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EXECUTIVE SUMMARY
INTRODUCTION

To date, thousands of law enforcement officials from across the country have been sent to Israel to meet with military and police forces, and thousands more have participated in conferences, trainings, and workshops with Israeli personnel.

Months after 9/11, American law enforcement representatives attended their first official training expedition to Israel to exchange “best practices,” knowledge, and expertise in counter-terrorism. This delegation included chiefs and deputy chiefs of police departments in California, Texas, Maryland, Florida, and New York, agents from the FBI, the CIA, and future officers of ICE, and directors of security at the MTA in New York City.

Participants were schooled in Israeli military approaches to intelligence gathering, border security, checkpoints, and coordination with the media, and met with high-ranking officials in the Israeli police and military, the Shin Bet, and the Ministry of Defense. Since then, US law enforcement exchange programs with Israel have become standard, with hundreds of American law enforcement officials from across the country going to Israel for trainings, and thousands more participating in security conferences and workshops with Israeli personnel in the United States.

These exchange programs with Israel facilitate the sharing of practices and technologies between US law enforcement and the Israeli military, police and intelligence agencies; instill militarized logics of security into the civilian sphere, normalizing practices of mass surveillance, criminalization, and the violent repression of communities and movements the government defines as threatening; and deepen ties between US and Israeli officials to shore up support for a shared security model that justifies flagrant human and civil rights violations.

WHO SPONSORS THESE TRAININGS?

In addition to the US and Israeli government agencies and private companies, non-profit organizations also play an important role in facilitating these joint trainings. These organizations include the Anti-Defamation League (ADL), and the Jewish Institute for National Security Affairs (JINSA), among others.
This report examines how these exchanges with the Israeli military, police, and intelligence agencies reinforce American law enforcement practices of:

- **Expanding surveillance:** Including comprehensive visual monitoring in public places and online, and the heightened infiltration of social movements and entire communities;
- **Justifying racial profiling:** Marking Black and Brown people as suspect, particularly Arabs and Muslims, and refining the policies, tactics, and technologies that target communities and social movements that seek racial justice;
- **Suppressing public protests through use of force:** Treating protestors as enemy combatants and controlling media coverage of state violence.

This report argues that while framed as an opportunity for US law enforcement to learn policing strategies from a closely aligned democracy with counter-terror experience, in fact these are trainings with an occupying force that rules a population deprived of human and civil rights.

Upon their return, US law enforcement delegates implement practices learned from Israel’s use of invasive surveillance, blatant racial profiling, and repressive force against dissent. Rather than promoting security for all, these programs facilitate an exchange of methods in state violence and control that endanger us all.
Israel is regarded as a global leader in the technologies and tactics of surveillance, and the Israeli government claims its expertise has proven effective in thwarting threats to its security. But by treating entire populations as a security threat, what Israel has in fact perfected is a system of invasive monitoring of all Palestinians in all places, with the goal of controlling the entire Palestinian population. During trainings in Israel, US law enforcement delegations meet with Israeli military, police, and intelligence agencies to train in these all-encompassing surveillance tactics and technologies.

Through an elaborate military bureaucracy and diverse technologies and policies, Israel monitors, restricts, and infiltrates Palestinians’ daily activities and movements in their physical and virtual spaces. The extensive surveillance of Palestinians is made possible by the elaborate system of walls, checkpoints, and permits, which regulates Palestinian movement, and a wide range of technologies that attempt to make all aspects of Palestinian life visible to the Israeli military. Israel’s use of these technologies is supplemented by informants who are coerced into collaboration with Israel by the Shin Bet through extortion, as well as by infiltration units of the Israeli military deployed to gather information on Palestinian protests and political activity, and to carry out arrests and extra-judicial killings.

While the US government has long scrutinized people of color and social movements both in the territorial United States and in its wars abroad, American law enforcement trainings in Israel have contributed to expanding surveillance practices in the United States.

