



THE MEDIA EDUCATION FOUNDATION PRESENTS

THE OCCUPATION OF THE AMERICAN MIND

Israel's Public Relations War in the United States

DISCUSSION GUIDE

Written by Loretta Alper & Jeremy Earp

Contents

A Note on This Guide	3
Synopsis	4
Pre-viewing Discussion Questions	5
Introduction	6
Key Points	
Discussion Questions	
The Catastrophe	9
Key Points	
Discussion Questions	
Propaganda is Not a Dirty Word	15
Key Points	
Discussion Questions	
Terror, Not Territory	21
Key Points	
Discussion Questions	
In the War of the Pictures, We Lose	27
Key Points	
Discussion Questions	
The Lobby	30
Key Points	
Discussion Questions	
Changing Perceptions	34
Key Points	
Discussion Questions	
After the Screening	38
General discussion starters, exercises, research assignments, and resources	

A Note on This Guide

This guide is to help teachers and screening organizers engage the issues presented in *The Occupation of the American Mind*. It opens with a set of discussion questions designed to help open up conversation before screening the film, then provides a series of key summary points and questions for each section, and a set of more general discussion starters, exercises, and research assignments at the end.

We've structured the key points to help you and your audience recall the specific details covered in each section of the film, and to provide a concrete reference point for substantive discussions about the film's overall arguments. The discussion questions are designed to inspire critical thinking and open-ended conversation about the film's specific arguments. And the discussion prompts and exercises at the very end are intended to broaden the conversation and help you engage some of the broader questions the film raises about U.S. news media coverage of the Israeli-Palestinian conflict and the role of public relations and propaganda in democratic societies.

The overall goal is to help you guide discussions — and assignments — that stay focused on the actual issues and arguments raised in the film in a way that allows for open debate.

Synopsis

Israel's ongoing military occupation of Palestinian territory and its repeated invasions of the Gaza strip have triggered a fierce backlash against Israeli policies virtually everywhere in the world — except the United States. *The Occupation of the American Mind* takes an eye-opening look at this critical exception, zeroing in on pro-Israel public relations efforts within the U.S.

Narrated by Roger Waters and featuring leading observers of the Israeli–Palestinian conflict, the film explores how the Israeli government, the U.S. government, and the pro-Israel lobby have joined forces, often with very different motives, to shape American media coverage of the conflict in Israel's favor.

The Occupation of the American Mind provides a wide-ranging analysis of Israel's decades-long battle for the hearts, minds, and tax dollars of the American people — a battle that has only intensified over the past few years in the face of widening international condemnation of Israel's increasingly right-wing policies.

Pre-Viewing Discussion Questions

To get a discussion going before showing the film, ask students or members of your screening audience any or all of the following questions:

- What news sources do you rely on for information about the world? Would you describe yourself as a *regular* listener, viewer, and reader of the news?
- Do you consider yourself to be well informed about the Israeli-Palestinian conflict? At the very least, would you say you have a good working knowledge of the key issues involved?
- Who are the Israelis? Who are the Palestinians? What is the conflict about? Where is the conflict being fought? How did it start? How long has it been going on? What role does the U.S. play in the conflict?
- Would you characterize the conflict as "complicated"?
- Do you ever discuss this subject with friends or family or anyone else in your social circles? Do you find it a difficult subject to discuss with people?
- How would you describe the climate on your campus — or in your community — when it comes to the Israeli-Palestinian conflict?
- How would you define the terms "anti-Semitism" and "Islamophobia"? How are they similar? How are they different, if at all?
- Do you consider mainstream news sources in the United States to be objective or biased in their coverage of the conflict? If biased, how so and against which side?

Introduction

Key Points

- On July 8th, 2014, the Israeli Defense Forces launched a military attack on the Gaza Strip, dropping over 20,000 tons of explosives, killing over 2,200 Palestinians, and wounding tens of thousands more. The overwhelming majority of these casualties were civilians.
- The scale of the attack sparked outrage, condemnation, and mass protests around the world, but in the United States, the American people held firm in their support for Israel. According to a CNN poll, 57% of Americans believed Israel's attack on the people of Gaza was justified, while just 34% believed it was unjustified.
- These attitudes about the Gaza invasion revealed a long-range pattern in American public opinion about the Israeli-Palestinian conflict. For decades, polls have shown that the American people have much more sympathy for the Israelis than for Palestinians, even though Palestinian casualties have far outnumbered Israeli casualties over the course of the conflict.
- In an attempt to understand why this is the case, *The Occupation of the American Mind* looks at how the conflict has been framed in U.S. news media and political discourse over time.
- The film begins by presenting evidence that official Israeli spokespeople outnumbered Palestinian spokespeople by a margin of 3 to 1 in mainstream American news coverage of Israel's 2014 attack on Gaza, allowing the official Israeli government narrative to dominate.
- Again and again, Israeli spokespeople were allowed to advance a narrative that framed Israel's bombardment of civilian populations in Gaza as a justifiable act of self-defense, an unavoidable response to unprovoked Hamas rocket attacks and Palestinian terrorism.
- U.S. political leaders of both parties, who appeared on television regularly during the invasion to support Israel's right to defend itself, repeatedly echoed these claims.

- Over the course of the invasion, this self-defense narrative went virtually unchallenged by U.S. news media anchors and commentators across all broadcast and cable news networks.
- In contrast with European news media coverage, which included a greater balance of Palestinian voices, the Palestinian side of the story barely registered in American news coverage of the invasion.
- The narrative that dominated U.S. news media's coverage of the 2014 Gaza invasion was consistent with the narrative that's circulated in U.S. news media for decades — that Israel is the victim and has a right to defend itself from Palestinian terrorist aggressors.
- What's gone missing in this narrative is the fact that for almost fifty years Israel has been militarily occupying Palestinian land and systematically denying the Palestinian people their most basic human rights.

Introduction

Discussion Questions

1. What quantitative methods do Yousef Munayyer and his organization use in their study of American media coverage of Israel's 2014 attack on Gaza? Do you think their methodology is sound?
2. It would seem to be common sense that an imbalance in official spokespeople in news coverage is bound to lead to bias in the coverage. Do you agree that's the case? If not, explain.
3. Do you feel American news media have a responsibility to make sure they give equal time to representatives of each side in this conflict? If so, why? If not, why not?
4. Yousef Munayyer says that the imbalance he found in American media coverage of the 2014 Gaza invasion went beyond the sheer number of official spokespeople that were featured. What other examples of pro-Israel bias did Munayyer discover in his research?
5. What's your take on media critic Peter Hart's comment that news coverage shapes public opinion? Is this the same thing as saying that media determines, dictates, or controls people's opinions? In your view, what are some specific ways media coverage might shape our opinions — not just on this issue but others too — even when we may not be aware it's happening?
6. What's the actual definition of the term "propaganda"? In light of this definition, do you agree with Mark Crispin Miller's claim that U.S. news media coverage of the conflict is essentially a propaganda story?

