

## **Influence of the Israeli Lobby on the Foreign Policy of the USA**

**Zaid Khan**

Department of Law, University of Punjab, Lahore, Pakistan  
Email: [zk999@gmail.com](mailto:zk999@gmail.com)

**Ali Mehdi<sup>1</sup>**

Department of Law and Social Sciences, Tabriz University, Iran  
[Mehdiimam@gmail.com](mailto:Mehdiimam@gmail.com)

### **Abstract**

Since variables mentioned in the topic have their utterly discrete identity, the research paper briefly touches on their several aspects. It is qualitative research which unfolds through the history of Jews, their emergence as a lobby, and their growing influence on every era of the US government to mould American policies in favour of Israel. The respective policies of the two countries are also analysed in terms of interdependencies including the effect on and response from the global community. As the topic depicts, the rationale of this study was to establish a relationship by viewing various sources, how the Israeli Lobby has influenced U.S. Foreign Policy and in turn what effect is it producing on other Middle Eastern countries. The type of research is descriptive and analytical using qualitative sources, such as newspapers, published articles, journals, books, and websites to investigate the stated hypothesis and answer the research questions.

**Keywords:** Israel, USA, lobby, Jews, foreign policy.

### **Introduction:**

William Shakespeare in his tragedy, the Macbeth, revealed a beautiful truth of existence. The revelation is not limited to any human being but is also applicable to the superpowers and masterminds of the world that make the countries dance on the stage they have set. Two discrete variables of this study U.S. itself and the great Israeli masterminds are also two characters of the world stage, who fall very well in the crux of the above lines. This will unfold as the study will move ahead.

Paul Findley a member of the U.S. House of Representatives suggested, “There is an open secret in Washington that all members swear to serve the interests of the United States, but there is an unwritten and overwhelming exception: The interests of one small foreign country almost always subsidizes U.S. interests. That nation of course is Israel” (Findley, 2007).

The U.S. national interest must have been the primary objective of America’s foreign policy. However, that has sadly changed, especially since the Six-Day War when the US relationship with Israel became the centrepiece of U.S. Middle East policy. The

---

<sup>1</sup> Corresponding author

combination of unwavering U.S. support for Israel and the effort to spread democracy throughout the region has inflamed Arabs and indirectly jeopardized U.S. security” (Mearsheimer and Walt, 2007).

Although it can be assumed that the two countries are strategically related due to shared strategic interests, however, other forces play a far more important role. “The overall thrust of U.S. policy in the region is due almost entirely to U.S. domestic politics and especially to the activities of the Israel Lobby” (ibid.). As lobbying is permitted within the U.S. legislative bodies, with some officials representing their clients, groups and societies have managed to skew foreign policy. However, no lobby has managed to divert it as far from the national interest of the U.S.A as the Israeli lobby, while simultaneously convincing Americans that U.S. and Israel’s interests are, if not identical, then at least mutual.

As the research goes ahead it will be described how the Lobby has accomplished this deed, and how its activities have shaped America’s actions, given the strategic importance of the Middle East and its potential impact on others.

### **Historical Background:**

The lobby is defined as “the act of attempting to influence decisions made by officials in the government, most often legislators or members of regulatory agencies.” Also, “to conduct activities aimed at influencing public officials and especially members of a legislative body on legislation.” In the U.S. political backdrop, “Israel lobby” is a convenient term for the loose coalition of individuals and organizations who actively work to shape U.S. foreign policy in a pro-Israel direction. Our use of this term is not meant to suggest that, the Lobby is a unified movement with a central leadership, or that individuals within it do not disagree on certain issues (Mead, 2007). This lobby mainly comprises American Jews who are endeavouring within their areas of influence to incline U.S. foreign policy in Israel’s interests.

In 1844, Christian restorationist George Bush, at New York University said in a book titled *The Valley of Vision; or, The Dry Bones of Israel Revived*, “the thralldom and oppression which has so long ground them (the Jews) to the dust,” now called for “elevating” the Jews “to a rank of honourable repute among the nations of the earth” by restoring the Jews to the land of Israel where the bulk would be converted to Christianity (Bush, n. d., p. 1-14). His thought was that this would be beneficial for all the nations, a way to communicate with each other.

For the first time in 1914; Jewish Zionism emerged as a force on the American scene under the leadership of Louis Brandeis, who raised millions of dollars to alleviate Jewish suffering in war-torn Europe. From that time, it became the financial centre for the world Zionist movement. The British Balfour Declaration of 1917 additionally advanced the Zionist movement and gave it official legitimacy (Neff, 1993). The U.S. Congress passed the first joint resolution stating its support for a homeland in Palestine for the Jewish people on September 21, 1922. On the same day, the Mandate of Palestine was approved by the Council of the League of Nations. Zionist lobbying in the United States helped in the creation of the State of Israel in 1947-48 (Walzer, 2007).

By the 1950s, Israel was losing its importance. Other problems in the Middle East and USSR were prominent, and Israel’s U.S. supporters were not as active as they had

been. Eventually, the tension between the administration and Israeli supporters was so acute that there was news that the administration would investigate the American Zionist Council. Therefore, an independent lobbying committee was established during the 1960s (Spiegel, 1986, p. 52).

