

FREQUENTLY ASKED QUESTIONS

*Economic Pressure as a Tool for
Establishing a Just Peace in the
Palestinian-Israeli Conflict*

Prepared by: Ecumenical Advocacy Group, Jerusalem
Spring 2005

Table of Contents

1. What does the Israeli Occupation of the Palestinian Territories mean for Palestinians and Israelis?.....	2
2. On what basis are the Israeli settlements in the Occupied Palestinian Territories considered both illegal and obstacles to peace in the Middle East?.....	3
3. What kinds of measures have the U.S. churches taken thus far to help bring about an end to the occupation and to build a just and lasting peace?.....	4
4. How much is U.S. foreign aid to Israel and how is it different from aid to other countries?.....	6
5. What are the specific changes in Israeli and/or Palestinian policies that are necessary for a sustainable peace?.....	6
6. Why are some churches initiating actions toward divestment at this point in the Palestinian-Israeli conflict?.....	7
7. When previously have U.S. churches adopted economic-based measures in the pursuit of justice and peace?.....	8
8. What are the proponents of divestments, boycotts, or other economic pressures hoping to achieve?.....	8
9. What does the international community say about the use and effectiveness of divestment and boycotts, particularly in promoting human rights and independence?.....	9
10. What is phased, selective divestment and how would it work?...	10
11. How do churches determine which corporations to engage in the divestment process?.....	10
12. Some churches, non-governmental organizations and governmental bodies are encouraging the boycott of products made in Israeli settlements located in the occupied territories. What is the purpose of the boycott and how does it work?.....	11
13. What actions have been taken by the European Union (EU) regarding the export of products from Israeli and the Occupied Palestinian Territories (OPT)?.....	12
14. Are other kinds of boycotts, related to sports or academic exchanges, also being considered?.....	13

15. Which churches have adopted positions calling for economic pressure on Israelis, Palestinians, and other Arab countries?.....	13
16. Why should Israel be singled out when there are other discriminatory and repressive governments?.....	15
17. Is this an act of anti-Semitism?.....	16
18. Are the churches also considering economic measures that will put pressure on Palestinians engaged in violent actions to bring an end to the violence?.....	16
19. What do Palestinians say about divestment and boycotts? Are they calling for such measures?.....	16
20. What do Israelis say about divestment and boycotts?.....	17
21. Will the measures hurt Palestinians or Israelis already living in poverty?.....	19
22. What would prompt the churches to declare an end to economic pressure and declare success?.....	20

Introduction

Since 1948, much of the world has been active in calling for a solution to the conflict in the Middle East that would respect the welfare, needs and rights of both the Arab and Jewish peoples. All major Christian denominations have repeatedly affirmed Israel's right to exist within permanent, recognized and secure borders, while at the same time recognizing Palestinian rights to self-determination. In 1967, following the Israeli occupation of the remaining Palestinian territory in East Jerusalem, the West Bank and the Gaza strip, those churches have continuously called for the end of the occupation and supported the international calls for a two-state solution. This would include a state of Israel with safe and secure borders based upon the Armistice Line of 1948 (its borders as recently as 1967). It would also include a state of Palestine with safe and secure borders based upon the Gaza Strip, the West Bank and East Jerusalem in a manner that permits geographical integrity and economic viability.

During 2000 – 2004, with the violence between the parties escalating, most major Christian communities have persistently held that the root of the violence on both sides is the continuing Israeli occupation and colonization of the Palestinian territories. Through decades of dialogue and advocacy, nothing has stopped the Israeli confiscation of Palestinian land and their environmental resources or the increasing settlement of an Israeli Jewish population in those territories. In fact, the population in the colonies doubled during the years of the Oslo process (September 1993-December 2000). Even now with a possibility of the colonies in the Gaza Strip being evacuated, colonies in the West Bank and East Jerusalem continue to expand and new outposts are being established.

Throughout the years of the conflict, church communities and other organizations have promoted a variety of non-violent direct actions that would help bring about positive change in this on-going conflict. Today, some of those churches, numerous non-governmental organizations, educational facilities and governments are either developing or implementing policies that place economic pressure on the State of Israel. The purpose is to signal that the road to a just peace is dependent on the immediate end of the occupation. This would make possible a negotiated peace agreement that promotes the security and prosperity of Israel as well as that of a Palestinian state. These positions have been informed by and are sensitive to the perspectives of Christians in the region as well as Christian-Jewish and Christian-Muslim relations. They are in concert with the voices of Israeli, Palestinian, and international peacemakers. They are in harmony with the stipulations of international law and standing UN resolutions.

Incorporating economic pressure into the churches' response to this conflict is a critical decision, not made without deliberation and concern for the variety of consequences. Boycotts and economic divestment raise questions for people as they seek to make wise, consistent and compassionate choices in their efforts to assist in an end to Israeli-Palestinian conflict through a just and durable peace. An ecumenical group of North American Christian workers in the Holy Land developed this document to help provide answers to some of the most common questions asked when churches, organizations and people weigh whether to begin economic direct action. Throughout the paper are numerous websites and articles listed which will assist those who want more detailed information. It is a working document and certainly not exhaustive, but we hope it will be a useful tool in your consideration.

You can direct questions or responses to:

English-speaking Congregation
Ecumenical Advocacy Group
PO Box 14076
Jerusalem 91 140
Via Israel

Frequently Asked Questions

1. What does the Israeli Occupation of the Palestinian Territories mean for Palestinians and Israelis?

Because of Israel's ongoing occupation of the Palestinian territories, the human rights of Palestinians continue to be violated, including the fundamental right to self-determination. The imbalance of power and authority between the parties greatly restricts the lives and livelihoods of Palestinians. Israelis and Palestinians are forced to live within an apartheid-like system that contributes more to fear and violence than to security for both. The State of Israel and its citizens suffer the negative effects of a militarized society and a declining legitimacy in international relations.

Detail

As an occupying power, Israel has obligations, under the Fourth Geneva Convention to safeguard the well being of civilians in the Occupied Territories, to not confiscate the natural resources, and to not move its own civilian population into the territories. Israel has consistently ignored all of these obligations. The military control or occupation of the Palestinian Territories has "excused" the State of Israel from granting Palestinians Israeli citizenship, meaning that Palestinians are a stateless nation.

Until 1993, Palestinians had no control over any civic, administrative or security issues in the Occupied Territories. During the Oslo process, 1993 – 1999, about 40% of the total Occupied Territory came under the administrative control of the Palestinian Authority, with about 18% being also under their security control, although Israel has maintained control of all border crossings and checkpoints.

In 2002, the government of Israel began building the "Separation Wall". While the government states that the Wall is necessary for Israel's security, its circuitous route ignores the 1967 Green Line, which serves as the internationally recognized boundary between Israel and the Occupied Territories, by cutting into the West Bank annexing more land to Israel, specifically Palestinian farmland. For Palestinians, permission to travel to other countries or even to other Palestinian areas can take weeks to obtain or be refused without explanation. This refusal of permission to move between Palestinian cities and into Jerusalem or Israel has resulted in high unemployment rates and an inaccessibility of Jerusalem's holy sites for Palestinian Muslims and Christians.

