organization was expected to fulfill certain Israeli national obligations. These included financial support for an actual "aliyah" (immigration) providing Jewish population for the Zionist state, which, although it posed as a democracy, was committed to maintaining its Zionist character. This commitment could be sustained only if the state first created and then maintained a permanent majority of Zionists.

But the conventionally recognized government of the state wanted to assert its independent sovereignty and the independent sovereignty of the state, itself, as distinguished from the Zionist movement. Now that Zionism was sovereignized in a state, in other words, the ambivalence of the movement became a problem in practical politics to add to the ideological conundrum it had been in the days of the Mandate.

The second condition contributing to the Zionist/Israel dilemma was that when the state declared its establishment and terminated the Mandate, it liquidated also the basis for international legal recognition of the Zionist movement which Article 4 of the Mandate had provided.

These ambiguous conditions troubled the management of the Zionist movement. In the context of Zionist ideology (and even Israeli/Zionist legislation) Zionists felt that if they were expected to continue carrying obligations for the state they were entitled to some input in the determination of the state's policies. The Zionist movement also was reluctant to lose its "recognized" international, legal status as "the representative" of "the Jewish people's" claim to identity as a "nationality". The so-called "non-Zionists" were now confronted with an agonizing dilemma of their own making. They, too, were juridically beneficiaries of the Zionist state's "supra-national", Zionist nationality claims for "the Jewish people". And these "non-Zionists" continued to protest their rejection of "Jewish people" nationality rights and obligations.

IX

The "Status" Law

This accumulation of dilemmas came to a climax in 1951 before and during the 23rd World Zionist Congress. Officials of the Israeli government were in attendance in their several capacities as members of political parties in Israel with "branches" in the various Zionist organizations operating in the countries from which "shekel"-determined President's Conference". It is an absolutely safe assumption that not one percent of the membership of a number of religious, fraternal and social-service institutions knew their organizations were represented in this Conference, much less possessed any sophisticated knowledge of its activities.

There is also an admitted Zionist lobby, headquartered in Washington. It is called "The American-Israel Political Action Committee", more popularly identified by the acronym AIPAC. AIPAC at least had the decency to admit it was not entitled to share in tax-deductible "philanthropic" dollars. Ostensibly, it financed its budget by special appeals for designated funds from card-carrying Zionists. It did not admit to subsidies from the Jewish Agency-American section because such financing would have altered its perceived status from an acknowledged lobby of Americans to that of a foreign agent.

It is obvious, from this functional/historical/structural analysis so far, that the Zionist apparatus was in effective control of practically all organized activity of Jews in the United States. But it would be inaccurate to attribute this situation to any formal, voluntary, deliberate and informed decision made by the majority of American Jews. Deception, manipulation through control of power-centers and control of funds were the decisive factors. Most American Jews - still innocent of the true character of Zionist ideology and of the racist/expansionist character of the Zionist state ("the Arabs" were successfully propagandized as villains) - were satisfied to be supportive of Israel, largely on humanitarian grounds. Virtually none, now involuntarily co-opted to "Jewish people" nationality, were aware of the Zionist state's claims to jurisdiction or of its designs against Arabs in general and the Palestinians in particular.

In 1963, J. William Fulbright, Chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations of the United States Senate, became suspicious of the "spontaneity" with which so many American Jewish organizations took official action or made official pronouncements in concert with particular Israeli interests and declared policies. At his instigation the Senate appropriated funds for a sub-committee to investigate the efficacy of the Foreign Agents Registration Act and its enforcement. Senator Fulbright had a whole roster of "unregistered foreign agents" he wished to investigate, operating in the interests of a number of foreign countries or "foreign principals". But, to a large extent, these were window-dressing.

The record (published in 1963) of the questioning and evidence produced by the investigation suggests unmistakably that Zionist activities were the prime target. The published transcript (mysteriously printed by the Government Printing office in such short supply it soon became unobtainable) contains about 400 pages devoted to the Zionist apparatus - by far the lengthiest of the records produced by the Hearings.

The committee had the power to subpoena files of the organizations...
state to make operational its asserted jurisdiction of "rights" and "duties" reaching to all Jews—no matter what their citizenship. It elevated Zionism from a mere theory to a legislated program alleging the Zionist state's claimed prerogative to conduct itself as if it were in fact—and were recognized in fact—as "the sovereign state of the Jewish people" as it was described by the Israeli Supreme Court in the so-called "Richman Case." 2

There can be little doubt that the assertion of such jurisdiction and the deliberate employment of such language in law (not mere propaganda) violated—at the least—the conventional amenities of the relationships of sovereign states and the integrity of the nationality status of the Jewish citizens of these states other than Israel.

But as had happened consistently in the historical development of the Zionist movement and despite formal protests of American anti-Zionist Jews, no effective, United States governmental action was taken against the proliferating acceptance of Zionist "duties" by an increasing number of American Jewish organizations. In 1964, the then-Assistant Secretary of State for Near Eastern Affairs did respond to lengthy and protracted protestations of the American Council for Judaism by declaring "the Jewish people" concept was not recognized by the United States as "a valid concept of international law." 3 But the declaration remained academic. Despite further urgings to apply the rejection to the Zionist apparatus in the United States, no practical governmental action was undertaken.

XII

The United States Senate Investigates

Such consistent—and probably deliberate—deliberation encouraged the Zionist apparatus to attempt to expand its controls over all organized activities of Jews in the United States. Efforts were made to co-opt entire organizations into the Zionist movement. But the tradition of anti-Zionism and the inbuilt antipathy of American Jews to any over-all "Jewish community" structure frustrated these efforts. Nothing daunted by the failure at grassroots recruiting, Zionist strategy resorted to an extension of its strategy of creating "front" organizations. In addition it infiltrated the chartered American organizations at sensitive levels. The rationale for this infiltration process was that now, with the State of Israel a recognized fact, it should be considered an integral part of the program of every organization of Jews (no matter its originally chartered purpose) to stimulate understanding and improve relationships between American Jews and the "Jewish" state. To facilitate realization of this "soft-sell" objective, American organizations were persuaded to employ Israeli citizens to teach Hebrew, to supervise programs featuring Israeli society, economy and, not the least, instruction in Middle East affairs, naturally from the Zionist/Israeli viewpoint. 4 The principal "front" created by the Zionist apparatus was given the ominous title of "Conference of Presidents of Major American Jewish Organizations", popularly known as "The

deleagtes had been elected (or selected). After protracted negotiations, which had preceded the Congress and continued to dominate the Congress' debates, arrangements were made for a cooperative effort between the Zionist organization and the Israeli government to draft legislation to replace the Mandate's Article 4 and regularize and legitimate the relationships between the movement and the government of the state. 5

This effort produced the "World Zionist Organization/Jewish Agency for Israel (Status) Law", enacted by the Knesset in 1952. The legislation assigned certain Zionist national responsibilities to the Zionist organization, leaving others to the conventionally recognized government of the state. The law specified that the state

Recognizes the World Zionist Organization as the authorized agency which will continue to operate in the State of Israel for the development and settlement of the country, the absorption of immigrants from the Diaspora and the coordination of the activities in Israel of Jewish institutions and organizations active in those fields. (Emphasis supplied) (Paragraph 4) 6

At another place the "Status" law acknowledges that "The World Zionist Organization ... is also the Jewish Agency..." (Paragraph 3)

Paragraph 5 of the "Status" Law states,

The mission of gathering in the exiles, which is the central task of the State of Israel and the Zionist movement in its days, requires constant efforts of the Jewish people in the Diaspora, the State of Israel, therefore, expects the cooperation of all Jews, as individuals and groups, in building up the State and assisting the immigration to it of the masses of the people, and regards the unity of all sections of Jewry as necessary for this purpose. (Emphasis supplied)

Paragraph 6 designates the World Zionist Organization as its agency "for achieving this unity..."

