

March 9, 1993

NOTE TO THE LEADER

FROM: SUZANNE NIEMELA *SNI*

RE: NATIONAL JEWISH COALITION CONTRIBUTION

Gary Klein will be giving a check to Campaign American during your meeting on Wednesday, March 10. However, he has been advised to present the check to Jo-Anne Coe or Mark Miller, one of which will be attending the meeting to receive the contribution.

The amount of the check will be \$5,000.

BRIEFING MATERIALS FOR NATIONAL JEWISH COALITION MEETING
Wednesday, March 10, 1993
2:00 PM - 2:45 PM

- o Schedule
- o Talking points
- o Attendees
- o President Clinton's Middle East Policy
(prepared by NJC)
- o Comparison of GOP and DEMs Party Platforms of Middle East
(prepared by NJC)
- o Summary of First Lady Hillary R. Clinton on Middle East policy
(prepared by NJC)
- o Newspaper articles summarizing election and party platforms
- o NJC Press release on Warren Christopher and Anthony Lake
- o Polling data reflecting lack of Jewish support for GOP in '92
(Source: New York Times/CBS News Polls)

FINAL
3/8/93
Contact:
Suzanne Niemela
202/408-5105

WEDNESDAY, MARCH 10, 1993

1:50 PM DEPART for Capitol Hill Club

2:00 PM- ATTEND National Jewish Coalition Meeting
2:45 PM

Capitol Hill Club
300 First Street S.E.
Washington, D.C.
202/484-4590

Location: Private Dining Room I, 3rd floor

Contact: Gary Hiller, Congressional Affairs
Director
202/547-7701

Hosts: Max Fisher, Honorary Chairman
George Klein, National Chairman

Format: Informal, Round Table discussion
Intro: George Klein to intro SEN. DOLE
Remarks: Brief remarks by SEN. DOLE with
discussion to follow

Attendance: 36

Focus: Strategies for expanding the Party
in order to build Republican
majorities in 1994 and 1996

March 9, 1993

MEMORANDUM TO THE LEADER

FROM: SUZANNE NIEMELA
THROUGH: JO-ANNE COE
RE: TALKING POINTS FOR MEETING WITH NATIONAL JEWISH
COALITION

The National Jewish Coalition will be meeting from 11:30 AM - 3:30 PM on Wednesday, March 10. You will be joining them for 45 minutes, (2:00 PM - 2:45PM) giving brief remarks and then proceeding into a "working session" to include a "lively, give and take discussion."

POINTS TO STRESS (per NJC)

- o Thank the NJC for its work on behalf of the Republican Party;
- o How to refocus efforts to expand the base of the Party;
- o The GOP lost Jewish support as compared to the last two national elections (see enclosed information);
- o The GOP had the most pro-Israel platform, and yet was not able to translate the platform into support;
- o The GOP and the NJC did not successfully counter the incorrect perceptions of the Republican Party's attitudes toward issues of concern to the Jewish community;
- o What are the goals for '94 and '96.

ATTENDEES AT NATIONAL JEWISH COALITION MEETING
Wednesday, March 10, 1993

Rabbi Milton Balkany (New York)
Stuart Bernstein (District of Columbia)
Paul Borman (Michigan)
Merom Brachman (Ohio)
Marshall Breger (Maryland)
Michael David Epstein (Maryland)
Max Fisher (Michigan)
Richard Fox (Pennsylvania)
Sam Fox (Missouri)
Norman Freidkin (Maryland)
Cheryl Halpern (New Jersey)
Mark Isaacson (Massachusetts)
George Klein (New York)
Abraham Sofaer (District of Columbia)
Arnold Thaler (New York)
Randy White (Massachusetts)

Middle East Regional and Foreign Policy
of Governor Clinton

LACK OF LEADERSHIP ON THE GULF WAR:

- Contrary to assertions that Clinton supported the use of force against Iraq, two days before the Persian Gulf War began, and one day after the Congress authorized the President to use military force, Clinton stated that "we should give sanctions more time and maybe even explore a full-scale embargo." [*Wall Street Journal*, March 19, 1992.]
- After Congress authorized the President to use military force in the Persian Gulf, Clinton stated: "I guess I would have voted with the majority if it was a close vote. But I agree with the argument the minority made." [*Arkansas Gazette*, January 15, 1991.]

SUPPORT FOR SALE OF F-15s TO SAUDI ARABIA:

- Clinton irresponsibly expressed support for the sale of F-15s to Saudi Arabia before any such sale was even proposed to the Congress - therefore, undermining any effective opposition to the sale in Congress. [Dallas, Texas, August 25, 1992.]
- Will Marshall, president of the Progressive Policy Institute, the research arm of the Democratic Leadership Council that advises Clinton's campaign, has stated that a Clinton administration would support the sale of F-15s to Saudi Arabia. (*Aerospace Financial News*, July 17, 1992).

CUTS IN FOREIGN AID:

- Clinton included foreign aid in a list of programs that would be cut during a Clinton presidency. "I would cut some money out of foreign aid." (CBS "*This Morning*," June 15, 1992.)
- In his Middle East position paper, Clinton failed to even mention the role of foreign aid, yet alone commit to providing adequate funds necessary for maintaining Israel's strategic position in the region.

ISRAELI SECURITY ISSUES:

- Clinton, in a speech to pro-Israel activists in October 1991, concluded that Israel will "inevitably" be required to trade land for peace. [*Arkansas Gazette*, October 7, 1991.]
- Clinton has termed Jewish settlements in Israel as an "obstacle to peace." [*New York Times*, April 1, 1992.]