Israeli citizens are no longer able to travel inside the Palestinian-controlled Occupied Territories. The Segregation Wall has largely restricted interaction of Palestinians and Israelis, promoting dehumanization of the other and fostering fear, which leads to violence and prohibits a lasting peace between the two groups. Israeli military service is mandatory, and those who refuse to serve in the military must serve jail time. In violation of over thirty U.N. Resolutions, Israel is severely hurting its legitimacy and international relations.

Main source: Weaver, Sonia K. *What is Palestine/Israel? Answers to Common Questions.* (2004) Winnipeg, MB: Mennonite Central Committee

2. On what basis are the Israeli settlements in the Occupied Palestinian Territories considered both illegal and obstacles to peace in the Middle East?

International law, the UN Charter and numerous UN Security Council resolutions clearly prohibit the settling of civilian population within territory gained through war. The presence and expansion of Israeli settlements in the Occupied Palestinian Territories, particularly during the years of the Oslo Process (1993-2000), has created a situation where the creation of a viable Palestinian state is almost impossible, and has created an apartheid-like structure under which Palestinians are living.

Detail

International law prohibits the annexation of territory by force, making Israel's colonization policy in the occupied territories illegal. The Hague Convention IV (18 Oct 1907, Section II, Art. 23 and Section III, Art. 46) and the Universal Declaration of Human Rights (10 Dec. 1948) Art. 17 (2) address the illegality of such territorial expansion. The UN charter itself states that territorial gains from war are unlawful, even if achieved in the course of self-defense, and that any state is obliged to withdraw once it has protected itself from danger. As well, the Fourth Geneva Convention (1949), to which Israel is a signatory, clearly states that the settlement of occupied territories is illegal:

Fourth Geneva Convention (1949): Art. 47: “Protected persons who are in occupied territory shall not be deprived, (...) as the result of the occupation of a territory, into the institutions or government of the said territory, nor by any agreement concluded between the authorities of the occupied territories and the Occupying Power, nor by any annexation by the latter of the whole or part of the occupied territory.” Art. 49: “The Occupying Power shall not deport or transfer parts of its own civilian population into the territory it occupies.”

As well, in both the UN Security council and the UN General Assembly numerous resolutions have passed calling for the immediate exit of Israel from all territory occupied during the 1967 war. For example:

UN Security Council Resolutions

Res. 242 (22 Nov. 1967): *Emphasizes “the inadmissibility of the acquisition of territory by war”, and calls for Israeli withdrawal of from all occupied territories; and Res. 446 (22 March 1979): “Determines that the policy and practices of Israel in establishing settlements in (...) territories occupied since 1967 have no legal validity” and calls on Israel “to rescind its previous measures and to desist from taking any action which would result in changing the legal status and geographical nature and materially affecting the demographic composition of the Arab territories occupied since 1967, including Jerusalem, and, in particular, not to transfer parts of its own civilian population into the occupied Arab territories”.*

*In the peace negotiations between the Palestinians and the Israeli government during the 1990s, the parties recognized the critical importance this issue played in finding a just solution to the conflict. The 1993 **Declaration of Principles** stipulated that “The two sides view the West Bank and the Gaza Strip as a single territorial unit, whose integrity will be preserved during the interim period,” (DoP, Art. IV). The September 1995 **Interim Agreement** stated that “Neither side shall initiate or take any step that will change the status of the West Bank and Gaza Strip pending the outcome of the permanent status negotiations.” In a bid to curb the ongoing violence, the ‘**Mitchell Committee**’ was sent on a fact-finding mission to the territories in spring 2001. In its recommendations, the Committee unambiguously condemned Israel’s continuing policies of land confiscation, property destruction and settlement expansion as illegal and as obstacles to peace, and calling for a “freeze of all settlement activity, including the ‘natural growth’ of existing settlements.*

'Israeli settlement activity has severely undermined Palestinian trust and hope. It preempts and prejudices the outcome of negotiations and, in doing so, cripples chances for real peace and security. The United States has long opposed settlement activity. Consistent with the report of the committee headed by Senator George Mitchell, settlement activity must stop. (US Secretary of State Colin Powell, speech at the University of Louisville, Kentucky, 19 Nov. 2001)

(excerpted from http://www.passia.org/index_publication.htm, Settlements and the Wall: Preempting the Two-State Solution)

3. What kinds of measures have the U.S. churches taken thus far to help bring about an end to the occupation and to build a just and lasting peace?

Many U.S. churches advocate for just U.S. government policies related to the Middle East, policies which would 1) promote a peaceful resolution to the Palestinian-Israeli conflict and end the cycle of violence, 2) ensure that Jerusalem will be a shared city by Jews, Christians, and Muslims, and 3) help to promote and protect the human rights of Palestinians and Israelis. In partnership with the churches in the region, many U.S. churches encourage participation in a national ecumenical prayer vigil for all who suffer due to the ongoing hostilities, support the Ecumenical Accompaniment Program in Palestine and Israel, send short-term delegations as well as long-term church workers to the region to accompany the local churches in their ministries, and support financially programs which alleviate human suffering and build civil society.

Detail

Many churches in the United States, particularly those associated with the National Council of the Churches of Christ in the USA, have for decades supported a peace agreement in the Middle East that is based on United Nations Security Council Resolutions 242 and 338 and that guarantees Israel's right to exist and the establishment of a Palestinian state. These churches have opposed the Israeli occupation of the West Bank and Gaza Strip and the construction and expansion of Israeli settlements in the occupied territories. They maintain that addressing the root causes of the conflict between the Israelis and Palestinians is in the best interest of both parties.

The churches, through grassroots activities and assembly resolutions, have expressed concern that U.S. administrations have not used their influence to stop Israeli settlement building and expansion in East Jerusalem and other Palestinian areas. Some churches adopted resolutions opposing further housing loan guarantees to Israel until the construction and expansion of settlements in the occupied territories stopped. On June 7, 2001, a high-level delegation of church leaders – representing Episcopal, Orthodox, Roman Catholic, United Methodist, and Lutheran churches, as well as the National Council of Churches – presented Secretary of State Colin Powell a letter supporting U.S. efforts to bring an end to Israeli-Palestinian violence and calling on the U.S. to “do what it must to bring Israel's settlement activity to an end.”

U.S. churches currently engaged in discussions about divestment have in the past called on the US to condition U.S. aid to Israel on meeting the rules and procedures that are applied to every other recipient of U.S. aid. They also called for U.S. aid to the region to be shifted away from weapons and toward development assistance. Several U.S. denominations participated in the development of proposals, such as “Toward a Safer Future for the Children of Abraham: A Proposal for Restructuring U.S. Aid to the Middle East,” in order to prompt discussion on this issue on Capitol

Hill and in congregations. It is understood that aid should be provided in ways that promote human rights and build self-reliant individuals, communities, and nations.