In 1954 the Israeli government and the Executive of the Jewish Agency signed a "Covenant". The Covenant, first of all, transformed the domestically enacted Knesset "Status" Law into an international instrument. It also specified the areas in which the Zionist movement, in "coordination" with the government of the state, would make the "Status" Law operative. (Paragraph 1 of the Covenant) 7

The general functions assigned the WZO/JA cover a full agenda of activities all of which are national in character; and furthermore, "development", "settlement" and "absorption of immigrants" are all Israeli/Zionist activities which have a relevance to the political situation involving the Zionist state and "Arabs", both within the state, or in the so-called territories. 8

These functions assigned to the World Zionist Organization/Jewish
Agency impact upon the state’s relationship to contiguous Arab states. Immigration, settlement, development are broad enough definitions to include just about any activity financed by “philanthropic” funds collected through the United Jewish Appeal. The functional situation, in other words, has changed little, if any, from that performed by the Jewish Agency under the Mandate. Only now the “cooperation” if with the Israeli government rather than with the Mandatory power.

It is a striking truth, but little recognized by governments of states other than Israel that at the 23rd Congress a resolution of the Zionist Organization itself, acknowledged the state:

...shall act in consultation and coordination with the World Zionist Organization ... in all activities conducted in the interests of the State of Israel within the Diaspora. (Emphasis supplied)

The same Zionist Organization-initiated resolution calls for

..prior consultation between the Government and Executive of the World Zionist Organization and the Jewish Agency ... on all matters regarding legislation by the State of Israel touching upon the activities of the World Zionist Organization.

And finally, the same resolution declares the state may

..from time to time empower the Executive of the World Zionist Organization and the Jewish Agency to work within the spheres defined ... by special agreement with the Israeli Government.

The “Status law” provided (Paragraph 9) for a “Coordination Board”, composed of an equal number of members representing the government and the WZO/JA. The minutes of the “Coordination Board” are classified information. But the Coordination Board has the authority to divide the Israeli national functions between the WZO/JA and the government and to allocate Zionist funds accordingly. In fact, the WZO/JA and the government each has departments with identical names. There is, for example, a Ministry of Immigration in the government and a Department of the same name in the WZO/JA. The WZO/JA has a Department of Agriculture as does the government.

Legal authorities who have examined the legislation and the actual functioning of both the government and the WZO/JA are uncertain whether to say the “Status” law created two, separate sovereignties contractually linked by law, or one sovereignty composed of an operational arm delivering services to the part of “the Jewish people” national entity living in Israel with another arm performing parallel services for the part of “the Jewish people” living in the Diaspora.

Whichever description is more precise is it clear that at its own volition the WZO is either an agency of the Israeli government or an integral part of the government. It certainly is not a free, voluntary, association. Furthermore, given the fiscal controls exercised by the JA, as the ultimate recipient of the largest share of overseas “philanthropy” contributed by American Jews, the national integrity of the UJA and of the tribunaries which direct either funds or services at this ultimate recipient is open to question.

Lack of General Knowledge

It is crucial that only an infinitesimal fraction of American Jews are aware of these intricate legitimations. A growing number are increasingly certain of the percentages of their “philanthropic” contributions which are spent in one or another Israeli/Zionist state project. But very few of even these are informed of the complex of contractual relations which exist for this distribution. They are also unaware that within Israel itself these Jewish Agency-controlled funds are available only for programs and services which benefit “Jewish people” nationals of the state. Non-“Jewish people” nationals may share equally or proportionately from Israeli state funds collected through taxation or perhaps obtained from the United States in the form of “foreign assistance.” But non-“Jewish people” nationals are excluded by Zionist organization legislation and administration from benefits accruing from the finances and services provided the state by this Zionist infra-structure. How government. To a substantial extent this duality in function and availability of resources accounts for the disparity within Israel between the “Arab” population and the Jewish population in such fields as housing, education, public utilities and services, “Jewish” agriculture, “Jewish” education, “Jewish” development are subsidized, over and above state allocations, by these “Zionist” funds. This structure accounts, to a large extent, for the racism practiced within Israel and is consistent with the ideological commitment of the Zionist organization to serve “the Jewish people.” But it is also true that the resultant discriminations are practiced with the full consent – even partnership – of the government of the state.19

XI

The Outbreak of the Covenant

The 1954 “Covenant” transformed the unilaterally enacted Knesset “Status” law into an operating international arrangement.

The World Zionist Organization/Jewish Agency remained a “public body.” Pursuant to Section 2 of the “Foreign Agents Registration Act of 1938, as Amended”, the World Zionist Organization was required to register as a “foreign agent” with the United States Department of Justice. Through the efforts of anti-Zionists, with Dr W.T. Mallison, Jr. acting as legal advisor, the Department of Justice required, as part of the recorded information, inclusion of relevant sections of the 1954 “covenant.”18

The “Status” Law/Covenant codified the State of Israel’s “Jewish people” claims. Together with the 1954 Covenant it authorized the Zionist
Agency impact upon the state's relationship to contiguous Arab states. Immigration, settlement, developments are broad enough definitions to include not only those activities financed by "philanthropic" funds collected through the United Jewish Appeal. The functional situation, in other words, has changed little, if any, from that performed by the Jewish Agency under the Mandate. Only now the "cooperation" is with the Israeli government rather than with the Mandatory power.

It is a striking truth, but little recognized by governments of states other than Israel that at the 23rd Congress a resolution of the Zionist Organization itself acknowledged the state.

shall act in consultation and coordination with the World Zionist Organization... in all activities conducted in the interests of the State of Israel within the Diaspora. (emphasis supplied) 25

The same Zionist Organization-initiated resolution calls for

Prior consultation between the Government and Executive of the World Zionist Organization and the Jewish Agency... on all matters regarding legislation by the State of Israel touching upon the activities of the World Zionist Organization.

And finally the same resolution declares the state may

From time to time empower the Executive of the World Zionist Organization and the Jewish Agency to work within the spheres defined... by special agreement with the Israeli Government.

