

---

# FORCE MULTIPLIERS

## THE INSTRUMENTALITIES OF IMPERIALISM

---

The New Imperialism, Volume 5

Edited by  
Maximilian C. Forte



Montréal, Québec, Canada

2015

## Library and Archives Canada Cataloguing in Publication

Force multipliers : the instrumentalities of imperialism / edited by  
Maximilian C. Forte.

(The new imperialism ; volume 5)

Includes bibliographical references and index.

Issued in print and electronic formats.

ISBN 978-0-9868021-7-1 (bound).-ISBN 978-0-9868021-6-4 (paperback).--

ISBN 978-0-9868021-8-8 (pdf)

1. Imperialism. 2. United States--Foreign relations. 3. United States--Military  
policy. 4. World politics--1989-. 5. International relations. 6. Instrumentalism (Phi-  
losophy). I. Forte, Maximilian C., 1967-, editor II. Series: New imperialism (Mon-  
tréal, Québec) ; v. 5

JC359.F67 2015

325'.32

C2015-906336-1

C2015-906337-X

Cover design: Maximilian C. Forte

© 2015 Alert Press

1455 de Maisonneuve Blvd., W.,  
Montreal, Quebec, Canada, H3G-1M8  
[www.alertpress.net](http://www.alertpress.net)

Some rights reserved.

Electronic copies of this work may be freely circulated without the permission of  
the publisher, but without altering any of the contents. Any number of chapters  
may be freely printed or photocopied, or provided as free digital copies, for use in  
a course in an educational institution. This book may not be republished and/or  
resold, in any format.

Printed in Canada

## Chapter 1

# PROTÉGÉ OF AN EMPIRE: INFLUENCE AND EXCHANGE BETWEEN US AND ISRAELI IMPERIALISM

*John Talbot*

**T**he relationship between the foreign policies of Israel and the US is one which is entrenched in the international political system, and has been for quite some time. This relationship is significant in terms of public policy development, as an alliance on the global stage, and it exercises a significant presence in media and public forums. However, it is not simply the relationship that creates action and international policies—there are more than just US intentions at work regarding this connection. Within the US there exists a significant interest group promoting ardent support for Israel and its actions. This interest group is much more than one all-encompassing body and contains many different components. While I specifically studied organizations such as the American Israel Public Affairs Committee (AIPAC; see Figure 1.1), I will make a slight generalization in referring to the overarching pro-Israel body as “the lobby”. The influence, and generally grandiose presence, of the Israel lobby is remarkable in comparison to the actual population of Jewish individuals in the US. However, it is important not to overestimate the influence and power of lobbying groups or to assume that all Jewish individuals necessarily support them. Nevertheless, the effectiveness of the lobby is substantial concerning the type of knowledge communicated regarding Israel, the public pressure to support Israel’s actions, and the lobby’s overall influence on policy making. The point of this is to use the work of the lobby as a point of entry into a larger discussion of the nature of the US-Israeli relationship around the ques-

tions of power differentials between the two, and the extent of the two nations' degree of mutual interdependence.

Figure 1.1: John Kerry Meets with AIPAC



U.S. Secretary of State John Kerry meets with leaders of the American Israel Public Affairs Committee (AIPAC) Conference at the Washington Convention Center in Washington, D.C., on March 3, 2014. (Photo: US Department of State)

Israel, like the US, is heavily militarized and seeks to expand its influence over other territories. Outlining the influence of Israel on the US, and the influence on and strategic interest of the US in Israel, is critical to understanding the US-Israeli relationship. I will also outline the significance of the Israel lobby today and how its influence has changed over time. In particular, this chapter will critically explore the question of what the US-Israeli relationship means for empire-building. Rather than either a mere pawn of the US, or a powerful force determining US foreign policy, I argue that Israel should be seen as an imperial protégé. As the reader already knows, a protégé is one who is protected by another, that is, under the supervisory care and patronage of another. While it admits an overarching power differential between patron and protégé, it does not necessarily imply servitude on the part of the protégé, and obviously not a commanding influence.