These denominations have encouraged advocacy related to the Palestinian-Israeli conflict and have consistently called upon their members to urge their elected officials to be determined in: seeking an end to the violence; establishing a cease-fire; calling all parties to adhere to their international obligations in regard to humanitarian law and human rights standards; seeking the establishment of an international peacekeeping presence in Jerusalem, the West Bank, and Gaza; facilitating the withdrawal of Israeli forces from Palestinian-controlled areas; bringing about an end to the occupation; and resuming negotiations that will lead to sustained peace with justice. The churches condemn unequivocally both the suicide bombings and Palestinian violence against Israeli society and the myriad forms of violence of the Israeli occupation of Palestinian territories.

Many delegations have been dispatched to the region representing the U.S. churches. The December 2000 statement of the U.S. Christian Ecumenical Delegation to the Middle East 1) called on the Israelis and Palestinians to cease all acts of violence and attempts to kill and return to the negotiating table immediately, 2) urged Israeli forces to end the use of disproportionate force in violation of international norms, as when tanks and helicopters are used to attack civilian neighborhoods, and 3) urged Israel to stop further confiscation of land, house demolitions, widespread closures, destruction of trees and agricultural fields, settlement expansions, and other policies that victimize Palestinians and change the "facts on the ground" before reaching a final negotiated peace agreement.

A number of denominations are encouraging their members to participate in the "Ecumenical Accompaniment Program in Palestine and Israel - EAPPI" announced in October 2001 by the World Council of Churches. Participants accompany Palestinians and Israelis in nonviolent efforts to end the occupation. The churches strongly support efforts to develop the potential of nonviolence to bring about just and peaceful change, encourage education on nonviolence, and encourage conscientious consideration to participation in nonviolent action for peace.

In an effort to educate their members about some of the underlying human rights issues in the Middle East, the churches produced a human rights resource, "The Middle East Human Rights Advocacy Handbook," which includes an overview of human rights issues throughout the Middle East and offers ideas for grassroots advocacy.

The churches have been involved in mobilizing grass-roots activists in the U.S. for prayer and advocacy, including an ecumenical prayer vigil for Middle East peace that began in 2000; developing and distributing congregational resources; encouraging church-to-church relationships with Palestinian congregations; and engaging the public media concerning U.S. policy toward the Middle East. At the same time, the churches have encouraged their members to reach out to people in the Muslim and Jewish communities in North America, in order to foster inter-religious dialogue and mutual understanding.

The churches in the U.S. join the churches in Jerusalem in seeking an open and shared city by all. Many churches in the U.S. endorsed the Jerusalem leaders' invitation to all parties concerned "to go beyond all exclusivist visions or actions, and without discrimination, to consider the religious and national aspirations of others, in order to give back to Jerusalem its true universal character and to make of the city a holy place of reconciliation for humankind."

For more information about the churches' ministry of advocacy, go to www.cmep.org

4. **How much is U.S. foreign aid to Israel and how is it different from aid to other countries?**

Israel's total aid (direct and indirect) is at least \$5 billion annually. There are at least three ways in which aid to Israel is different from that of any other country. First, since 1982, U.S. aid to Israel has been transferred in one lump sum at the beginning of each fiscal year, which immediately begins to collect interest in U.S. banks. Second, Israel is not required to account for specific purchases and thirdly, the amount of aid the U.S. gives to Israel is unparalleled in the history of U.S. foreign policy.

Detail

- *Israel's total aid (direct and indirect) is at least \$5 billion annually*
- *Total of direct U.S. aid to Israel has been at around \$3 billion (usually 60% military and 40% economic) per year for the last 25 years (U.S. Congress approved \$2.76 billion in its annual aid package for Israel in 2004)*
- *Israel usually gets another \$3 billion in indirect aid: military support from the defense budget, forgiven loans, and special grants*

"There are at least three ways in which aid to Israel is different from that of any other country. First, since 1982, U.S. aid to Israel has been transferred in one lump sum at the beginning of each fiscal year, which immediately begins to collect interest in U.S. banks. Aid that goes to other countries is disbursed throughout the year in quarterly installments.

"Second, Israel is not required to account for specific purchases. Most countries receive aid for very specific purposes and must account for how it is spent. Israel is allowed to place U.S. aid into its general fund, effectively eliminating any distinctions between types of aid.

"A third difference is the sheer amount of aid the U.S. gives to Israel, unparalleled in the history of U.S. foreign policy. Israel usually receives roughly one third of the entire foreign aid budget, despite the fact that Israel comprises less than .001 of the world's population and already has one of the world's higher per capita incomes. In other words, Israel, a country of approximately 6 million people, is currently receiving more U.S. aid than all of Africa, Latin America and the Caribbean combined when you take out Egypt and Colombia."

SOURCE: Bowles, Matt (SUSTAIN). U.S. Aid - Lifeblood of the Occupation. From website: http://www.sustaincampaign.org/about_usaidtoisrael.html

For more information on US aid to Israel also see www.ifamericaknew.org

5. **What are the specific changes in Israeli and/or Palestinian policies that are necessary for a sustainable peace?**

For any peace agreement to be sustainable it must be based on justice. If not, any agreement would only serve at best as a temporary truce, because the sources of the conflict would not have been addressed. Clearly violence needs to stop to initiate peace-making's first steps. The Palestinian struggle for freedom needs to discontinue the use of violent attacks. Israel needs to halt its greater direct violence and its structural violence aimed at Palestinians. The most important next step towards implementing a lasting peace is the end of the Israeli occupation of East Jerusalem, Gaza, the West Bank and the Golan Heights. The Separation Barrier/Wall must also be dismantled, as it contravenes international law.

Detail

A just peace, according to the American Friends' Committee's "Principles for a Just and Lasting Peace," (28 October 1999) would include the following components:

