

FROM THE HEBREW PRESS

This section includes articles by Israeli journalists and commentators that have been selected for their frank reporting, insightful analyses, or interesting perspectives on events, developments, or trends in Israel and the occupied territories.

GIDEON LEVY, "THE EMPTY SQUARE,"
HA'AREZ, 7 SEPTEMBER 2003.

Are there not at least 100,000 Israelis who are shocked by what Israel is doing to the Palestinians these days? Isn't there at least a tiny minority of a few tens of thousands who are losing sleep over the targeted assassinations? Or over the separation wall that is tearing Palestinians from their land? Or over the mass imprisonment that an entire nation has been living in for almost three years? Or over the abuse and humiliation an entire nation is being subjected to? Aren't there at least 10,000 Israelis who are not willing to remain silent? Does nothing that happens to our neighbors under the occupation have anything to do with us?

Judging by the conventional criteria of public mood and public readiness to act, the answer to all these questions is a resounding no.

The occupation has disappeared from the Israeli agenda and the Palestinians are not present as long as they don't perpetrate terrorism. Every day of quiet in Israel is another day of crass disregard of what is going on in our backyard. If there's no terrorism, there are no Palestinians.

For them, however, quiet is an unknown commodity. There, dozens of people are arrested every day, thousands are beaten and humiliated, are held up for hours at useless checkpoints that have nothing to do with security, and are locked up like cattle in pounds. Not a day goes by there without defoliation, uprooting of trees, arrests, demolitions, shooting, and killing. There is no need to elaborate any longer about what goes on at the checkpoints, and now the separation barrier is compounding their troubles. An entire nation is imprisoned, and beside it another nation carries on in total disregard, living from "We Won't Stop Singing" to "Take Me, Sharon."

A future historian who will examine the recordings and videos of the period's radio

and television programs will have no idea that there was such a thing as an occupation here. But the fact that the great majority of the media is oblivious to what's going on does not absolve Israeli citizens of responsibility. Every Israeli knows something about the occupation. There is no Israeli who doesn't know that the past three years were the cruelest the Palestinian nation has known. Yet, amazingly, and depressingly, Rabin Square, the country's protest site, is empty. It's almost impossible to grasp the fact that more than a year has gone by without one mass demonstration against the occupation in the midst of such an outrageous reality. Visitors to major cities in Europe, where the lives of the residents are far more placid and where the governments are tainted with far fewer wrongs, almost always encounter mass demonstrations against some injustice. But here? Nothing.

As it happens, last Wednesday was a rare day of protest: at three sites in Tel Aviv, and at almost the same time, people protested against three gross wrongs. The largest demonstration, of a few hundred people, was against cruelty to animals. Shortly before, some 200 people marched in the area of the old Central Bus Station against the deportation of foreign workers. At the same time, a few dozen activists of the Gush Shalom peace movement demonstrated outside the Defense Ministry against the targeted assassinations.

This, according to the scale of political correctness, though not according to the criterion of injustice and importance, is the order of Israeli protest: cruelty to animals ahead of deportation of foreign workers and both of those ahead of liquidations, and all three together able to attract a bare handful of people. And it's not that the Israelis are refusing to venture out of their homes: a few days before that, 200,000 showed up for the Love Parade in Tel Aviv. Morbidly, we can say that the livers of force-fed geese are of greater concern to Israelis than the Palestinians with liver ailments who are

unable to get to a physician or a hospital for medical treatment.

MK Yossi Sarid (Meretz), the only politician who showed up for the demonstrations (the foreign workers and the animals), noted that cruelty is cruelty, and no matter against whom. But it's impossible to ignore the fact that the protest against the greatest iniquity is the smallest in scale here.

The performing arts, too, have removed the occupation from their agenda. Instead of being the avant-garde of the protest movement, as in other countries, artists are accompanying Prime Minister Ariel Sharon to serve him as a bizarre decoration in his visit to India this week. The Acre fringe theater festival next month will not stage even one play about the occupation. The exhibition of photographs by the graduates of Camera Obscura, the photography school, which opened last week, contains not one photo from the occupied territories. Only a few artists were present at last week's demonstrations—notably, of course, in the one against cruelty to animals (the singer Hava Alberstein and the actress Gila Almagor were conspicuously present in the demonstration against the expulsion of foreign workers).