The relationship between Israel and the government of the United States which started with strong support for Israel's creation of a Jewish state remained cold until 1967. Some experts believe that before 1967, the government of the United States was somewhat hostile to Israel (Friedman, 2007). On the contrary, since 1976, Israel had been the largest annual recipient of direct economic and military assistance and the largest gross recipient of such assistance since World War Two (Arkin, 2021).

America has paid an enormous price for its unduly support for Israel (Findley, 2007). The same is reflected in the hatred for the U.S. government among Muslims in general and Middle East Arabs in particular. Although the average American may not know why the U.S. is so unpopular around the world, every single person in the Middle East can discuss at length the cluster munitions and other American weapons that Israel drops in civilian areas maiming and killing small children as well as the American made jets and bombs that routinely kill Arabs (Mearsheimer and Stephen, 2007, p. 5).

There are key U.S. policies in encouraging the U.S. to wage aggressive war against Iraq and soon perhaps Iran, but they are also key U.S. policies that encourage future terrorism against the U.S. and its allies (ibid.). Furthermore, it is known throughout the world that the U.S. has agreed for decades in obtaining Israel's and expanding its nuclear weapons, while at the same time, the U.S. is trying to stop other nations, particularly in the Middle East, from doing the same (ibid.).

Israeli-U.S. relationship is undoubtedly a contentious issue (Jukes, 2010), it is therefore important that it is dealt with straightforwardly. It is historically precise that Israel became the bully of the Middle East, starting even before May 15, 1948, when it declared itself a state (Bacon, 2007). Although there are defendants for Israel (Rowe, 2015), however, the general opinion of anybody with an understanding of the situation does not favour Israel (Farooq, 2006). The full details of the efforts of the Zionists to grab the Palestinians' land are outlined in Ilan Pappé's book, *The Ethnic Cleansing of Palestine*, which argues that "No lobby has managed to divert U.S. foreign policy as far from what the American national interest would otherwise suggest, while simultaneously convincing Americans that US and Israeli interests are essentially identical" (Pappé, 2007). However, cautiously saying, "In its basic operations, it is no different from interest groups like the Farm Lobby, steel and textile workers, and other ethnic lobbies" (Mearsheimer and Walt, 2007, p. 16)

### **The Israeli Lobby:**

The key institutions of the Israeli lobby were created during the Reagan years to reestablish the U.S. - Israeli strategic alliance shaken during the 1967 war. The most significant of these institutions was the American Israel Public Affairs Committee (AIPAC) (Plitnick and Toensing, 2007). The Fortune List has ranked AIPAC as the fourth most powerful among all lobbying groups. Interestingly, the Reagan regime was also intimately connected to the Christian Coalition, and several personalities from that administration, both Christian and Jewish, have re-emerged in the administration of

George W. Bush. From the 1980s onwards, it can be safely said that these two major categories have been effectively lobbying on behalf of hard-line Israeli policies; and have been very dominant, especially in Congress (Massing, 2006).

By the time of Reagan's presidency, AIPAC's points of view were welcomed by an administration that was already convinced of Israel's strategic value. Formal negotiations started to take place between policymakers and AIPAC before the presentation of any legislation. Similarly, congress seconded and backed almost every legislative initiative proposed by the lobby and trusted AIPAC for views and insight on matters about the Middle East (Kathleen and Christison, 2006).

The culmination of the Cold War brought a question mark on Israel's usefulness. The threat of the Soviet Union had subsided, and pan-Arab nationalism was largely a lost cause. However, now the subject under focus was the probability of nationalist or Islamist forces winning control of oil-producing Arab states. Israel had a part to play, which it did tremendously well. Israel's contribution in smashing Arab nationalists was and is still held in high esteem in Washington. Israeli military and intelligence assistance has been well-documented in Latin America and other parts of the world (Chomsky, 1999, p. 15). Moreover, in the Middle East, where U.S. intelligence weaknesses are glaring, Israel plays a virtually irreplaceable role, mainly owing to its population of native speakers of Arabic (Brad, 2012). Consequently, political, moral and material support for Israel, though partially troughed due to the invasion of Lebanon in 1982, 1987-1993 Palestinian and the 2006 Lebanon war, swelled up and remains quite strong among Americans to date (Plitnick and Toensing, 2007).

It can also be seen that US rejoinders to Israeli demands are not always absolutely positive. US reservations over Israeli arms sales to China, the Bush administration's tight-lipped response to Israel's financial compensation requests for its Gaza "withdrawal" and its underlying messages to the Israeli government that it should not ask for funding for its "convergence plan" are additional examples (Plitnick and Toensing, 2007). On the other hand, pro-Israel lobbyists strongly contested many of such U.S. initiatives, as they do any hint of U.S. "pressure" on Israel to resolve its conflict with the Palestinians (Chomsky, 1999, p. 15). Although some analysts believe that Americans by and large do not offer a blind backing of all Israeli actions, the positive disposition toward Israel remains a factor in the minds of policy and decision-makers (Quandt, 2005).