Countering longstanding struggles of civil rights organizations and movements, these joint trainings expose US law enforcement to the comprehensive monitoring and infiltration tactics and technologies in the Israeli arsenal, modeling the apparatus of a sweeping surveillance state.
VISUAL MONITORING
American police officers on tour regularly visit the network of 400 cameras which blankets the Old City of Jerusalem and monitors Palestinian movement. Following visits to Israel by the Atlanta Police, The department created a Video Integration Center, collecting and monitoring footage from the city’s thousands of public and private 24-hour surveillance cameras. The Atlanta Police Department reported that the center is modeled after the command and control center in the Old City of Jerusalem and mimics Israeli methods to proactively monitor crime.

INfiltration
American law enforcement delegations regularly meet with the Israeli military and Shin Bet on their trips to discuss human intelligence methods such as the use of informants and infiltrating protests with undercover officials. The NYPD also ran a “Demographics Unit” to spy on daily life in Muslim communities in New York City. Informants known as “mosque crawlers” were deployed to visit mosques, bodegas, and student organizations, and kept extensive dossiers on Muslim communities. Founders of this program admitted that they were inspired by Israeli practices in the Occupied Palestinian Territories.1

Corporations Cash In
These exchanges create opportunities for Israeli security corporations that manufacture and market networked surveillance to obtain deals and contracts in the United States. In Baltimore, a camera network for the Citiwatch program is operated by the Israeli company Nice Systems. Nice Systems and Israeli company Verint also have contracts with the LAPD. Cellebrite, an Israeli company specialized in technology to collect data from cell phones, has contracts with police departments and law enforcement agencies in at least 20 states.

Israel is heralded as a nation that keeps its citizens safe in the face of perpetual threat, but Israel’s security regime is designed to subjugate Palestinians, and relies on systematic racial differentiation between Palestinians and Israeli Jews — that constitutes Apartheid. During trainings in Israel, US law enforcement delegations meet with Israeli military, police, and intelligence agencies to train in Israeli counterterrorism, which by definition necessitates refining methods of racial profiling.

The very structure of Israel’s military rule over the Palestinian people and their lands is premised on a racial distinction between Jewish Israelis and Palestinians, in which religion and ethnicity are the basis for determining which legal system is applied. Israeli military rule over the Occupied Palestinian Territory is run as a counterinsurgency campaign, positioning Palestinians as enemy suspects and defining any opposition to the occupation as a criminal offense, usually “terrorism.” The Israeli military has complete authority to search, detain, and arrest any Palestinian without a warrant, and works with the military court system to prosecute and imprison Palestinians defined by Israel as threatening due to their participation in civic and political life.

Within Israel, the definition of criminality is based on distinctions between Israeli and Palestinian citizens — as well as between Jewish ethnic groups. Despite their citizenship status, Palestinian citizens of Israel are subject to systematic profiling, excessive and often lethal use of force deployed with impunity, and disproportionate incarceration. Jewish Israelis of Arab and North African descent have long been viewed by the Israeli police as prone to crime, and are subject to disproportionate policing and incarceration. Ethiopian citizens of Israel also report heavy police presence in their neighborhoods, harassment, arrests without cause, and the denial of due process.

Throughout Israeli counterterrorism trainings for American police and security forces, direct parallels are made between the Palestinians and those who are presumed to threaten American safety, bolstering the idea of a US-Israeli alliance against Muslims and Arabs. Israeli trainings in counterterrorism reinforce a highly militarized discourse that calls for institutionalized racial profiling and state violence targeting Black and Brown communities and social movements that seek racial justice.

What American law enforcement learn from Israeli policing is an official policy of marking entire populations as suspect, a model that is in direct opposition to efforts to end the racial profiling that has long been constitutive of American policing.

“I think profiling is something that we’re going to have to start thinking about as a country... you look at Israel and you look at others, they do it and they do it successfully.”

President Donald Trump, during the 2016 Presidential race
AIRPORT SECURITY
Most US law enforcement trainings include a tour of the Tel Aviv Ben Gurion Airport, featuring Israel’s notorious passenger screening process, conducted by airport personnel trained by the Shin Bet who work with Israeli intelligence agencies and armed undercover security officers. But the core of Israel’s airport security is systematic racial profiling. Ben Gurion Airport’s racial profiling begins at the checkpoint miles before the terminal entrance, continues through selective questionings and tracking by undercover agents, and includes searches and interrogations of Palestinians as well as of Arab and Muslim foreign nationals. During the trainings in Israel, airport officials explain to US delegates how they use ethnic and racial characteristics to identify suspicious passengers, and how to screen and question these passengers, read their body language and verbal responses, and perform searches. Former TSA director Peter Neffenger testified that the agency has trained with Israel on behavioral detection and that its work has been greatly informed by Israeli airport security.