On the "Status" law: (Paragraph 5) for a "Coordination Board", composed of an equal number of members representing the government and the WZO/IA. The minutes of the "Coordination Board" are classified information. But the Coordination Board has the authority to divide the Israeli national functions between the WZO/IA and the government and to allocate Zionist funds accordingly. In fact, the WZO/IA and the government each has departments with identical names. There is, for example, a Ministry of Immigrant in the government and a Department with the same name in the WZO/IA. The WZO/IA has a Department of Agriculture as does the government.

Legal authorities who have examined the legislation and the actual functioning of both the government and the WZO/IA are uncertain whether to say the "Status" law created two, separate sovereignties contractually linked by law, or one sovereignty comprised of an operational arm delivering services to the part of "the Jewish people" national entity living in Israel with another arm performing parallel services for the part of "the Jewish people" living in the Diaspora.

Whichever description is more precise it is clear that if its own volition the WZO is either an agency of the Israeli government or an integral part of the government. It certainly is not a free, voluntary, association. Furthermore, given the fiscal controls exercised by the JA, as the ultimate recipient of the largest share of overseas "philanthropy" contributed by American Jews, the national integrity of the UJA--and of the tributaries which direct other funds or services to this ultimate recipient--is open to question.

Lack of General Knowledge

It is crucial that only an infinitesimal fraction of American Jews are aware of these intricate legalisms. A growing number are increasingly conscious of the percentages of their "philanthropic" contribution which end up in one or another Israeli/Zionist state project. But very few of even these are informed of the complex of contractual relations which account for this distribution. They are also unaware that within Israel itself these Jewish Agency controlled funds are available only for projects and services which benefit "Jewish people" nationals of the state. Non-"Jewish people" nationals may share equally--or proportionately--from Israeli state funds collected through taxation or perhaps obtained from the United States in the form of "foreign assistance." But non-"Jewish people" nationals are excluded from Zionist organization legislation and administration from benefits accruing from the finances and services provided the state by this Zionist infrastructure, shadow government. To a substantial extent this duality in function and availability of resources accounts for the disparity within Israel between the "Arab" population and the Jewish population in such fields as housing, education, public utilities and services. "Jewish" agriculture, "Jewish" education, "Jewish" development are subsidized, over and above state allocations, by these "Zionist" funds. This structure accounts, to a large extent, for the racism practiced within Israel and is consistent with the ideological commitment of the Zionist organization to serve "the Jewish people." But it is also true that the resultant discriminations are practiced with the full consent--even partnership--of the government of the state. 26

The Openly Covenant

The 1954 "Covenant" transformed the unilaterally enacted Knesset "Status" law into an operating international arrangement.

The World Zionist Organization/Jewish Agency remained a "public body." Pursuant to Section 2 of the "Foreign Agents Registration Act of 1938, as Amended," the World Zionist Organization was required to register as a "foreign agent" with the United States Department of Justice. Through the efforts of anti-Zionists, with Dr. W.T. Mallison, Jr. acting as legal advisor, the Department of Justice required, as part of the recorded information, inclusion of relevant sections of the 1954 "Covenant." 27

The "Status" Law/Covenant codified the State of Israel's "Jewish people" claims. Together with the 1954 Covenant it authorized the Zionist
state to make operational its asserted jurisdiction of “rights” and “duties” reaching to all Jews—no matter what their citizenship. It elevated Zionism from a mere theory to a legislated program alleging the Zionist state’s claimed prerogative to conduct itself as if it were in fact—and were recognized in fact—as “the sovereign state of the Jewish people” as it was described by the Israel’s highest courts in the so-called “Richman Case”. Those who are familiar with the history of Zionism will recall that this was a significant step in the evolution of Zionism as a political entity.

But as had happened consistently in the historical development of the Zionist movement and despite formal protests of American anti-Zionist Jews, no effective, United States governmental action was taken against the proliferating acceptance of Zionist “duties” by an increasing number of American Jewish organizations. In 1964, the United States Senator from New York, Jacob Javits, introduced a resolution expressing the sentiments of the American Jewish community. But the declaration remained academic. Despite further urgings to apply the rejection to the Zionist apparatus in the United States, no practical, governmental action was undertaken.

The United States Senate Investigates

Such consistent—and probably deliberate—dilution encouraged the Zionist apparatus to attempt to expand its control over all organized activities of Jews in the United States. Efforts were made to co-opt entire organizations into the Zionist movement. But the tradition of anti-Zionism and the historic antipathy of American Jews to any over-all “Jewish community” structure frustrated these efforts. Nothing doubted by the failure at grassroots recruiting, Zionist strategy resorted to an extension of its strategy of creating “front” organizations. In this way, it infiltrated the charter of American organizations at sensitive levels. The rationale for this infiltration was that, with the State of Israel a recognized fact, it should be considered an integral part of the program of every organization of Jews (no matter its originally charter purpose) to stimulate understanding and improve relationships between American Jews and the “Jewish” state. To facilitate realization of this “soft sell” objective, American organizations were persuaded to employ Israeli citizens to teach Hebrew, to supervise programs featuring Israeli society, economy and, not the least, instructions in Middle East affairs, naturally from the Zionist/Israeli viewpoint.

The principal “front” created by the Zionist apparatus was given the ominous title of “Conference of Presidents of Major American Jewish Organizations”, popularly known as “The Conference”.

Delegates had been elected (or selected). After protracted negotiations, which had preceded the Congress and continued to dominate the Congress’ debates, arrangements were made for a cooperative effort between the Zionist organization and the Israeli government to draft legislation to replace the Mandate’s Article 4 and regularize and legitimate the relationships between the movement and the government of the state.

This effort produced the “World Zionist Organization/Jewish Agency for Israel (Status) Law”, enacted by the Knesset in 1952. The legislation assigned certain Zionist national responsibilities to the Zionist organization, leaving others to the conventionally recognized government of the state. The law specified that the state recognizes the World Zionist Organization as the authorized agency which will continue to operate in the State of Israel for the development and settlement of the country, the absorption of immigrants from the Diaspora and the coordination of the activities in Israel of Jewish institutions and organizations active in those fields. (Emphasis supplied) (Paragraph 3)

At another place the “Status” law acknowledges that “The World Zionist Organization... is also the Jewish Agency...” (Paragraph 3)

Paragraph 5 of the “Status” Law states,

The mission of gathering in the exiles, which is the central task of the State of Israel and the Zionist movement in our days, requires constant efforts of the Jewish people in the Diaspora, the State of Israel, therefore, expects the cooperation of all Jews, as individuals and groups, in building up the State and enabling the immigration to it of the masses of the people, and regards the unity of all sections of Jewry as necessary for this purpose. (Emphasis supplied) (Paragraph 5)

Paragraph 6 designates the World Zionist Organization as its agency “for achieving this unity...”

In 1954 the Israeli government and the Executive of the Jewish Agency signed a “Covenant”. The Covenant, first of all, transformed the domestically enacted Knesset “Status” Law into an international instrument. It also specified the areas in which the Zionist movement, in “coordination” with the government of the state, would make the “Status” Law operative. (Paragraph 1 of the Covenant)

The general functions assigned the WZO/JA cover a full agenda of activities all of which are national in character; and furthermore, “development”, “settlement” and “absorption of immigrants” are all Israeli/Zionist activities which have a relevance to the political situation involving the Zionist state and “Arabs”, both within the state, or in the so-called territories.