## Questions of Interest

If the US is defined as an imperialist nation, and one engaged in empire building, then we must consider what exactly the US gains from its support for Israel. When studying empire and imperialism from an anthropological perspective, it becomes important to highlight not only the explicit understandings of what is going on, but also the tacit happenstances which shape and influence the scenario at hand. An explicit example of imperial practice is the amount of military aid Israel receives each year from the US. Israel, according to a report from the Congressional Research Service, is “the largest cumulative recipient of US foreign assistance since World War II,” and to date the US has provided Israel with \$124.3 billion in bilateral assistance (in current, non-inflation-adjusted dollars) (Sharpe, 2015, p. 2; also, see Figure 1.2). In 2007, the US and the Israeli government agreed to a \$30 billion military aid package covering the years of 2009 to 2018 (Sharpe, 2015, p. 4). This military aid could be seen as the outstretched hand of US empire holding onto a strategic position in the Middle East; the desire for US funding could also lead to an increase in US political influence over Israel. Here the “special” aspect of the relationship is highlighted as “Israel is the only recipient [of foreign military aid] that does not have to account for how the aid is spent, an exemption that makes it virtually impossible to prevent the money from being used for purposes the United States opposes” (Mearsheimer & Walt, 2006, p. 2). Does the US actually have a relationship of political control over Israel? If not, why would the US set aside its own interests and preferences in order to advance and financially support the interests of another state, as Mearsheimer and Walt argue (2006, p. 1)? Attempts to answer these questions often lead towards explanations of shared strategic interests or compelling moral imperatives, however, as this chapter argues, there is a deeper explanation that is not readily visible.

Figure 1.2: A US-Israeli Air Force



A US-made F-15E Strike Eagle, part of the Israeli Air Force's Squadron 115, takes part in "Blue Flag 2013," a multinational aerial combat exercise with participation of the air forces of the US, Israel, Italy, and Greece, held at the Ovda air base in southern Israel. US Ambassador Dan Shapiro was the guest of the Israeli Air Force, and he met the US personnel who are charged with operating and maintaining the airplanes. At the military exercise he commented, "It's a powerful symbol of the partnership between the United States and Israel when our pilots and Israeli pilots are flying together". (Photo: US Embassy, Tel Aviv)

In supporting Israel, the US is essentially supporting a state which sometimes directly defies it. Israel spies on the US, engages in racist and imperialist practices towards the states around it (sometimes in stark contrast with publicly stated principles of the US), and furthermore Israel does not adhere to the US ideal of a liberal democracy—a democracy where all people are purported to have equal rights (Mearsheimer & Walt, 2006, p. 9). These issues challenge the notion that the US-Israeli relationship is simply an imperialist or strategically-motivated one. The "force multiplier" concept discussed in the Introduction to this volume is put to the test by the US relationship with Israel. There is the question of how the US aiding Israel in warfare and occupation benefits the US, aside from providing a market for US military corporations. Another question concerns the assumption that the Israel lobby is completely steering things such as US intervention in Iraq. An additional question involves the potential of overestimating the influence of the lobby, while obscuring the fact that the US could be acting of its own accord to serve its own interests. "American Exceptionalism" and the supposed "moral duty" of the US to bring "rights" to the world is something the lobby can capitalize on, not something that it created. Further, "in late 2013 and early 2014,

AIPAC suffered a series of high-profile defeats that led some observers to question whether the group would retain its influence in coming years” (Right Web, 2014).

In this chapter I thus explore the potential that the US is not simply engaging in an imperial practice with Israel but instead financing a protégé—whether it is active on the US’ behalf or not. Israel is a protégé in the practice of colonization, militarization, nationalism, and acts of imperialism. I also explore the metaphor of Israel being a “little brother” figure to the US—by this I mean it is mimicking and acting as the US itself does.