It is pertinent to mention, that subject specialists believe that peaceful resolution of the issues of Israeli occupation and Palestinian statelessness has never been an end state for Washington, but simply an effective tool to achieve other policy objectives. Therefore, peace initiatives are much more susceptible to derailment (Salman, 2011; Baig, 2021).

With time, the Israeli lobby has become an essential part of the policymaking system in the United States (Joachim, n. d.). Moreover, as the strategic objectives of Israel are more clearly defined, Israel's interests started to overshadow those of the U.S. itself (Weber, 2009).

### **Strategies of Israeli Lobby:**

Experts opine that the Lobby pursues two broad strategies.

- i. Firstly, it utilizes its significant influence in Washington, pressuring both Congress and the executive branch. Whatever may be the views and beliefs of an individual lawmaker or policymaker, the Lobby intelligently and effectively convinces that supporting Israel is the ‘smart’ choice (Mearsheimer and Walt, 2007).
- ii. Secondly, it makes every effort to guarantee that public discourse depicts a positive picture of Israel, by reiterating the myths about its founding and by supporting policy debates based on its point of view. Their objective is to prevent unfavourable critical arguments from getting a fair hearing in the political theatre. Careful orchestration of the debate is essential to warrant uninterrupted U.S. support because a truthful discussion of U.S. - Israeli relations might lead Americans to favour a different approach.

### **Foreign Policies – Outlook:**

The Realist theory of international relations claims that the structure of a state’s domestic politics has little or no impact on its foreign policy especially on security issues (Somin, 2006). They believe that what matters is the geostrategic location, size, and relative power of states in the international system (Donnelly, 2000). According to the theory, states act defensively to maximize their security or possibly try to make the best use of their relative security power. Ideology, political structure and other domestic political forces have little or no impact on them (Walt, 1998). Consequently, during the cold war up to now as international relations are troubled, it’s not a matter that the Soviet Union was a communist state. A Soviet government with a different socioeconomic system or ideology would have behaved more or less in the same way as Lenin and Stalin and their successors did (Lilienthal, 1978). Today, they argue that Iranian and North Korean nuclear proliferation should not concern us much more than the possession of nuclear weapons by France, Britain, or Israel. The reality is, that the former are authoritarian or totalitarian states and the latter democracies have little contact with the way they use their nukes. Therefore, Adolf Hitler and Nazi ideology had little impact on the course of German foreign policy in 1930; any other German government would have behaved equally given the same international situation (Lilienthal, 1978; Walt, 2018).

Concerning relations between the United States and Israel, realists opine that the U.S. inclination towards Israel is not based on the security need of the U.S., but rather something else. They believe that a powerful domestic lobby, whose interests are at chance with U.S. national interests, has captured that US foreign policy towards a very important region of the world. Resultantly, the U.S. plunged into a major needless war in Iraq and now risks another, equally pointless conflict with Iran (Somin, 2006).

### **United States Foreign Policy**

Where there is oil there is America. If one looks at American military bases and one will find a whole lot of oil all around. Saudi Arabia at 263 billion barrels has the largest proven oil reserves of any country. Saudi Arabia also happens to be a major command centre (Detsch, 2020).

The United States is being labelled by some as the foundation and fortification of contemporary colonialism (Miyawaki, n. d.; Abbitt, 2001; Kumagome, 2001). This is

chiefly due to its policy decisions which are determined to fasten the shackles on underdeveloped countries by annihilating them militarily and conquering their economies. Furthermore, the powerful elite class seems to be in a hurry for the accomplishment of this program (Davis, 2011). History has shown us that every new wave of colonial domination by Western powers, driven by economic lust and hunger for supremacy; was always accompanied by a theoretical moral justification for immoral acts. US invasion of Afghanistan, Iraq and now possibly Iran or god-forbid Pakistan, is self-explanatory and the counterarguments are self-defeating. The United States has proved that on a single alleged reason of neutralizing ‘weapons of mass destruction’ it can invade any country single-handedly; barring the apologetic military contribution of the United Kingdom.

We can see the United States along with its military campaign to capture the world’s major oil resources has also started redrawing the world economic map through globalization (Hart, 2010). Alongside, it is also trying to demolish the fortresses of ideologies of its adversaries through all possible means. The fall of the Soviet Union was an ideological defeat which capitulated the USSR.

### **Israel’s Foreign Policy:**

Israel’s foreign policy is primarily influenced by Israel’s strategic situation, the Arab- Israeli conflict, and the rejection of Israel by most of the Arab states (Federal Research Division, 2004). Therefore understandably, the objective of Israeli policy is to overcome diplomatic isolation and achieve recognition, and subsequently foster friendly relations with as many nations as possible, both in the Middle East and beyond as long as its security is not threatened. Throughout its short history, Israel has simultaneously practised open and secret diplomacy to further its main national goals. It has always portrayed a requirement for peace, while simultaneously engaging in military procurement, the export of arms and military assistance, intelligence cooperation with its allies, commercial trade, the importation of strategic raw materials, prisoner-of-war connections and other arrangements for hostage releases. In parallel, it has also sought to promote Jewish colonization in Israel and to protect vulnerable Jewish communities in the Diaspora (Federal Research Division, 2004).