CLINTON ADVISERS:

- Clinton's chief pollster, Stanley Greenberg, wrote a book in 1980 that equated pre-1967 Israel with the apartheid policies of the South African government. The book, *Race and State in Capitalist Development*, concluded that "[l]abor zionism, which had advanced the *kibush haavoda*, the conquest of labor, in the Palestine period, now justified the development of a state structure that was fully identified with the dominant Jewish population and maintained the Israeli Arab population in a semi-proletarian and dependent status." (see Greenberg, Stanley, Race and State in Capitalist Development (1980) p.397-398.)
- Clinton's chief foreign policy adviser, Anthony Lake, is associated with the left-wing of Cyrus Vance's State Department under President Carter. During Vance's tenure, the State Department recommended that President Carter support a United Nations Security Council Resolution in 1980 that censured Israel for settlement activity (including Jerusalem) and called for the dismantling of existing settlements (UNSC Res. 465, March 1, 1980). The resolution described settlement activity as a "flagrant violation of international law and a serious obstruction to peace." (see Vance, Cyrus Hard Choices (1983) p.165).
- Anthony Lake served as Vance's Director of Policy and Planning and was described by Vance as someone "whom I relied heavily on a host of matters." Lake assisted Vance on issues that included the Middle East, and Vance concluded that no Middle East peace solution could be reached until "a just answer to the Palestinian question could be found, one almost certainly leading to a Palestinian homeland and some form of self-determination." (see Vance, Cyrus, Hard Choices (1983), p.164-165.)

Comparison of Middle East Planks in the
Republican and Democratic Party Platforms

SUMMARY

Republican Party Statements

Recognize Israeli sacrifice during the Persian Gulf War in terms of life and property.

Develop and enhance U.S.-Israel relations through political and economic cooperation, military prepositioning, and joint military exercises and contingency plans.

Continue to provide adequate levels of economic and security assistance (twice discussed).

Recognize Israel as an important ally in the Middle East as the only true democracy in the region, and her proven capability and reliability, as demonstrated in the Gulf War.

Limit the proliferation of non-conventional arms to the Middle East.

Recognize Israel's interpretation of UN Res. 242 and 338 that affirm Israel's right to exist in secure and recognized borders.

U.S. should not impose solution to Middle East peace process on Israel.

Oppose the creation of an independent Palestinian state, or any political entity that would jeopardize Israel's security.

Oppose any dialogue with PLO until it meets conditions stated by President Bush in 1990.

Commitment to withdraw from U.N., or withhold financial support, if the U.N. does not allow Israeli participation.

Democratic Party Statements

No statement.

No statement.

No statement.

Recognize long-standing relationship based on shared values, mutual commitment to democracy, and strategic alliance.

No statement.

No statement.

U.S. should act as an honest broker in Middle East peace process.

No statement.

No statement.

No statement.

Support an undivided Jerusalem with free access to all holy places by people of all faiths.

Affirmation of right of Jews to live anywhere in Jerusalem.

Support for Jewish emigration to Israel from any nation, recognizing the agreement for loan guarantees to Israel to provide humanitarian assistance to new immigrants.

Call for an end to the Arab boycott of Israel.

Call for a real peace in the Middle East that includes treaties, security, diplomatic relations, trade, investment, cultural exchange, and tourism through direct negotiations.

Support an undivided Jerusalem as capital of Israel with free access to holy places by people of all faiths.

No statement.

Promote humane treatment of the politically oppressed including the Soviet Jews seeking absorption in Israel.

No statement.

Call for direct negotiations to achieve peace.

Comparison of Middle East Planks in the
Republican and Democratic Party Platforms

<u>Issue</u>	<u>Republican Party Statement</u>	<u>Democratic Party Statement</u>
Recognition of Israeli sacrifice during the Persian Gulf War	"The strong ties between the U.S. and Israel were demonstrated during the Gulf War when Israel chose not to retaliate against repeated missile attacks, even though they caused severe damage and loss of life."	No statement.
Development and enhancement of strategic U.S.-Israel relationship	"We will continue to broaden and deepen the strategic relationship with our ally Israel . . . by taking . . . concrete steps to further institutionalize the partnership. This will include maintaining adequate levels of security and economic assistance; continuing our meetings on military, political and economic cooperation and coordination; repositioning military equipment; developing joint contingency plans; and increasing joint naval and air exercises."	No statement.
Maintaining Israel's qualitative military advantage	". . . the United States should continue to provide large-scale security assistance to Israel, maintaining Israel's qualitative military advantage over any adversary or coalition of adversaries."	No statement.
Support for foreign aid to Israel	"We will continue to broaden and deepen the strategic relationship with our ally Israel [by] maintaining adequate levels of security and economic assistance." In addition, "Consistent with our strategic relationship, the United States should continue to provide large-scale security assistance to Israel . . ."	No statement.
Israel as important ally in the region	"In this environment (post-Gulf War Middle East), Israel's demonstrated strategic importance to the United States, as our most reliable and capable ally in this part of the world, is more important than ever."	"The end of the Cold War does not alter America's deep interest in our long-standing special relationship with Israel, based on shared values, a mutual commitment to democracy, and a strategic alliance that benefits both nations."

