



# U.S. politics: Israeli interests reign supreme

By ANALYST

It might seem impossible for Congress to be more pro-Israel but in fact the U.S. general election held last November shows that nothing is impossible where the interests of Israel are concerned. Crucial in the election of pro-Israel congressmen was the role of the Pro-Israel Action Committees (PACs), which disbursed fortunes to secure the election of men favourable to their cause. More than two million dollars was pumped into 81 PACs to ensure the spread of pro-Zionist influences throughout Congress, irrespective of party affiliation. These funds were channelled into securing the election of 81 candidates known to be amenable to pressure.

## PAC FUNDS

PAC funds work positively to ensure the election of pro-Zionist candidates and negatively to prevent the election of anyone insufficiently pro-Zionist. PACs not only identify candidates who shall serve their interest but also identify incumbents they would sooner be rid of. Steve Symms was one such legislator who made the mistake of visiting Libya while a member of the House of Representatives. In doing so he was only doing his duty as representative of Idaho, an agricultural mid-west state with a surplus of wheat. Symms tried to make a deal with the Libyans to buy some of this surplus and thus help the farmers. This spelt his doom; in November he was replaced by pro-Israeli John Evans.

Another candidate licking his wounds this New Year is Ed Zschau in California, defeated because he "would not automatically vote pro-Israeli on any issue before him." Funds in this case went to the pro-Israel incumbent Alan Cranston, PACs pumped \$125,000

into his election campaign to ensure re-election. John Evans had received even more, \$128,000. These two are Democrats but Robert Kasten, Republican incumbent in Wisconsin, got \$111,000 and Tom Daschle, another Democrat, \$106,000.

## PROVEN RECORD

To merit funding on this scale a candidate has to show not only proven record of unremitting support for Israel but to sit on one or more key committees. Cranston, for example, is a member of the Near East Subcommittee of the all-powerful Senate Foreign Relations Committee. His record shows that he consistently opposed arms sales to any Middle Eastern country (Israel excepted) while clamouring for the level of aid to Israel to be raised. Any committee in charge of funds is targeted by the PACs for takeover. Robert Kasten will more than repay the \$117,000 disbursed to re-elect him; he is chairman of the Foreign Operations Subcommittee of the Senate Appropriations Committee, which disburses billions in aid to Israel every year. In comparison with this \$117,000 is a mere bagatelle.

Israel received \$20.5 billion in economic and military aid between 1978 and 1985, an average of \$2.5 billion per fiscal year. During this period it was on the verge of bankruptcy but Israel was bailed out by the U.S., which gave the Zionist entity more than 30 per cent of all the foreign aid disbursed by the U.S. government. As America's No. 1 ally Israel creams off the lion's share; ally No. 2 Egypt, comes next; and allies 3 and 4, Pakistan and Turkey, follow Egypt. These four countries (one Jewish, three Muslim) account for the bulk of the foreign aid appropriations each year and together form the pattern whereby the U.S. keeps the Muslim World subservient to its interests.

Cranston not only disburses largesse to Israel to the tune of billions, he even advocates lowering

the interest rate on the loan: while other countries pay an average of 11.4 per cent Israel will pay only 5 per cent. Washington stands to lose \$531 million in interest payments if Cranston's bill, co-sponsored by Daniel Inouye, to reduce interest for Israel is passed. Daniel Inouye received \$48,825 from the PACs - again, sound investment! In defending his bill, Cranston's comment was revelatory: he said that the U.S. was treating Israel 'like a Third World country is treated by the IMF'. Although the U.S. is in a state of financial crisis, with cutbacks affecting every area of domestic spending, generosity to Israel is on the increase.

## SAME PATTERN

The same pattern is repeated in the House of Representatives where the pro-Israel lobby invested on an average \$6,000 to \$7,000 on each candidate to secure the re-election of Lawrence Smith, a member of the Middle East Subcommittee of the House of Foreign Affairs Committee, PACs cheerfully shelled out seven times that sum, \$42,050 to be exact. Nor do these astronomical sums represent the true level of money injected into campaign funds: PAC funds are listed in the Federal Election Commission reports but private donations are not. The figures quoted have to be increased by about 60 per cent, for while PACs can donate up to \$5,000 to each candidate, individual donors are limited to \$2,000. Sums like \$117,000 are made up by consortia of PACs, to which must be added the unknown sums contributed by individual donors.

The two-party system in American works to Israel's advantage. One only needs to fund either the incumbent or the challenger, irrespective of party; then, whichever party wins, Israel never loses. In the Senate, the Jews are evenly matched (four Democrats and four Republicans) but as the Senators are pro-Israel religious denomination matters little. Pro-Arab senators are an extinct species. They included Senator Barry Gold-

water, a one-time candidate for the Presidency, who is himself part Jewish, and Charles Mathias, both now retired.

## PRO-ISRAEL LOBBY

If 'pro-Arab' individuals do not retire they are ruthlessly eliminated. In 1982 pro-Israeli elements unseated a Republican, Paul Findley of Illinois, from the House and in 1984 they eliminated Charles Percy from the Senate. There can be no doubt that the Zionists had determined to make an example of both these men. The main pro-Israel lobby is the American Israel Public Affairs Committee (AIPAC). Its executive director is Thomas Dine. After the elimination of Percy he could not conceal his glee. "All the Jews in America, from coast to coast, gathered to oust Percy. And American politicians - those who hold public positions now, and those who aspire - got the message." It is perhaps impossible to be more candid than that. The defeat of the other, Percy, is an instance of the operation of private funding referred to. A Jewish real estate developer in California donated \$1.2 million to defeat Percy. This, in addition to \$240,000 contributed to his rival by a consortium of 55 PACs which pooled their resources to destroy him.

After these chilling examples, everyone, in office or out, got the message. What spelt their doom was support for arms sales to America's Arab allies in the Middle East. Although their defeat is a short-term Zionist victory it is in reality a long-term defeat. Percy's elimination led to the greatly reduced \$265 million arms sale to Saudi Arabia. Henceforward Israeli interests will be in a position to block any future arms sale to either Saudi Arabia or Jordan. This will make it increasingly difficult for the government of these countries to justify their pro-American attitudes. To this degree the administration's attitude is more subtle than that of Congress.