It is important to recognize that being critical of the Israel lobby and the Israeli government neither directly nor indirectly entails anti-Jewish sentiments. To be anti-Israel or anti-Zionist is not the same thing as being anti-Semitic. The public body of Israel and Jewish individuals are not always a reflection of the political elites representing them on the global stage. While an argument could be made that Israel, the Israeli lobby in the US, and the US’ interests are the same, this argument would need to be further qualified: the institutionalized leadership of the lobby has driven pro-Israel politics to a point where they have become antithetical to what is good for both Israel and the US (Meerman, 2007). This is not a discussion about Jewish individuals, but rather it concerns the corporate, governmental, and institutional actors steering the US-Israeli relationship.

## The Tail Wagging the Dog?

“Why has the United States been willing to set aside its own security in order to advance the interests of another state” (Mearsheimer & Walt, 2006, p. 1)? Why would US foreign policy shape itself to benefit another state over the interests of average US citizens? Answers to these basic questions are often generalized and rhetoricized with arguments of shared strategic interests and/or compelling moral imperatives. However, this is not an answer; here we are examining the significant influence of the Israel lobby as one manifestation of the US-Israeli relationship.

The US has made it completely clear that it is an ardent supporter of Israel on the global stage and this stance has arguably been more problematic than beneficial. Since the US is a permanent member of the UN, it has the power to veto resolutions which go against Israel’s interests—resolutions that might have otherwise passed with a majority (Meerman, 2007). The US exists

as a diplomatic ally which will use its power on the international stage to put an end to anything that may challenge Israel's actions. However, the lobby recognizes that influence comes from more than just the policy-makers and thus they, with their allies, also influence and station allies in the media and universities. Pastor John Hagee from Christians United for Israel in *The Israel Lobby* documentary states, "we have millions of people in the infrastructure...we have the major radio, television ministries in America supporting what we're doing" (Meerman, 2007). When faced with unfavourable reporting on Israel the "Lobby organizes letter writing campaigns, demonstrations, and boycotts against news outlets" (Mearsheimer & Walt, 2006, p. 21). There are people on university campuses in the US (and Canada) who are stationed to protect the interests of Israel (Meerman, 2007). At Concordia University in Montreal, organizations such as the Committee for Accuracy in Middle East Reporting in America (CAMERA), Hillel, and Israel on Campus are clearly in line with the lobby's vision. Indeed, the only ethnic community to be represented on Concordia's Board of Governors (which is supposed to be "representative of the wider community"), appears in the form of the Executive Director of Hillel Montreal.<sup>1</sup> The lobby uses this presence to shut down opponents and to completely halt discussion. Those who do speak out are met with such force that it creates a deterrent, stopping other people from criticizing anything pro-Israel (Meerman, 2007). If the goal is to "prevent critical commentary about Israel from getting a fair hearing in the political arena," then it is arguably true that they have achieved this in some sense (Mearsheimer & Walt, 2006, p. 16). The lobby's influence over the media and academia allows for a monopolization of the discourse surrounding Israel's actions.

"The mission of AIPAC is to strengthen, protect and promote the U.S.-Israel relationship in ways that enhance the security of Israel and the United States" (AIPAC, 2014), clearly the rhetoric of security is not something used only for US motives. The lobby capitalizes on this discourse, assuming US support for Israel is a given. With the "War on Terror" after 9/11, US support for Israel has used as justification the claim that "both states are threatened by terrorist groups originating in the Arab or Muslim world". (Mearsheimer & Walt, 2006, p. 4)

The idea of stopping "rogue states" is one of the notorious publicly-stated aims of US neoconservatives (Mearsheimer & Walt, 2006, p. 4). Such rhetoric not only more easily generated support for Israel's actions, but it also prompted the US itself to act. US



leaders constantly support Israel's repression of the Palestinians while taking aim at Israel's so-called primary enemies—Iran, Iraq, and Syria (Mearsheimer & Walt, 2006, p. 26). The recent Iraq war was justified in the media as integral to the US' security. However, an underlying fact was that there was no credible threat against the US from Iraq, but there arguably could have been one against Israel which in the past had been targeted by Iraqi missiles (Mearsheimer & Walt, 2006, p. 30; see Figures 1.3, 1.4, and 1.5).