In less than two weeks, the Israel Air Force has liquidated eleven Hamas activists in Gaza without a trial, and along with it have killed and maimed innocent passersby. No one knows for sure who the liquidated people are and why they had to die, and no one asks why this criminal policy is continuing even after it has proved ineffective. The Palestinians, and the international community, conclude—and rightly so—that all Israelis support the occupation policy of their government.

This indifference is not new, of course—it has gone on from the start of the intifada. Since former prime minister Ehud Barak succeeded in convincing the majority of Israelis that there is no partner for peace, and since the onset of the large-scale terrorist attacks, the Israelis have turned their gaze away from the territories and are not protesting against anything, believing that the terrorism gives Israel the right to do whatever it pleases. Now the indifference and the blindness are intensifying. It's not only a question of the distorted moral visage of a society that takes this attitude toward suffering and injustice—it's also a question of the society's inner resilience. In the long term, this apathy is an ominous portent, even more than the assas-

sinations, deportations, and force-feeding of geese.

DANNY RUBINSTEIN, "MANHUNTS IN THE STREETS OF JERUSALEM," HA'ARETZ, 7 OCTOBER 2003.

Shabab (*shobe billi buki*) means illegally present, and is the term used by official Israel to describe Palestinians from the territories who move into Israel without legal permits. They are usually West Bankers, not Gazans, because the fence around Gaza prevents easy movement out.

The West Bankers who make their way into Israel without permits are nearly always day laborers looking for work. The defense establishment conducts a constant manhunt for them and in the middle of last week, for example, reported that 1,200 were arrested in the Sharon area in or near the seam area, meaning the area just west of the Green Line.

There are various estimates about the dimensions of the phenomenon but clearly thousands are involved. Palestinian labor affairs minister Ghassan al-Khatib says the number of West Bankers with permits to work in Israel is less than 3,000, compared to nearly 18,000 from Gaza. And the 3,000 he counts from the West Bank includes those who work in the settlements. That 3,000 is very low, especially when compared to the times when no permits were necessary, and as many as 100,000 West Bankers worked inside Israel.

Palestinian estimates of *shababim*, Palestinians working without permits, range from 20,000 to 40,000, including those who find work in East Jerusalem. A Palestinian source dealing with labor issues in Qalqilya says that the entire workforce of the city and its environs amounts to about 15,000, of whom 6,000, meaning nearly 40 percent, worked in the past in Israel. Now, nearly all are unemployed. Last week only 142 residents of Qalqilya worked—with permits—inside Israel. That's mostly because Israeli employers avoid whenever possible hiring Palestinians from the West Bank, preferring foreign workers; Chinese, Thai, Romanian, and others.

It is quite complicated for a Palestinian to get legal permission to work in Israel. The employer must apply to the authorities, providing the name of the worker to be employed. The security services check the worker's history—and there are criteria that anyway must be met: they must be over the age of 35, have at least five children, and no security history, which means never

having been arrested and preferably none of his relatives having such a record. If the license is granted, it goes to the Palestinian Authority Labor Affairs Ministry offices in the district where the worker lives, and the PA Employment Bureau hands over the license.

While 142 people from Qalqilya worked legally in Israel in recent weeks, it's estimated that about 1,000 people from Qalqilya are working illegally in Israel. A third or more stay overnight in Israel, usually at the workplace: construction sites, groves, warehouses. Most are employed by Israeli Arabs, the cities and villages of the Triangle area, from Kafr Qassem in the south to the Wadi Ara area in the north, and its in those villages and towns that the illegal Palestinian workers find shelter and refuge.

When they are caught by the Israeli authorities, they go through a usually short interrogation. Often they sign a document promising they won't work in Israel again without a permit, and are sent back to the West Bank. Those discovered to have worked illegally in Israel in the past or have a record for security crimes, are arrested, put on trial, and usually fined a few thousand shekels and/or jailed for a brief term. Most can't afford the fines, so they end up in jail for a month or two—and sometimes more.

The security services file a complaint with the police against the employer, as well. In many cases, the illegal worker is required to appear in court to testify against his employer and receives a special permit to be in Israel for that purpose, for that day only. The worker is greatly embarrassed, because the employers usually did him a great favor by taking the risk for him, so how can he testify against the employer? Many of the workers therefore decide not to testify, but that seals their fate—their names are automatically added to the black list of West Bankers not allowed to enter Israel. Those who do testify can try their luck and apply for a work permit.