These functions assigned to the World Zionist Organization/Jewish
VIII

"The Jewish People"

"The Jewish people", in other words, was a beneficiary of what Dr. W.T. Mallinson in his legal analyses of the situation, has described as a "functional second nationality", in addition to the legal, conventional nationality of Jews in the countries of their citizenship. 22 To put it still another way—and in somewhat less legalistic terms—"the Jewish people" was considered part of the body-politic of the Zionist state. It was the recipient of "rights" and, via the ongoing operations of the Zionist organization, expected to fulfill certain Israeli national obligations. These included financial support for an actual "aliyah" (immigration) providing Jewish population for the Zionist state, which, although it posed as a democracy, was committed to maintaining its Zionist character. 23 This commitment could be sustained only if the state first created and then maintained a permanent majority of Zionists.

But the conventionally recognized government of the state wanted to assert its independent sovereignty and the independent sovereignty of the state, itself, as distinguished from the Zionist movement. Now that Zionism was sovereignized in a state, in other words, the ambivalence of the movement became a problem in practical politics to add to the ideological conundrum it had been in the days of the Mandate.

The second condition contributing to the Zionist/Israel dilemma was that when the state declared its establishment and terminated the Mandate, it liquidated also the basis for international legal recognition of the Zionist movement which Article 4 of the Mandate had provided.

These ambiguous conditions troubled the management of the Zionist movement. In the context of Zionist ideology (and even Israeli/Zionist legislation), Zionists felt that if they were expected to continue carrying obligations for the state they were entitled to some input in the determination of the state's policies. The Zionist movement also was reluctant to lose its "recognized" international legal status as "the representative" of "the Jewish people's" claim to identity as a "nationality". The so-called "non-Zionists" were now confronted with an agonizing dilemma of their own making. They, too, were juridically beneficiaries of the Zionist state's "supra-national", Zionist nationality claims for "the Jewish people". And these "non-Zionists" continued to protest their rejection of "Jewish people" nationality rights and obligations.

IX

The "Status" Law

This accumulation of dilemmas came to a climax in 1951 before and during the 23rd World Zionist Congress. Officials of the Israeli government were in attendance in their several capacities as members of political parties in Israel with "branches" in the various Zionist organizations operating in the countries from which "shekel"-determined President's Conference". It is an absolutely safe assumption that not one percent of the membership of a number of religious, fraternal and social-service institutions knew their organizations were represented in this Conference, much less possessed any sophisticated knowledge of its activities.

There is also an admitted Zionist lobby, headquartered in Washington. It is called "The American-Israel Political Action Committee", more popularly identified by the acronym AIPAC. AIPAC at least had the decency to admit it was not entitled to share in tax-deductible "philanthropic" dollars. Ostensibly, it financed its budget by special appeals for designated funds from card-carrying Zionists. It did not admit to subsidies from the Jewish Agency-American section because such financing would have altered its perceived status as an acknowledged lobby of Americans so that of a foreign agent.

It is obvious, from this functional/historical/structural analysis so far, that the Zionist apparatus was in effective control of practically all organized activity of Jews in the United States. But it would be inaccurate to attribute this situation to any formal, voluntary, deliberated and informed decision made by the majority of American Jews. Deception, manipulation through control of power-centers and control of funds were the decisive factors. Most American Jews—still innocent of the true character of Zionist ideology and the racist/expansionist character of the Zionist state ("the Arabs" were successfully propagandized as villains) — were satisfied to be supportive of Israel, largely on humanitarian grounds. Virtually none, now involuntarily co-opted to "Jewish people" nationality, were aware of the Zionist state's claims to jurisdiction or of its designs against Arabs in general and the Palestinians in particular.

In 1963, J. William Fulbright, Chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations of the United States Senate became suspicious of the "spontaneity" with which so many American Jewish organizations took official action or made official pronouncements in concert with particular Israeli interests and declared policies. At his instigation the Senate appropriated funds for a sub-committee to investigate the efficacy of the Foreign Agents Registration Act and its enforcement. Senator Fulbright had a whole roster of "unregistered foreign agents" he wished to investigate, operating in the interests of a number of foreign countries or "foreign principals". But, to a large extent, these were window-dressing.

The record (published in 1963) of the questioning and evidence produced by the investigation suggests unmistakably that Zionist activities were the prime target. The published transcript (mysteriously printed by the Government Printing office in such short supply it soon became unobtainable) contains about 400 pages devoted to the Zionist apparatus—by far the lengthiest of the records produced by the Hearings.

The committee had the power to subpoena files of the organizations
questioned. And the record therefore, is probably the most complete and
detailed exposure of the extent and intricacies of the Zionist network ever
assembled. It is, in fact, probably a fair assumption that the record "knows"
more about the extent of Zionist leverers and lever-operators than even most
officials of the Zionist organization, let alone either the average Zionist or
even less, the average Jew.

A whole system of "conduits" existed to "launder" funds, or to appear to
launder them. The perception made it possible for private foundations,
Middle East study centers, Synagogue Councils and other institutions,
previously removed from Zionist discipline, to accept measurable
contributions with either genuine or easily feigned innocence. The
"Administrative expenses" of the "President's Conference", for example,
were financed from "philanthropic" funds which had gone to the Jewish
Agency and "returned" to the United States to subsidize political activities
in support of Israeli interests.

Although the Foreign Agents Registration Act required coordination
between the Department of Justice and the Department of State; neither
Executive Department of the United States Government took any
significant action. Congress did enact amendments to the Foreign Agents
Registration Act however and these amendments - designed to close
loopholes in the statute and to produce better enforcement - did not go
unnoticed by the managers of the Zionist movement.

III
Re-Organization of the Jewish Agency

In 1971, spearheaded by Jewish Agency officials in Israel and by "non-
Zionist" "philanthropists" in the United States, the Jewish Agency was
"re-organized". Mr Max Fisher, who was Mr Nixon's court Jew and
President of the United Israel Appeal (The United Palestine Appeal, re-
named to reflect the establishment of the State of Israel) was the leading
participant from the United States. Mr Arzy Fincus, who was Chairman of
the old Jewish Agency Executive, was the leading Israeli.