The Catastrophe

Key Points

- Zionism was the Jewish nationalist movement that emerged in Europe in the late 1800s. At its core, it was dedicated to the idea that the Jewish people, after centuries of living as persecuted minorities within other countries, were entitled to a state of their own in historic Palestine, the Biblical homeland of the Jews more than 3,000 years before.
- There were two basic problems with the choice of Palestine as a Jewish homeland from the start. First, Palestine was already home to hundreds of thousands of Palestinian Arabs who had been living there for centuries (first under the rule of the Ottoman Empire, then, after World War I, under the rule of the British). Second, the indigenous Palestinians had aspirations of their own for freeing themselves from imperial rule and forging an independent state of their own in Palestine.
- Despite Palestinian objections, the British government laid the foundation for a Jewish state in Palestine in 1917. In a pledge that would come to be known as The Balfour Declaration, Arthur Balfour, foreign secretary of the British government, wrote an official letter to Lord Walter Rothschild, head of the organization of British Zionists, promising that the British government would work to bring about “a national home for the Jewish people in Palestine.”
- According to historians, the primary reason the British declared their support for a Jewish state in Palestine was that they saw the Zionists as a potentially valuable ally in the region in the wake of World War I and the dissolution of the Ottoman Empire.
- In 1922, the League of Nations created the British Mandate for Palestine granting Great Britain administrative control of region. The League’s incorporation of the Balfour Declaration into the Mandate charged Great Britain with responsibility for overseeing the creation of a Jewish homeland in Palestine.

- The period of the British Mandate began a renewed wave of Jewish immigration to Palestine. Between the 1880s and 1921, approximately 187,000 Jewish immigrants entered Palestine. That number would more than double in the years leading up to World War II with nearly 450,000 Jews arriving by 1940.
- As immigration increased, tensions between the indigenous Arabs and Jewish settlers steadily escalated, putting more and more pressure on the British colonial government to resolve their competing claims to the land.
- In the wake of World War II and the Holocaust, Jewish immigration accelerated further, creating more conflict and pushing the situation to a breakpoint.
- In 1947, deciding that the best course of action was to relinquish control of the region, the British government turned administration of the Palestine situation over to the newly created United Nations and subsequently withdrew from Palestine.
- Later that same year, the UN came up with its solution: they passed UN Resolution 181 partitioning Palestine into two parts.
- Jews, who were a third of the population, would receive 56% of the land. Palestinians, who were two-thirds of the population and lived on more than 90% of historic Palestine, would receive 44%.
- Under these terms, Israel would be recognized as a Jewish — meaning Jewish-majority — state even though nearly 50% of the population within its newly drawn borders would be Palestinian Arabs.
- UN 181 was immediately accepted by the Zionists, but was unanimously rejected by Arab leaders as an unfair allocation of their land. The result was civil war.
- With the British Mandate set to expire in May of 1948, civil war raged between Palestinian Arabs and Zionists as each side sought to take advantage of the power vacuum left by the upcoming British departure.

- Zionist militias launched a wave of terror attacks in an attempt to gain control of Arab territory. And as the violence escalated, approximately 100,000 Palestinians fled, becoming refugees.
- On May 14, 1948, David Ben-Gurion, the head of the Jewish Agency, the de facto governmental organization in Palestine, proclaimed the establishment of the State of Israel. And U.S. President Harry S. Truman immediately recognized the new state.
- A day later, May 15, 1948, Egypt, Syria, Lebanon and Jordan invaded the newly created state, triggering the first Arab-Israeli war.
- In 1949, after ten months of fighting, a triumphant Israel signed a set of armistice agreements with the defeated governments of Egypt, Syria, Lebanon, and Jordan, formally ending the war and establishing new territorial armistice lines.
- The newly drawn borders, which would come to be known as the Green Line, increased the size of the state of Israel from 56% to 78% of historic Palestine.
- This meant that the indigenous Palestinians would be reduced to 22% of their homeland.
- The 1948 war caused dramatic demographic change throughout the Middle East. Over the course of the war, approximately 750,000 indigenous Palestinian Arabs either fled or were expelled from Palestine while an additional 700,000 Jews entered Israel as either Holocaust refugees or exiles from neighboring Middle Eastern countries.
- To this day, Israelis celebrate the 1948 war as the War of Independence, while Palestinians commemorate it as the Nakba, or Catastrophe.
- Just shy of two decades later, in June of 1967, the second major flashpoint of the Israeli-Palestinian conflict began when Israel launched a preemptive strike against neighboring Egypt, Syria, and Jordan, triggering what would come to be known as The Six Day War.

- Over the course of just six days, Israel defeated the outgunned armies of the three Arab nations.
- They also seized additional territory, and began to militarily occupy the Sinai Peninsula, the Gaza Strip, the West Bank, East Jerusalem, and the Syrian Golan Heights in direct violation of international law forbidding the takeover of territory by war.
- In the immediate aftermath of the '67 war, the UN Security Council passed Resolution 242 explicitly calling on Israel to adhere to international law and withdraw its armed forces from the additional land it had captured.
- To this day, Israel has yet to fully comply.
- While Israel would eventually sign separate peace agreements with Egypt and Jordan and return the land it illegally seized from the two countries, it continues to militarily occupy the Palestinian territories they took during the Six Day War.
- Since UN Resolution 242 was passed, Israel has also confiscated additional Palestinian land for Jewish settlements, methodically constructing massive Jewish-only settlement blocks on Palestinian territory in the West Bank and East Jerusalem.
- Israel's ongoing settlement project stands in direct violation of official U.S. policy and the Fourth Geneva Convention, which expressly forbids states from transferring civilian populations into territory it occupies.
- By relying disproportionately on pro-Israel voices that consistently de-emphasize legitimate Palestinian grievances, American news coverage of the conflict has by and large failed to account for many of these most basic historical facts.