- (1) Self-determination: Israelis now have their own state; now Palestinians need a state and the right to live as a sovereign people within their own borders. UN resolutions 242 and 338 are the starting points for the discussion of borders. Both sides need to work on basis of respect for rule of law and self determination for both peoples.*
- (2) Rights: the guarantee of human rights for all is crucial for a sustainable peace, including the freedom to practice one's religion, freedom of assembly, free speech, free press, the right to education and adequate nutrition, civil rights for all persons, the safeguarding of the rights of minorities, the right to legal representation and a fair trial, protection against discrimination, freedom of movement and freedom from collective punishment.*
- (3) Economic justice and natural resources: all parties need equal access to land and water resources, fair taxation and the distribution of resources are required, both between the two societies and within each society.*
- (4) Governance: both peoples must have the right to choose their own means of governance.*
- (5) Security: "the foundations of security are to be found in trust, respect, and mutual recognition of the humanity and past and present sufferings of both parties. . .military might only increases fear and distrust and exacerbates the power differences that already exist" between the two parties. Hence substantial reduction of arms is important, in addition to trust building measures between both parties.*
- (6) Status of Jerusalem and settlements in Gaza and the West Bank: Jerusalem must be shared by both peoples, with open access guaranteed to them. The Israeli settlements on the West Bank and Gaza, which are illegal under the Fourth Geneva Conventions, are a serious obstacle to peace. A just solution for Palestinian refugees requires a combination of acknowledgement, compensation, restitution or repatriation for those who have lost their homes and lands, a process fundamental to long-term reconciliation of the two peoples.*
- (7) Responsibilities of the international community: Via UN resolution 242, the international community has expressed its support for a two-state solution. The world community needs to support the above principles drawn on international law. The world community can also help facilitate peace in the region by working on disarmament in the whole region, the implementation of the nuclear non-proliferation treaty and related international agreements against the spread of weapons of mass destruction.*

For the complete text of this document, see www.afsc.org

6. Why are some churches initiating actions toward divestment at this point in the Palestinian-Israeli conflict?

After years of making resolutions calling for Israel to follow international law, end the settlement expansions and end the occupation of Palestinian territory, several things have prompted churches to act now:

- The Wall – and all the destruction and chaos it has caused – and its condemnation by the International Court of Justice;*
- The cumulative effect of 4 years of increased violence, harsh restrictions and increasing land confiscation;*
- The growing likelihood that there may not be enough contiguous land to make a Palestinian state if it goes on much longer.*

Detail

In a background paper explaining the Presbyterian Church (USA)'s decision to institute a phased, selective divestment in mid-2004, they expressed the reasons they had come to the decision at this point. They expressed it this way: The General Assembly has approved numerous resolutions on Israel and Palestine through the years, repeatedly affirming, clearly and unequivocally, Israel's right to exist within permanent, recognized, and secure borders (for example: 1969, 1974, 1977, 1983, 1989). It has deplored the cycle of escalating violence - by both Palestinians and Israelis - which is rooted in Israel's continued occupation of Palestinian territories. Presbyterians have also expressed concern about the loss of innocent lives of Israelis and Palestinians (see "Resolution on the Middle East," 1997, and "[Resolution on Israel and Palestine: End the Occupation Now](#)," 2003).

7. When previously have U.S. churches adopted economic-based measures in the pursuit of justice and peace?

Churches choose to use economic measures when they feel that other measures, such as statements or resolutions, are not making the kind of impact necessary for change. There have been many examples of churches using successful economic pressure to create a difference. During the Civil Rights Movement in the U.S., many African American churches used boycotts of buses and of particular institutions that practiced racism. They saw it as a powerful method of showing non-violent resistance to the business community. International boycotts have been endorsed by many denominations, including the National Council of Churches, in the 1980's to encourage South Africa to end the system of apartheid. More recently, the National Council of Churches and many denominations have been involved in boycotts of certain products that are associated with companies that violate farm workers rights including a current boycott of Taco Bell and a recently ended five-year boycott of the Mt. Olive Pickle Company that ended successfully with the signing of a union contract. In all of these examples, churches have found that these efforts of economic pressure, although perhaps minimal in the larger sense, have helped to highlight the moral questions that lie behind the injustices.

8. What are the proponents of divestments, boycotts, or other economic pressures hoping to achieve?

Ultimately, the proponents of divestment/boycott campaigns seek to build a peaceful, grassroots movement that will pressure Israel to live up to its obligations under international law to end the Israeli occupation of Palestinian territory and their control over Palestinian lives and livelihoods. It is a step taken because other measures, on their own, have proven unable to do so. They also seek to pressure companies whose goods and materials help under gird the military occupation and the colonization of East Jerusalem, the West Bank and the Gaza strip.

Detail

Leveraging the economic power of the church through a responsible and deliberate process of phased, selective divestment, goods boycotts and other economic pressures is an attempt to say once and for all that the only road to security, justice and peace for both Israelis and Palestinians is to start by ending the occupation of the Palestinian territories. Churches have used economic non-violent action in South Africa, Sudan, Indonesia, and against corporations throughout the later part of the twentieth century.

In the struggle against apartheid, divestment was shown to have a multiplier effect: by threatening the profit margins of companies, these campaigns encouraged companies to exert pressure of their

own on the South African government. Divestment, then, is a moral response to Israel's human rights abuses and military occupation, and a non-violent way of pressuring Israel to bring that occupation to an end. Furthermore, it will pressure the U.S. government to transform its Middle East policy from one that is biased and destructive to one that seeks genuine justice and peace for both the Israeli and Palestinian people.

Although the true economic impact of a boycott is unknown, its value in raising awareness of Israel's occupation is tremendous. When we exercise our economic power and take a moral stance as individuals and as communities to speak out against oppression, we get the attention of world leaders.

Resources:

(www.endtheoccupation.org, Divestment Fact Sheet, Oct 7, 2004)

(<http://www.globalexchange.org/countries/palestine/divestmentfaq.html>)

(<http://www.pcusa.org/israelandjewishrelations/divestment.htm>)

9. What does the international community say about the use and effectiveness of divestment and boycotts, particularly in promoting human rights and independence?

While this question is open to debate still, there is increasing agreement throughout the world that economic pressures, when planned and targeted carefully and deliberately, can be effective tools in promoting human rights and independence. Most will agree that the divestment campaign against South Africa's apartheid system helped bring about change. From 1977 to 1985, 55 universities and others joined the divestment campaign, although 30 of them only joined in the last year. Nelson Mandela credits the University of California's divestment of \$3 billion in 1986 as a major factor in the final turning point. Others will argue that economic measures actually violate human rights as they only hurt the poorest people, not the decision-makers with power. Many say the economic sanctions against Iraq caused the death of thousands of children.

Detail

Boycotts, divestment, economic sanctions, and other forms of economic protest have been used throughout modern history in a variety of contexts for various reasons. While definitions of "success" are difficult to agree upon, many people from most nations can point to one or more uses of peaceful economic protest that brought about a positive result, such as the Gandhi-led Indian boycott of foreign goods during India's struggle for independence, or the widespread international divestment from apartheid South Africa in the 1980s.

One measure of international perspectives regarding economic protest is the sum of policies and practices of the United Nations (UN). The UN Charter gives the Security Council power to "call upon Member States to apply measures not involving the use of armed force in order to maintain or restore international peace and security. Such measures are commonly referred to as sanctions." Commonly UN sanctions take the form of placing economic pressure on a regime the Security Council deems to be engaged in significant abuses of human rights or ignoring the body of international law. In its history the UN has imposed sanctions in sixteen cases.

While the past two decades have seen significant debate regarding the specific uses and designations of sanctions, there is increasing agreement, both inside and outside the UN, that measures of economic protest can be effective means of peaceful action when planned and targeted both carefully and deliberately.