Israel as only true democracy in region	"[O]ur ally Israel [is] the only true democracy in the Middle East."	No statement.
Limit arms proliferation in the Middle East	"We . . . will continue to negotiate with the major arms supplying nations to reach an agreement on limiting arms sales to the Middle East and preventing the proliferation of non-conventional weapons."	No statement.
Support for Israel on terms of U.N. Resolutions 242 and 338	"It will be up to the negotiators (in the peace process) to determine exactly what is required to satisfy these resolutions (242 and 338), but we firmly believe Israel has a right to exist in secure and recognized borders."	No statement.
No imposed solution on parties in peace process	"The United States is prepared to use its good offices to mediate disputes at their (the Middle East parties) request. We do not believe the U.S. should attempt to impose a solution on the parties."	"The United States has a responsibility to act as an honest broker in achieving Middle East peace."
Opposition to Palestinian state	"We oppose the creation of an independent Palestinian state. Nor will we support the creation of any political entity that would jeopardize Israel's security."	No statement.
Opposition to dialogue with the Palestine Liberation Organization (PLO)	"Israel should not be forced to negotiate with any party. In this regard, the United States will have no dialogue with the PLO until it satisfies in full the conditions laid out by President Bush in 1990."	No statement.
Support for Israel in the United Nations	"We continue to back legislation mandating that if the U.N. and its agencies were to deny Israel's right to participate, the United States would withhold financial support and withdraw from those bodies until their action was rectified."	No statement.
Affirmation of right of Jews to live anywhere in Jerusalem	"We believe Jerusalem should remain an undivided city, with free and unimpeded access to all holy places by people of all faiths. No genuine peace would deny Jews the right to live anywhere in the special city of Jerusalem."	"Jerusalem is the capital of the state of Israel and should remain an undivided city accessible to people of all faiths."

Support for Jewish emigration to Israel

"Republicans believe freedom of emigration is a fundamental human right and that Jews from any nation should be free to travel to Israel . . . We congratulate President Bush and Secretary Baker on the agreement with Israel for a generous package of loan guarantees that will provide new immigrants with needed humanitarian assistance."

"Promote the principle of humane treatment and sanctuary for politically oppressed people everywhere, be they . . . Soviet Jews seeking U.S. help in their successful absorption into Israeli society."

End Arab boycott of Israel

"We continue to support Egypt and other pro-Western states in the region against subversion and aggression and call for an end to the Arab boycott of Israel."

No statement.

Real peace in the Middle East

"Peace must come from direct negotiations . . . [O]ur objective is not simply to end the state of war; rather, it is to establish real peace, one with treaties, security, diplomatic relations, trade, investment, cultural exchange, even tourism. We want the Middle East to become a place where people lead normal lives."

"Direct negotiations between Israel, her Arab neighbors and Palestinians . . . are the only way to achieve enduring security for Israel and peace for all parties in the region."

Views and Perspectives of Hillary Clinton*

The following information on Hillary Clinton is compiled not because of *her* views in and of themselves, but because she has long been one of Governor Clinton's closest advisers in his capacities as Governor and candidate for President.

• Hillary Clinton served as chairman of the New World Foundation that makes contributions to causes ranging from multiculturalism to nuclear disarmament through the Marxist-oriented Institute for Policy Studies. Contributions during Mrs. Clinton's 1987-1988 tenure included the following:

- \$15,000 to Grassroots International, an organization that has made contributions itself to constituent-member groups of the PLO.
- \$5,000 to the CISPES Education Fund (Committee in Solidarity with the People of El Salvador), a United States support group for the communist rebels of El Salvador.
- \$35,000 to the Christic Institute, a leftist group which maintains that CIA drug dealers were responsible for both the Vietnam War and the Iran-contra affair.
- \$15,000 to the National Lawyers Guild, an organization founded in the 1930s as an adjunct to the American Communist Party.
- Center for Constitutional Rights, founded by radical lawyer William Kunstler.
- Coalition for a New Foreign Policy, the planners of a 1987 peace rally denounced by the AFL-CIO as a "classic front" for far left groups.

• In a 1982 article for the *Harvard Educational Review* (Vol. 43, page 4, 1974), Hillary Clinton wrote:

The basic rationale for depriving people of rights in a dependency relationship is that certain individuals are incapable or undeserving of the right to take care of themselves and consequently need social institutions specifically designed to safeguard their position. . . **Along with the family, past and present examples of such arrangements include marriage, slavery, and the Indian reservation system.**

* See article by Daniel Wattenberg in *American Spectator* (July 1992), or *Human Events*, July 4, 1992.; and see article by Evan Gahr in *Insight* magazine, or "Hillary's PLO Connection," *New York Post*, August 13, 1992.

NJC Bulletin

Acknowledgement of Need to Continue, Not Alter, Bush Policies

The National Jewish Coalition congratulates Bill Clinton on his recent victory. With victory, though, comes responsibility. These responsibilities include maintaining America's important role in international affairs.

On January 20, 1993, President-elect Bill Clinton will inherit the difficult tasks of keeping the Middle East peace talks on track, continuing to define and enhance U.S.-Israel relations in the post-Cold War era, and assisting the former Soviet Union and Eastern bloc nations in their transition to democracy and capitalism.

Yet after one year of getting to know Bill Clinton on the campaign trail, a campaign almost devoid of any debate on foreign policy, there is still much we do not know about him and how he will address international problems.

Throughout the long campaign season, Bill Clinton was reluctant to commit to maintaining current levels of economic and military assistance to Israel. Neither his Middle East position paper nor the Democratic Party platform mention the role of foreign aid at all, much less call for maintaining adequate funding levels. This level of aid is necessary for maintaining Israel's security against any coalition of adversaries in the region. In fact, during a CBS "This Morning" show in June, Clinton even went so far as to say that he would cut some foreign aid programs.