MUSLIM BAN
While the Israeli government uses race to justify treating Palestinians as enemy combatants and subjects them to a different system of laws, policing and incarceration, the American government polices people of color, Muslims, and social justice activists in the United States as a homegrown counterinsurgency campaign. Israeli trainings of US law enforcement include the legitimization of practices, like systematic racial profiling and criminalization of entire communities, that pave the way for discriminatory immigration policies such as the Muslim ban.
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CORPORATIONS CASH IN
Logan International Airport in Boston was the first of many US airports to contract New Age Security Solutions, headed by the former director of security at Tel Aviv’s Ben Gurion Airport, to revamp its security system. Logan was also the first US airport to pioneer the Israeli inspired Screening Passengers by Observation Techniques (SPOT) program in 2003, which has since spread to airports nationwide. SPOT subsequently came under fire for being ineffective, wasteful, and facilitating discriminatory racial profiling at airports around the country.
Israel is considered a global leader in achieving security through effective containment of civil resistance, and has become a prominent exporter of crowd-control weapons and technologies. The Israeli military regime is a system of totalizing control over the Palestinian population, a system that does not tolerate opposition or dissent of any kind. During trainings in Israel, US law enforcement delegations meet with Israeli military, police, and intelligence agencies to discuss the use of force against civil dissent.

Whenever Palestinians resist the Israeli occupation, they face indiscriminate and brutal force by the Israeli military and police. In the First Palestinian Intifada, Israeli forces’ use of live ammunition and unrestrained crowd-control weapons was widely criticized by international human rights organizations. Condemnations of Israel’s continually expanded criteria for open-fire orders intensified during the Second Intifada, when Israel applied wartime rules of engagement to Palestinian civilians and practiced widespread interrogations, torture, maiming, and killing of protestors. In the subsequent sustained unarmed protests against the separation barrier in West Bank villages over the last 15 years, the IDF has used crowd-control measures and technologies ranging from tear gas canisters, pepper-gas spray, and stun grenades, to beating demonstrators with clubs and shooting them with rubber-coated metal bullets, and in some cases live ammunition.

During the Great March of Return, the mass protests in Gaza launched in 2018 for the right of return and an end to the unlivable conditions caused by Israel’s military blockade, Israel stationed more than 100 snipers, tanks, and drones along the fence, and has since killed over 150 protestors and wounded and maimed more than 16,000.

Israel’s protracted military rule based on racial distinction has also shaped its repression of protests by its own citizens, both Palestinians and Jews of color. Protests by Palestinian citizens of Israel have long faced violent and sometimes lethal crackdowns, including at demonstrations in solidarity with the Gaza march. The recent wave of protests by Ethiopian citizens against police brutality were also met with the use of crowd-control measures, beatings, and arrests, a display of force usually reserved for Palestinians.

In the United States, there has never been a clear separation between military and policing projects, and many American residents and citizens have long been treated as enemy combatants. Most recently, militarized state violence was deployed against the Movement for Black Lives in Ferguson, Baltimore, and across the nation, where unarmed protestors faced police and the National Guard fully armed with riot gear, including armored vehicles, tear gas, stun grenades, rubber bullets, and semiautomatic rifles. Activists protesting deportations and police killings of Black and
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enforcement participants are continually trained in how to better suppress protests in their own cities and towns. Israeli methods of controlling dissent are displayed to American police delegations through briefings and live demonstrations of suppressing an occupied population. Israeli trainings normalize a military application of force in quelling popular protests, as well as legitimate state control over media coverage of such actions, gravely undermining constitutional and civil rights.

Brown people are subjected to curfews, mass arrests, and further violence, demonstrating not only an utter disregard for Brown and Black lives, but also the extent that entire populations in the United States are viewed as threats and as enemies, justifying the use of lethal force as a first resort.