Several websites to check:

- www.Globalexchange.org
- www.Uncommonknowledge.org/00fall/534.html
- www.Usaengage.org/archives/news/970921wsj.html
- www.cnn.com/specials

Sources:

“Use of Sanctions Under Article VII of the UN Charter”. Office of the Spokesman for the Secretary General. Updated January 2005, <http://www.un.org/News/ocsg/sanction.htm>

“Field Guidelines for Assessing the Humanitarian Implications of Sanctions”. United Nations Inter-Agency Standing Committee, October 2004. Online version, <http://www.humanitarianinfo.org/sanctions/handbook/>

10. What is phased, selective divestment and how would it work?

“Phased, selective divestment” denotes a particular process for addressing divestment issues. It includes a full range of efforts including education, interpretation and public witness, as a way both to create a better informed constituency regarding the nature of Christian witness through the use of financial resources and to engage actively in advocacy around the issues that promote the divestment process. The policy includes a step-by-step process by which churches would engage corporations, with a view to changing both corporate and government policies and practices and, failing that, to support the divestment from these corporations as an act of Christian witness.

<http://www.pcusa.org/mrti/whatisdivestment.htm>

11. How do churches determine which corporations to engage in the divestment process?

A committee, probably a committee for Socially-Responsible Investing, will identify companies that do business with Israel and prioritize them using selection criteria about how much they support and sustain the occupation, settlements and violence against civilians.

Detail

For example, the Presbyterian Church (USA)'s MRTI (Mission Responsibility through Investing) Committee has outlined the following process for prioritizing and engaging the companies:

Classification System

MRTI will compile a listing of multinational corporations operating in Israel and Palestine based on the following criteria:

1. *Multinational corporations that provide products or services to or for use by the Israeli police or military to support and maintain the occupation.*
2. *Multinational corporations that provide products, services, or technology of particular strategic importance to the support and maintenance of the occupation.*
3. *Multinational corporations that have established facilities or operations on occupied land.*
4. *Multinational corporations that provide products or services, including financial services, for the establishment, expansion or maintenance of Israeli settlements.*
5. *Multinational corporations that provide products and services, including financial services, to Israeli or Palestinian organizations/ groups that support or facilitate violent acts against innocent civilians.*

6. *Multinational corporations that provide products or services, including financial services, that support or facilitate the construction of the Separation Barrier.*

Progressive Engagement List

A list of multinational corporations identified for progressive engagement by MRTI will be prepared using the classification system, measured against the following factors:

1. *History and nature of involvement in Israel and Palestine.*
2. *Magnitude and strategic importance of involvement.*
3. *Acts of corporate opposition to the occupation, direct contributions to the victims of the occupation, support of a viable economy for an independent Palestinian state, and non-discrimination against Israeli Arabs or Palestinians in employment practices.*

Process

1. *MRTI will correspond with the leadership of those multinational corporations, expressing the concerns of the General Assembly and pursuing a process to identify desirable changes in the company's role in Israel and Palestine.*
2. *MRTI will notify appropriate PC(USA) governing bodies, soliciting their involvement in the process of engagement with corporate leaders.*
3. *In the course of the dialog with multinational corporations, MRTI may request the General Assembly Council to authorize the filing or co-filing of shareholder resolutions with subject multinational corporations using 433 appropriate channels for the filing.*
4. *MRTI, in cooperation with ecumenical partners, will monitor regularly the progress made with subject multinational corporations.*
5. *When MRTI is persuaded that a particular multinational corporation, after extensive engagement, remains uncooperative or has refused to be in dialog with the churches, MRTI may prepare a recommendation to the General Assembly Council, asking the General Assembly to place the multinational corporation on the divestment/proscription list and urging the Foundation and the Board of Pensions to comply with the action of the General Assembly.*

<http://www.pcusa.org/mrti/social-investment-policies.htm>
www.ucdivest.org

12. Some churches, non-governmental organizations and governmental bodies are encouraging the boycott of products made in Israeli settlements located in the occupied territories. What is the purpose of the boycott and how does it work?

The purpose of boycotting products made in Israeli settlements in the occupied territories would be to purposely not purchase any products, produce or services produced in those settlements, in the hopes that this would send a clear message that doing business with the settlements, which were built illegally on Palestinian land, is not conducive to a just and lasting peace.

Detail

The goal of a boycott is to provide a specific action by which ordinary people can express their commitment to justice and peace. For example, encouraging people around the world not to buy produce from the Israeli settlements helps raise awareness that building settlements on occupied land is illegal and emphasizes the principal demand that the State of Israel is obliged to follow international law in specific action. By focusing on products from the settlements also makes clear this is not a general boycott of all Israeli goods. It is a specific attempt to dismantle the systemic occupation of the Palestinian territories by eliminating economic gain made possible by the occupation. An Israeli group that provide a list of settlement products to boycott is Gush Shalom (the

Peace Block) at <http://www.gush-shalom.org/Boycott/boyceng.htm>. Their slogan is "A Penny to the Settlements is a Penny Against Peace."

13. What actions have been taken by the European Union (EU) regarding the export of products from Israel and the Occupied Palestinian Territories (OPT)?

The EU makes a deliberate distinction between Israeli products originating within in the 1948 boundaries of the State of Israel and those originating in Israeli settlements which are over those boundaries coming from the OPT. Clear indication of product origin is required of all imports and special customs fees are imposed on Israeli products originating from with the OPT.

Detail

The European Union (EU) is Israel's largest single trading partner: approximately 40 percent of Israeli imports come from the EU, and approximately 30 percent of Israeli exports are sent to the EU. The details of this significant trade relationship are outlined in the Association Agreement, the primary document governing EU-Israeli relations. The Association Agreement, in effect since the year 2000, formally established a policy of free trade in Israeli manufactured goods and a liberalized trade policy in agricultural goods.

The EU does, however, distinguish between Israeli products originating over the Green Line and those originating within the internationally recognized boundaries of the state of Israel. In the words of the EU website detailing the EU's formal position on the Middle East peace process, "The EU relies on international law for the territorial definition of the State of Israel, thus excluding the territories under Israeli administration since 1967 in the West Bank, Gaza Strip, East Jerusalem and the Golan Heights." In practice, this means the EU does not recognize products originating in settlements as entitled to preference under the trade regulations established in the Association Agreement. In 2001, the European Commission initiated a policy requiring the customs authorities of all EU member states to verify the origin of any imported products from Israel and to impose customs taxes on those products originating over the Green Line.