When it is not the rhetoric of security it is the “victim of history” discourse which is completely used to the lobby's advantage. “Israel is a country born of victimhood,” consisting of people who have constantly been driven from their homes, who had to deal with the devastating effects of the holocaust, and face anti-Semitism that still exists today (Meerman, 2007). While this is important to recognize, it is turning this narrative into public policy which becomes problematic, especially when it sanctions the displacement and abuse of others for the cause of one group's primacy.

Figure 1.3: US Patriots in Israel



In this photo, US-made and US-installed Patriot missiles are being launched to intercept an Iraqi Scud missile over the city of Tel Aviv on February 12, 1991. (Photo: Government Press Office, Israel)

Figure I.4: US-directed “Interoperability” with Israel



A US Soldier with the 5<sup>th</sup> Battalion, 7<sup>th</sup> Air Defense Artillery Regiment checks cable connections before testing Patriot missile communications as part of “Austere Challenge 2012” in Beit Ezra, Israel, on October 24, 2012. Austere Challenge is a three-week bilateral exercise designed to increase air defense “interoperability” between the US and Israel. (Photo: US Department of Defense, Staff Sgt. Tyler Placie)

Figure I.5: Defending Israel



Israel Air Defense Command's MIM-104D Patriot surface-to-air missile battery in 2014. (Photo: US Department of Defense, Erin A. Kirk-Cuomo)

## Israel as a Force Multiplier for the US?

In response to what Mearsheimer and Walt present as a seemingly subservient US Congress, Noam Chomsky argues this standpoint may actually have appeal for the US: “it leaves the US government untouched on its high pinnacle of nobility...merely in the grip of an all-powerful force that it cannot escape” (Chomsky, 2006). Further he argues that,

“Jewish influence over politics and opinion seriously underestimates the scope of the so called ‘support for Israel’...the argument much overestimates the pluralism of American politics and ideology. No pressure group will dominate access to public opinion or maintain consistent influence over policy-making unless its aims are close to those of elite elements with real power”. (Chomsky, 1999, p. 17)

There are times when the US Congress has gone directly against, and even humiliated the Israel lobby, in the name of its own “national interest” (Chomsky, 2006). With this in mind it is clear that configurations of domestic politics are complex and multilayered. Isolating certain areas of influence such as the lobby ignores the existence of US imperial interests at play, or the power of other lobbies, such as that of the oil companies. What has to be taken into consideration when evaluating the US-Israeli relationship is not just US interests in Israel, but rather its interests in the Middle East as a whole.

Control of oil is a decisive instrument of global policy and the Middle East is host to a vast amount of oil reserves. “A quick glance at a map of the Middle East places Israel in the vicinity of Iraq, Iran and Saudi Arabia,” a hot bed of oil geo-politics over the last century (Urie, 2013). “Since World War II, it has been virtually an axiom of US foreign policy that these energy reserves should remain under U.S. control” (Chomsky, 1999, p. 17), and thus interest in Israel’s position has been a necessary one to ensure US oil interests in the region were maintained. Israel became strategic in maintaining US influence in the region during the Cold War era as well, continuing to serve as a barrier against indigenous radical nationalist threats (Chomsky, 1999, p. 20). Justifying the beginnings and continuation of economic support thus became a rational action. Israel managed to provide camouflage for the US presence in the Middle East. The US does not have military bases or other launch pads in Israel, rather it is the defence contracts, development strategies, and the overarching economic support which en-

courages Israel to act according to the US' own strategic interests. Despite the lack of a direct military presence, Israel is surely regarded as a part of "the elaborate base and backup system for the Rapid Deployment Force ringing the Middle East oil producing regions" (Chomsky, 1999, p. 22). Israel was not only historically strategic for the US:

"The War on Terrorism is the New World Order unleashed and unbound. It replays the Cold War dynamic, aims to reproduce its oppressive structure, and continues to satisfy longstanding U.S. interests in the Middle East: control of oil and rejection of Arab radicalism, which have led to support for colonial Israel". (Bashir, 2007)

The continuous development of neoliberal capitalism is advanced through the US relationship with Israel. US arms manufacturers and US-based multinational oil companies have gained significantly from Israeli aggression (Urie, 2014). The intense militarization of Israel and its persistent colonial engagements work in tandem with US imperial interests. The Zionist imperative of "Jewish supremacy in Palestine—as much land as possible, as few Palestinians as possible" was used to support US interests and resulted in a heavily militarized and fundamentalist Israel (Bashir, 2007).

For Israelis it is clear that at least in some ways they are subordinate to US aims. "Israel has had to subordinate itself to US imperial imperatives" due to its dependence on economic support; this, at times, "generates the occasional Israeli public resentment at the extent of U.S. control" (Bashir, 2007). "Israel has indeed understood that there is no occupation, no expansion, and no rejection of Palestinian national rights," without US support (Bashir, 2007).

Since the early entrenchment of the relationship during the Cold War, the US has been promoting its political ideology as well as its products within Israel. Foreign consumerism and dependency on US products are an important method of promoting US universalism and empire. It also acts to fundamentally serve US economic interests. Israel's perennial quest for US funding and support on the global stage has arguably bonded it to US values and influence. For Israel it is through both consent—the want of US support—and coercion—the fear of losing support—that Israel becomes a piece of US empire. Israel is unique as it is financed by imperialism but it is not economically exploited by it (Bashir, 2007). The promotion of a mentality of "sameness" links Israel and the US. Further, compliance without coercion rationalizes the US belief in its own exceptionalism as a necessary and progressive force

of global modernization (Mirrlees, 2006, p. 204). Israel as a piece of US empire serves the integration of the world with the social relations and cultural values of US neoliberal capitalism: “the frontier, exclusionary society that Zionism has built is thus on the decline, being slowly replaced by a liberalized nation, both economically and politically” (Bashir, 2007).

Some political elements of Americanization which challenge traditional Israeli notions are visible regarding Israel’s move from their previous Westminster-derived model of parliamentary democracy to a more US model which has an incomplete separation of powers between those who are elected and its premier (Aronoff, 2000). Further, Americanization can be recognizable within various cultural patterns throughout “spheres of Israeli culture, from language and names to work patterns, physical structures, and more” (Rebhun & Waxman, 2000, p. 65). It is important to keep in mind that the US’ “cultural industry and its commodities are functional to the US empire’s political-economic dominance” (Mirrlees, 2006, p. 217). The spread of the US’ cultural values and its commitment to free markets, liberal democracy, and neoliberal values are crucial to the maintenance of US dominance.

If one were to assume Israel is a force multiplier of US imperialism, one would nonetheless have to admit that Israel offers a unique case study which should not sit comfortably with reductionist ideas or one-sided understandings of the relationship between Israel and the US. That relationship is not driven only by oil geopolitics and other quests for commercial gain, nor is Israel simply imbibing US ideals and wielding them on the global stage. On the other hand, one must also remember to factor in the reality of over 200,000 current US citizens living in Israel, and the fact that an even larger number is of US ancestry, which blurs the demographic, cultural, and political lines that are used to draw the Israel and the US as two, neatly separate entities, and which strengthens the perspective of Israel as a colonial settler-state. Thus we have different descriptive options for arguments that see Israel in a subordinate role: a tool, an extension, or a minion. However, there is another option, one that differs from either Israel as a commander of US foreign policy, or Israel as a servant of the US, and that is the figure of the protégé.