At other times during the campaign, Clinton exhibited a troubling lack of sophistication with regard to foreign affairs. For example, he quickly expressed support for the sale of F-15s to Saudi Arabia even before President Bush had concluded discussions with Israel on how to maintain Israel's security in light of such a sale. In addition, he also termed Jewish settlements in Israel as an "obstacle to peace," and said that Israel would "inevitably" be required to trade land for peace.

These statements must raise eyebrows in our community. How is Bill Clinton going to further develop U.S.-Israel relations in light of such words? Let's look at his foreign policy advisers. Since the election, Clinton has turned to both Warren Christopher and Anthony Lake. Both are associated with the Cyrus Vance-wing of the Carter Administration, whose policies caused great concern to the pro-Israel community during the late-1970s. The Vance State Department supported a U.N. resolution calling Israeli settlement activity a "flagrant violation of international law and a serious obstruction to peace." concluded that a Palestinian state was necessary for peace in the Middle East, and according to some published reports chronicling its Capitol Hill briefings, highly criticized Israel's defensive response to terrorist activity in Lebanon.

In the end, however, it is the fulfillment of promises that measures the success of a President, not his words. In that regard, Clinton can learn much from President Bush's achievements on issues of concern to the American Jewish community. President Bush promised to repeal the U.N. Zionism is racism resolution; and he did it. He promised to seek the right of emigration for Jews in the Soviet Union, Ethiopia, and Syria; and he did it. He promised to remove Israel from international isolationism; and he did it. He promised to bring the Arabs to the peace table without any conditions and on Israel's terms; and he did it. He promised to strengthen Israel's security and develop U.S.-Israel military cooperation; and he did it.

Bill Clinton may believe that he was elected on a mandate for change. But not everything must change. Even Clinton, in his efforts to fulfill his own promises, recognizes that the Bush Administration's foreign policy in the Middle East and elsewhere is the best approach and does not require any alteration. Recent articles note that Bill Clinton is considering James Baker as a special envoy to the Middle East. In addition, Clinton is considering President Bush as a special adviser for matters involving the former Soviet Union.

The fact that Clinton is seriously considering such critical roles for Secretary Baker and President Bush is a testament to their success while in office. Despite the 68-85% of American Jews who voted against President Bush, there are strong parallels between the agendas of the Clinton and Bush Administrations. A prominent leader of an American Jewish organization concluded on a recent visit to Israel that "on substantive issues, such as the peace process and foreign policy, there will be total continuity between the two administrations" and no differences on "critical questions."

We hope, of course, that Bill Clinton follows his instincts and seeks the advice of both James Baker and President Bush to insure steady progress in America's global role. Change just for the sake of change does not benefit the country. Clinton must fulfill his own promises to keep the Middle East peace talks on track, further the development of U.S.-Israel relations, and assist in the stable transition of the former communist countries to democracy. These policies require a consistent approach. Clinton must respect the success of President Bush on these policies and not jeopardize U.S. foreign policy by relying on his own inexperience and the unsuccessful policies of past Democratic administrations.

Los Angeles Times September 24, 1992

PERSPECTIVE ON POLITICS

Jews Have the GOP All Wrong



American Jews can vote Republican with confidence that no one could have done better on Middle East issues.

By ABRAHAM D. SOFAER

American Jews have never accepted the Republican Party. Even after the Reagan/Shultz team had proved its bona fide support for Israel, only 30% of Jewish voters supported the Republican ticket in the 1984 election. Support for George Bush was lower in 1988 (25%), and some polls have indicated an even smaller percentage of Jewish voters prefer Bush over Clinton. In a political system in which presidential elections are usually determined by less than 5%, this disparity of support is astonishing.

Jewish voters, like other Americans, vote on the full range of issues, not just Israel. But the security of Israel is a major issue to most of American Jewry, and the relatively low level of support for President Bush stems in part from a seriously distorted view among Jewish-American voters of the Republican record on Israel. By every objective standard, the Bush/Baker team has done exceptionally well.

— *Economic assistance.* The Bush Administration increased economic assistance for Israel to the highest level ever (\$1.2 billion in grants), provided \$400 million in loan guarantees in 1990 and now will make available \$10 billion more. Following the Gulf War, Israel received emergency assistance of \$650 million.

— *Political support.* The Bush Administration undertook in 1988 to reverse the U.N. resolution that Zionism equals racism. Secretary of State James A. Baker III succeeded in achieving what for years U.N. and U.S. diplomats claimed was politically and legally "impossible." Baker also held firm to commitments to oppose the creation of a Palestinian state, and to terminate the dialogue with the Palestine Liberation Organization if it resumed support for terrorist acts against Israel. His insist-

ence that any state wanting a role in the peace process must establish full, diplomatic relations with Israel is helping to overcome the last vestiges of Israel's political isolation.

— *Military assistance.* The Bush Administration continued \$1.8 billion of all-grant military support for Israel, with important modifications,

including early disbursement (worth \$90 million per year) and the allowance of \$475 million per year in purchases from Israeli companies. The United States has financed two-thirds of the Arrow anti-missile program (\$188 million) so critical to Israel's security. Joint exercises continue, and this Administration has created a \$100-million stockpile of arms in Israel for use by either country.

— *Israel's security.* The Gulf War contributed enormously to regional security and led to the destruction of Iraq's capacity to harm Israel for many years to come. Even though the use of force against Iraq was both legally and morally beyond doubt, most Democrats and virtually all Jewish Democrats in Congress voted against authorizing the President to act. This anti-war Jewish contingent would have had enormous influence on a Democratic President, and would have provided such a President political protection from criticism by Israel's supporters. Had the Democrats succeeded in preventing war against Iraq, the consequences for Israel could have been catastrophic.