*In 2004, a new agreement was reached by the EU and the Israeli Ministry of Trade and Finance to help enforce the EU's policy. Beginning in February 2005, all Israeli exports to the EU must be clearly labeled with a geographic indication of origin specifying not only the state of Israel, but also the city or town of origin. Those items originating over the Green Line will be subject to strict customs fees: according to the Israeli business news service **Globes**, this could amount to as much as \$7 million in annual customs fees on the approximately \$100 million in annual exports to the EU from the settlements.*

Sources:

Europa: The European Union Online: "The EU and the Middle East Peace Process"
http://europa.eu.int/comm/external_relations/mepp/

"EU Approves Arrangement for Marking Territories Products". Globes Online: Israel Business News. January 2, 2005. <http://www.globes.co.il/serveen/globes/docview.asp?did=870073&fid=942>

14. Are other kinds of boycotts, related to sports or academic exchanges, also being considered?

There are lots of web sites on divestment and a few on academic or sports boycotts. Dozens of colleges and universities in the U.S. have campaigns that are working in support of divestment. Here are several quotes from articles supporting the academic boycott of Israel.

M. Shahid Alam, professor of economics at Northeastern University, Boston, excerpted from “The Academic Boycott of Israel, Counterpunch on July 31, 2002.

“I see this as a moral gesture, part of a growing campaign by international civil society to use its moral force to nudge Israelis, to awaken them to the ugly and destructive reality of their Occupation, which has now lasted for more than thirty-five years and shows no sign of ending any time soon.”

“When the young Palestinians learn that academics the world over, that young people on campuses in Britain, France, Canada, and United States are stirring on their behalf, this will convince them that they are not alone; and once they are so convinced, they may be persuaded to renounce their acts of desperation. The academic boycott of Israel uses non-violent means, it leverages moral suasion, to reduce the violence of the colonizer as well as the colonized.”

Diana Neslen, *Jewish Socialist* 47, Winter 2002/2003

“The boycott is a blunt weapon, it does not discriminate, and its efficacy depends on factors well beyond its remit. Many people, while sympathising with the boycott as a strategy, are concerned that it will alienate potential supporters of Palestinian self-determination. They also have tactical quarrels with the organisers. But it’s a tactic, not a strategy, and one of its by-products is an increased awareness of Israeli behaviour. The onus is not on its proponents to defend it but on its opponents to offer an alternative.”

Paul de Rooij, *Washington Report on Middle East Affairs*, January/February 2005

Israeli professor of history Ilan Pappé called on his academic colleagues to “boycott us” because he believes external pressure is essential for Israel to change. Although Israeli academics may be more liberal than the population at large, Pappé didn’t believe that demand for change would come from this quarter. If Israeli academics actively were working for change, he explained, then the boycott might be seen as counterproductive. It was clear from several presentations, however, that Israeli academic institutions are part of the problem. Support for the boycott also came from a handful of academics in Israel, some Israeli academics working abroad, and a significant number of Jewish academics.

(Pappé’s remarks are from “London Conference, a Prelude to Academic Boycott of Israel”)

A site with comprehensive information and articles on the academic boycott of Israel is at www.monabaker.com

15. Which churches have adopted positions calling for economic pressure on Israelis, Palestinians, and other Arab countries?

Numerous main line Protestant churches in the USA, such as the Episcopal Church, the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America, the Presbyterian Church (USA), the United Church of Christ and the United Methodist Church; many Christian organizations, such as the American Friends Service Committee and the Mennonite Central Committee; and numerous ecumenical bodies, most recently

the World Council of Churches, have adopted positions or encouraged action that speaks to the necessities and justifications of economic pressures to bring about change related to justice in the Middle East.

Details

Following are excerpts from official positions or statements of some of the Christian communions concerning the need to use economic pressure in order to help achieve a just and lasting peace in the Middle East:

American Friends Service Committee (AFSC) 28/10/99 Principles for a Just and Lasting Peace Between Palestinians and Israelis *All countries, but especially the United States, should affirm the principles of self-determination in accordance with human rights and international law, and should support the control and reduction of arms into the area and the expansion of economic, non-military aid. Aid should be linked to programs that build democratic infrastructures, secure human rights, and preserve human dignity* [<http://www.afsc.org/israel-palestine/news/principles.htm>]

Mennonite Central Committee (MCC) Land Confiscation and Israeli Settlements

Ask lawmakers to urge Israel to fulfill its obligations under the Fourth Geneva Convention and stop building illegal settlements in the occupied territories. Urge that foreign aid to Israel (particularly from the United States) be connected to a halt to settlement expansion. Ask that your government insist on sufficient proof that 'Made in Israel' imports are not produced in the occupied territories [<http://www.mcc.org/areaserv/middleeast/land.html>]

United Church of Christ (UCC) – 1999, "Bringing Justice and Peace to the Middle East"

BE IT RESOLVED that the Twenty-second General Synod of the United Church of Christ calls on the Executive and Legislative branches of the United States Government to monitor closely types of aid to the State of Israel and Palestinian areas, to use financial resources in non-violent ways that deter development of Israeli settlements in Palestinian areas, and to use financial resources to promote peace and justice for both Israelis and Palestinians.

See also The Palestinians, Israel and the Churches' Economic Leverage [2005]
<http://www.globalministries.org/mee/leverage.pdf>

The Episcopal Church [2004] In response to existing church policy, the Socially Responsible Investment Committee decided to:

-Recommend to the Executive Council -- the Church's governing board -- in November that SRI spend the next 12 months investigating what corporate actions might be appropriate with companies that contribute to the ongoing Occupation, especially in the areas of home demolitions, settlement building and the separation wall. SRI will also spend this period seeking dioceses and congregations that may be interested in being partners in this effort.

-Continue to better educate itself on the subject of the Israeli/Palestinian conflict in partnership with the Episcopal Church in Jerusalem and the Middle East. It will also welcome input from the wider Church, ecumenical and interfaith partners and others, including the American Jewish community. The committee recognizes its primary responsibility to implement existing policies of the Church adopted previously by its General Convention and the Executive Council.

[http://www.episcopalchurch.org/1866_54100_ENG_HTM.htm]

Evangelical Lutheran Church in America (ELCA) [1991] Church-wide Assembly Action: Conflict in the Middle East : *‘to oppose further housing loan guarantees to Israel unless and until the construction and expansion of settlements in the occupied territories is stopped.*
[http://www.elca.org/dcs/elca_actions/ca91_6_33.html]

Presbyterian Church in the U.S.A. (PC(USA)) [2003] Resolution on Israel and Palestine: End the Occupation Now

- I. *Urges the United States government to demonstrate its seriousness about being the sponsor of the Middle East peace process and the creation of a viable Palestinian state ..., by*
 1. *undertaking steps to restructure and reallocate its present annual aid to the Middle East to enable and support strategies for development of the region as a whole;*
 2. *devising such strategies that will result in human advancement, economic growth, a more equitable distribution of resources, improvement in the quality of education, greater participation in governance, and the empowerment of women;*
 3. *assuring that U.S. policies and development assistance programs contribute to these ends; [*<http://www.pcusa.org/israelandjewishrelations/divestment.htm>*]*

United Methodist Church (UMC) – excerpted from 2004 General Conference Resolution, Peace in the Middle East,

Be it further resolved, that we urge the U.S. government to end all military aid to the region, and second to redistribute the large amount of aid now given to Israel and Egypt; to support economic development efforts of nongovernmental organizations throughout the region, including religious institutions, human rights groups, labor unions, and professional groups within Palestinian communities.