The Israeli employers are usually given stiff fines, tens of thousands of shekels, as well as community service. There are many heart-wrenching stories about Israeli employers, both Jewish and Arabs, who had loyal workers from the West Bank for decades with whom strong bonds of friendship and trust were formed, and suddenly, the Israeli employers are required to throw out their workers, their friends. The Israeli wanted to continue employing the Palestinian, who, destitute, pleaded for work, but both had no choice. There were cases of

Israeli bosses who took pity on their Palestinian workers and continued paying them partial salaries even though the Palestinians could not come to work.

The streets of East Jerusalem provide a complete picture of the situation. A genuine manhunt has been underway in recent weeks in the center of the city and in the seam area between East Jerusalem and the West Bank. Border Patrol troops concentrate suspects in courtyards and empty lots, and they are interrogated, often accompanied by beatings and deliberately humiliating abuse. They are questioned about how they reached the city, largely to find the taxi driver who brought them. Police orders say that Arab drivers must find out if their passengers have permits to be in Israel. The drivers, thus turned into subcontractors of the police, know if they are caught with a *shabab* in their car, they could lose their licenses and their taxis will be confiscated for at least some time.

Hundreds and perhaps thousands of Palestinians work illegally in East Jerusalem, trying to earn a few shekels. They come from the refugee camps near Hebron and Ramallah, and are constantly on the lookout for someone who needs help cleaning a courtyard, plastering a roof, or washing a stairwell. They work in cleaning up after renovations, and as porters, earning a few dozen shekels a day. Many Jerusalemites are afraid to hire them. An Ein Kerem family that employed three Bethlehem men to install a new kitchen was recently fined NIS 10,000. An Arab gas station owner, an elderly man whose gas station is very close to the northern border of Jerusalem, employed two nephews who lived on the other side of the Green Line, a few minutes walk away. But that made them West Bankers, and he did not have permits for them. He was fined NIS 10,000 and given a suspended sentence. The Israeli gas company was unable to help. An agronomist from Kiryat Yovel speaks of an Arab acquaintance of his from the village of Hussan, near Bethlehem, who offered to prune the trees in the garden for NIS 100. But the Kiryat Yovel resident, afraid to hire the man, instead offered to simply give the Palestinian NIS 100. The Palestinian broke down in tears.

Shabah wages are among the lowest if not the lowest in the market, far below minimum wage. The Israeli public, which sometimes displays some empathy for expelled foreign workers, appears completely uninterested in the suffering of the illegal

Palestinian workers. The reason, of course, is the terror attacks and the conflict, in general. Moreover, there's no lack of Israelis who inform on neighbors or acquaintances with illegal Palestinian workers and regard their tip-offs to the police to be their personal contribution to the security of the state.

The most cynical exploitation of illegal Palestinian workers was the work of the government just a few weeks ago, when during the tentative political negotiations with the Palestinians, it freed a few dozen illegal workers and presented them as a special goodwill gesture of freeing security prisoners.

JEFF HALPER, "ISRAEL AND EMPIRE,"
20 SEPTEMBER 2003 (EXCERPTS).

Jeff Halper teaches anthropology at Ben-Gurion University. He is coordinator of the Israeli Committee Against House Demolitions and editor of the Israeli-Palestinian magazine News from Within, published by the Alternative Information Center. He was interviewed by Jon Elmer of the independent online journal From Occupied Palestine, available online at www.fromoccupiedpalestine.org.

Elmer: You use the term "matrix of control" to describe the Israeli occupation. Can you explain exactly what that is and how it functions?

Halper: The Israel-Palestine conflict is often framed in terms of territory: ending the occupation, a viable Palestinian state, and what that means in terms of territory. But two states and a complete end of the occupation, even in the best scenario, is not really the best solution. The whole Palestinian state would be on only 22 percent of the country, divided between the West Bank and Gaza. . . .

The issue is this: will the Palestinians in the end have a state that has potential for economic development, that has real political sovereignty, that has control of its borders, that has control of its resources, like water? Will Palestinians have a state that is a coherent territory that people can move freely within? Is it a real state, even if it's a small one, or is it really a Bantustan controlled by Israel?

And so, the matrix of control talks about how Israel controls the Palestinians: through incorporating the West Bank into Israel—proper with roads, through connecting electrical systems, water systems, urban systems,

and so on. It talks about Israel keeping military control, about Israel keeping control of parts of the country, like Jerusalem and parts of West Bank, which in the end will leave the Palestinians with nonviable islands.