The Catastrophe

Discussion Questions

1. What was the role of the Zionist movement in the creation of the modern-day state of Israel? Why was there a clash between the aspirations of the Zionist movement and the aspirations of the Arabs of Palestine in the years leading up to the creation of the state of Israel?
2. What role did UN Resolution 181 play in the creation of the state of Israel?
3. How did there come to be a Jewish-majority state in an Arab-majority land? What were the events that made that possible?
4. What is the Nakba?
5. What is the technical definition of "ethnic cleansing"? Why do you think so many people — not only Palestinians, but a growing number of Israeli historians — have described the events leading up to the creation of the state of Israel as a textbook case of ethnic cleaning?
6. Name the specific international laws that Israel is currently violating. On what specific grounds is Israel in violation of these laws? What are the origins of these laws, and why were they passed in the first place?
7. Is there anything about the basic historical facts presented in the film that changes your perception of the Israeli-Palestinian conflict?
8. Do you agree with some of the commentators in the film that U.S. news media coverage doesn't do a good job reminding people of the wider context of the Israeli-Palestinian conflict?
9. If people aren't aware of the larger context of the conflict, what conclusions do you think they'll be likely to draw from media coverage of violent clashes between Israelis and Palestinians?

10. To its critics, Israel is a "settler-colonial state." What is a settler-colonial state? Do you agree with those who say Israel fits the definition of one? Why or why not?

11. Explain the role of anti-Semitism in Israel's creation. Do you think there's a convincing case to be made that the long history of anti-Semitism, persecution, and violence Jewish people have endured might justify the suffering that innocent Palestinians have experienced as a result of the creation of the state of Israel? Explain why you disagree or agree with this line of thinking.

Propaganda Is Not A Dirty Word

Key Points

- In the summer of 1982, Israel launched a military offensive against neighboring Lebanon in an attempt to drive out the Palestinian Liberation Organization, which had been attacking Israel along its northern border.
- In addition to a ground invasion, Israel bombed Lebanon's densely populated capital, Beirut, fifty miles to the north.
- All told, Israel's bombardment killed an astonishing 17,000 Lebanese and Palestinians, and wounded another 30,000 people — almost all of these casualties were civilians.
- Israeli officials framed the invasion as an act of self-defense, but the brutality of the attack nevertheless shocked the world, earning Israel widespread condemnation from the international community, the United States government, and the American news media.
- As innocent Lebanese and Palestinian casualties filled American TV screens, including thousands of children, prominent U.S. news media commentators openly expressed horror at the aggressiveness of Israel's bombardment.
- Just a few months later, Israel came under further scrutiny from U.S. news media when news broke that Israel's Lebanese allies, operating with the consent of the Israeli government, had massacred several thousand defenseless Palestinian civilians in the refugee camps of Sabra and Shatila.
- In response to the media outcry, the Israeli government went on the offensive, going on television and aggressively denying any and all responsibility for the massacre and sternly rejecting calls for accountability.
- Despite the Israeli government's counter-offensive in the media, the damage had been done: polls showed that Israel's image had taken a hit around the world — including in the United States.

- In the wake of these two events, pro-Israel advocates in the U.S. grew increasingly concerned about the direction of American news media coverage of Israel. Convinced that negative media coverage posed a direct threat to American public support for the U.S. alliance with Israel, in 1994 an organization of pro-Israel groups called the American Jewish Congress convened a conference in Jerusalem to deal with the problem.
- The primary aim of the conference was to develop and refine a new U.S.-based "hasbara" strategy to help Israel counter negative media coverage of Israeli policies and actions.
- "Hasbara," the Hebrew word for "explain," is widely taken to be synonymous with the word "propaganda." Throughout the conference, participants used the terms hasbara, public relations, and propaganda interchangeably.
- The hasbara conference was chaired by U.S. advertising executive Carl Spielvogel, the legendary ad man whose agency created the highly acclaimed Miller Lite Beer ads in the 1970s.
- Conference participants included a wide range of American public relations experts, corporate communications strategists, media experts, journalists, and leaders of major U.S.-based Jewish groups.
- One of the main conclusions of the conference was that pro-Israel advocates needed to do a better job spinning unpopular Israeli policies, especially Israel's illegal occupation and settlement project, by finding ways to reinforce Israel's historic image as underdog and victim — in the words of one participant, as David up against the Arab Goliath.
- The conference also concluded that Israel needed to get out in front of negative media coverage of Israeli crackdowns on Palestinian resistance to the occupation, by trying to shape the media frame in advance.
- The most basic recommendation was to make Israeli hasbara or propaganda an ongoing and forward-looking effort, rather than mobilizing it reactively to clean up the fallout from discrete actions or events.

- In the years after Lebanon, Israeli officials and pro-Israel advocates in the U.S. began to implement a formal hasbara media strategy that started to change the tone and tenor of American media coverage.
- During American media coverage of the First and Second Intifadas, for example, Israeli spokespeople repeatedly took to the broadcast airwaves to explain that Israel's violent military crackdown on Palestinian dissent was a case of simple self-defense, casting Palestinian resistance to Israel's occupation as terrorism and positioning themselves as the victim.
- Since that time, and especially since the 9/11 terror attacks, the U.S. news media have largely accepted and perpetuated the official Israeli narrative that the Israeli-Palestinian conflict has less to do with the occupation and settlements than with Israel's right to defend itself from Palestinian terrorists.
- So dominant is this self-defense frame, that the charge made by many human rights groups that the Israeli government may itself engage in terrorist actions against innocent Palestinians in Gaza and elsewhere is not seriously entertained in American news media.
- These Israeli public relations efforts have only become more explicit, sophisticated, and intense as news media have proliferated over the years.
- The wildly popular Israeli reality show "The Ambassador," based on the American reality show "The Apprentice," is a good indication of just how openly these U.S.-targeted hasbara efforts are embraced within Israel.
- One of the results of these hasbara efforts is that pro-Israeli spokespeople now far outnumber pro-Palestinian voices in American media, the wider context of Israel's occupation mostly drops out, and the conflict comes across as an inexplicably confusing and endless cycle of violence that begins when Palestinians attack and Israelis retaliate in self-defense.

- Terms like “cycle of violence,” “relative calm,” and “lull in the violence” constantly recur in American news coverage, creating the impression that the violence that matters is the violence done to Israelis when Palestinians resist, not the ongoing systematic violence of Israeli occupation that victimizes Palestinians daily, largely out of view.
- Given how much airtime the official Israeli narrative has gotten in U.S. news media compared to Palestinian perspectives over the past 30 years, it stands to reason that American public has been overwhelmingly supportive and sympathetic to the Israeli side during this period.