### **US-Israel Relations in Different Eras:**

Following are the different governmental eras of the U.S. and their specific reaction towards Israel in their particular times.

- i. **Carter Government (1977-1981):** In the Middle East the Carter period means U.S. involvement was very dynamic. The peace process led to some resistance in U.S.-Israeli bilateral relations. Carter initiated the Camp David process which was viewed by some in Israel as creating U.S. pressure on Israel to withdraw from occupied territories and to take risks for the sake of peace with Egypt. During the period of President Carter, support for the Palestinian “homeland” and Palestinian political rights created additional tensions with Israel (Arkin, 2021).

- ii. **Reagan Government (1981-1989):** Israeli supporters expressed concerns early in the first Reagan term about latent difficulties in U.S.-Israeli relations, in part because numerous presidential appointees had ties or past business associations with key Arab countries, but President Reagan's support for Israel and the suitability between Israeli and Reagan standpoint on terrorism, security co-operation and the Soviet threat led to eventful improvements in bilateral relations. The Lebanon War of 1982 opened up some serious differences between Israeli and U.S. policies, such as Israel's use of Reagan's peace plan of September 1, 1982. However, it did not change the administration's favoritism for Israel and the importance it placed on Israel's importance to the United States. The ties further strengthened during Reagan's second term in office.
- iii. **George Bush Government (1989-1992):** President Bush raised Israeli fury when he reminded a press conference on March 3, 1990, that east Jerusalem was occupied territory and not a sovereign part of Israel as the latter had declared earlier. The United States also opposed several other issues including the Israeli plan to hold elections for a Palestinian peace conference delegation in the summer of 1989. The relations soared after the Labour Party won the 1992 elections.
- iv. **Clinton Government (1993-2000):** Though generally uncelebrated, the U.S. under Clinton brokered several peace deals for Israel. In the Clinton government on September 10, Israel and the PLO signed and exchanged letters of mutual recognition. President Clinton himself arbitrated the Jordan-Israel peace treaty in October 1994 and along with President Hosni Mubarak and King Hussein witnessed the Interim Agreement between Israel and the Palestinians and later mediated meetings between Israel and PLO in the White House. In parallel, Israel also received substantial monetary and military aid during the period.
- v. **George W. Bush Government (2001-2009):** George W. Bush and Prime Minister Sharon established their good relations from the outset. In the post-9/11 scenario, Sharon blamed the Bush administration for appeasing the Palestinians at Israel's expenditure in a bid for Arab support for the U.S. war on terror; though the term itself had not been coined (The Jewish Virtual Library, 2004). The relationship however remained unaffected. Subsequently during White House meetings US President and Israeli Prime Minister discussed the possible U.S. invasion of Iraq, Israel's constraint on Palestine, and Israel's request for additional military aid and loan guarantees to help Israel prepare for the war against Iraq (Mark, 2002). In March 2003, the President requested Congress for \$1 billion in military assistance and \$9 billion in loan guarantees for Israel (Brad, 2012). Bush era, by and large, strengthened Israel politically, economically and militarily (Congressional Research Report, 2008).

**United States Political Support to Israel:** Presently, the United States is the sole superpower. The common concept about U.S.-Israel relations is that Jews have a hold on

the American economy. Notwithstanding, if we go back and look into history we realize some more ideological similarities, such as:

- i. Both nations are living on territory which was inhabited by some other nation(s).
- ii. Both nations occupied that piece of land and became the owner of that land by force.
- iii. Both nations initially established small settlements and later expanded their territory through conflicts.
- iv. After gaining control, both nations treated the original inhabitants with cruelty and alienated them from their homeland.

In UN Security Council the U.S. never used its veto power till 1972, but in 1972 America used its veto power for the first time when Lebanon and Egypt came against Israel in the UN Security Council and the U.S. gave its veto in favour of Israel. Since then the US has been using the same to shield Israel (Neff, 1993, p. 40).

**United States Military Support to Israel:** The supporters of U.S. Aid to Israel are of the point of view that U.S. military aid has given strategic benefits to the U.S. They argue that Israel stands alongside the U.S. in the war against terror and countering the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction. Israel also assists the U.S. military by sharing priceless intelligence and advancement in defence technologies, which have played a major role in saving the lives of U.S. soldiers in Afghanistan and Iraq. Moreover, the U.S. also proposes hundreds of millions of dollars' worth of military equipment and more than 75 % of U.S. military aid is spent by the Jewish state within the US (Mearsheimer and Walt, 2007). Notwithstanding that Israel against three other members of the UN, employed the doctrine of preemption unlawfully under international law. Despite the same, Israel has been the biggest annual receiver of direct economic and military support from the United States since 1976, and overall biggest receiver since World War II. Moreover, Israel is the only state, which is involved in the joint development of military technology and regularly engages in joint military exercises.