The matrix of control talks about the use of planning and law, and administration bureaucracy to control the movements, building, and commercial activity of the Palestinians. In other words, what the matrix of control says is that besides the issue of military control, and besides the issue of territory, Israel exerts a lot of control over Palestine. It controls the water, it controls the borders, it controls Jerusalem, it controls their army, it controls their freedom of movement. And unless we dismantle the matrix of control, we haven't really done anything. The difference between a real Palestinian state, even if it's small, and a Bantustan, is the matrix of control.

Now, I don't think we can dismantle the matrix of control. I think it has gone too far, and that the occupation is permanent. We are in a state of apartheid. But not everybody agrees with me—Uri Avnery doesn't agree with me, the people who are in favor of a two-state solution still think that we can end the occupation, or that we can roll it back enough that a Palestinian state will emerge. But the danger in being for a Palestinian state is that if you don't understand the control dimensions, then you are actually agitating for a Bantustan. I mean, Sharon also wants a Palestinian state; he wants a state that is completely controlled by Israel. So if you only look at territory and you don't look at the issue of control, you end up advocating a Bantustan.

Elmer: Do you see a long-term political plan within Israel? Or is it just reacting?

Halper: Well, Sharon is accused of not having a political plan, and just blindly hitting out against the "infrastructure of terror," as they call it. But I think there is a very definite political plan—apartheid. Sharon calls this plan cantonization: a Palestinian state on about 42 percent of the West Bank in three or four islands, all controlled and surrounded by Israel.

The plan involves making the Palestinians submit by getting a weak Palestinian leadership that will sign off on this Bantustan, this cantonization. It involves getting rid of the Palestinian middle class that would oppose it by what we call "quiet transfer"—forcing them out of the country with bad housing, bad education, and no economic life, in

order to create a very malleable Palestinian mass that would then simply passively accept a Bantustan. Sharon is not saying that explicitly, he is leaving things deliberately vague, but that is where he is going.

Elmer: Would a move toward a one-state solution, as you've suggested, increase the likelihood of traditional ethnic cleansing? As Sharon has said, there is already a Palestinian state: Jordan.

Halper: It depends on how threatened Israel becomes. It doesn't need ethnic cleansing at this stage, because Israel is in a situation where it controls the whole country. A Palestinian state is necessary for Israel, because unless you can place the Palestinians into a state of their own, then Israel really does have existential dangers.

There are three and a half million Palestinians in the territories, and almost a million in Israel, that threaten the Jewish majority. So the only way to keep a Jewish majority is to control the whole country. It is to take the Palestinians, put them into these little islands, and call it a state. That's what Israel will try to do.

Now, to the degree that this does not work, because, for example, the international community doesn't accept the Bantustan—as in the case of South Africa—or because of continued Palestinian resistance, or a movement towards one state develops, or the refugees show signs of wanting to return—namely, in a situation where Israel feels demographically threatened, and therefore existentially threatened, it could resort to transfer as a last resort.

Elmer: Commenting on the expulsion option, David Ben-Gurion wrote in the 1930s, "What is inconceivable in normal times is possible in revolutionary times; and if at this time the opportunity is missed and what is possible in such great hours is not carried out—a whole world is lost."

Are the assassinations that Israel is conducting right now an attempt to create the pretext for "revolutionary times," in much the same way that they used the bombing raids on southern Lebanon in 1981 and early 1982 to provoke the inevitable retaliation that provided the pretext for the war on Lebanon in 1982?

Halper: The assassinations are partly an attempt to destroy a real Palestinian leadership. Israel needs a quisling, a collaborator-type leader—like in South Africa in the

Bantustans—in order to make its apartheid plan work. I asked a Palestinian fellow the other day, "Look, Abu Mazin [Mahmud Abbas] didn't work, Abu Ala [Ahmad Qurai'] doesn't seem to be working, aren't there any strong Palestinian leaders?" He said, "Israel killed them all." Like Abu Jihad [Khalil al-Wazir, head of the military wing of the PLO killed in Tunis in 1988], the strong Palestinian leaders were killed by Israel. And now they are threatening Arafat. You eliminate the leaders that could really stand up to you, and you only allow leaders who will sign off on this Bantustan to emerge. I think it's a part of Israel's strategy. Israel thinks that if it can defeat the Palestinians militarily, it can make them submit. It has to break the Palestinians militarily.