It is beyond the scope of this analysis to detail the specifics of the
"re-organization". It suffices to state that, in essence, the "re-
organization" structurally, was nothing more than an effort to revive the
perception of the Jewish Agency as a body representative of "the Jewish
people" by co-opting again, as Weizmann had done in 1929, a roster of
"non-Zionist" "philanthropists". Reflecting this objective the re-organized
Agency is now called the "Reconstituted Jewish Agency". Special
weighting was given to the dominant financial role which the American
United Jewish Appeal played in assembling the Jewish Agency budget.6 The
"non-Zionists" on the new executive all come from the United Israel
Appeal. Dr Israel Goldstein, an American now residing in Israel and
Chairman of the Keren Hayehod, the Hebrew name of the international
structure whose American branch is United Israel Appeal, warmed up the
"democratizing" of the New Agency:

the task of precisely identifying Zionist or Zionist organizations. In a loose
sense any Jew (or Christian) contributing to the United Jewish Appeal
became a supporter of the Zionist movement, willy-nilly. Local fund-
raising organizations for the UJA were in the same position. Contractual
agreements between such local fund-raising organizations (in the character
of community funds, helping to support local hospitals, community centers
and the like) and the UJA and the Jewish Agency/Zionist organization,
made it virtually impossible for an American Jew to assist financially any
local Jewish institutions without, involuntarily, contributing to the
advancement of Zionist objectives.

The Government was not unaware of these dilemmas. At times after the
establishment of the Zionist state, when conflicts between the state and the
United States developed, the Executive branch of the Government
sometimes threatened either to embargo UJA funds or to deprive them of
the privilege of tax-deductibility for Federal Income Tax purposes. The
action was never taken, but the "leaks" indicated the Government knew
UJA funds were not employed in full compliance with the Internal Revenue
regulations. On several occasions anti-Zionists - informally - suggested to rep-
resentatives of Arab governments posted in the United States that formal
protests, in low-level diplomatic instruments, should be made to the United
States Government. The substance of the suggested protest would be that in
allowing the privilege of tax-deductibility the United States Government
was acquiescing in actions hostile to states with which the United States
maintained - and wanted to maintain - friendly relations. Nothing came of
these suggestions, either.

VII
The State and its Extra-Territorial Zionist Apparatus

The establishment of the Zionist state created ideological and structural
dilemmas for the Zionist movement. The situation was reminiscent of the
condition Weizmann confronted just before he initiated the negotiations to
create the Enlarged Jewish Agency.

Two, related problems were involved. First, the Declaration of
Establishment of the state identifies "the Jewish people" and the Zionist
movement as parties to the establishment. It also declared that the state was
"open" to "Jewish immigration" and "Ingestering the Exiles". In plain
language this means the recruitment of Jews to populate the state. The state's
earliest legislation included "The Law of (the) Return", granting any Jew,
anywhere - as a constituent of "the Jewish people" - the right to
immigrate. The "Law of (the) Return" was followed by the Nationality
Law which automatically invested every Jew who immigrated with Israeli
citizenship unless the "oleh"('immigrant') renounced the citizenship. (Some
Israeli legal authorities contend that Israeli citizenship is automatically
acquired merely by application for an immigration visa, whether, or not,
immigration takes place).
European homes. This, in turn, enhanced Zionism's appeal to the survivors to elect Palestine as their haven for refuge. The more this "choice" became evident the greater were the Zionist claims upon the merged funds.

VI
"Great Power" Declarations

This situation obtained in 1947 and 1948, at the time of the great debate about Palestine's political future. The establishment of the Zionist state forced the JDC into almost total eclipse. The "national/home" now existed. Its accessibility plus the coercive methods used by the Zionist apparatus in the D.P. camps, (many of the same are now employed on emigrants from the Soviet Union) plus Zionist-stimulated fears among Jews in Arab countries (Iraq is a good example!) produced a flood of immigration and created attendant economic and social problems. With their critical capacities still numb'd by the European tragedy the "non-Zionists" gave unstintingly -- and without any real control -- to the now Zionist-dominated United Jewish Appeal. The JDC was forced, for the first time, to undertake some ("non-political"?) programs in the Zionist state.

It is crucially important that for all these years the Zionist organization was a recognized "public body". Nevertheless, all countries in which it operated local branches privileged it to function as if it had been a domestic, voluntary, free association of local citizens. United Jewish Appeal funds were employed to help build what British -- and later a joint British-American -- investigating commission identified as a "state within a state". It helped finance the Zionists' organization's political activities (including the organization, transportation, food, clothing and housing for "immigrants"). But contributions to the UJA were accorded privileges usually limited to genuinely philanthropic institutions. In Britain, while the Mandate was operative, this was perhaps understandable. The Mandate authorized "cooperation" between the Mandatory government and the Jewish Agency. In the United States, anti-Zionists regularly protested this "mingling" of "philanthropic" and national/political funds. They claimed a kind of taxation without representation. Many of them refused to contribute to the UJA under these circumstances. But a majority of American Jews felt a moral obligation to help in the reconstruction of the lives of their fellow Jews who had survived Hitler. Traditional anti-Zionists objected to being coerced into support of the "Jewish state"-building process by the contractual relationship between the JDC and the PFF, together with the World Zionist Organization/Jewish Agency's role as recipient of the contracted percentage designated for "relief and reconstruction" in Palestine. Lower bureaucratic levels of the United States Government sometimes offered encouraging response to these anti-Zionist objections. But no corrective action was ever taken at the policy-making level. There was little doubt the reason was political.

The Government's refusal to enforce its own tax regulations complicated

Among those representing the so-called non-Zionist side of the expanded Agency ... there are many people who are outright Zionists. (Emphasis supplied)

The most important alteration effectuated by the "reconstitution" is that the new Agency is now held out to be purely "philanthropic." That is, its claimed, actual functions are to supply the funds and supervise activities in the fields of "immigration, absorption, agricultural, settlement, education, health and welfare." To put it differently, the Reconstituted Jewish Agency will no longer engage in the kinds of political activities in which the enlarged Agency was involved. If the plastic surgery can withstand close scrutiny of these new claimed services, the "new" Agency could be relieved of the obligation to register as a "Foreign Agent."

Political activities are now the responsibility of the World Zionist Organization. WZO is both a full partner in the Reconstituted Agency and also claims to be an "independent" institution committed to Israeli national interests including political action in countries in which the WZO has branches.

The WZO is assured that its budget, derived from Reconstituted Jewish Agency receipts,

Will remain more or less in the same proportion to the sum of the Jewish Agency. In 1971, the WZO was budgeted at $28 million from Jewish Agency funds, these are admittedly used for "activities in the diaspora of a political nature."

The former Coordination Board of the "Status" Law is now baptized the "Coordination Forum."

The "Reconstitution" was simply a moving around of the same pieces on the same old chess board. The cosmopolitan however, has produced some new perceptions, favorable to the image of the Zionist movement. Ostensibly, through their "non-Zionist" delegates, all local Jewish fundraising organizations are participants in the Reconstituted Jewish Agency. But even with this inflated image the Reconstituted Agency claims to represent only 2.5 million Jews and the number of admitted, registered Zionists in 1971 was only 900,000, worldwide.

The historic pattern of Zionist arrogation of authority to represent Jews therefore, remains the same. Without derogating a natural -- and it uninform -- sympathy for Israel (or at least its supposedly "deprived" and "threatened" people) the Zionist claim that "the majority of Jews" are committed genuinely and knowledgeably to Zionism and its racist/jewish people" national identity is a propagandaistic inflated facade. Maintenance of the facade is facilitated by a highly sophisticated "information" operation, on the one hand, and uninformed or even worse, misinformed Jews, on the other hand. And the facade is converted to substantive distortion of
American policies by as craven and unimaginative a collection of political
leaders and advisors is to be found anywhere on planet earth.