— *Saving Jews.* The Bush Administration helped save hundreds of thousands of Soviet Jews, and are continuing that process. Bush also personally worked to save thousands of Ethiopian Jews, both as vice president and President.

— *The peace process.* The Bush/Baker team succeeded in bringing most of Israel's enemies to the peace table without any compromise of its security. Many Jewish leaders and commentators attacked the Administration and predicted that it would never succeed in moving the peace process forward. Much remains to be done, which is why it is so important that the same leadership be continued.

Instead of focusing on this record of

support for Israel's well-being, critics refer repeatedly to those few instances where the record could have been even stronger. The President admitted he was wrong to suggest that Israel's supporters are too powerful. Supporters of Israel are entitled like other Americans to work for what they believe is right. Furthermore, U.S. support for unbalanced resolutions against Israel in the U.N. Security Council is unfair.

But these shortcomings cannot justify disregarding how much was done. Furthermore, one cannot reasonably assume that the Democrats could have matched this Republican record. Have Democrats said fewer nasty things than Republicans about Israel or American Jewry? Was the Carter/McHenry team any more balanced in the Security Council? Should we expect more from Clinton? As for Iraq, the Democrats would have done less than President Bush to stop Saddam Hussein, not more. Unquestionably, the Bush/Baker style differs from that of Reagan/Shultz; but the results of their efforts are at least equally deserving of support.

How could this record then evoke so negative a reaction from so many Jewish Americans? Max Fisher says that American Jews—normally serious people—are irrational when it comes to politics. They welcome promises of more spending, though they know that more spending will be socially irresponsible. They want to be uplifted with rhetoric, when they know Americans need to be brought down to earth. The source of these attitudes is a complex story, reflecting our compassion based on long periods of suffering and injustice. But we do our country, ourselves and Israel a great disservice by such indulgence.

It is time to evaluate that record fairly, and to vote with the clear realization that each of us is responsible for the consequences of his or her vote. And in terms of Israel's interests, a vote for Bush ensures continuity of the peace process and of the close and constructive relationship between him and Prime Minister Yitzhak Rabin.

Abraham D. Sofaer, an adjunct professor at the Hoover Institution, served as legal adviser to the State Department from 1985 to 1990.

FORWARD

May 8, 1992

Letters to the Editor

'Clinton Adviser Hostile to Israel'

In reference to David Twersky's fine article regarding Bill Clinton's foreign policy team (Forward, April 17): Mr. Clinton has made generally nice noises about Israel. He has lambasted the Bush administration for facilitating the growth of "overt anti-Semitism." It is unlikely — indeed, hard to imagine — that a Clinton White House could ever prove more hostile toward Israel's elected government than the Bush administration (particularly Secretary of State Baker) has proven.

But a Clinton White House would likely include at least one key adviser with views that American supporters of Israel might not cheer. When I was a law student at Yale University in the '80s, I met Stanley Greenberg, now top pollster and key brain-trust member in the Clinton organization. Mr. Greenberg was then affiliated with the Southern African Research Program at Yale and at Wesleyan University, teaching courses that included "Marxian Political Economy and the Social Sciences," "Politics of Divided Societies," and "Race and Ethnic Conflict in Southern Africa." In a conversation with me at a reception in the Connecticut home of Senator Dodd, Mr. Greenberg expressed a profound distaste for, if not hostility to, Israel.

At the time, I was surprised, given Mr. Greenberg's marriage to Rosa DeLauro, then the top staffer for the pro-Israel Senator Dodd and now a representative with strong support in New Haven's Jewish community. But Mr. Greenberg's animus for Israel was already firmly rooted in his scholarship, particularly in his 1980 opus, "Race and State in Capitalist Development," a 410-page tome (excluding appendices) that examines "the impact of capitalist development on patterns of racial and ethnic domination" in four settings: Alabama, South Africa, Israel and Northern Ireland.

"Race and State" begins with an introductory chapter entitled "The Racial Orders," in which Mr. Greenberg characterizes Israel as a "settler regime ... established, if not as direct agent of European colonial expansion, then at least as part of a more general expansion of world markets and intrusion on peasant societies."

A chapter entitled "The Histadrut: Bounded Working Class and the Jewish Ascendancy" con-

*Mr. Greenberg
characterizes
Israel as a
'settler regime.'*

cludes that "the conquest of labor" in the Palestine context ... included barring the way to Arab laborers who were being dislodged from pre-capitalist relations. ... The Histadrut chose not to organize across the boundaries of the working class but to erect barriers to Arab penetration of the Jewish sector."

In a concluding chapter entitled "Capitalist Growth and Persistent Racial Domination," Mr. Greenberg asserts that Israel's "pattern of mixed capitalist and collective economic development, under the ascendancy of the Jewish labor movement, brought the intensification of discrimination against the Arab population." That "pattern," Mr. Greenberg continues, has now become "state discrimination on a large scale" and has "maintained the Israeli Arab population in a semiproletarian and dependent status." Presumably the status of Arab "peasants" and "proletarians" in the surrounding Arab regimes (which consistently elude Mr. Greenberg's

interest) is immeasurably superior.

To Mr. Greenberg, South Africa (at least the South Africa of 1980) and Israel are peas in a pod. He concludes his opus with the hope that outside pressures will blow the nasty capitalist houses down:

External factors — the international community, the national state, credit markets, diffuse labor markets, and liberal ideology — all contributed to the undermining of racial domination in Alabama and the Protestant ascendancy on Northern Ireland. These same forces on a wider scale, while not yet decisive in South Africa and Israel, exacerbated the internal contradictions, encouraging subordinate resistance and encouraging some class actors to seek out alternative ways of organizing society. *Over some indefinite period, the external factors could shift the balance against the current European and Jewish regimes.* [Emphasis added]

Well, Stan, one apartheid regime down and one to go.