Propaganda Is Not A Dirty Word

Discussion Questions

1. Norman Solomon describes Israel's invasion of Lebanon in 1982 as a "watershed" moment, and Phyllis Bennis calls Israel's role in the massacres at Sabra and Shatila a "game-changer." According to the film, what made this war and these massacres so radically different from previous Israeli actions?
2. How was U.S. news media coverage of Israel's invasion of Lebanon and the massacres at Sabra and Shatila different from the way Israel had been covered before? Why do you think there was a shift in how Israel was covered?
3. What were some of the specific stated aims of the American Jewish Congress Conference in Jerusalem in 1984? Do you see any of these aims as antithetical to the demands of democracy?
4. What is the literal translation of the Hebrew word "hasbara"?
5. At one point, a conference participant openly says that the most accurate connotation of the term "hasbara" is "propaganda," going so far as to argue that pro-Israel advocates shouldn't shy away from saying so. Why does he say it's justifiable to do propaganda on behalf of Israel in American media? Do you agree with this? Do you see any dangers in it? If so, where, exactly, does the danger lie?
6. In the film, Sut Jhally argues that Carl Spielvogel's distinctive background as the ad man who helped re-brand Miller Lite beer made him the perfect candidate for presiding over the development of a pro-Israel PR strategy after Lebanon. Why does Jhally say this?
7. How, specifically, did Israel implement its hasbara strategies in the years after Lebanon?
8. Why do Phyllis Bennis, Amira Hass, and Norman Solomon take issue with how the term "terrorism" tends to be used in coverage of the Israeli-Palestinian conflict? What reasons do each of them give? What's your opinion of what they say?

9. Although the Israeli reality show "The Ambassador" is no longer on the air, it was a wildly popular show in Israel at the time. Why do you think that was the case? Why do you think Israelis seem to place such a high premium on public diplomacy of this kind? Do you think a reality show pitting potential U.S. ambassadors against one another would be a hit in the United States? If not, why not?
10. In the film, Peter Hart says that Israel's position is always "the first position" in American media coverage of the conflict. What do you think he means by "first position"? Do you agree with him? If so, why do you think being first matters? How does it affect things?
11. What's meant by the term "media framing"?
12. How does omitting the context of Israel's occupation of Palestinian land change the frame of the conflict and the way that violence is understood?
13. According to Yousef Munayyer, why is the phrase "cycle of violence" a one-sided and inadequate description of the reality of this conflict? And what does he say about how this media trope reinforces the official Israeli narrative?
14. Sut Jhally claims that American media coverage of the conflict reveals another kind of occupation — an occupation of the "American mind." What do you think he means by this? Do you agree? If so, who or what is doing the occupying, and why?

Terror, Not Territory

Key Points

- The ongoing peace process that began with the Oslo Peace Accords in 1993 was designed to negotiate the terms of Israel's withdrawal from Palestinian territory in accordance with UN Resolution 242, which made an explicit connection between Israeli withdrawal and a just and lasting peace.
- The international consensus that has formed around 242 embraces a two-state solution based on the borders both sides agreed to after Israel's victory in the 1948 Arab-Israeli war. The armistice lines, known as the Green Line or the pre-67 borders, would entitle Israel to live on 78% of historic Palestine, while allotting the Palestinians 22%.
- By definition, the international consensus for a two-state solution would require that Israel end its illegal military occupation of the West Bank and East Jerusalem, dismantle the settlements they've built in the West Bank, live within the pre-'67 borders on 78% of historic Palestine, and allow Palestinians to have an independent, free, and contiguous state on the remaining 22% of their historic homeland.
- After rejecting Zionist claims to Palestinian land for decades, Palestinian leaders long ago agreed to the terms of this international consensus for a two-state solution. Israel, likewise, has said it agrees with the general terms of the two-state solution.
- But since Oslo, Israel has not only maintained its military occupation of Palestinian territory, but has also annexed additional Palestinian land for its Jewish-only settlements.
- When the Oslo agreements were forged in 1993, there were approximately 200,000 illegal Jewish settlers living in the Occupied Palestinian Territories. In the years since Oslo, that number has more than tripled: approximately 650,000 Israeli settlers now living in the West Bank and East Jerusalem.
- In addition, since 1967 Israel has demolished approximately 28,000 Palestinian homes.

- This illegal takeover of Palestinian territory since Oslo has led some critics to characterize the current peace process as an “annexation” process.
- The fact that one in eleven Israeli Jews currently live in illegal settlements in the West Bank presents a major logistical hurdle to creating a Palestinian state along the agreed-upon pre-67 borders. As Rashid Khalidi says about a Palestinian state, "there's no place to put it."
- There is strong evidence that a number of Israeli leaders never intended to relinquish control of the Occupied Territories, either seeing these territories as Israel's by birthright and Biblical mandate, or as necessary in order to expand and secure the Israeli state.
- In one of many examples of this expansionist mindset, Prime Minister Benjamin Netanyahu admitted in a secretly recorded video in 2001 that he fully intended to sabotage the Oslo peace process and short-circuit calls for an Israeli withdrawal all along.
- In the video, Netanyahu tells a group of illegal Jewish settlers that all Palestinian territory rightfully belonging to Israel, and explains that the way to hold on to the land is to invoke security threats.
- Netanyahu openly expresses confidence that this security argument will be enough to manipulate the American people, saying, "America is a country that can be easily moved."
- The United States government, in principle, has long been officially opposed to the idea of Israel holding onto Palestinian territories, even for alleged security reasons, yet it has repeatedly promoted the official Israeli narrative by invoking Israel's right to defend itself.
- Despite Israel's violations of international law, the U.S. has also continued to give Israel billions of dollars of military aid and provided crucial diplomatic cover in the UN.

- The reason the United States government has continued to support Israel despite its human rights violations cannot be reduced to the Israeli government controlling the levers of U.S. power.
- The more likely explanation is that beginning in the late 1960's, U.S. officials started to see Israel as what the Nixon administration called "a cop on the beat" to check Soviet power and protect U.S. interests in the Middle East, especially energy supplies.
- Since the Nixon years, the U.S. government has provided Israel with roughly \$3 billion a year in military aid and vetoed one UN resolution after another condemning the occupation and settlements.
- Nevertheless, in the realm of politics and public opinion, questions have persisted about Israel's repression of Palestinian rights, and a number of well-funded public relations organizations have emerged within the United States to deflect this criticism and keep U.S. military aid flowing.
- In 2009, one of these groups, the Israel Project, turned to conservative pollster and re-branding expert Frank Luntz for pointers on how to make sure the American people remained loyal to Israel despite its devastating invasion of Gaza in 2008, its illegal occupation, and its continued settlement expansion.
- After conducting extensive polls and focus groups to determine which words and phrases were most effective in shaping American opinions of the conflict, Luntz concluded that the occupation – and especially the settlements – presented a major public relations problem.
- In his report, Luntz comes up with a solution to this problem, strongly urging Israel and its defenders to avoid talking about the occupation, the settlements, and the pre-'67 borders, and to say instead that the conflict is "about ideology, not land – about terror, not territory."
- By steering clear of the occupation, Luntz says, the conflict will seem like an endless "cycle of violence" that begins when Palestinians attack and Israelis retaliate in self-defense.