2004 United Methodist Church Book of Resolutions, Abingdon Press

World Council of Churches (WCC) Central Committee Meeting, 15-22 February 2005

- *encourages member churches to work for peace in new ways and to give serious consideration to economic measures that are equitable, transparent and non-violent;*
- *reminds churches with investment funds that they have an opportunity to use those funds responsibly in support of peaceful solutions to conflict. Economic pressure, appropriately and openly applied, is one such means of action.*

www.oikoumene.org > Central Committee > Documents

16. Why should Israel be singled out when there are other discriminatory and repressive governments?

All repressive and discriminatory governments should be confronted in terms of their denial of human rights to others. Israel is expected to conform to international standards of justice and fairness in the same manner that all nations are expected to act. That being said, it is worthwhile to point out a few factors which call for action in the Palestinian-Israeli context at the present time:

-The illegal occupation of the West Bank (including East Jerusalem) and Gaza has been a fact since 1967.
-Continual expansion of settlement activity in the occupied territories makes an equitable agreement more and more unlikely.
-It is quite possible, as many people have argued, that the road to peace in the Middle East "passes through Jerusalem"
-The United States has, arguably, a stronger influence on Israeli policies and practices than on any other nation in the world. Thus, it is incumbent on those who help provide moral and ethical leadership in this country to pay specific attention to the on-going human rights crisis in the Middle East.

17. Is this an act of anti-Semitism?

No. Critique of Israeli government policies and actions are judged by the same standard used for all nations.

Details:

Abuse, discrimination, violence against, or harassment of individuals because of race, religion, culture, ethnicity, or national origin must be strongly condemned by all civilized societies. Such behavior fosters division and hatred, and promotes the idea that people should be judged on the basis of origin, race or belief, rather than on the basis of character and action.

Criticism of a nation, its policies and actions, however, is not only valid, but vital to continuing assessment of human rights for the entire world's people. Speaking out against government policies is a basic human right that holds all people accountable for their actions and upholds basic human rights for all. To criticize the policies and practices of the nation of Israel is no more anti-Semitism than criticism of the actions of China is a slur on its people's Asian heritage or culture.

Israel, as well as other modern nations, recognizes that nations must subscribe to certain standards and norms for the common good. This is the basis of the treaties, conventions, protocols, and laws which nations have developed and signed – including Israel - so that individuals of all nations share certain basic rights.

An excellent article, "It's Not Anti-Semitic" by Professor Judith Butler can be found at:
http://www.lrb.co.uk/v25/n16/butl02_.html

18. Are the churches also considering economic measures that will put pressure on Palestinians engaged in violent actions to bring an end to the violence?

In the case of the Presbyterian Church (USA), while the General Assembly resolution initiating the process of phased, selective divestment mentioned only multinational corporations operating in Israel, MRTI will also include the concern of violence against both Israelis and Palestinians since violence on both sides prevents a just and lasting peace.

<http://www.pcusa.org/mrti/guidelines.htm>

19. What do Palestinians say about divestment and boycotts? Are they calling for such measures?

Palestinians and Palestinian organizations overall support divestment and broader sanctions against Israel, towards the goal of ending the Occupation. After thirty-eight years of statements, Palestinians have gained some hope as they see alternative concrete actions being considered by friends around the globe. Some Palestinian organizations are actually raising their own calls for boycotts and sanctions.

Detail

Universally, Palestinians support divestment and broader sanctions against Israel towards the goal of ending the Occupation. One Palestinian organization, the Grassroots International for Palestinian Protection has called for sanctions against the Israeli government including ending economic association agreements with Israel as long as it continues to violate these agreements and/or humanitarian law; and a civilian boycott of all official Israeli organizations and institutions. Another example is Stop the Wall.org, which is a wide network of Palestinians environmental and justice organizations has also called for a sanction and boycott campaign. They ask for support for the Palestinian struggle against the wall and the occupation by a sustained and coordinated boycott campaign. They suggest a consumer boycott on goods, an arms embargo on Israel, and an academic, cultural and sports boycott until the occupation is ended.

The Palestinian Campaign for the Academic and Cultural Boycott of Israel (PCACB) has called for all academic institutions to boycott all Israeli “academic and cultural institutions as a contribution to the struggle to end Israel’s occupation, colonialization and system of apartheid” (7 July 2004 Statement). In addition the PCACB has called for academic institutions to divest from Israel, as well as suspend all forms of funding to Israeli institutions. The Palestinian Non-government Organization Network (PNGO) has also called on the international community to implement a complete boycott of all Israeli cultural institutions.

The Palestinian Initiative (al-Mubadara) has called for a broad international campaign of sanctions against Israel in order to end the Occupation and pressure Israel into abiding by international laws.

For a more in-depth view, see the upcoming statement by a diverse group of Palestinian Christians on www.sabeel.org

20. What do Israelis say about divestment and boycotts?

In general Israelis are divided on this issue. Most Israeli Jews, even some of the more liberal peace activists, condemn such approaches as anti-Semitic, unfair, and a collective punishment against all Israelis, while also failing to address what they see as the main problem of Palestinian terror. Some Israeli Jews feel just the opposite and that such action will help force Israel to truly become a member of the community of nations by freeing itself of an illegal occupation and respecting international law and human rights for all people.

Detail

In “Protestant Church Fights Back on Boycott” by James D. Besser in The Jewish Week, (01.21.2005)

Ethan Felson, Assistant Executive Director of the Jewish Council for Public Affairs thinks this is a policy that is unrelated to peace and continues to cause enormous pain.

Rabbi Gary Brettton-Granatoor, Director of Interfaith Relations for the Anti-Defamation League expresses gladness about the disagreement on the divestment resolution in the Presbyterian Church but would like such disagreement to be organic and internal. He believes that the National Jewish groups have brought to light the tremendous pain in the Jewish community over divestment.

In “Bad Waters: An Open Letter to the Presbyterian Church (USA)” dated July 26, 2004

Rabbis for Human Rights express lack of empathy in the divestment resolutions of the Presbyterian

Church and violation of rights of Jews for equal treatment. According to them the resolution ignores the homicidal ideologies among the Palestinians and its deepest flaw lies in its highly charged language. Divestment according to the Rabbis would be discriminatory behavior against Jews and their State. It serves as collective economic punishment for nearly half of the Jews of the world living in Israel.

The Israeli Coalition Against Home Demolitions (ICAHN) has endorsed selective divestment as an important way to hold Israel accountable to the world community for its human rights violations. It argues that selective sanctions and divestment strategies are not anti-Semitic per se. Rather, it suggests that sanctions, divestment and boycotts "are directed at ending a situation of intolerable conflict, suffering and moral wrong-doing, not against a particular people or country."

