

Israeli Lobby - The Report

By Ted Lang
3-25-6

"Mearsheimer and Walt's paper leaves absolutely no doubt that Israel not only controls our entire government, our Pentagon, our foreign policy and our political parties, but our media as well."

It's all coming together so quickly now, but never should we even remotely consider relaxing our assault. In federal government circles, selection by upper management of a candidate to attend the senior management program offered to upwardly mobile government executives as offered by the John F. Kennedy School of Government of Harvard University, is in and of itself a high privilege and an honor. It clearly signifies to all that an attendee and graduate of the program is destined for the highest ranks of government service; namely, the Senior Executive Service.

During my employment with the federal government, virtually every high-level executive I reported to was an SES that graduated from this high-power school. The John F. Kennedy School of Government of Harvard University is, therefore, a very prestigious center of learning, both in terms of academic ranking and in terms of its ranking by the highest levels of management within the United States government. Professor Stephen M. Walt is a professor at JFK, while John J. Mearsheimer is a professor in the Department of Political Science at the University of Chicago.

As with all institutions of higher learning, professors at these colleges and universities are continuously urged, if not actually pressured, to produce essays, technical reports, and books expounding upon their respective areas of expertise based on their concentration of educational and research disciplines. The JFK School provides just such a vehicle for technical reporting and essay writing in their "Faculty Research Working Papers Series." It was through this venue, that Mearsheimer and Walt published their latest eye-opening report, entitled: "The Israel Lobby and U.S. Foreign Policy." Needless to say, at this time in our nation's history, it couldn't come at a more critical time.

As Americans feverishly attempt to understand the workings of the twisted mind of a totally out-of-control genocidal lunatic and mass-murdering warmongering buffoon and his gang that has hijacked

the government of the United States, explanations for his unilateral and unnecessary invasion abound in limitless speculation and inquiry. However, the most frequently offered rationale, if that is what it can be called, is that it was primarily about oil. But considering the hostility of Israel, its penchant and perfected planning and execution of terror, it becomes increasingly clear that the foreign policy of the United States is dictated by Israel. I have often pointed out that assessment in this space.

Mearsheimer and Walt's paper leaves absolutely no doubt that Israel not only controls our entire government, our Pentagon, our foreign policy and our political parties, but our media as well. Digressing a moment from the natural order of topics in their magnificent paper, let's move immediately to the report's treatment of Israeli control of the American corporate mainstream establishment media, as it will be the intention of that un-American element and institution to work hard and feverishly to spike and cover up this damaging report that exposes the motivational madness of the Bush regime.

Addressing the section, "Manipulating the Media," Mearsheimer and Walt offer: "In addition to influencing government policy directly, the Lobby [AIPAC] strives to shape public perceptions about Israel and the Middle East. It does not want an open debate on issues involving Israel, because an open debate might cause Americans to question the level of support that they currently provide. Accordingly, pro-Israel organizations work hard to influence the media, think tanks, and academia, because these institutions are critical in shaping popular opinion."

The report goes on: "The Lobby's perspective on Israel is widely reflected in the mainstream media in good part because most American commentators are pro-Israel. The debate among Middle East pundits, journalist Eric Alterman writes, is dominated by people who cannot imagine criticizing Israel., He lists 61 columnists and commentators who can be counted upon to support Israel reflexively and without qualification., Conversely, Alterman found just five pundits who consistently criticize Israeli behavior or endorse pro-Arab positions. Newspapers occasionally publish guest op-eds challenging Israeli policy, but the balance of opinion clearly favors the other side."

Certain key elements of the Alternative Media, this site among them, have consistently exposed the one-sidedness of the MSM in protecting Israel and extending this protection therefore to the Bush administration. That is precisely what empowers the administration as a regime. And what it doesn't say in the report, is the astonishing control that Jews sympathetic to Israel, and therefore supportive of the Bush crime machine, overwhelmingly own, manage and operate print and TV and cable electronic news reporting. This subject wasn't even touched on.

The report then turns to a brief analysis of the New York Times. This

is "America's newspaper of record" and as Bernie Goldberg has revealed, is the national editorial gatekeeper and assessor of what is newsworthy and what is not. It is the Times that decides what news will be on TV and cable later in the evening, and you may rest comfortably sure that this Mearsheimer and Walt report will not make it, nor will Charlie Sheen. It is the Times, that blocked the Downing Street Memo report and is now also dedicated to blocking a full, open investigation of the Bush 9-11 plot.

Concerning the Times, Mearsheimer and Walt offer: "Editorial bias is also found in papers like the New York Times. The Times occasionally criticizes Israeli policies and sometimes concedes that the Palestinians have legitimate grievances, but it is not even-handed. In his memoirs, for example, former Times executive editor Max Frankel acknowledged the impact of his own pro-Israel attitude had on his editorial choices. In his words: I was much more deeply devoted to Israel than I dared to assert., He goes on: Fortified by my knowledge of Israel and my friendships there, I myself wrote most of our Middle East commentaries. As more Arab than Jewish readers recognized, I wrote them from a pro-Israel perspective.,"

The report goes on to give examples of the organized manner in which the Israeli Lobby encourages the supportive consumers of newspaper, radio and television news, to literally bombard news entities with protest letters and e-mails in the true and time-worn fashion of Zionist agitation to stifle news and views they don't like, and to urge for propaganda favoring Israel. Examples of Zionist rank and file pressure on CNN and NPR are cited. The report concludes this section on the media offering, "These factors help explain why the American media contains few criticisms of Israeli policy, rarely questions Washington's relationship with Israel, and only occasionally discusses the Lobby's profound influence on U.S. policy."