- Luntz also strongly recommends shifting the focus away from the occupation to the Hamas Charter, parts of which call for the destruction of Israel and the killing of Jews, saying it's a surefire way to make Americans think Palestinians, not Israelis, are the bullies.
- In the film, Yousef Munayyer asks why the official charter of the ruling Likud Party of Israel, which flatly rejects the right of Palestinians to have a state, gets so much less attention in U.S. news media than the Hamas Charter.
- Luntz also recommends building sympathy for Israel by reminding Americans that Israel gave up control of Gaza in 2005 in hopes of achieving peace and a two-state solution, and only got unprovoked rocket attacks in return.
- As Yousef Munayyer and Phyllis Bennis point out, while it's true that Israel withdrew its military and approximately 9,000 settlers from inside Gaza, what's less known is that to this day Israel maintains total military control of Gaza's coast, harbors, airspace, border crossings, and people, who can come and go only at the discretion of the Israeli military.

Terror, Not Territory

Discussion Questions

1. What was the basis for the two-state solution, and what did it require of both sides?
2. Why does Norman Finkelstein say that the current peace process, initiated at Oslo, has in actuality turned out to be "an annexation process"?
3. The leaked video of Israeli Prime Minister Benjamin Netanyahu's comments to Israeli settlers garnered a lot of attention in Israeli and international media, but was barely mentioned in mainstream American news media. Why do you think this is? What do you think Netanyahu's comments revealed about Oslo and the peace process, and how did they seem to contradict the official Israeli government line? Also, what do you think Netanyahu meant, exactly, when he said he will define the entire Jordan Valley as a military zone?
4. According to the film, why does the U.S. government feel it has a strategic interest in promoting the official Israeli narrative? Does it make sense that the United States would continue to perpetuate the official Israeli narrative even though, in principle, it's on record as being opposed to the occupation and settlements?
5. Who is Frank Luntz? What's his actual job? What political affiliations does he have?
6. What are the key conclusions presented in Luntz's *Global Language Dictionary*? What are his recommendations designed to achieve? Do you agree that Luntz's recommendations, if followed, would be effective in shaping American perceptions of the conflict in Israel's favor? Why or why not, and what does your take on this say about your opinion of the American people?
7. What do you make of the fact that the American people seem to harbor strong opposition to Israel's repression of Palestinian rights and yet consistently show higher levels of support for Israelis?

8. Why does Luntz say it's crucial to make the conflict about “terror, not territory”?
9. What is Yousef Munayyer’s point about the Likud Charter in relation to the Hamas Charter?
10. In your view, why has the Hamas Charter been such an effective hasbara talking point? Do you think it's linked up with more general attitudes about Islamic extremism in the U.S.? Do you see a difference between the militarist and violent statements made in the Hamas Charter and the kinds of things groups like Isis have said about Israel, the United States, and the West?
11. Separate and apart from your own opinions of the Hamas Charter, what do you make of the U.S. military assessment of Hamas that's discussed in the film? How does it contradict the dominant media narrative we get in the U.S. about Hamas? And why do you think these high-level military assessments seem so out of step with the way political commentators like Sean Hannity of Fox News and Jake Tapper of CNN talk about Hamas?
12. How have pro-Israel advocates used the 2005 Gaza withdrawal as a hasbara talking point? What's the main point these advocates seem to be making when they invoke the withdrawal? Do you agree with the commentators in the film that these advocates only tell part of the story? Do you think the dominant narrative about the Gaza withdrawal has been important in shaping American public opinion?

In the War of the Pictures, We Lose

Key Points

- In late December of 2008, Israel launched a massive ground and air assault on the Gaza Strip called Operation Cast Lead.
- Over a period of three weeks, the Israeli military dropped over 600 tons of bombs on Gaza, killing nearly 1,400 Palestinians and injuring thousands more.
- Israeli officials justified the deadly assault as an act of self-defense, repeatedly claiming in U.S. news media — largely without challenge — that it was necessary to stem the tide of relentless and unprovoked Hamas rocket attacks on Israel.
- What this narrative failed to mention was that in 2008 both sides agreed to a ceasefire that had successfully curtailed Hamas rocket fire into Israel.
- In fact, it was only when *Israel* broke the ceasefire by attacking a tunnel building project and killing six Hamas militants in November of 2008 that Hamas resumed firing rockets.
- Nevertheless, Israeli officials repeatedly took to the American broadcast airwaves and claimed that it was Hamas that broke the ceasefire unprovoked, leaving the impression that Israel had no choice but to bomb Gaza.
- While the Israeli government itself would later acknowledge that they, and not Hamas, had broken the ceasefire, this fact was mentioned only a single time in U.S. news media coverage, buried deep within the inside pages of the New York Times.
- One of the reasons for the lack of coverage was no doubt the day Israel chose to break the ceasefire: coincidentally or not, it was the day of Barack Obama's historic election as President of the United States.

- With all eyes on the election, Israeli officials were later able to claim that Hamas had broken the ceasefire, leaving Israel no choice but to bomb Gaza.
- In international news media, the fact that Israel had broken the ceasefire was repeatedly discussed, and journalists relentlessly grilled Israeli officials about it.
- But according to an extensive review of U.S. media coverage of the Gaza invasion, Israel's dual claims that it was Hamas that broke the ceasefire and that Israel was therefore merely defending itself against unprovoked Hamas rockets attacks were never challenged by American officials or American media commentators.
- Many of the talking points Israeli officials employed to counter the shocking number of Palestinian casualties that filled American TV screens seemed to make their way into Frank Luntz's recommendations in his 2009 *Global Language Dictionary*.
- These Israeli talking points included repeated expressions of sympathy for Palestinian civilian casualties, and then repeatedly asking the American people what they would do if they had to endure thousands of unprovoked rocket attacks.