As Weizmann observed in the 1920's when he was trying to neutralize
anti-Zionists with the semantics of "non-Zionism", it is still true that the right
hand does not know what the left hand is doing. It may also be true that
having been misled to make commitment of money, effort and emotion,
many of these Jews do not even the right hand to know what the left is
doing. Such knowledge would create intense, personal discomfort
contemplating the inoperability of unpleasant task of undoing what had been
blindly done. And because "social" (and economic) status has so often been
closely tied to financial support of Zionist ventures such an "undoing",
in some situations, can result in rather revolutionary alterations of life-
styles.

XIV

Conclusions

This overview of the development of the Zionist structure and its
method of operations suggests several conclusions for those attempting to
replace Zionism's exclusive ideology and program with non-racial, non-
discriminatory programs.

The conclusions may be relevant whether the desired objective of any
activist is to democratize the life-patterns of Jews (or more precisely Jewish
organizations) in the United States or, on the international scene, to
eliminate Zionism's divisive impact on Middle East and to democratize
Palestine. The conclusions may be relevant also to any prepared to settle for
the shorter-term goal of containing Zionism by putting an end to
Zionist/Israeli expansionism.

A. Some "Do's"

1. It is probably an exercise in futility simply to compile an inventory of
"Zionist organizations". At their inflated most they authentically represent
a mere fraction of the Jews of the world and particularly of Jews in the
United States. 6

2. It is probably also a tactical mistake to challenge Zionism as a purely
"Jewish" problem, largely restricted to the narrowest definitions of the
Arab/Zionist conflict. The lack of effectiveness of this approach is, in part at
least, attributable to the inadequacy of Arab public relations over a long
period of time. Given the effectiveness and sophistication of Zionist
propaganda generally and the tardiness of "the Arabs" in mounting hosts
to the machinery and the information policies needed to counter this
propaganda – in a head-to-head confrontation – the battle must remain
uneven for a long time. Meanwhile, the Zionist asset – with American
indulgences – proceeds inexorably to consolidate its territorial gains in the
Middle East and, by smooth propaganda, to anesthetize both Jews and
others to its policies.

in the clamor for "refuge". At best "the Arabs" became non-people. At
worse they were inhuman, ignorant, backward, unworthy of consideration
when compared to the "need" of "the Jewish people". Enormous and
well-orchestrated political, economic, social and emotional pressures swept
virtually all Americans -- including others than Jews -- into almost
uncritical trust in and support of the Zionist movement and its objectives.
The absence of competent Arab information, responsibly demonstrating
the inevitable deprivation of national rights for non-Jewish people
Palestinians, if the Zionist aspirations were realized, also contributed to the
virtually unchallenged Zionist political achievements.

The second development which facilitated the efforts of the Zionist
movement to capitalize on wittingly "non-Zionist" participation in the
Jewish Agency was the merger in 1938 of the two, principle "charitable"
foundations sustained by American Jews to provide relief for the shattered lives
of European Jews. 7 The Zionists initiated the merger. 8 The American Joint
Distribution Committee for decades had been the major overseas relief
instrument. The JDC had been founded and controlled by anti-Zionists. It
was committed -- on principle -- to constructive projects for rebuilding and
sustaining Jewish institutions in the countries in which the Jews lived.
Consistent with the ideology of the leaders of American Jews the JDC also
worked in sophisticated ways to establish or to firm up the application of
equal citizenship rights and responsibilities for Jews in their native or
citizenship countries.

The major Zionists fund was the Palestine Foundation Fund (Keren
Hayesod). It was a "general revenue" source for the Jewish Agency. Its
contributions were augmented by contributions from the Jewish National
Fund which concentrated on the acquisition and development of land in
Palestine for "the Jewish people".

The plausible rationale which the Zionists offered for merging the
Palestine Foundation Fund and the JDC was "efficiency", "reduction of
duplicating fund-raising mechanisms", "diminution of overhead". Informed
anti-Zionists opposed the merger. But the appeal to such
"efficiency", with greater amounts of money available to the needy recipients,
together with the calculated predictions to support the camouflage
Zionist program as the only available, "permanent" solution for Europe's
Jewish victims of Hitler, made the merger proposition irresistible. And so
the United Jewish Appeal was born. The JDC was technically a full partner.
But, as in the Jewish Agency, the more disciplined zealousity of the Zionists
fund-raising machinery slowly eroded the influence of the JDC anti-
Zionists, now diluted by Weizmann semantics to "non-Zionists".
Allocations to the JDC were gradually reduced. Those to the PFF
increased. For the Zionists, it was a self-fulfilling arrangement. The less
resources available to the JDC the less it could provide for restoration of
acceptable conditions for Jews who might elect repatriation to their
constituency, by the disciplined voting of the 50% Zionist membership, augmented by the Zionist organization’s selection to fill the “non-Zionist” seats from those countries where there was not even a de jure constituency (or recognized leadership) as among American Jews, the American “non-Zionists” early on lost influence and then interest in the Agency. By the middle 1930’s meaningful “non-Zionist” representation was nonexistent. The Jewish Agency and the World Zionist Organization were, for all practical purposes, identical.

The United Jewish Appeal

The default (or freezing out) of the “non-Zionists” created no problems of conscience for the Zionist organization. On the contrary, it simplified the Agency’s increasingly apparent and deliberate divergence from and defiance of the Mandate and the Mandatory’s policies. It facilitated the Agency’s organization of illegal immigration, for example; and when, in the closing years of World War II, the Agency concentrated its principal efforts on mobilizing the support of the United States Government for its territorial/statehood claims, it could do so without any visible and therefore politically effective opposition from “non-Zionists” within its own ranks. This necessitated the creation of independent anti-Zionist efforts, of which the American Council for Judaism was then the foremost, organized group.

Two factors facilitated the transition of the Zionist movement in the United States from the artificial “partnership” with the “non-Zionists” to an independent, solo role uninhibited by even mild, internal, “non-Zionist” restraints.

The first were the genocidal policies of Hitler, coupled with the slow perception by the rest of the world of the dimensions of the tragedy. Whatever were the true dimensions, there was no efficacious international program for coping with it. Consequently, the portrayal of the problem and the activation of a program offering a perceived relief commensurate with Zionist definitions of the problem became the almost exclusive prerogative of the Zionist movement. The offered solution was recognition of the historical Zionist aspiration toPalestine to create a Zionist state in which all Jews—the Jewish people—would possess the nationality right of immigration and to which all Jews were, correspondingly, “obliged” to provide resources to support conventional institutions of statehood. The expertise of Zionist propagandists made the most of this in the 1930’s and 1940’s with the result that “non-Zionists” into the Enlarged Jewish Agency. Near-biased support for the “realism” of the Zionist solution to “the Jewish problem” practically foreclosed public, analytical debate or dialogue about Zionism. Palestinian and/or Arab interests and rights in a democratic, self-determination formula were simply blotted out.