**United States Financial Support to Israel:** Israel is the largest cumulative recipient of U.S. foreign assistance since World War II and was the largest annual recipient of U.S. foreign assistance from 1976-2004. Since 1985, the United States has provided nearly \$3 billion in grants annually to Israel, whereas almost all U.S. aid to Israel is in the form of military assistance. In the past, Israel also received significant economic assistance. Moreover, strong congressional support for Israel has resulted in Israel's receiving benefits not available to other aid recipients. For example, Israel can use U.S. military assistance for research and development in the United States and for military purchases from Israeli manufacturers. In addition, all U.S. foreign assistance earmarked for Israel is delivered in the first 30 days of the fiscal year (Arkin, 2021).

In August 2007, the Bush Administration declared an enhancement in U.S. military assistance to Israel by \$6 billion over the coming decade. The agreement calls for incremental annual increases in Foreign Military Financing (FMF) to Israel, reaching \$3 billion a year by FY2011. In addition for FY2011, the Obama Administration has requested \$3 billion in FMF to Israel. According to the State Department, "U.S.



assistance will help ensure that Israel maintains its qualitative military edge over potential threats and prevent a shift in the security balance of the region. U.S. assistance is also aimed at ensuring for Israel the security it requires to make concessions necessary for comprehensive regional peace.”

**United States in Support of Israel at the United Nations:** The United States has been vehemently supporting the Israelis at the United Nations. The U.S. had vetoed 43 several times to the resolutions directly about Israel, and all of them single-handedly (The Jewish Virtual Library, n. d.). The War of Lebanon perhaps demonstrates the extent of support Israel was receiving at the United Nations from the United States of America. The Bush administration started with an endorsement to allow Israel to destroy Hezbollah. Experts also believe that Israel had decided and intended to confront Hezbollah; the kidnappings gave the much-desired Casus Belli (Mearsheimer and Walt, 2007). Despite stern international disapproval, the Bush government vetoed United Nations resolutions and prevented a cease-fire to allow Israel to inflict maximum damage and punishment on Hezbollah. Consequently, Ehud Olmert expressed his gratitude to Bush for “safeguarding Israel’s interest in the Security Council” (Srouf, 2007, p. 152). Meanwhile, U.S. Congress also voted unanimously to support Israel, and the mainstream American media backed Israel by not condemning its attacks against civilians and Lebanon’s infrastructure (Zunes and Feffer, 2006). Human Rights Watch concluded: “Israel has violated one of the most fundamental tenets of the laws of war, the duty to carry out attacks on only military targets” (Srouf, 2007, p. 150). “This was remarkable, as almost every other nation plus the United Nations criticized Israel (Mearsheimer and Walt, 2007).

Almost all U.S. vetoes cast since 1988 blocked resolutions against Israel, based on their lack of condemnation of Palestinian terrorist groups, actions, and incitement. This policy, known as the Negroponte doctrine, has drawn both praise and criticism (Global Policy Forum, 2004). UN diplomats have indicated that the United States would veto any unilateral attempt to declare a Palestinian state at the Security Council (Ravid and Mozgovaya, 2010).

**Israel’s Response to the United States:** On the contrary to overwhelming U.S. support Israel’s actions belie its loyal alliance. Israeli government officials frequently ignore U.S. requests and break promises made to top U.S. leaders. For example, despite U.S. reservations, Israel supplied advanced U.S. military technology to China, which is regarded as a potential U.S. rival. U.S. State Department Inspector-General referred to the same as “a systematic and growing pattern of unauthorized transfers” (Kempster, 2002).

Moreover, Israel is perhaps the only ally country that spies on the United States, and its willingness to spy on its principal benefactor cast serious doubts (Ravid and Mozgovaya, 2010). Israel “conducts the most aggressive espionage operations against the U.S. of any ally” (CNI, 2023; Cameron, 2001). Famous examples are Jonathan Pollard, an Israeli spy in the U.S. who gave Israel large quantities of classified material in the early 1980s (which Israel reportedly passed onto the Soviet Union to gain more exit visas for Soviet Jews); and also of Pentagon official, Larry Franklin, who passed classified information to an Israeli diplomat, allegedly aided by two AIPAC officials (Mearsheimer and Walt, 2007).

**Socio-Political Impact on the United States:** The U.S. relationship with Israel adversely affects the practicality of the U.S. dealing with other states (Mearsheimer and Walt, 2007). Similarly, Israel’s nuclear arsenal is the reason; its Arab neighbours have also indicated a security-based desire for nuclear weapons, which increases upon the threat of regime change (Sayigh, 1992). Yet Israel is not much of an asset when the United States contemplates using force against these regimes, because it cannot participate in the fight (United States Senate Handbook, 2011, p. 72). Therefore, giving Israel the status of America’s most trusted ally against Middle East dictatorships not only exaggerates Israel’s actual ability to influence these issues but also makes U.S. efforts more difficult (Mearsheimer and Walt, 2007).

Israel’s unflinching support is also having a detrimental effect on U.S. political stature outside the Middle East. Foreign elites consider the United States’ support and tolerance of Israeli oppression in the occupied territories as morally unintelligent and a handicap in the war against terror (Jewish Lobby in the United States Handbook, 2009). For example, in April 2004, 52 former British diplomats wrote a letter to Prime Minister Tony Blair stating that the Israel-Palestine conflict had “poisoned relations between the West and the Arab and Islamic worlds,” and also warned that policies of Bush and Prime Minister Ariel Sharon were “one-sided and illegal” (Boyce, 2004).