In the War of the Pictures, We Lose

Discussion Questions

1. Prior to the 2008-2009 Gaza invasion, an Israeli official bluntly predicted that Israel would most certainly lose the “war of pictures” in the media coverage. What did the official mean by this exactly? And how did Israel go about counteracting the problem they anticipated?
2. Why do you think Israel was so successful in asserting that it was Hamas that broke the ceasefire to justify its 2008-2009 invasion of Gaza? What role did U.S. news media play in this? Why do you think they played the role they did? And why would Israel feel it needed to make the claim that Hamas broke the ceasefire in the first place?
3. The film provides multiple examples of British television journalists aggressively questioning the official claims of Israeli officials. Do you think these interrogations were fair? Have you ever seen this type of questioning from mainstream American journalists? If American news media personalities were this tough in their questioning of Israeli officials, what do you think the reaction would be?
4. What does it tell you that there is such a striking difference between U.S. news media's handling of official Israeli claims and the way international media outlets handle them?
5. What were the major talking points Israel used to explain their 2012 and 2014 invasions of Gaza? Do you see any common themes running through these talking points, the talking points Israel employed in 2008, and the talking points Frank Luntz lays out in his *Global Language Dictionary*?
6. How did American news media journalists and commentators handle the official talking points that circulated during these three invasions of Gaza? Do you think their handling of these official talking points was consistent with the basic demands of journalism?

The Lobby

Key Points

- The effort to shape American perceptions of the Israeli-Palestinian conflict has been taken up by a number of pro-Israel groups commonly referred to as the Israel Lobby.
- The Israel's lobby's goal of promoting pro-Israel narratives has been most visible in the U.S. Congress, due largely to the efforts of one of the most influential lobbying groups working on Capitol Hill today – the conservative American Israel Public Affairs Committee, better known as AIPAC.
- AIPAC's annual conference draws nearly 10,000 attendees from around the country, including the most influential members of both houses of Congress from both parties.
- In addition to AIPAC, there are roughly three dozen pro-Israeli political action committees (PACs) that have given a combined \$55-60 million dollars to American political leaders over the past 15-20 years. (In contrast, there are one or two Arab-American PACs that have given a total of just under a million dollars to American politicians.)
- A number of powerful evangelical Christian groups also lobby American political leaders on behalf of Israel. In their view, the Bible says that all of Palestine, even the 22% that Palestinians hope to establish state on, belongs to Israel by decree of God.
- Other elements of the lobby serve as media watchdogs, keeping track of what American news media organizations publish or broadcast and attacking them when they think the coverage is unfavorable to Israel.
- These attacks also focus on American political leaders who stray from the right-wing Israeli and AIPAC line.
- One of the key weapons in the lobby's attack arsenal is the charge of anti-Semitism, which is routinely leveled against critics of Israeli policy and defenders of Palestinian rights.

- Jews who have stood up for Palestinian human rights have not been immune from these attacks, again and again labeled by pro-Israel PR operatives as "self-hating Jews."
- All of these pressures have made it exceedingly difficult for the legitimate grievances of the Palestinian people to get a fair hearing in American news media.

The Lobby

Discussion Questions

1. AIPAC supports both Democrats and Republicans in Congress, making it unique as a special interest lobby. In real terms, how much of an effect do you think AIPAC has on America's seemingly unconditional support for Israel?
2. According to the film, what is the Israel's lobby's primary job?
3. The film is very careful not to overstate the influence of the lobby, yet at the same time argues that the lobby has immense power. What, exactly, does the film say about how the lobby influences U.S. policy, American political culture, news media coverage, and American public opinion? And in what specific ways is it careful not to overstate the influence of the lobby? Do you agree with the film's overall take on the power and limitations of the Israel lobby?
4. Evangelical Christian groups more or less agree with right-wing advocacy groups like AIPAC that Palestinians have no essential right to their own state. But their reasons for believing this are vastly different. What are the essential differences between the views of right-wing Christian groups within the Israel lobby and right wing groups like AIPAC when it comes to Israel's occupation of Palestinian land?
5. In the film, former AIPAC staffer M.J. Rosenberg argues that it isn't accurate to call the Israel lobby the Jewish lobby. Why does he say this? In Rosenberg's view, what would be a more accurate name for the lobby?
6. Extremist organizations like "Americans for a Safe Israel" have called the '67 boundary lines "the Auschwitz borders." Why do you think groups like these invoke the Holocaust to argue against the international consensus for a two-state solution? Do you think their argument has merit?
7. In your view, does linking the Holocaust to Israel's security do more to help clarify the basic stakes of the conflict or help to perpetuate the conflict? Explain your position.

8. People often say we need to learn “the lessons of Holocaust.” What does that mean to you? And in what ways do you think those lessons might apply to the Israeli-Palestinian conflict?
9. What is the self-proclaimed role of media watchdog groups like CAMERA? What's your take on what these groups are doing? What sort of effect do you think they've had on the accuracy of media coverage of the conflict?
10. Pro-Israel media watchdog groups have repeatedly argued that mainstream American media outlets are pro-Palestinian. What evidence do they base their claims on? What's their methodology? Do you agree with their conclusions?
11. Award-winning journalist Ayman Mohyeldin has never spoken publicly about NBC's decision to take him off assignment in Gaza. Regardless of NBC's motives, and even though Mohyeldin was subsequently reinstated, what message do you think his removal sent to other journalists covering the conflict?
12. What sort of impact do you think it has when pro-Israel advocates equate criticism of Israel's policies with anti-Semitism and label people who support Palestinian rights "terrorist sympathizers"? Have you ever felt like your own views of the conflict might elicit these kinds of responses? If so, how did that affect how you talked about the conflict?
13. What did the filmmakers' Lexis-Nexis study of the 2014 Gaza invasion reveal about American news coverage? How did these findings link up with the overall argument of the film?
14. In your opinion, why do so few American journalists question or challenge the prevailing Israeli narrative about the conflict?