I would be surprised if Mr. Greenberg adheres today to his Marxist reductionism of his academic past. At the least, his involvement in the electoral fray in our country appears to indicate a realization that reform of at least *this* "capitalist regime" is at best approached from inside the regime rather than from outside it. Moreover, it is hard to discern the relative weight that Mr. Greenberg's views would be accorded in the making of Middle East policy in a Clinton White House.

Still, as Chaucer wrote, "What's seyd is seyd, and forth it gooth." Mr. Greenberg has had something to say about Israel in the past, and those concerned about that country's relationship with the United States ought to know about.

*David Wecht
Washington, D.C.*

NEW YORK POST

Founded by Alexander Hamilton in 1801

PETER S. KALIKOW
Publisher

LOU COLASUONNO
Editor

ERIC BREINDEL
Editorial Page Editor

JAMES C. LYNCH
Managing Editor

STEVE CUOZZO
Managing Editor

RICHARD GOODING
Metropolitan Editor

America's oldest continuously published daily newspaper

8-1392

Hillary's PLO connection

Even when Hillary Clinton adopts a homemaker pose — as she did with her cookie recipes during the Democratic National Convention — she makes news. But the concerns that many have with Bill Clinton's "Hillary problem" have nothing to do with unease about Hillary's professional accomplishments or her outspokenness.

The doubts that many — particularly Reagan Democrats — have about Hillary Rodham Clinton turn on her ties to the radical left.

We have noted previously that when Hillary was a director and chairman of the board of directors of the New World Foundation (in 1987 and 1988), this ultra-left foundation gave grants to a number of extremist organizations, including the Committee in Solidarity with the People of El Salvador (CISPES) — a group with ties to the Communist Party USA and El Salvador's Marxist guerrillas.

Now Evan Gahr of Insight magazine reports that while Hillary Clinton was chairing the New World Foundation, a \$15,000 grant was awarded to a group called Grassroots International, which has direct ties to the PLO — one of the world's foremost terror organizations.

According to the report, Grassroots International funneled the money to the Union of Palestinian Working Women's Committees and to the Union of Palestinian Medical Relief Committees, both based on the West Bank. The executive director of Grassroots acknowledges "it's safe to say" that these organizations are constituent-members of the PLO.

Money is fungible. Money that goes to PLO "Medical Relief Committees" — even if it reaches its intended destination — simply enables the PLO to spend other funds on terror.

Hillary Clinton's press secretary has said that Hillary did not vote on the grant to the two PLO groups. We doubt that such an explanation would be accepted from any other chairman of a foundation, let alone a small outfit directed by a handful of dedicated radicals.

It's worth noting that New World's grant to the PLO front groups was dispensed before Yasser Arafat "renounced" terrorism. Thus, it isn't even possible to claim that Hillary's founda-

tion decided to reward the PLO for adopting an ostensibly more moderate line, or that Hillary *et al.* were taken in by Arafat's posturing as a moderate.

The plain fact is that Hillary Clinton is comfortable in this radical-left political universe: giving grants to PLO front groups; giving grants to outfits like CISPES; giving grants to the National Lawyers Guild, long the legal arm of the American Communist Party, not to speak of a number of like-minded organizations.

Ms. Rodham Clinton's devotion to the hard left is her business. But since she's been billed as a key factor in the Clinton campaign — an important policy adviser to the Democratic nominee — her views are altogether relevant to would-be Clinton supporters. If Gov. Clinton were to be elected, Hillary Rodham Clinton would be an important force in American life.

Thus, Jews and other friends of Israel have particular reason to wonder what's going on here. Clinton and his running mate, Sen. Albert Gore, represent themselves as staunchly pro-Israel. Do they disagree with Hillary? Has she changed her views?

Let's have some answers.

There are, of course, other American politicians whose wives travel in non-mainstream political circles. But Bill and Hillary Clinton have made it clear from the outset that they are engaged in a joint political enterprise. ("Vote for him and get me free.")

Hillary has already played a significant role in making political appointments in Arkansas, where her husband is governor. Her future importance — should Bill Clinton win the presidency — can't seriously be questioned. Clinton's alleged centrism has a great deal to do with the commanding leads he now enjoys in the polls.

But because Hillary would not be an ordinary First Lady, Americans are entitled to a full explanation of her political views — on issues ranging from the notion that the traditional family "is a form of slavery" to her apparent sympathy for Palestinian cause. Hillary's role in directing money to groups linked to the PLO raises questions that can't be answered by another chocolate chip cookie "bake-off."