**Israel’s Need for Protection:** Israel is today’s nuclear power and has the strongest military power in the Middle East (Mearsheimer and Walt, 2007). Israel’s conventional forces are sophisticated and the largest in the region. Therefore, the present strategic balance is strongly in favour of Israel, which has continued to tilt further due widening of the qualitative gap between Israeli own military potential and the deterrence power of its neighbours. Most scholars believe that Israel can protect itself and that Iran, Iraq and Syria are not a threat to Israel (Cordesman, 1998). If it’s true, which it surely is, then Israel’s accumulation of arms and weapons is not understandable.

Perhaps the U.S. willingness to provide military aid to Israel is more astonishing, as it will have a dramatic effect on Israel’s policies towards the Palestinians. The aid is therefore been used not to reinforce Israeli defence but to finance the Israeli occupation of Palestinian lands. It must be understood that Israel cannot build a society based on the principles of democracy, human rights, and compliance with international law while brutally occupying other people and their land and the United States is currently paying for that occupation with its annual aid (USA Facts, 2021). The fact is that America was the first state that accepted Israel in 1948 (Ginsberg, 1993) whatever government will come into power in US and Israel, it is envisaged that their relationship will stay strong and stable.

## **Conclusion:**

In this research, we unfolded various facets of the Israeli Lobby and its direct and indirect impact on US Foreign Policy shaping. We started with the description of the Israeli Lobby that, the core of the Lobby is comprised of American Jews who make a significant effort in their daily lives to bend U.S. foreign policy so that it advances Israel’s interests. Their activities go beyond merely voting for candidates who are pro-Israel to include letter-writing, financial contributions, and supporting pro-Israel organizations. But not all Jewish Americans are part of the Lobby because Israel is not a

salient issue for many of them. In a 2004 survey, for example, roughly 36 per cent of Jewish Americans said they were either “not very” or “not at all” emotionally attached to Israel.

Jewish Americans also differ on specific Israeli policies. Many of the key organizations in the Lobby, like AIPAC and the Conference of Presidents of Major Jewish Organizations (CPMJO), are run by hardliners who generally supported the expansionist policies of Israel’s Likud Party, including its hostility to the Oslo Peace Process. The bulk of U.S. Jewry, on the other hand, is more favourably disposed to making concessions to the Palestinians, and a few groups, such as Jewish Voice for Peace strongly advocate such steps. Despite these differences, moderates and hardliners both support steadfast U.S. support for Israel.

The United States has a divided government that offers many ways to influence the policy process. As a result, interest groups can shape policy in many different ways, by lobbying elected representatives and members of the executive branch, making campaign contributions, voting in elections, moulding public opinion, etc. It is not surprising that Israel and its American supporters want the United States to deal with any threats to Israel’s security. If their efforts to shape U.S. policy succeed, then Israel’s enemies get weakened or overthrown, Israel gets a free hand with the Palestinians, and the United States does most of the fighting, dying, rebuilding, and paying.

But even if the United States fails to transform the Middle East and finds itself in conflict with an increasingly radicalized Arab and Islamic world, Israel still ends up protected by the world’s only superpower. This is not a perfect outcome from the Lobby’s perspective, but it is preferable to Washington distancing itself from Israel or using its leverage to force Israel to make peace with the Palestinians.

Indeed, the mere existence of the Lobby suggests that unconditional support for Israel is not in the American national interest. If it was, one would not need an organized special interest group to bring it about. But because Israel is a strategic and moral liability, it takes relentless political pressure to keep U.S. support intact.

At the beginning of the research, a connection was established with the play of William Shakespeare, the mere purpose was to make a layperson understand under the influence of all the theories, bookish reviews and geo-political standings of Israel and America, that: the U.S. is being a puppet in such a manner that U.S. government and its people, despite having sufficient self-awareness of Israel not being their true ally and not gaining U.S. a good name in the world community; is still dancing on its instructions. And if this out-of-proportion support to Israel is allowed to continue, the time is not far it is feared that this superpower will lose its supremacy in the eyes of the world and its people.

## References

- Abbitt, E. S. (2001). Androgyny and otherness: exploring the west through the Japanese performative body. *Asian Theater Journal*, 18 (2). Hawaii: University of Hawaii Press.