Its 2005 statement "Sanction against the Israeli Occupation: Its Time," opens:

You can't have it both ways. You can't complain about violence on the part of the Palestinians and yet reject effective non-violent measures against the Occupation that support their right to self-determination, such as economic sanctions. You can't condemn the victims of Occupation for employing terrorists while, by opposing divestment, thereby sheltering the Occupying Power that employs State Terror. You can't end the isolation and suffering of people living under Occupation while permitting the Occupying Power to carry on its life among the nations unencumbered and normally, by withholding a boycott of its economic and cultural products.

They also say, "We believe that in most cases merely enforcing existing laws, international as well as domestic, would render the Occupation untenable and would pull Israel back into compliance with the norms of the international community. We also favor selective divestment and boycott as tools of moral and economic pressure."

According to ICAHN, the following Jewish or Israeli organization support selective sanctions on Israel: European Jews for a Just Peace (a coalition of 16 Jewish groups from eight European countries, Not in My Name (US), Matzpun (Israeli/International); Jews Against the Occupation (NYC Chapter); the petitions of South African government minister Ronnie Kasrils and legislator Max Ozinsky, which has gathered more than 500 signatories from South African Jews; Jewish Voices Against the Occupation (US); Jewish Women for Justice in Israel and Palestine (US); Gush Shalom (Israel); Jews for Global Justice (US); and Visions of Peace With Justice (US), among others.

William Baue, "To Divest or Not to Divest: Ethical Considerations of Addressing the Israel-Palestinian Conflict"

In November 2004, Jewish Voice for Peace (JVP) called on Caterpillar to review whether the sale of its bulldozers to the Israeli army violates its own code of Worldwide Business Conduct.

Rabbi Mordechai Liebling of the Shefa Fund believes that the divestment movement's one-sidedness will undercut its moral legitimacy seeking that both Israel and the Palestinian groups that support suicide bombings against civilians must be held accountable.

Yariv Oppenheimer of Peace Now thinks divestment is not the right way to change the situation since Israelis feel the entire world is against them resulting in the immediate response of anger and mistrust. Therefore this will not convince the Israelis that the occupation is a bad thing.

"Why Jews should support Divestment," The Jordan Times (November 30, 2004)

Shamai Leibovitz, an Israeli human rights lawyer and veteran of the Israeli army, calls on Americans to demand

that their tax dollars do not fuel Israel's consistent and appalling violations of international law and human rights. He adds that people abusing the concept of "anti-Semitism" in order to support the Israeli government's racist policy towards Palestinians do nothing less than desecrate the memory of those Jewish victims of real anti-Semitism. Leibovit also strongly argues that the myth about this being not a good time to divest because Israel is becoming involved in the "Peace Process" needs to be done away with. This argument was in fact used for the benefit of Israel for dozens of years as an excuse to continue inflicting suffering, humiliation and destruction upon Palestinians in the West Bank and Gaza. As an Israeli thoroughly familiar with Israeli politics, Leibovit believes selective economic pressure holds promise to be the most effective way to end occupation and will eventually lead to the path of peace and security. He calls upon the Jewish community to unite with others behind the divestment resolutions.

Paul de Rooj, *Washington Report on Middle East Affairs*, Jan/Feb 2005

Ilan Pappé, Israeli professor of history, asserts that change will not come from within and that external pressure is essential for Israel to change.

21. Will the measures hurt Palestinians or Israelis already living in poverty?

No. It is unlikely that divestment measures would have any impact on the Palestinians living in the West Bank and Gaza Strip. The situation for them has been dire for quite some time. And Israeli citizens are able to receive subsidies and housing assistance through a variety of government programs. While it is true that divestments from multinational companies that pay large amounts of tax to the government of Israel could eventually result in cuts to government programs that assist Israeli citizens, it should be noted that the government itself has also diverted funds away from these programs, and in favor of such projects as the "separation" barrier, settlements, etc.

Detail

It is unlikely that divestment measures would have any impact whatsoever on the Palestinians living in the West Bank and Gaza. In the World Bank report dated Nov. 22, 2004, they note that "as many as 600,000 Palestinians cannot afford to meet basic needs in food, clothing and shelter to survive. " In Jan 2004, UNRWA reported that more than half the Palestinian population now lives below the poverty level, but due to physical and financial constraints, they are only able to support 61,000 of the most destitute registered refugee families.

*According to an article published on Palestine Monitor entitled *Poverty and Destruction in the Occupied Territories* "There has been no private investment in the West Bank since Sept, 2000...Most of the businesses created as a result of economic cooperation...were shut down."*

In a few words, things couldn't get any worse.

Israeli citizens, including recent immigrants, are able to receive subsidies and housing assistance through a variety of government programs according to the Central Bureau of Statistics. Many of these programs, however, as well as benefits offered to all Israeli citizens, including Israeli Arabs, have been cut back in the past two years to provide funding for other areas of the government. Divestments of multinational companies that pay large amounts of tax to the government of Israel could eventually result in more cuts to these programs. Israeli Arabs (Palestinians who live inside Israel) show concern that their incomes will also be affected by a general divestment of companies doing business in Israel, but show support of divesting in companies that provide for military operations, i.e. weapons, bulldozers, parts for equipment, etc.

22. What would prompt the churches to declare an end to economic pressures and declare success?

The campaign will hopefully help Israeli citizens themselves realize that maintaining the occupation and racial discrimination against Palestinians is morally abhorrent and an economic drain on Israel. The campaign will

end when Palestinians are finally allowed the rights of freedom and self-determination, when Palestinians inside Israel are given equal civil rights, when there is a just solution for the 5 million Palestinian refugees who wish to return home, and when there is equality, peace and security for all people of the region.

<http://www.globalexchange.org/countries/palestine/divestmentfaq.html>

Several websites list companies doing business in Israel:

- The Israeli Embassy: www.israelemb.org/economic/uscompanies.htm
- Global Exchange: www.globalexchange.org/countries/palestine/usinvestments.html

Companies selling arms to Israel:

- The World Policy Institute: www.worldpolicy.org/projects/arms/reports/israel

Several web sites concerned with divestment include:

<http://www.divest-from-israel-campaign.org/>

<http://www.divestment.org/divestment/>

<http://www.mylinkspace.com/israel.html>

A fact sheet on divestment can be found at the US Campaign to End Israeli Occupation web site:

<http://www.endtheoccupation.org/>

Products to boycott: www.Boycottisrael.org

Some of the Ecumenical Advocacy Group, Spring 2005, who contributed to the document:

*Sri Mayasandra, **Christi and Timothy Seidel**, Mennonite Central Committee*

Douglas Dicks, Presbyterian Church (USA) Regional Liaison -- Israel, Palestine and Jordan

*Janet Lahr Lewis, Rev. Sandra Olewine, Mission Personnel, General Board of Global Ministries,
United Methodist Church*