B. Some “Do’s”

1. Basic strategy for winning minds to non-racial, non-discriminatory, democratic alternatives to Zionism should be designed to separate the “garden-variety”, uninformed or misinformed Jew (and other Americans) from slavish, uninformed following of Zionist “leadership.” This approach requires genuine alternatives. Positive and affirmative programs are needed rather than head-to-head, purely negative confrontation. The information-strategy employed must be targeted at a broad cross-section of the total American people rather than a frontal, one-dimensional appeal to, or attack on, Jews. The latter approach is often counterproductive because it nourishes suspicions that Jews are being singled out as victims for holding opinions or engaging in activities which do—in part—obtain among others than Jews.

2. Despite the recommendation for broad-gauge campaigns it is important that Jews be fully a part of the effort. In the first place, knowledgeable Jews have a sensitivity to actions or semantics which, justifiable or not, Jews traditionally find offensive. (Many an information effort has been arranged because an unfortunate—and unnecessary—word or phrase or allusion was employed). Terms like “international Jewry” or “Judaism”, allegations of “conspiracy” are examples of semantics which trigger suspicions about the motives of the one who promotes them. Exaggerated analogies comparing Zionism’s rather moderate racism to “Hitlerism” open the door to polemics which divert attention from the real issues.

There is no intricate Zionism “conspiracy”. Zionism has employed one of the best propaganda machines the world has ever known. It generally signals its intentions loudly and clearly. It has succeeded in furthering undemocratic programs and policies because all too few knew enough about Zionism to read and properly interpret its gaudy propaganda.

Visible participation by responsible Jews in any campaign to defeat Zionism is probably important also because it adds credibility to the substance of the campaign and to the decent intentions of the campaigners, as well. AJAZ is a working, practical example. It enlist supporters from a cross-section of America despite— or perhaps because of—the fact it is known as American Jewish Alternatives to Zionism.

A third reason for an information campaign designed to appeal to the totality of Americans—including Jews but not setting them apart—is that identification with the American body politic is precisely what most American Jews want. Zionism calls this “assimilation”, using the term pejoratively and suggesting that “assimilation” in the United States (or any democratic state) means the disappearance of Jews. Something of this is perceived by the Israeli propaganda line that equates the Palestinian goal of a secular, democratic, unitary state as the destruction of the state and Israeli propaganda itself adds, of “the Jewish people”, as well. But Zionist propaganda itself trades on the fundamental aspiration of Jews—by
least in the United States— to be recognized as full and accepted parts of the
American people. This is why Zionist propaganda in the United States
stresses that Israel is "the bulwark of democracy" in the Middle East, "the
defender of American interests against communism", "America's only
reliable ally in the Middle East". Without these propaganda themes— using
only narrow, chauvinistic appeals to Zionist loyalty and its segregationalist
ideology— support among American Jews would diminish because support
among Americans generally would decline.
3. A corollary to these strategic/personnel suggestions concerns the
substance of any contemplated information programs. As a general rule,
substance should be put in the context of broad American interests. Such
interests can be in two broad categories. One is perceived national, material
interests. Oil, of course, tops the list at the moment. Markets for American
products are another. Strategic, geopolitical interests also enlist interest
among Americans. Without exploiting "cold war" mentality, some affinity
to the "west" in terms of mutual, material interests is also "salable" to
American audiences. These considerations may seem mundane to
ideologues and people motivated sincerely by high principles. But they
ought not to be dismissed cavalierly or contemptuously by any seeking a
hearing for the commendable objective of winning American
comprehension of the humanity of Arabs (or any other non-Americans) and
for justice and equity in the deployment of American power, of all kinds.
These are commendable, lofty purposes. The use by information-planners
of such earthly but not unpalatable means for achieving them is entirely
justifiable.
A second category of American interests which provides a context in
which information programs should be conceived and implemented is the
American people's conception of itself (even if not always warranted) as a
nation motivated by the best distillation of liberal, democratic ideals.
Zionist-nationalism, in almost every respect is contrary to these same ideals.
The opportunities to explore its true character are almost as extensive as the
specifics of the Arab/Israel/Zionist conflict, on the one hand, together with
the traditional aspiration of American Jews for acculturation, on the other
hand. It is beyond the purview of this analysis to develop these categories in
detail. But in deference to EAFORD's declared, central purposes,
contrasting Zionist nationalism's values with the standards of a society in
which race/religion neither enhances nor impairs any citizen's full
participation in that society's system of rights and obligations should be a
highly efficacious formula for offering an alternative to Zionism which can
command general American support, including the support of American
Jews. A caveat is again in order. Such an appeal should emphasize the
historic, organic, functional racism/theocracy of Zionism, as codified in
Israel's law. Exaggerations of isolated examples of discrimination which
cannot be related to the Zionist/Israel legal/political system are probably,
a Jew who was willing to contribute material aid to the building of the
"national home" but was recognized as opposing the concept of "Jewish"
nationalism. Weizmann's own, cynical definition of the term is apt. In his
autobiography, Trial and Error, he described the synthetic creation as

Those wealthy Jews who could not wholly divorce themselves from a
feeling of responsibility toward their people, but at the same time
could not identify themselves with the hopes of the masses, were
prepared with a sort of left-handed generosity, on condition that their
right hand did not know what their left hand was doing... They
would give— with disclaimers; we would accept— with reservations.5

The principle focus of Weizmann's "diplomacy" were the leaders of the
American Jewish Committee, in the mid-1920's the most prestigious
collection of American Jews, generous philanthropists, but anti-Zionist
almost to a man. How this relationship was finally consummated is a story
of naivete on the part of American Jews. They believed Weizmann's
tactically watered-down version of Zionist aspirations and relied upon the
Mandatory to enforce the "safeguard" clauses of the Balfour Declaration,
protecting both Palestinian Arabs and anti-Zionist Jews from any possible
threats to their existing nationality status by any unrestricted Zionist
aggressiveness. These "non-Zionist" Americans were also victimized by a
sense of guilt at their own security in the United States, on the one hand,
and the still precarious conditions under which Jews in eastern and middle
Europe continued to live, on the other hand.
The wily Weizmann was equal to the challenge. Mixing deceit with
trading upon the innocence (and idealistic impulses) of his American
"negotiating partners", the Enlarged Jewish Agency was established in
1929.

IV

The Enlarged Jewish Agency

In broad terms the Agency became the institution "cooperating" with the
Mandatory in the national home project. In return for their prestige— and
financial support— the "non-Zionists" were allocated 50% of the
membership of the Enlarged Agency.6 But the Zionist organization was
given the right to appoint members to the Agency, on the precedent where the
American "non-Zionists" had no constituency and no means for
creating one.
From the beginning the structure was poorly built. The 50% membership
constitutionally allocated to the World Zionist Organization was a
disciplined caucus. Its policy positions were determined by the Congress.
The "non-Zionists", on the other hand, had no real constituency. The
American Jews had consistently resisted over-all umbrella structures
which, in some prescribed, democratic procedure might have elected
representatives to the Agency. Constantly frustrated by this lack of a
from all countries in which recognized Zionist movements had been established. The Congress is the supreme authority of the Zionist movement.