Despite the continued criticism from human and civil rights advocates, US law enforcement participants are continually trained in how to better suppress protests in their own cities and towns. Israeli methods of controlling dissent are displayed to American police delegations through briefings and live demonstrations of suppressing an occupied population. Israeli trainings normalize a military application of force in quelling popular protests, as well as legitimate state control over media coverage of such actions, gravely undermining constitutional and civil rights.

CLOCKWISE FROM ABOVE:

Activestills.org
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QUELLING THE MEDIA

The Israeli government and military censorship tightly control reporting concerning the occupation of Palestine and on Israel’s use of force. The New York Times, among others, has admitted to altering its reporting in light of interventions by the Israeli military censor, which recently acknowledged it completely censored at least 21 percent of news items it reviewed in 2017. The IDF Spokesperson’s Unit yields tremendous power over Israeli journalists and operates as the state’s “largest public relations office,” restricting and shaping local coverage of “security affairs.”

Beginning with the very first official American officers’ delegation to Israel, trainings by Israeli officials included “coordination with the media.” Law enforcement from San Bernardino and Los Angeles, among others, reported that they learned about how to intervene and shape media access and coverage of violence committed by the military and police. Through exposure to Israeli methods, these trainings encourage US law enforcement to adopt Israel’s view of the media as an arm of the government and to reframe coverage of state violence.

CROWD-CONTROL TECHNOLOGY

Joint trainings of US and Israeli military and police also help facilitate the sales and transfer of crowd-control technologies between the two governments. Developed by the Israeli Police and manufactured by Israeli company Odortec, “Skunk,” is a foul-smelling liquid designed to cause nausea that is sprayed at high pressure onto protesters, where it lingers for days on clothing, skin, and in the air. Skunk is used by the IDF as a tool of collective punishment that is deliberately sprayed into stores, schools, houses, yards, and fruit orchards of communities whose members participate in demonstrations.

CORPORATIONS CASH IN

Based on its proven effectiveness against Palestinian protests – particularly in West Bank village demonstrations against the separation barrier – Israel markets Skunk to police units worldwide, including departments in the United States. The American company Mistral Security reportedly began selling Skunk to US police departments, including the St. Louis Metropolitan Police, following the 2014 protests in Ferguson. Mistral Security advertises the product as applicable to “border crossings, correctional facilities, demonstrations, and sit-ins.”
Recent encounters of Black communities with the police in Ferguson and across the country have led both Palestinian and Black Lives Matter activists to draw parallels between Palestine and the United States, and inspired activist delegation visits and exchanges of means of resistance. These activists build on a rich history of solidarity between US social movements and the Palestinian struggle for liberation. The movement for justice in Palestine in the United States has joined the movement for Black Lives, the movement at Standing Rock, and the movement for undocumented immigrants and against the Muslim Ban, to call for racial justice, human rights, and civil liberties for all.

The Deadly Exchange Campaign builds on this crucial work to demand that the American government end its violence in the name of security. We hope that local government nationwide heed the calls from communities across Palestine and the United States to help build a world with real safety that we all can inhabit with dignity.
1 // Programs include the Anti-Defamation League’s National Counter-Terrorism Seminar and Advanced Training School; Jewish Institute for National Security Affairs’ Law Enforcement Exchange Program; and trainings and seminars by the Georgia International Law Enforcement Exchange, among others.


9 // Israeli state data reveals that only 25% of those held in Israeli prisons are Jewish. Of the incarcerated Israeli citizen population 43% are Palestinian, more than twice their rate in the population.

10 // Emmanuel Rosen and Ron Cahlili, Don’t Call Me Black, (Tel Aviv: DocuDrama Ltd., 2008).

11 // The IDF arsenal also includes collective punishment of protesting villages, including use of curfew, limiting access to the village, exposure of the entire village to hazardous crowd-control weapons such as tear gas and the “skunk,” interrogations, nightly raids, and routine arrests of children to leverage protestors to cease their political activities.

12 // The IDF has been using these bullets since the late 1980s to disperse demonstrations in the Occupied Palestinian Territories. Since 2000, they have killed at least 18 Palestinians, including 12 minors.

13 // The IDF also employs live ammunition, though this does not qualify as a crowd-control technology and gravely violates international law.