Elmer: Can you describe what you have called the "paradigm panic" within Israeli society—how Rabin shaking hands with Arafat in Oslo disturbed the "Arabs are our enemy" paradigm?

Halper: From the 1920s until 1993, every generation of Israelis was educated into the notion that "Arabs are our enemy. We're the good guys; they are the bad guys, they are terrorists, they just want to kill us, they just want to 'throw us in the sea'—there is no political solution." After Oslo there starts to be a little bit of a change.

In Oslo the whole world turned around. On every Israeli television, there it was, Yitzhak Rabin, a soldier, shaking hands with Yasir Arafat. Maybe there will be a Palestinian state, maybe no occupation, maybe no refugee problem. . . . And you have a paradigm panic. For example, there was a popular bumper sticker in Israel after Oslo saying, "This is a nightmare peace." But in 1994 and 1995, there was a small window where it looked like the old paradigm might be changing, but it was closed down again with the election of Benjamin Netanyahu in 1996.

The Hamas bus bombings in 1996 did enough to give Netanyahu that fraction of a percentage point electoral advantage in which he beat Peres in the election—and that of course led to the collapse of the whole Oslo process. With Netanyahu, you have a return to the old paradigm, and Israelis are even further into that mindset today.

Elmer: Norman Finkelstein has commented that the Israelis have always bided their

time, waiting for a “miracle.” He cites several examples: 1) The Balfour Declaration of 1917, which nobody could have predicted, 2) The USSR and USA agreeing in the United Nations in 1947 on the founding of a Jewish state, 3) during a serious economic crisis in the 1960s came the “miracle” of the June 1967 war, and 4) the “miracle” of the immigration of one million Soviet Jews, right at the time that the “demographic bomb” was at its most threatening. Can you comment on this?

Halper: It’s true, we’re waiting, but waiting from a position of power. In all these instances, even though we had problems, we were still the strong party. Today we are also waiting, because Israelis don’t believe there is any solution. And Israelis are also very disenfranchised; we have a system of government here that is really a rule by political parties. You vote for parties, you don’t vote for candidates in Israel, so there is a huge distance between the parties and the people. No political party in the history of Israel has ever gotten a majority in the Knesset, so there has always had to be coalition governments, with partners that your own voters wouldn’t necessarily agree to.

As Avi Shlaim [pointed out] in *The Iron Wall*, when Nasir approached Ben-Gurion in 1954 with a famous negotiation, Ben-Gurion turned him down. He said that the Arabs will always make peace with us, because we are strong. The Arabs will always sue for peace, so we can’t do it too early. First, let’s get everything we want. So it is not a passive waiting. You create a situation where you pick your opportunities, and you are ready to spring.

The June 1967 war was a miracle in a sense—it was unpredictable. On the other hand, when it happened, Israel was right there ready and knew exactly what to do. Within two weeks you had the Dayan Plan [settling Jews in densely populated Arab areas, i.e., Hebron], Allon Plan [establishing settlements as territorial buffers in strategic areas], and Israel had already taken half of the West Bank.

Israelis today say that there is no solution, but we have American support, European support, we’re strong militarily, so something is going to give, at some point, in some way. And when it does, we are primed to take advantage of it. For now, we can wait.

Elmer: Noam Chomsky has said that Israel is essentially an offshore American base. What strategic role does Israel play in the

American Empire, and what does that mean for activism within the United States, in terms of ending the occupation? Does it make activism in the United States just as important, or more important than in Israel, or in even in Palestine?

Halper: I don’t completely agree with Chomsky—I think he underestimates the proactiveness of Israel, and how Israel manipulates the United States. In a way, if you did a rational analysis, you would say that [America’s support of Israel] is counter-productive for the United States. It is messing up the whole Muslim world, it is messing up oil, and now there is occupation of Iraq and its comparison to here. The alliance of America and Israel made sense in the cold war—we used to have a joke within Israel that we were America’s largest aircraft carrier. Maybe then it made sense, but today?

The key that everyone is missing, though Chomsky has picked up on it because this is what he studies, is that Israel has located itself very strategically right in the center of the global arms industry. Israel’s sophisticated military hardware and military software are very important to weapons development in the United States. Israel has also become the main subcontractor of American arms. Just last year, Israel signed a contract to train and equip the Chinese army. It signed another multi-billion dollar contract to train and equip the Indian army. What is it equipping them with? It is equipping them with American weapons.