## Israel as a US Protégé

What I previously explored are the two most prominent explanations of the US-Israeli relationship: one was that there is a significant and powerful pro-Israel lobby in the US which has a grappling hold on the US congress, media, and universities (also, see Figure 1.6). The second assumed Israel was, and is, in a strategic position to protect the US' imperial political and economic interests. However, the US is neither simply a pawn of a powerful lobby, nor are its projects strictly rational and based on cost/benefit analysis. Here I outline the prospect that the relationship is one that has resulted in the production of a protégé. I do not state the US is purposely creating a protégé; rather it only came as a result of historical ties and each state's goals. This aspect of the US-Israeli relationship can prove to be reciprocal in the sense that it is mutually beneficial. However, it can also explain how sometimes they significantly oppose each other in order to serve their own imperial interests.

Figure 1.6: Big Brother Visits His Israeli Protégé



On October 3, 2010, a delegation of former US NBA basketball players visited the Hatzirim Air Force Base and met with Israeli Air Force soldiers of the Desert Birds Squadron, who operate US-made UH-60 Black Hawk helicopters. The visit to Israel was organized by the American Israeli Public Affairs Committee (AIPAC) and also included visits with President Shimon Peres. The visit by the US basketball players to the base involved interacting with Israeli soldiers, and allegedly “learning” about “Israel’s security situation”. (Photo: Cpl. Iris Lainer, Israel Defence Force Spokesperson’s Unit)

Within the scope of imperialism we find nationalism, colonialism, exceptionalism, state violence, heavy militarization, and the

creation of a state of emergency. If Israel is acting as a protégé, its engagement in each of these areas must be clearly understood. Clearly the US does not have a monopoly on the politics of violent domination as, “the human catastrophe of the Palestinian people under Israeli occupation and repression resembles quite closely the callous way that the US has acted around the globe” (Urie, 2014).

For the US, Cold War threats and now the “War on Terror” managed to create a forum in which the rhetoric of international security was justifiable. These emergencies became both descriptors and prescriptors for their own imperial action. Following suit, Israel has managed to use its “victim of history” discourse (Meerman, 2007) to create its own state of emergency. It was the horrors of Nazi Germany that drove many Jewish individuals to Palestine. Historically speaking, the view is that Israel has had to endure the wars that are occurring in the Middle East simply because they are a “Jewish state in the midst of an Arab world” (Chomsky, 1999, p. 99). This victim/emergency discourse allows for the rhetoric of security to become rampant in both media propaganda and as a justification for both the occupation of Palestinian land and potential further bombardments of Palestinian territory and neighbouring nations.

Creating a state of emergency in its conflict with Palestine generates a fear of, and opposition to, the Palestinian people and their cause. The successful media campaign in Israel has painted the Palestinians not as a people facing the colonial violence of Israel, but rather as aggressors. The rhetoric of Israel “feeling ‘isolation,’ ‘under siege,’ and ‘suffering daily attack’” (Said, 2001, p. 31), exists to ensure support and sympathy for Israel while giving no voice to the Palestinians. Just as the US dominates discourse with the rhetoric of saving US lives, so does Israel in the name of Israeli safety. Both the US and Israel most recently purport “counter terrorism” as a basis of their actions; their ability to control the way the media presents this message is a critical part of their success. Here it becomes tenable that the presence of a strong pro-Israel lobby influencing media and educational institutions in the US is in fact a working body of Israeli imperial efforts. Important to note is that despite their relative proximity to Palestinians, “Israelis will not learn much about what happens day to day inside Palestinian society, unless it concerns terrorism, a security threat, or war. They will hardly meet Palestinians, nor socialize with them” (Silverstein, 2014/10/28). This is similar to the US’ ability to create a distant enemy, an other, for which US citizens cannot feel empathy.

A state of emergency involves militarization and thus engagement in violence. Militarization is a precursor to war-making and so is the violence it entails. Charles Tilly explained the interdependence between war-making and state power, however he also highlighted various domestic forms of violence that arise (Tilly, 1985, p. 181).