14 // Adalah petitioned the Israeli Supreme Court to urgently grant access to Ramallah hospitals for wounded protesters to save their limbs. The IDF petitioned to refuse their request as punishment for participating in the protests, and the Court ruled in favor of the IDF and denied them access, causing them permanent disability.


To date, thousands of law enforcement officials from across the country have been sent to Israel to meet with military and police forces, and thousands more have participated in conferences, trainings, and workshops with Israeli personnel.

Months after 9/11, American law enforcement representatives attended their first official training expedition to Israel to exchange “best practices,” knowledge, and expertise in counter-terrorism. The delegation was sponsored by the Jewish Institute for National Security Affairs, and included chiefs and deputy chiefs of police departments in California, Texas, Maryland, Florida, and New York, agents from the FBI, the CIA, and future officers of ICE, and directors of security at the MTA in New York City.

Participants were schooled in Israeli military approaches to intelligence gathering, border security, checkpoints, and coordination with the media, and met with high-ranking officials in the Israeli police and military, the Shin Bet, and the Ministry of Defense. Since then, US law enforcement exchange programs with Israel have become standard, with hundreds of American law enforcement officials from across the country sent to Israel for trainings, and thousands more participating in security conferences and workshops with Israeli personnel in the United States.¹

The exchanges outlined in this report include both government and private programs that bring US law enforcement and Israeli officials together to share ideas and expertise at the local, state, and national level. The effect of the exchange programs with Israel is three-fold: At the most concrete level, they facilitate the sharing of practices and technologies between US law enforcement and Israeli military, police and intelligence agencies. In this way, they instill militarized logics of security into the civilian sphere, normalizing practices of mass surveillance, criminalization, and the violent repression of communities and movements the government defines as threatening. Finally, they deepen ties between US and Israeli officials to shore up support for a shared security model that justifies flagrant human and civil rights violations.

BACKGROUND

The post-9/11 era is defined by severe US government infringement of civil liberties and human rights in the name of national security. The War on Terror has broadened the domestic implementation of military
tactics, methods, and technologies by law enforcement, escalating the criminalization of communities of color, intrusive surveillance of Muslim and Arab communities, violent repression of Indigenous-led movements, and unprecedented deportations of undocumented immigrants. Under the banner of “counterterrorism,” these policies target people of color, poor people, and the growing opposition to the Administration’s violation of civil rights and dismantling of basic services.

While the melding of police and military forces, tactics, and technologies have escalated since 9/11, repressive war-like policing has long been a staple of US state practice. In a history spanning many Administrations, the US government has blurred the boundaries between domestic and foreign, deploying the same martial counterinsurgency tactics in its campaigns abroad as it did against its own population. From the colonization of the Philippines to the invasion of Vietnam and more recently Iraq and Afghanistan, pacification techniques used on the warfront were frequently deployed against communities of color and social movements in the United States.\(^2\) Consolidating this trend over the past several decades, the intertwined Wars waged on Crime, Drugs, and now Terror, have normalized an unlimited horizon for military and police action in the United States. This militarization of domestic law enforcement is further reinforced by the 1033 program transferring excess military equipment to local police departments,\(^3\) and by trainings for American officers with the Israeli military and police.

The events of 9/11 coincided with the Second Palestinian Intifada (uprising), which included mass non-violent protests, strikes, boycotts, and armed resistance and attacks. With the launch of the War on Terror, both American politicians and Israeli officials proclaimed that they were fighting the same Muslim enemy – the “same terrorists.” The Second Intifada created fertile ground for Israel to refine its counterinsurgency policies, tactics, and technologies in Palestinian territory. Israel framed all tactics of the popular uprisings against its military occupation as terrorism, and claimed that based on its daily encounter with such threats it was best suited to share expertise that could help reinforce American national security. The American government concurred that Israel was a model for successful “counter-terrorism” and looked to policies and tactics used by Israel against occupied Palestinians.\(^4\) In American government discourse, Palestinian resistance to
the occupation was abstracted to a depoliticized global problem of "Muslim terrorism."