- Arkin, D. (2021). US state department approves sale of CH-53K helicopters to Israeli Air Force. *IsraelDefense*. Retrieved April. 3, 2023 from <https://www.israeldefense.co.il/en/node/51168>
- Bacon, G. (2007). The bully of the Middle East. *Greg Bacon's Blog*. Retrieved January 22, 2023 from <http://wakeupfromyourslumber.com/node/3497>
- Baig, M. A. (2021). ). US interests in the Middle East: Foreign policy objectives & failures. *Paradigm Shift*. Retrieved January 22, 2023 from <https://www.paradigmshift.com.pk/us-interests-in-the-middle-east/>
- Boyce, G. (ed). (2004). Doomed to failure in the Middle East. – A letter from 52 former senior British diplomats to Tony Blair. *The Guardian*. Retrieved January 22, 2023 from <http://www.guardian.co.uk/politics/2004/apr/27/foreignpolicy.world>
- Brad, M. (2012). U.S. – Israel intelligence cooperation. *Jewish Virtual Library*. Retrieved January 22, 2023 from [http://www.jewishvirtuallibrary.org/jsource/U.S.-Israel/intell\\_coop.html](http://www.jewishvirtuallibrary.org/jsource/U.S.-Israel/intell_coop.html)
- Bush, G. (n. d.). *Valley of vision: or, the dry bones of Israel revived: an attempted proof, from Ezekiel, Chap. Xxxvii, 1-14, of the Restoration and Conversion of the Jews*. Forgotten Books New York.
- Cameron, C. (2001). Suspected Israeli spies held by U.S. *Fox News*. Retrieved January 22, 2023 from <http://www.commondreams.org/headlines01/1212-06.htm>
- Chomsky, N. (1999). *Fateful triangle: The U.S., Israel and the Palestinians*. Boston: South End Press, pp. 15, 21, 24–26.
- CNI. (2023). Overview: Israeli spying. *The Council for the National Interest*. Retrieved January 22, 2023 from <https://cnionline.org/cost/israeli-spying/>
- Cordesman, A. H. (1998). Military balance in the Middle East. Arab Israeli balance – overview. *Center for Strategic and International Studies*. Retrieved January 22, 2023 from <https://www.csis.org/analysis/military-balance-middle-east-vi-arab-israeli-balance-overview>
- Davis, S. (2011). The U.S. military base network and contemporary colonialism: Power projection, resistance and the quest for operational unilateralism. *Political Geography*, 30 (4), 215-224. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.polgeo.2011.04.003>
- Detsch, J. (2020). U.S. troops really are in Syria to protect the oil for the Kurds. *Foreign Policy*. Retrieved January 22, 2023 from <https://foreignpolicy.com/2020/08/05/kurds-oil-syria-us-troops-trump/>
- Donnelly, J. (2000). *Realism and International Relations*. Cambridge University Press.

- Farooq, M. O. (2006). Zionism and Israel: setting the record straight. *Global Web Post*. July 2006. Retrieved January 22, 2023 from <http://globalwebpost.com/farooqm/writings/other/einstein.htm>
- Federal Research Division. (2004). Country studies: Israel. *Library of Congress*. Retrieved January 22, 2023 from <http://countrystudies.us/israel/106.htm>
- Findley, P. (2007). The open secret about the Israel lobby. *Counterpunch*. Retrieved January 22, 2023 from <https://www.counterpunch.org/2007/10/16/the-open-secret-about-the-israel-lobby/>
- Ginsberg, B. (1993). *The fatal embrace: Jews and the state*. The University of Chicago Press.
- Global Policy Forum. (2004). U.S. veto on Yassin draws criticism. Retrieved January 22, 2023 from <http://www.globalpolicy.org/component/content/article/196/42654.html>
- Hart, G. (2010). Redrawing the map of the world? Reflections on the 2009 world development report. University of California, Berkeley, *Geography Journal*.
- Ilan, P. (2007). The ethnic cleansing of Palestine. *Oneworld*.
- Jewish lobby in the United States handbook. (2009). *Organization, operations, performance*. Int'l Business Publications.
- Joachim, M. (n.d.). *Judsonia rising: the Israel lobby and American society; What the Israel lobby really is, how it hurts the US, what to do about it*. Retrieved January 22, 2023 from <http://www.eaazi.org/ThorsProvoni/Judonia1.htm>
- Jukes, P. (2010). Tony Judt: A man of his word. *Prospect*, 173. Retrieved January 22, 2023 from <http://www.prospectmagazine.co.uk/2010/07/tony-judt-a-man-of-his-word/>
- Kathleen and Christison, B. (2006). The rise of the Israeli lobby: a measure of its power. *CounterPunch*.
- Kempster, N. (2002). Israel accused of arms transfer violations: weapons: The inspector general's report also criticizes the State Dept. for failing to stop the transactions. *Los Angeles Times*.
- Kumagome, T. (2001). Japanese colonial memory and modernity: successive layers of violence' trans. In Victor Koschmann's *Race Panic and the Memory of Migration*. Hong Kong: Hong Kong University Press.
- Lieberman, R. C. (2009). The "Israel Lobby" and American politics. *Perspectives on Politics*, 7(2), 235–257. Retrieved January 22, 2023 from <http://www.jstor.org/stable/40406928>