This state development and the resulting internal violence is also an area in which Israel bears similar markings as the US. A disconnection between a vast majority of the citizens and their government is something the public of Israel and the US share in common (Vice, 2012). An example of this is that in Israel the government does not allow free protest. Activists are upset over education, healthcare, and affordable housing, yet they are prevented from vocalizing it (Vice, 2012). Internal discourse is stifled in order to present the veneer of a monolithic nation-state, an arguably necessary tactic of imperial nations.

Out of all of the protégé's imperial actions it is Israel's external violence which is the most visible. The US is engaging in non-territorial empire development (though chapter 5 in this volume would disagree on this point), and Israel is expanding its direct territorial empire. Israel's actions thus constitute imperialism in the colonial mode. Furthermore, it is in connection with Israel's colonial mission towards Palestine and the US' empire development that we see a prominent circular chain of influence of each state on the other:

“US support reinforces Israeli colonialism and occupation, which bolsters Israeli militarization of state and society, which generates new ideological and political justifications and breeds new religious fanaticisms, leading to further indigenous resistance and to more US interventions in the region”. (Bashir, 2007)

Their colonial actions include a number of brutal tactics which furthers Israel's end goal of controlling the land. Most often Israel engages in the creation of discriminatory structures which make life difficult for Palestinians, often resulting in outright displacement. Israelis often even resort to flat out conquest, war, and murder. It is here that Israel even managed to influence US imperialism in certain respects: “Israel was the first nation to develop drones, which it uses both to spy on its Arab neighbors and assassinate undesirable Palestinians,” something the US counter-terror strategy picked up and now wields ruthlessly across the Middle East (Silverstein, 2014/10/28). (However, on its own, this fact is insufficient in de-



nying that an imperial relationship exists between the US and Israel, since colonial territories were frequently arenas where colonial powers tested new measures of policing, repression and counterinsurgency—with an excellent example being the history of the US in the Philippines [see McCoy, 2009]).

The ongoing exchange of US and Israeli imperialism is ultimately a cycle of violence. However, Israel's ability to wield this violence is dependent on the US and thus so is its colonial expansionism. Without the funding, "Israeli militarism and Jewish fundamentalism in Israel would be on the defensive" (Bashir, 2007). Despite the persistent Israeli nationalism and increasing exceptionalism, a withdrawal of US funding could lead to an "abandonment of the 'national security' ethic and the rejection of living by the sword would have a real chance of gaining political ascendancy in Israel" (Bashir, 2007). By existing as a protégé of the US through "siding with, serving, depending, and even subordinating itself to the imperatives of U.S. empire" (Bashir, 2007) the view of the US and Israel as a hostile presence in the Middle East will continue to be perpetuated.

It is also arguable that the figure of the protégé might *not* attenuate the tension in dominant analyses (such as between Mearsheimer & Walt vs. Chomsky), but rather it could reinforce one side of the debate. In this respect, we have an example of such a case in the writing of noted Israeli author, Gideon Levy:

"We have a protégé that humiliates its patron power and a power that grovels in front of its protégé; a power that acts against its own interests and a president who acts contrary to his worldview. We have a protégé whose dependence on the power grows with its effrontery and a power's unbelievable weakness in the face of its protégé's brazenness". (Levy, 2014/10/19)

## Conclusion

Given a brief exploration such as this, it is difficult to do justice to the full complexity of the phenomenon of the US-Israeli relationship. It seems there is no end in sight for US support of Israel nor an end to Israel's colonial undertakings. Seeing Israel as a protégé of the US does not preclude the risk that US empire may one day no longer need Israel, and this implies that the US ultimately has the upper hand in the relationship. Losing US support "would be a

catastrophe for Israel because Israel has no other friends in the world” (Meerman, 2007).

Explaining the historical intricacies of the US-Israeli relationship was beyond the scope of this chapter, nor did this chapter do justice to explaining the struggles of Palestinians. This chapter should thus be read as an invitation or an encouragement for the reader to seek out more sources themselves. My perspective remains that Israel’s attack on Gaza and the Palestinians is a war crime among an ongoing series of war crimes (Urie, 2014). When nationalism and exceptionalism are rampant, the idea that militarized security could be a basis for peace and reconciliation must be questioned.