The American and Israeli governments, Israeli scholars, and American participants and sponsoring organizations justify these exchanges on the grounds that the United States and Israel share the mission of the War on Terror. Israeli scholars of policing explain that for the United States, Israel’s counterterrorism model is “an important example to draw lessons from both because it has been developed in the context of a democratic policing agency, and because it is the result of decades of experience.”5 American facilitators and participants of these programs similarly argue that the United States and Israel are allied democracies whose law enforcement agencies play a crucial role in preserving national security.

Contrary to these assertions, the Israeli military and police impose a military occupation over a civilian population in Gaza, the West Bank and East Jerusalem to maintain the Israeli security model. While framed as an opportunity for US law enforcement to learn policing strategies from a closely aligned democracy with counter-terror experience, in fact these are trainings with an occupying force that rules a population deprived of human and civil rights. Rather than promoting security for all, these programs facilitate an exchange of methods of state violence and control, including mass surveillance, racial profiling, and suppression of protest and dissent.

WHAT US LAW ENFORCEMENT SAY ABOUT THEIR TRAINING IN ISRAEL

“No experience in my life has had more of an impact on doing my job than going to Israel”
– Cathy Lanier, former Chief of the Metropolitan Police Department in DC

“I returned home with a notebook full of practical ideas to implement in my efforts to keep my jurisdiction safe” – Bob Brooks, former sheriff of Ventura County, CA

“I find myself referring back to that experience regularly in my duties and interactions”
– Chief Joe Chronister, former North Las Vegas Police Chief
THE ISRAELI OCCUPATION AS SECURITY LABORATORY

Israel’s occupation of the West Bank and Gaza is regarded as a “laboratory,” where the tactics and technologies of Israel’s booming security industry are developed. Israeli arms companies market their weapons and technologies as “battle-tested” and “field-proven.” The Israeli security industry’s products and services are precisely the technologies Israel has been using to contain the Palestinian people half a century before the War on Terror.

“After every campaign of the kind that is now taking place in Gaza, we see an increase in the number of customers from abroad”

Eli Gold, CEO of Israeli military corporation Meprolight, after Operation Protective Edge, a 51 day offensive in Gaza in 2014

But Israel did not develop its thriving military industries independently. Since 1946, the United States has designated $134.7 billion in military aid to Israel, with $30 billion over the last decade alone, more than is designated in military aid for any other country in the world. Israel is also the only US military aid recipient that is not required to report how it uses this assistance and that was granted the permission to spend over 26 percent of the aid on its own military industries. Over the last several decades, Israel has invested US dollars into its military corporations, becoming one of the top ten weapon exporters in the world and beginning to compete with American industries for foreign weapons contracts.

The competition posed by Israel influenced the new memorandum that will take effect in 2019 and will remain until 2028, growing US military aid to an annual $3.8 billion. But while constituting an increase in aid, the new memorandum has also eliminated the provision enabling Israel to spend it on its own industries. Over the course of the next decade, 100 percent of the US military aid to Israel will be spent on American military corporations and contractors. US military aid to Israel is first and foremost a means of increasing profits to US military corporations, after their products are tested and refined in Occupied Palestinian Territory.
WHO SPONSORS THESE TRAININGS?

In addition to the US and Israeli government agencies and private companies, non-profit organizations also play an important role in facilitating these joint trainings. These organizations include the **Anti-Defamation League (ADL)** and the **Jewish Institute for National Security Affairs (JINSA)**, the **American Jewish Committee (AJC)**, and the **American Israel Education Foundation**, an affiliate of the **American Israeli Public Affairs Committee (AIPAC)**. Of these organizations, the ADL and JINSA have established long-standing programs promoting and facilitating US law enforcement trainings in Israel under the banner of “counterterrorism.”

The Anti-Defamation League is an organization dedicated to combatting anti-Semitism and advocating for Israel. The ADL is a self-proclaimed “civil rights” agency, and has worked to train law enforcement professionals nationwide on what it defines as extremism, terrorism, and hate crimes. But the ADL has also long surveilled, blacklisted, and targeted activists for racial justice and Palestinian rights, and endorsed Islamophobic nominations, publications, and campaigns. The ADL facilitates US police trainings in Israel through its **National Counter-terrorism Seminar**, sending hundreds of top ranking American officials to Israel since the program’s inception in 2003. That same year the ADL established an **Advanced Training School** that brings delegations of Israeli law enforcement officials to speak to over 1,000 US participants to date.