Changing Perceptions

Key Points

- Over the past few years, it's become harder for the mainstream media, the political establishment, and public relations specialists in the U.S. to manage information about the conflict.
- The internet and social media have made it possible for people to access news and information about the conflict that's been typically left out of mainstream media coverage.
- A number of recent documentaries by both Israeli and Palestinian filmmakers have also shed powerful and unprecedented light on Israel's repressive policies and abuse of Palestinian rights.
- And Palestine solidarity groups such as Boycott, Divestment, and Sanctions (BDS), Students for Justice in Palestine (SJP), and Jewish Voice for Peace (JVP) have been gaining strength, numbers, and momentum around the country.
- At the same time, the influential Black Lives Matter movement has drawn attention to the connections between violence against African Americans in the U.S. and Israel's military repression of Palestinian rights, pledging in its platform to stand in solidarity with the Palestinian people.
- All of these things have combined in recent years to make the reality of Israel's occupation more and more visible, to more and more Americans, than ever before.
- Polls suggest that these developments have been having an effect: While support for Israel remains strong among older Americans, it's in steep decline among young people who rely primarily on independent online news sources for information about the world.
- In his latest report for pro-Israel advocacy groups, public relations expert Frank Luntz characterized the shift in young Americans' attitudes as a "disaster," and called on Israel's supporters to respond with newer and better PR.

- And powerful right-wing billionaires like Sheldon Adelson and Haim Saban have answered Luntz's call, pledging millions of dollars to intimidate pro-Palestinian activists on college campuses, and going so far as to lobby state legislatures to outlaw BDS activities and prevent state governments from working with companies that support BDS.
- Despite these well-funded attempts to demonize and silence pro-Palestinian student groups and human rights activists, these campaigns have only served to re-energize groups that are mobilizing against U.S. support for Israel on behalf of Palestinian civil rights.
- Given the sheer amount of military, economic, and diplomatic aid the U.S. gives to Israel, the ongoing struggle for Palestinian rights may well depend, in the end, on the American people's grasp of the core issues of the conflict and their understanding of what life is like for the Palestinian people living under Israeli military occupation.

Changing Perceptions

Discussion Questions

1. According to a 2016 Pew Research poll, more than 70 percent of Americans older than 50 years old say they “often” watch TV news, compared with fewer than 50 percent of Americans under 50 who say they do. In the same poll, only about a quarter of 20-somethings and college students said they watch TV news regularly, compared with roughly 50 percent who said they regularly consume online news.
2. How do you think these demographic trends correlate to polls that show that support for Palestinians is most pronounced among young Americans? What would you say to those who argue that this is simply a sign of anti-Israel bias in independent news sources? How does all of this relate to the film's overall argument that there's been a decades-long institutional bias in mainstream news media coverage of the conflict?
3. What sort of specific effects do you think pro-Palestinian solidarity groups have been having on perceptions of the conflict? Why has the Black Lives Matter movement aligned itself with Palestinian activists? What sorts of parallels are there between the two movements, especially when it comes to what they're opposing and fighting for?
4. What's your take on the debate surrounding the BDS movement on American college campuses? What kinds of arguments have you heard for and against BDS? Where do you stand on this? Has your opinion on the BDS debate changed at all as a result of watching this film?
5. What does Frank Luntz say about how young Americans view the conflict?
6. What kinds of organized efforts are being made to push back against changing perceptions of the conflict? Who is funding these efforts? Where are they targeted? What do you think of them?

7. In what ways, if any, has *The Occupation of the American Mind* changed the way you see and understand the Israeli-Palestinian conflict?

After the Screening

Some general discussion starters, exercises, and research assignments

1. In [an article](#)¹ explaining why he believes the American people have such consistently high levels of sympathy for Israelis over Palestinians, conservative commentator and former George W. Bush speechwriter David Frum said the following: “It's often said that perception is reality. It's even more true, however, that reality is perception. Israel's Arab enemies are unpopular because Americans see them for what they are. And Israel is liked because Americans see it for what it is.”
2. What do you think Frum is saying when he says that "reality is perception" more often than "perception is reality"? If this were true, what are some of the conclusions that would follow? Does Frum seem to be saying that the sources of information we rely on are not important? That we can somehow access reality separate and apart from media? Also, if it's true "reality is perception," what would that say about why American public sympathy for Israel is higher than most other places in the world?
3. A few years back, Ed Herman and Noam Chomsky developed an [influential propaganda model](#)² of news. In this model, five different "filters" determine which stories make it into U.S. news media, shape how these stories are presented, and keep information that's not deemed relevant out of the frame.
4. Once you have a good working grasp of Herman and Chomsky's five filters, respond to these questions:
 - a. Is the overall argument of *The Occupation of the American Mind* consistent with this propaganda model?
 - b. Does the film seem to point to examples of the five filters at work in news coverage of the conflict?
 - c. If so, which filters, and how do they work when it comes to news coverage of Israel?
 - d. Finally, do you believe that American news media may in fact be “manufacturing consent” for the U.S. special relationship with Israel?

5. Research Zionist attitudes toward the indigenous Arab population of Palestine from the earliest days of the Zionist movement right up to the founding of the state. Read as many first-person sources as possible, and collect some quotes that strike you as interesting. When you're done researching, think about these questions:
 - a. How would you characterize early Zionist attitudes toward Arabs?
 - b. Did you find a range of attitudes?
 - c. Any patterns?
 - d. How do you think some of these views may have shaped early Jewish-Arab relations, Zionist politics, and subsequent Israeli policy decisions?
 - e. Do you see any continuity between the early attitudes you came across and the mainstream media narrative about the conflict today?
6. Israeli hasbara has consistently framed Palestinian resistance to Zionism as a form of anti-Semitism grounded in ancient antipathy to Jews. To make their case, pro-Israel advocates have repeatedly cited Palestinian Arabs' rejection of UN Resolution 181, which proposed partitioning historic Palestine and creating an Israeli state on 52% of the land. Again and again, Israeli hasbara has cited the Palestinian-Arab delegation's rejection of partition as evidence that Arabs are motivated primarily by anti-Semitism and deep-seated, even religious, hostility to the Jews.
7. To evaluate this repeated claim, read the [Palestinian-Arab delegation's actual statement](#)³ rejecting UN Resolution 181's proposal for the partition of Palestine.
8. Summarize the key arguments the delegation makes against partition. Do you find evidence of anti-Semitism in their rejection of 181?
9. During the early years of the Zionist movement, from the late 1800s through the 1930s, most Jews did not consider themselves Zionists and had no intention of moving to Palestine. That changed after World War II and the Holocaust, when hundreds of thousands of Jews fled Europe and became refugees with nowhere to go. It was then that more and more Jews started to resettle in Palestine, especially after being turned away by the United States and other countries.