- Lilienthal, A. M. (1978). *The Zionist connection*. New York: Dodd, Mead.
- Mark, C. R. (2002). Congressional research service report. *Almanac of Policy Issues*. Retrieved January 22, 2023 from [http://www.policyalmanac.org/world/archive/crs\\_israeli-us\\_relations.shtml](http://www.policyalmanac.org/world/archive/crs_israeli-us_relations.shtml)
- Massing, M. (2006). The storm over the Israel lobby. *The New York Review*. Retrieved January 22, 2023 from <https://www.nybooks.com/articles/2006/06/08/the-storm-over-the-israel-lobby/>
- Mead, W. R. (2007). Jerusalem syndrome: decoding the Israel lobby. *Review of The Israel Lobby and U.S. Foreign Policy*, by J. J. Mearsheimer & S. M. Walt. *Foreign Affairs*, 86(6), 160–168. Retrieved January 22, 2023 from <http://www.jstor.org/stable/20032515>
- Mearsheimer, J. J., and Walt, S. M. (2007). *The Israel Lobby and US foreign policy*. New York: Farrar, Straus & Giroux
- Miyawaki, A. (n. d.). *Contemporary colonialism - a view from the east*. Retrieved January 22, 2023 from <http://hemi.nyu.edu/cuaderno/politicalperformance2004/colonialism/atsuko.html>
- Neff, D. (1993). Lessons to be learned from 66 UN resolutions Israel ignores. *Washington Report*. Retrieved January 22, 2023 from <https://www.wrmea.org/1993-march/lessons-to-be-learned-from-66-u.n.-resolutions-israel-ignores.html>
- Plitnick, M., and Toensing, C. (2007). The Israel lobby in perspective; Middle East research and information project. *Middle East Report* 243, 33. Retrieved January 22, 2023 from <http://www.merip.org/mer/mer243/israel-lobby-perspective>
- Quandt, W. B. (2005). *Peace process: American diplomacy and the Arab-Israeli conflict since 1967*. Washington, DC: Brookings Institution Press.
- Ravid, B. and Mozgovaya, N. (2010). Netanyahu: Direct talks are only path to true Mideast peace. *Haaretz*. Retrieved January 22, 2023 from (<http://www.haaretz.com/news/diplomacy-defense/netanyahu-direct-talks-are-only-path-to-true-mideast-peace-1.321667>)
- Rowe, R. (2015). Two views on nuclear talks with Iran. *San Diego Union – Tribune*. Retrieved January 22, 2023 from <https://www.sandiegouniontribune.com/lifestyle/people/sdut-persian-gulf-separate-israelis-iranians-2015mar28-htmllstory.html>
- Salman, M. (2011). The U.S. isn't interested in Mideast peace. *Haaretz*. Retrieved January 22, 2023 from <http://www.haaretz.com/print-edition/opinion/the-u-s-isn-t-interested-in-mideast-peace-1.342382>

- Sayigh, Y. (1992). Reversing the Middle East nuclear race. *Middle East Research and Information Project – Middle East Report*, 117(22).
- Somin, I. (2006). Realism and the Mearsheimer-Walt theory of the Israel lobby. *Trackbacks*. Retrieved January 22, 2023 from <http://volokh.com/posts/1164134596.shtml>
- Spiegel, S. (1986). *The other Arab-Israeli Conflict making America's Middle East policy, from Truman to Reagan*. University of Chicago Press.
- Srour, S. (2007). The Israeli lobby and the U.S. – response to the war in Lebanon. *The American Journal of Social Sciences*, 24 (1), 150-153. <https://doi.org/10.35632/ajis.v24i1.1582>
- The Jewish Virtual Library. (2004) *Presidential candidates' views on the Middle East – George Bush*. Retrieved January 22, 2023 from <http://www.jewishvirtuallibrary.org/jsource/U.S.-Israel/Bush2003.html>
- The Jewish Virtual Library. (n. d.). *U.S. vetoes of UN resolutions critical of Israel*. Retrieved January 22, 2023 from [www.jewishvirtuallibrary.org/jsource/UN/usvetoes.html](http://www.jewishvirtuallibrary.org/jsource/UN/usvetoes.html)
- United States Senate Handbook. (2011). *Israel lobby in United States handbook*. Washington DC: International Business Publications.
- USA Facts. (2021). How much military aid does the US give to Israel? *USA Facts*. Retrieved January 22, 2023 from <https://usafacts.org/articles/how-much-military-aid-does-the-us-give-to-israel/>
- Walt, S. M. (1998). International relations: one world, many theories. *Foreign Policy*, 110, 29–46. <https://doi.org/10.2307/1149275>
- Walt, S. M. (2018). US grand strategy after the cold war: can realism explain it? Should realism guide it? *International Relations*, 32(1), 3–22. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0047117817753272>
- Walzer, L. (2007). United States–Israeli relations: The impact on US national interests. Masters, thesis. Naval Postgraduate School, Monterey, CA.
- Weber, M. (2009). A straight look at the Jewish lobby. *Institute for Historical Review*. Retrieved January 22, 2023 from <http://www.ihr.org/leaflets/jewishlobby.shtml>
- Zunes, S., and Feffer, J. (2006). Congress and the Israeli attack on Lebanon: A critical reading. *FPIF*. Retrieved January 22, 2023 from [http://www.fpif.org/articles/congress\\_and\\_the\\_israeli\\_attack\\_on\\_lebanon\\_a\\_critical\\_reading](http://www.fpif.org/articles/congress_and_the_israeli_attack_on_lebanon_a_critical_reading)