JINSA is a think tank that advocates for US-Israeli security cooperation, increased domestic military spending, and military aid to Israel, and has board members with close ties to US defense contractors. JINSA launched its Law Enforcement Exchange Program (LEEP) shortly after 9/11 at the initiation of Louis Anemone, former NYPD chief and, at that time, head of security for the Metropolitan Transit Authority, who contended that what is happening in Israel “may be the vanguard of what we may be facing in the future in America.” Since 2002, JINSA has run annual trips to Israel for US federal, state, and local law enforcement. Over 11,000 additional American law enforcement officials have attended **LEEP conferences** nationwide, which invite Israeli security officials as experts.

These organizations play an important role in facilitating and solidifying partnerships between the US and Israeli governments that promote ideas, practices, and technologies that commit violence and infringe on civil rights.

IN THIS REPORT

This report examines three major topics of exchange through US law enforcement training with the Israeli military, police, and intelligence agencies: surveillance, racial profiling, and use of force. The first chapter outlines how US law enforcement is trained in Israeli surveillance, infiltration
of protests, and scrutiny of online dissent of Palestinians under military occupation, as well as of Palestinians and Ethiopian citizens of Israel mobilizing for racial justice. The second chapter delineates how US law enforcement learns from Israeli racial profiling that singles out Palestinian, Mizrahi, and Ethiopian Jewish citizens of Israel by monitoring public spaces, airports, and transportation, and by infringing on the freedoms of Palestinians under occupation. The third chapter discusses the lessons US law enforcement receives about how to apply Israeli methods and weapons for suppression of protest and control of media coverage.

Countering decades of mobilizing by civil rights organizations and movements, this report demonstrates that the delegations’ endorsement of Israel’s use of expansive surveillance, blatant racial profiling, and brutal force as a model for US law enforcement puts us all in danger.
To date, thousands of law enforcement officials from across the country have been sent to Israel to meet with military and police forces, and thousands more have participated in conferences, trainings, and workshops with Israeli personnel.

This chapter explores how US law enforcement is trained in Israeli surveillance, infiltration of protests, and scrutiny of online dissent of Palestinians under military occupation, as well as of Palestinians and Ethiopian citizens of Israel. Over the last several decades, Israel has emerged as a global leader in homeland security. It is internationally heralded as a country that enforces security through far-reaching population monitoring, and its surveillance practices and technologies have received global acclaim. The War on Terror has been used to legitimize comprehensive surveillance directed at citizens and residents of the United States. While the US government has long surveilled people of color and social movements both in the territorial United States and in its wars abroad, the War on Terror paved the way for the widespread use of new technologies and tactics and to roll back protections of long fought for civil liberties.

This report documents that US law enforcement trainings with Israel have contributed to expanding surveillance in the United States. The tactics and technologies presented to US law enforcement include comprehensive visual and online monitoring, heightened infiltration, and systematic racial profiling of entire movements and communities.

**ISRAELI SURVEILLANCE**

Israel is regarded as a global leader in the technologies and tactics of surveillance, and American law enforcement is particularly interested in learning from Israel’s unique capabilities. The Israeli government claims its surveillance expertise has proven effective in thwarting long-standing threats to its security. But what Israel has in fact perfected is an effective system of monitoring all Palestinians in all places, with the goal of controlling the entire Palestinian population that is deemed a security threat. Through an elaborate military bureaucracy and with the use of diverse technologies and policies, Israel views, records, restricts, and infiltrates Palestinians’ activity and movement in their physical and virtual spaces. The extensive surveillance of Palestinian
life is made possible by the elaborate system of barriers, checkpoints, and permits, which divides, contains, and regulates Palestinian movement. The permit and ID systems enable Israel to track and continually categorize all Palestinians.\footnote{Following its occupation of the West Bank, East Jerusalem, and Gaza in 1967, Israel issued Palestinians orange, green, or blue ID cards, as a way to visually differentiate populations according to their location of residence and degrees of freedom of movement. Israel also established the Civil Administration, an arm of the Israeli military tasked with issuing permits to Palestinians to determine which territories they can enter and for how long. Both the ID and permit systems are derived from European colonial practices.}