It should be crystal clear that my labeling of the MSM as being "The Zionist Media" is now virtually proven fact, especially coming from this highly regarded institution of government studies and from trainers of candidates for the Senior Executive Service. And you can count on the fact that the Zionist media is burning the midnight oil to feverishly suppress this critical exposé.

The report's opening remarks now: "U.S. foreign policy shapes events in every corner of the globe. Nowhere is this truer than in the Middle East, a region of recurring instability and enormous strategic importance. Most recently, the Bush Administration's attempt to transform the region into a community of democracies has helped produce a resilient insurgency in Iraq, a sharp rise in world oil prices, and terrorist bombings in Madrid, London, and Amman. With so much at stake for so many, all countries need to understand the forces that drive U.S. Middle East policy.

The U.S. national interest should be the primary object of American

foreign policy. For the past several decades, however, and especially since the Six Day War in 1967, the centerpiece of U.S. Middle East policy has been its relationship with Israel. The combination of unwavering U.S. support for Israel and the related effort to spread democracy throughout the region has inflamed Arab and Islamic opinion and jeopardized U.S. security.

This situation has no equal in American political history. Why has the United States been willing to set aside its own security in order to advance the interests of another state? One might assume that the bond between the two countries is based on shared strategic interests or compelling moral imperatives. As we show below, however, neither of those explanations can account for the remarkable level of material and diplomatic support that the United States provides to Israel." Now we may all rest more than comfortably assured that virtually all organized Jewry, and all levels of American government, political parties, and especially the media, will violently explode with outrage and spring into overwhelming unified and coordinated action over this 83-page unabashed truthful report which exposes the horrific damage Zionism has already perpetrated against our once free and beautiful nation. This Zionism required "the Pearl Harbor of the 21st Century," and it is becoming increasingly clear that such an amount of plotting and execution as serves the immediate interests of Israel likely generated the compliant action on the part of the traitors in our own government that engineered and made 9-11 happen. It makes the likelihood of 9-11 less an act of random terrorism and more a deliberate action considering all the key Pentagon players who have dual citizenship with Israel.

How could any thinking American anywhere in our government entrust our most powerful military might and its top secret sensitivity to individuals with dual citizenship with the 106th ranking nation in terms of population, and a ranking as fourth as a world-leading nuclear power, a rogue nation that is actively waging terrorism upon other nations? How can such power be turned over to citizens of a nation that lusts for the destruction of the entire Arab world and Islam, a race, people and nations that control the Earth's most vital oil supplies? How can politicians calling themselves "Americans" put their entire nation at risk of reprisal for the terrorist outrages that Zionist criminals in Israel have perpetrated against all the peoples of the Middle East? How? Ask Bush!!!

Need one raise more obvious questions? Where did WE learn how to become terrorists and turn on our own? Why did we turn against the whole world and ignore human decency and morality, and ignore the Geneva Conventions and begin campaigns of torture and mass terror, and slaughter unarmed captive men, women and children? Who showed US how to do this and get away with it? Who? Ask Israel!!!

Mearsheimer and Walt summarize: "It is not surprising that Israel and

its American supporters want the United States to deal with any and all 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 [AIPAC's] perspective, but it is obviously preferable to Washington distancing itself from Israel, or using its leverage to force Israel to make peace with the Palestinians."

The report concludes: "Can the [Israeli-AIPAC] Lobby's power be curtailed? One would like to think so, given the Iraq debacle, the obvious need to rebuild America's image in the Arab and Islamic world, and the recent revelations about AIPAC officials passing U.S. government secrets to Israel. One might also think that Arafat's death and the election of the more moderate Abu Mazen would cause Washington to press vigorously and evenhandedly for a peace agreement. In short, there are ample grounds for U.S. leaders to distance themselves from the Lobby and adopt a Middle East policy more consistent with broader U.S. interests. In particular, using American power to achieve a just peace between Israel and the Palestinians would help advance the broader goals of fighting extremism and promoting democracy in the Middle East.

But that is not going to happen anytime soon. AIPAC and its allies [including Christian Zionists] have no serious opponents in the lobbying world. They know it has become more difficult to make Israel's case today, and they are responding by expanding their activities and staffs. Moreover, American politicians remain acutely sensitive to campaign contributions and other forms of political pressure and major media outlets are likely to remain sympathetic to Israel no matter what it does." <<Theodore E. Lang

3/25/06 © THEODORE E. LANG 3/25/06 All rights reserved

Ted Lang is a political analyst and freelance writer.

[Disclaimer](#)

[Email This Article](#)

[MainPage](#)

<http://www.rense.com>