It regulates the activities of a number of "Departments", most of which were organized to fulfill social, economic and educational functions in the process of building "the national home". There is, for example, a Department of Education, a Department of Agriculture, a Department of Settlement and Immigration. The Congress' Executive determines the budget and allocates funds. Theoretically, the funds are derived from what amounts to a tax, called the "shekel". Payment of the shekel is mandatory for voting representation in the Congress. In reality, the shekel produced only nominal sums and the homeland-building activities of the Zionist movement are financed by substantial sums collected throughout the "Diaspora" by local agencies of which The Palestine Foundation Fund and The Jewish National Fund are the largest.

In the mid-1920's, when British doubts began to rise, Chaim Weizmann was the President of the Congress and Zionism's principal liaison with the Mandatory government. It therefore became essentially Weizmann's responsibility to persuade the Congress that it was necessary to provide a satisfactory answer to the Mandatory's inquiry about the capability of the movement to represent "the Jewish people". In addition to this political consideration, it was becoming increasingly clear that the Zionist movement, on its own, was incapable of financing the building of the National Home. At least funds of that dimension could not be raised with sufficient rapidity to offer conclusive proof to the "satisfactory British that "the Jewish people" was prepared to mobilize sufficient resources to exploit to full advantage the "promise" of the Balfour Declaration. Weizmann's access to British authority provided him with insights into that authority which enabled him to anticipate a British reversal of policy, given any plausible pretext.

The dilemma for the Congress - or at least for its ideological purists - was that to satisfy the Mandatory's implied demands it would be necessary to recruit Jews who were not "shekel" payers (not Zionists) into the work of building the National Home. Weizmann was always capable of temporarily sublimating his ideology to pragmatism. He finally won a bitter fight in the Congress to "negotiate" with Jews, many of whom as individuals were not only not Zionists, but were publicly denigrated active opponents of the whole concept of "Jewish" nationalism and therefore opposed to the idea of a Jewish "national home".

III

"Synthetic" Zionism and the Jewish Agency

Reluctantly the Congress gave its consent. Weizmann proceeded to lay plans for enticing the support and participation of the leadership of essentially anti-Zionist American Jews. To bridge the gap Weizmann coined the term "non-Zionist". The nomenclature was intended to identify on the whole, counter-productive. A good example of the importance of this proposition is the fairly recent altercation over the report on Israeli torture of Arabs made by the former United States diplomat, Ms. Alexandra Johnson. The argument which ensued in the United States revolved not so much about Ms. Johnson's stated facts as about her assertion that the practice of torture seemed to reveal a pattern attributable to Israeli government policies. Official efforts to water down Ms. Johnson's findings questioned the asserted "pattern". Her report could have been strengthened had she prefaced it with a brief inventory of Israel's "basic" Zionist legislation such as "The Law of Return", the "Nationality Law" and the "Statutary Law". The Zionist bias in those laws makes the "practice" of torture of non-Jewish people far more credible to a world long brain-washed to believe Zionism is a liberal, humanitarian movement which could not possibly torture political dissenters.

Two other observations, briefly stated, may add practical value to this analysis.

1. There is definitely a tide of change rising now in American opinion. Most analysts of public opinion believe the change is more accurately described as a diminution of enthusiasm for Israel than as any positive, supportive position for "the Arabs". This suggests -- or adds emphasis to -- the necessity for anti-Zionist information to provide credible alternatives stated in the context of American interests and values.

2. Regardless of what knowledgeable experts may know about Zionism, there is a strong vestige of popular belief it is a well-meaning humanitarian, constructive movement. That mythology is sustained by the very extensive Zionist network which is expertly structured to spread "the Zionist creed" throughout the country at a woman's notice and on any issue on which the Zionist managers decide such an orchestrated effort is in order.

To meet this apparatus with any degree of success now requires -- in addition to good substance in the offered information -- sufficient resources for mobilizing and coordinating the now rather significant numbers of American individuals and some organizations who seek justice for "the Arabs" and providing guidance for them to respond on every level where Zionist propaganda is activated.

This, in turn, requires easy accessibility to authoritative and where possible, official documentation of Arab policies and actions. It requires, also, greatly increased numbers of personnel who, by training and experience, know how to relate to the average American. The efficacy of these assets would undoubtedly be enhanced if, in addition, there were a central address to which interested Americans could turn for promptly delivered information. Such an agency, loosely coordinating the information effort, could also eliminate much present duplication of effort, some of which is of less than acceptable quality.

No miracles will result from any campaign even if it is based upon all, or
most of the information and recommendations of this analysis, but an effort, properly conceived in advance, provided with respect able resources, could rather quickly surface and mobilize a constituency in support of liberal, democratic specifics for coping with the problems that unorganized support or acquiescence in Zionist propaganda programs have produced in the past for anti-Zionist (or even non-Zionist) Jews and Arabs, particularly Palestinians.

1. The American Jewish Yearbook, 1978. The American Jewish Committee, N.Y. The Jewish Publication Society, Philadelphia, Vol. 79, pp. 331-338. See 67 organizations identified as "Zionist and Pre-Israel." The Yearbook is the most authoritative handbook through the maze of American "Jewish" organizations. Even this list does not include the United Jewish Appeal which is dominated by Zionist interests.

2. See Alan Taylor, "Protest in Israel," Institute for Palestine Studies, P.O. Box 764, Beirut, Lebanon. See also particularly, Chapters VI - VII, pp. 36ff.

3. State of Israel Bond Organization may now be added to them. Its primary function is the sale of Israel bonds. Its largest market is the United States.


5. ibid, p. 100.


8. ibid.


10. For a detailed account of Zionist manipulations to create the United Jewish Appeal, see The Political World of American Zionism, Samuel Halpern, Wayne University Press, Detroit, Michigan 1961, pp. 190ff.


14. Several individuals have taken the initiative to institute legal action against the United States Government, petitioning for a withdrawal of Federal Income Tax deductions for United Jewish Appeal contributions. The most successful of these actions is that of Mr. Michael ben-Asher, President, International Seminars, Inc., 750 Hallowell Drive, Huntington Valley, Pennsylvania, 19006. Mr. Ben-Asher's most recent action is an appeal brief from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals, District of Columbia Circuit, 1979, in the United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia. Copies of the brief may be obtained from Mr. Ben-Asher.

15. The most publicized of these potential actions was mentioned by President Eisenhow-er, 1976, in response to a question whether Jewish communities should be entitled to "American" military and economic assistance in the event of a Middle Eastern war.


18. See Malin's companion, sequential study. "The Legal Problems Concerning the Political Status and Political Activities of the Jewish Organizations: A Study in the United States."
All human beings are born free and equal in dignity and rights. They are endowed with reason and conscience and should act towards one another in a spirit of brotherhood.
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