Countries that have Established Full Diplomatic Ties
with Israel Since 1989

• Albania	8/19/91
• Angola	4/16/92
• Armenia	4/22/92
• Azerbaijan	4/6/92
• Belarus	5/26/92
• Benin	7/23/92
• Bulgaria	5/3/90
• Central African Republic	1/16/89
• China	1/24/92
• Congo	7/15/91
• Czechoslovakia	2/19/90
• Estonia	1/8/92
• Ethiopia	1/22/91
• Georgia	5/92
• Greece	5/22/90
• Hungary	9/18/89
• India	1/29/92
• Kazakhstan	4/10/92
• Kyrgyzistan	3/4/92
• Latvia	1/6/92
• Lithuania	1/6/92
• Mongolia	10/3/91
• Nigeria	5/4/92
• Poland	2/27/90
• Russia	10/18/91
• Sierre Leone	5/27/92
• Slovenia	4/28/92
• Tajikistan	4/13/92
• Turkey	1/19/91
• Ukraine	12/26/91
• Uzbekistan	2/22/92
• Yugoslavia	10/8/91
• Zambia	12/26/91



NATIONAL
JEWISH
COALITION

FOR IMMEDIATE RELEASE
Contact: Gary Hiller
(202) 547-7701

December 23, 1992, . . . Washington, DC. . . The National Jewish Coalition (NJC) expressed "concern" today over Bill Clinton's nomination of Warren Christopher as Secretary of State and Anthony Lake as National Security Advisor. Both Christopher, who was Deputy Secretary of State during the Carter Administration, and Lake, who was Director of Policy Planning in the Cyrus Vance State Department, were closely associated with policies which proved to be damaging to the U.S.-Israel relationship.

As senior Administration officials under President Jimmy Carter, Christopher and Lake were integrally involved in formulating and implementing a U.S. Middle East policy which sought to return Israel to its pre-1967 borders, create an independent Palestinian homeland, and overlook acts of PLO terrorism. The State Department in which they held senior positions was also the first to term Israeli settlement activity as "illegal" - a classification subsequently dropped by the Reagan and Bush Administrations.

Christopher, specifically, was a principle architect of the Carter Administration's unprecedented strategy, unveiled in 1978, to condition defensive arms sales to Israel to arms sales to Arab states. According to former National Security Advisor Zbigniew Brzezinski, this policy was "designed to paralyze the powerful Israeli lobby on the Hill." On a number of occasions, Christopher has articulated an aversion to the use of force under most circumstances and reportedly was opposed to expressing concern over the Soviet invasion of Afghanistan out of fear of provoking the Soviets. In addition, he was highly critical of Israel's responses to threatening military activities by PLO terrorists based in southern Lebanon.

"Clinton should try to build upon the many foreign policy successes of President Bush and President Reagan. We hope that these nominations are not a signal that President-elect Clinton seeks to adopt the failed policies of the Carter State Department," the NJC said.

"Clinton's nomination of Warren Christopher and Anthony Lake are the latest in a series of appointments that gives American Jews and the pro-Israel community some cause for concern. In addition to his selections for Secretary of State and National Security Advisor, President-elect Clinton has named other individuals to important positions that are troublesome," the NJC added.

- Johnetta Cole, who was appointed coordinator of the transition team dealing with educational, humanities and labor issues, has served in leadership positions of radical leftist, pro-Soviet, pro-PLO, and anti-Israel organizations. She has also been involved in an organization which supports Cuban dictator Fidel Castro, and has been a vocal, ardent supporter of Communist leaders in the U.S.
- Donna Shalala, who was nominated to be Secretary of Health and Human Services, conceived and implemented a radical quota program and has been at the forefront in advocating a radical notion of "political correctness" and "proper speech" as chancellor of the University of Wisconsin at Madison. She also advocated a campus appearance by Minister Louis Farrakhan of the Nation of Islam - an appearance which led to an outbreak of anti-semitic incidents.

"We hope that all of these appointment do not reflect potential policies by a Clinton Administration that may be harmful to the American Jewish community and the State of Israel," the NJC concluded.

#

The National Jewish Coalition was founded in 1985 to enhance ties between the American Jewish community and Republican officials and decision makers.

JEWISH VOTE IN PRESIDENTIAL ELECTIONS
(New York Times/CBS News Polls)

1976

Ford	34%
Carter	64%

1980

Reagan	39%
Carter	45%
Anderson	15%

1984

Reagan	31%
Mondale	67%

1988

Bush	35%
Dukakis	64%

1992

Bush	12%
Clinton	78%
Perot	10%

March 10, 1993

Senator --

In case the subject of aid to Israel comes up at your 2 p.m. meeting with the national Jewish Coalition today:

The AIPAC people told me they are almost totally occupied with keeping aid to Israel at the \$3 billion level this year.

Congressman Obey's remarks in the NY Times (attached) recall your ideas of three years ago. Senator Leahy's proposal to raise aid to the former USSR to \$1 billion -- \$300 million more than the Administration proposed -- set off more speculation that the money would have to come from the Israel/Egypt accounts although Leahy did not say so specifically.

The Israelis will argue that most of the aid goes back to the US to repay loans or buy equipment but that could be done with the money if we gave it to a lot of countries.

The bottom line is that within a shrinking aid budget, Israel keeps getting the lion's share, gets as much as \$2 billion more in other benefits and has the \$10 billion in loan guarantees for housing which are just about to kick in. On the other side we have only a fraction of that to foster a historic change in the former USSR and continuing needs in Africa, Latin America and Asia.

It would be better for both the US and Israel if we worked out some more non-cash ways of aiding Israel -- beginning with more economic reform on their part -- and on to things like technical assistance in water resource management that Foreign Minister Peres mentioned, basing for US military units and some new trade and investment programs beyond the US-Israel Free Trade Agreement.

John Z.

Clinton Challenged on Share of U.S.

Aid Going to Israel and Egypt

By ELAINE SCIOLINO

Special to The New York Times

WASHINGTON, March 8 — The Clinton Administration was forced by an influential Democrat in Congress today to confront the delicate subject of whether the United States can afford to pour billions of dollars into Israel and Egypt in light of a shrinking foreign aid budget and President Clinton's determination to resuscitate the American economy.