Israel is very important, because on the one hand it is a very sophisticated, high-tech arms developer and dealer. But on the other hand, there are no ethical or moral constraints: there is no Congress, there are no human rights concerns, there are no laws against taking bribes—the Israeli government can do anything it wants to. So you have a very sophisticated rogue state—not a Libyan rogue state, but a high-tech, military-expert rogue state. Now that is tremendously useful, both for Europe and for the United States.

For example, there are American congressional constraints on selling arms to China because of China’s human rights problems. So what Israel does is it tinkers with American arms just enough that they can be considered Israeli arms, and in that way bypasses Congress.

For the most part, Israel is the subcontractor for American arms to the “Third World.” There is no terrible regime—Colombia,

Guatemala, Uruguay, Argentina, and Chile during the time of the colonels, Burma, Taiwan, Zaire, Liberia, Congo, Sierra Leone—there is not one that does not have a major military connection to Israel. Israeli arms dealers are there [acting as] mercenaries—the guy behind Noriega was Michael Harari, an Israeli, who got out of Panama. Israeli mercenaries in Sierra Leone go around the UN boycotts of what are called blood diamonds, same in Angola. Israel was very involved in South Africa, of course, during the apartheid regime. Now Israel is developing missile systems with England, developing a new jet aircraft for Holland, and it just bought three sophisticated submarines from Germany. So Israel is playing with the big boys.

Israeli arms dealers are at home, they're like fish in water, in the rough and tumble countries that eat Americans alive: Uzbekistan, Kazakhstan, Russia, China, Indonesia, these countries where Americans just cannot operate, partly because of business practices, and partly because they have [congressional] constraints and laws.

So this is the missing piece. If you read the American Israel Public Affairs Committee (AIPAC) Web site, the main pro-Israel lobby in the United States, there's one piece called "Strategic Cooperation." The United States and Israel have a formal treaty, a formal alliance, which gives Israel access to almost all of American military technology.

When AIPAC sells Israel to Congress, it doesn't go to congressmen and ask them to support Israel because it is Judeo-Christian, or because it is the "only democracy in the Middle East," which it also does. It sells it on this basis: "You are a member of Congress and it is your responsibility to support Israel, because this is how many industries in your state have business links to Israel, this is how many military research people are sitting in universities in your district, this is how many jobs in your district are dependent on the military and the defense industry," and they translate it down to the extent to which your district is dependent on Israel. Therefore, if you are voting against Israel, you are voting against the goose that lays the golden egg.

In most of the districts in the United States, members of Congress have a great dependence on the military. More than half

of industrial employment in California is in one way or another connected to defense. Israel is right there, right in the middle of it all. And that is part of its strength.

And then we (the Israeli Committee Against House Demolitions, for example) come to a member of Congress, we talk about human rights, about occupation, about Palestinians, and he says: "Look I know, I read the papers, I'm not dumb, but that is not the basis on which I vote. The basis on which I vote is what is good for my constituents". . .

If you want to talk about empire, although it is a tiny country, Israel is a key member of the empire. If you look at the AIPAC Web site they'll say in black and white that the job of Israel is to protect American economic interests in the Middle East. They say we are developing laser weapons from outer space to protect American interests. It's all up-front. Israel sees itself, and is proud of being a part of the American Empire. Where Israel has a great PR advantage is that it presents itself as a victim. It is a country surrounded by a sea of Arabs, and Arabs are all terrorists, and Muslims are fanatics.

Elmer: And playing the victim becomes a political tool, much like anti-Semitism.

Halper: Yes. Anti-Semitism feeds on the idea that Israel is a victim. The Foreign Ministry of Israel invented a new form of anti-Semitism in the last few years called the "New anti-Semitism," and they then found some professors willing to give it some academic credibility. The New anti-Semitism that is now being spread all over says that any criticism of Israel is anti-Semitism, period. And it has been very effective.

A member of Congress will say, "besides voting for my constituents, I also have to get re-elected, and the last thing I need is someone saying I'm an anti-Semite." This complex is very powerful, it allows Israel to avoid accountability—you can't apply international law to Israel, you can't apply human rights obligations, you can't hold it responsible for its actions, because we are the victims, we are the weak party, we are just defending ourselves. You can't criticize us, we are Jews, and you persecuted us. This complex is impenetrable, and this is why Israel can thumb its nose at everybody.