10. What role do you feel the realities of Jewish suffering during the Holocaust should play in evaluating Zionist claims to Palestine? Do you agree with Palestinian Arabs who have argued that they were not responsible for the Holocaust and therefore should not have been expected to relinquish a large portion of their historic homeland to make way for a new Jewish state? Finally, do you think the Holocaust gave Jews a greater and more legitimate claim to the land than the indigenous Arabs?
11. The Israeli government claimed that its 1982 invasion of Lebanon, including its heavy bombardment of densely populated Beirut, was a defensive action launched in response to attacks on Israel's northern border by the Palestinian Liberation Organization (PLO). A number of Israeli historians and journalists have contradicted Israel's claims. Research what's been written about the events leading up to Israel's invasion of Lebanon. Then make a case for or against the official Israeli claim that they were acting in justified self-defense in Lebanon. Try to tie your argument to the film's overall argument about Israel's self-defense claims over the years.
12. According to media expert Norman Solomon, "Classic PR is to say the problem is not the policy, it's the presentation." With this quote in mind, examine [this official report](#)⁴ from the American Jewish Congress's 1984 hasbara conference.
13. In the report, what are some of the specific Israeli policies that participants felt posed a PR problem, and what were their suggestions for doing a better job presenting these problems to the American people? More than 30 years later, do you think the PR problems discussed at this conference still pose a problem in the United States? When you look at U.S. news media coverage of the conflict today, do you see evidence of any of the hasbara strategies proposed at this conference being put to work?
14. Read journalist Glenn Greenwald's article "[Terrorism in Israel's Gaza Attack](#)"⁵." Write up a brief summary of what you see as his most important and interesting points. Then explain whether you agree or disagree with his bottom-line conclusion that Israel's actions should be considered terrorism. Be sure to avoid generalizations and make concrete references to what Greenwald actually says in this piece when making your case.

15. Staying with the article, "[Terrorism in Israel's Gaza Attack](#)⁵," briefly summarize Greenwald's essential problem with the way U.S. officials and American news media use the word "terrorism." Then compare this common usage to Frank Luntz's discussion of terrorism in his [Global Language Dictionary](#)⁶, especially Luntz's thoughts on the words "terror, not territory"?
16. Take a deeper look at the so-called "special relationship" between the United States and Israel. When did this "relationship" begin, and why? What was the nature of the U.S. relationship with Israel prior to the development of the special relationship? What are some of the key features of this relationship? And how do you think the U.S. special relationship with Israel has affected America's self-proclaimed role as an "honest" and "neutral" broker throughout the ongoing Middle East peace process?
17. Israeli officials and pro-Israel advocates have repeatedly invoked Israel's withdrawal from Gaza in 2005 as proof that the conflict is about terrorism and Hamas's desire to kill Jews, not about the occupation, the settlements, and Israel's near-total control of Palestinian territory and Palestinian lives. The official Israeli argument, which has been repeatedly echoed by U.S. political leaders of both parties, is that Israel withdrew from Gaza in a gesture of peace only to see Hamas take over Gaza and begin bombarding Israel with rocket fire — proof, Israeli officials say, that Palestinian grievances are less about land than hate.
18. Research Israel's withdrawal from Gaza, Hamas's subsequent takeover of Gaza, and how this laid the ground for Israel's 2008-2009 invasion of Gaza. Be sure to read multiple sources on all sides of the issue, not just mainstream news outlets. And think about these questions:
 - a. What were the real reasons Israel decided to withdraw from Gaza?
 - b. What was the sequence of events that led up to Hamas gaining power in Gaza?
 - c. Was the U.S. involved in any of this?
 - d. When Hamas was firing rockets at Gaza prior to Israel's invasion, is it accurate to say they were unprovoked?
 - e. Is it accurate to say that Israel's subsequent invasion met the legal definition of self-defense?

19. The question of how much power and influence the Israel lobby has in American politics has long been the subject of debate. Some have argued that lobbying for Israel is simply “pushing an open door,” meaning that Congress needs little convincing because it's already pre-disposed to a foreign policy agenda that is pro-Israel. But others have made the case that the lobby’s political clout and campaign contributions have allowed it to exert disproportionate power over both the executive and legislative branches of the U.S. government.
20. John Mearsheimer and Stephen Walt's 2006 essay, “[The Israel Lobby](#)”⁷ (published as a book in 2007), helped spark a debate about exactly these questions. [The book was attacked in conservative circles](#)⁸ as an anti-Semitic screed whose disproportionate focus on the Israel lobby reinforced conspiracy theories about Jews controlling the media and the world. While on the left, analysts like [Noam Chomsky expressed concern](#)⁹ that the book may have overstated the role of the lobby and therefore understated the primacy of America's strategic interests and imperial designs in the region.
21. [This article](#)¹⁰ by former CIA analysts Bill and Kathleen Christison provides a good summary of the arguments that have been made for and against the power of the Israel Lobby.
22. Take a look at all of these pieces, summarize their key ideas, decide which arguments make most sense to you, then give your own take on this. Explain as clearly you can how much influence you think the lobby has in the United States, what the concrete effects of that influence are, and also any areas where you think the influence of the lobby may not be as great as some believe.
23. Read Frank Luntz's [latest report](#)¹¹, especially what he says about young people's perceptions of the conflict. What reasons does Luntz give for this hemorrhaging of support for Israel among young Americans, and what specific recommendations does he make for fixing it? Do you think his recommendations will succeed? Why or why not?

24. Summarize the debate about BDS. What are the main positions of those who are opposed to BDS? What are the main positions of those who support it? Then read the [BDS movement's platform](#)¹² for yourself. Do you agree or disagree with how its opponents have talked about it? Why or why not?
25. Write up a summary of anything that has changed in your perception of this conflict as a result of watching this film.

Resources

- ¹ http://mefdownloads.s3.amazonaws.com/David_Frum.pdf
- ² <https://chomsky.info/consent01/>
- ³ http://mefdownloads.s3.amazonaws.com/Partition_Plan_Rejected.pdf
- ⁴ http://mefdownloads.s3.amazonaws.com/Hasbara_Conference.pdf
- ⁵ <https://theintercept.com/2014/07/29/terrorism-israelgaza-context/>
- ⁶ http://mefdownloads.s3.amazonaws.com/Global_Language_Dictionary.pdf
- ⁷ <http://www.lrb.co.uk/v28/n06/john-mearsheimer/the-israel-lobby>
- ⁸ <http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/content/article/2006/04/04/AR2006040401282.html>
- ⁹ <https://chomsky.info/20060328/>
- ¹⁰ <http://www.counterpunch.org/2006/06/16/the-power-of-the-israel-lobby/>
- ¹¹ <https://jewishphilosophyplace.files.wordpress.com/2014/09/luntz-presentation-9-2014.pdf>
- ¹² <https://bdsmovement.net/call>