The Administration immediately said it was committed to continuing the aid, but the mere fact that Representative David Obey, the Wisconsin Democrat, was raising the issue meant that a sacrosanct item in next year's budget, which is just beginning to be debated by Congress, could be in for new scrutiny.

"There are also tremendous pressures on us, given the demands of our domestic economy," said Mr. Obey, who has long taken a very hard line on foreign aid spending, during a hearing of the foreign operations subcommittee of the House Appropriations Committee. "There'll be tremendous pressures on the budget because of escalating needs with respect to assistance to the Soviet Union."

"I think that demonstrates that we cannot forever assume that we're going to be providing this high percentage of this bill to the Middle Eastern region. I think we have a right to expect over time to see that decline."

Pressure From Constituents

Pressure is coming from the voters back home, added Mr. Obey, who heads the subcommittee, to change the practice. "People routinely call my office and say, well, with the budget squeeze, can we expect that Israel and Egypt are going to be taking a part of that cut?"

Of the \$13.9 billion foreign aid budget for 1993, \$5.1 billion — or 36 percent — will be sent to Israel and Egypt. By contrast, total aid to Russia for the last two years was a total of \$650 million. Adding strain to next year's budget is the fact that Mr. Clinton has called for an additional \$300 million in additional aid for Russia, but that money must be taken away from other countries.

Mr. Obey's remarks were reminiscent of an article on the Op-Ed page of The New York Times three years ago by Senator Bob Dole, the Kansas Republican, who said that the United States was going to have to spend a lot more money in eastern Europe and that at least some of the money would have to come from long-term aid recipients like Israel and Egypt, among others.

Dole Rebuked on Issue

His remarks elicited a rebuke from Senate Republicans, who asserted that he created a false impression that American support for Israel was waning.

The new Administration has sig-

naled its unflinching support both for Israel and for the Middle East peace negotiations, and even a debate on the issue of an aid reduction would be read in Jerusalem as an effort to undermine the Government of Prime Minister Yitzhak Rabin, which took office last year.

In the hearing today, Edward P. Djerejian, Assistant Secretary of State for Near Eastern and South Asian Affairs, was just as blunt as Mr. Obey in saying the new Administration had no intention of reducing aid to either country.

"Both President Clinton and Secretary Christopher have gone on record regarding the importance of continuing the aid to Israel and Egypt at the current levels," Mr. Djerejian said,

referring to Secretary of State Warren Christopher. "We remain steadfast in our commitment to direct substantial foreign aid resources to the security of Israel, to support for Egypt's vital role in the stability and security of the region, and to promotion of comprehensive and lasting peace in the Middle East."

Arms Purchases Criticized

Mr. Obey criticized the practice by which Egypt, and to a lesser extent Israel, buy vast amounts of military equipment from the United States under the assumption that there will be continuing American aid to pay for it over the years.

"It is, in fact, going to be virtually impossible for this committee to consider reductions in aid to that region

over the next decade if those military contracts continue to be signed because of the principle of so-called cash flow financing," said Mr. Obey, who called on the new Administration to abandon the practice.

He also criticized both Egypt, and Israel to a lesser extent, for failing to institute the changes necessary to make their economies more healthy. "For a number of years, people have looked at the Egyptian program as being a black hole, and I think there is more than a little concern about the ability of the Israeli Government to get its own economic house in order."

'Moving Up the Pace'

Mr. Djerejian gave a spirited defense of both countries' attempts at economic liberalization. But he ac-

knowledged, "There's a serious question of moving up the pace of economic reforms in Israel, and we will be engaged on this very actively."

As for Egypt, Mr. Djerejian conceded, "The Egyptian economy remains dominated by large, inefficient public sector monopolies, the activities of private businessmen remain heavily restricted, and the regulatory environment remains extremely uncertain."

On another foreign aid issue, Mr. Djerejian said that the Clinton Administration hopes to give Jordan \$50 million in security aid that has been withheld by Congress because of Jordanian support for President Saddam Hussein of Iraq after his 1990 invasion of Kuwait.

Sanctions Against Iraq

Mr. Djerejian said that he will recommend shortly to Mr. Christopher that he release the funds, in part to support Jordan's helpful role in the

Middle East peace negotiations. He also said that in recent months Jordan has tightened sanctions against Iraq.

During and after the Persian Gulf crisis, Jordanian officials, including King Hussein, repeatedly said the kingdom was doing all it could to enforce the sanctions. But American intelligence reports indicated that there were substantial violations of the sanctions and little policing of the border with Iraq, a situation that worsened relations between the two countries.

The decision to send the aid does not need to be approved by Congress, although there remains considerable resistance to it on Capitol Hill and it is unlikely the Administration will move on the matter without considerable consultation with Congress. Last September, the Bush Administration, after consultations with Congress, dispensed \$55 million in security and economic aid to Jordan that had not gone forward in 1991.

People around the table

TOP
Leadership
(to recognize)

- Max Fisher - Honorary Chairman (MI)
- Cheryl Halpern - just elected as National Chairman (NJ)
- George Klein - outgoing National Chairman - now Honorary Chairman (NY)
- Dick Fox - Honorary Chairman (PA)
- Ambassador Joe Goldenhorn - new Honorary Chairman (DC)

- Herb Linsenberg
- Liz Dubin
- Stuart Bernstein
- Albert Small
- Mel Dubinsky
- Eric Javitz
- Jonathan Kaabe
- Chris Gersten
- Jim Nuzzo
- Michael Stein
- Paul Borman
- Arnold Thaler
- Rabbi Drosner
- Simcha Lyons
- Mark Isaacson
- Marshall Breger
- William Kilberg
- Herbert Ascherman
- Jeff Altman