## Notes

- 1 For an archived list of the members of Concordia University’s Board of Directors for the period in which this chapter was written and published, see:  
<http://web.archive.org/web/20150831013900/http://www.concordia.ca/about/administration-governance/board-senate/governors/list.html>

## References

- AIPAC. (2014). Our Mission. *AIPAC: America’s Pro-Israel Lobby*.  
<http://www.aipac.org/about/mission>
- Aronoff, M.J. (2000). The Americanization of Israeli Politics and Realignment of the Party System. *Israel Studies*, (5)1, 92–127.
- Bashir, A-M. (2007). Israel in the U.S. Empire. *Monthly Review*, (58)10.  
<http://monthlyreview.org/2007/03/01/israel-in-the-u-s-empire/>
- Chomsky, N. (1999). *The Fateful Triangle: The United States, Israel, and the Palestinians*. (2<sup>nd</sup> ed.). Cambridge, MA: South End Press.
- . (2006). The Israel Lobby? *Znet*.  
<http://www.chomsky.info/articles/20060328.htm>
- Levy, G. (2014/10/19). Yankees, Go Home, for the Sake of Peace. *Haaretz*, October 19.  
<http://www.haaretz.com/opinion/.premium-1.621429>
- McCoy, A.W. (2009). *Policing America’s Empire: The United States, the Philippines, and the Rise of the Surveillance State*. Madison, WI: University of Wisconsin Press.
- Meerman, M. (Director). (2007). The Israel Lobby [Documentary]. The Netherlands: VPRO, Dutch Public Broadcasting.

- Mearsheimer, J., & Walt, M. (2006). The Israel Lobby and U.S. Foreign Policy. <http://mearsheimer.uchicago.edu/pdfs/A0040.pdf>
- Mirrlees, T. (2006). American Soft Power, or American Cultural Imperialism? In Colin Mooers (Eds.), *The New Imperialists: Ideologies of Empire* (pp. 199–228). Oxford: Oneworld.
- Rebhun, U., & Waxman, C.I. (2000). The “Americanization” of Israel: A Demographic, Cultural and Political Evaluation. *Israel Studies*, (5)1, 65–91.
- Right Web. (2015). American Israel Public Affairs Committee. *Institute for Policy Studies*. [http://rightweb.irc-online.org/profile/American\\_Israel\\_Public\\_Affairs\\_Committee](http://rightweb.irc-online.org/profile/American_Israel_Public_Affairs_Committee)
- Said, E.W. (2001). Palestinians under Siege. In Roane Carey (Ed.), *The New Intifada: Resisting Israel's Apartheid* (pp. 27–44). London: Verso.
- Sharpe, J.M. (2015). US Foreign Aid to Israel. Washington, DC: Congressional Research Service. <http://fas.org/sgp/crs/mideast/RL33222.pdf>
- Silverstein, R. (2014/10/28). What Israel Has to Teach Us. *Tikun Olam*, October 28. <http://www.richardsilverstein.com/2014/10/28/what-israel-has-to-teach-us/>
- Tilly, C. (1985). War Making and State Making as Organized Crime. In P. Evans, D.
- Rueschemeyer & T. Skocpol (Eds.), *Bringing the State Back* (pp. 169–186). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Urie, R. (2013). Capitalism and US Oil Geopolitics. *Counterpunch*, September 20. <http://www.counterpunch.org/2013/09/20/capitalism-and-us-oil-geo-politics/>
- . (2014). The U.S., Israel and Oil Geopolitics. *Counterpunch*, July 17. <http://www.counterpunch.org/2014/07/17/the-u-s-israel-and-oil-geopolitics/>
- Vice. (2012). Israel's Radical Left [Documentary]. United States of America: Vice News.