While claiming to protect Israeli life, the permit system has actually served three main functions: to create Palestinian dependency on Israel and therefore widen and deepen Israel’s control over Palestinian daily life; to regulate and manage the Palestinian labor force that works inside Israel; and to recruit thousands of Palestinian informants to collaborate with the Israeli secret services, the Shin Bet.\footnote{Another layer of surveillance supplementing the ID and permit system is built into Palestinian’s physical environment. The labyrinth of walls, fences, turnstiles, and checkpoints that Israel has constructed throughout Palestinian territory renders Palestinian life uncertain in a continually changing landscape. These barriers themselves become sites of observation that aim to transform each Palestinian person into an object of Israeli military control. A wide range of X-ray machines, radars, sensors, remote-controlled cameras, and drones intend to make all aspects of Palestinian life visible to the Israeli military, and ensure that Palestinians always feel that they are being watched. These technologies are then marketed abroad as “battle-proven,” generating significant revenue for private Israeli companies and for the state military industries.}

Surveillance technologies such as wiretapping and online infiltration are supplemented with the use of informants who are coerced into collaboration with Israel by the intelligence corps and the Shin Bet. The permit system renders Palestinians vulnerable to extortion, since the granting or revoking of a permit can determine access to employment, medical treatment, and family visits across Palestinian Territory and in Israel.
Palestinians classified by the Shin Bet as security threats cannot obtain movement permits. Over 200,000 residents of the West Bank, nearly 20 percent of Palestinian male residents ages 16-55, are classified as security threats, irrespective of evidence. The Shin Bet alone determines the parameters of the continually fluctuating blacklist, which are not transparent but are overwhelmingly upheld by Israel’s Supreme Court. Palestinians do not know what may cause them to be put on the blacklist, which leads to perpetual uncertainty and paralysis, and has a chilling effect on political activity. This disorientation and dependency creates fertile ground for Shin Bet recruitment efforts. Palestinian informants are recruited by exploiting vulnerability, such as withholding work, medical, and family unification permits in exchange for participation, or with threats to LGBTQ Palestinians to expose their sexuality in their communities. Israeli surveillance thus oppresses Palestinians both through physical mechanisms of control and through fear that compels Palestinians to censor themselves.

Israel enforces an all-encompassing online surveillance, monitoring social media using advanced algorithms and fake accounts to arrest Palestinians for comments posted online. Hundreds of Palestinians have been arrested and questioned based on their posts on social media over the past few years. Suspects are identified through the use of computerized programs that analyze social media posts as well as by human intelligence and infiltration.

In recent years the Israeli courts were quick to accept online expression as a basis for the arrest and prosecution of Palestinians. What constitutes unlawful social media posts remains undefined and discretionary, and has come to include poetry, cartoons, songs, and captions expressing criticism of Israel. The Israeli police data also reveal the use of online surveillance to scrutinize its citizens along racial lines, targeting Palestinian and Ethiopian activists for criticizing the government.

**EXPANDING SURVEILLANCE: AMERICAN POLICY, ISRAELI TACTICS**

During their delegations to Israel, US law enforcement are regularly trained in tactics and technologies of Israeli surveillance, including comprehensive visual and online monitoring and systematic infiltration. The comprehensiveness of Israeli surveillance, both physical and digital, is often praised by US law enforcement delegates upon
their return. On various trips, US law enforcement officers have met with Israeli intelligence officials from the Shin Bet and the Mossad. On other trips, officers visited Israeli security companies that market new technologies for surveillance, including drones, cell-phone interceptors, and facial recognition cameras. Through joint trainings, US law enforcement are exposed to the comprehensive monitoring and infiltration tactics and technologies in the Israeli arsenal, modeling for them a sweeping surveillance state.

**VISUAL AND ONLINE MONITORING**

Israeli checkpoints, roadblocks, and other physical barriers in the West Bank have formed so comprehensive an enclosure that it has been termed the “Iron Ring” around Palestinian life. Following 9/11, the NYPD installed a network of more than 8,000 cameras to provide 24-hour blanket surveillance over the city, known as the “Ring of Steel.” As the proximity in name and practice suggest, camera networks have become a staple of both the US and Israeli surveillance arsenal, and law enforcement agencies from both countries regularly meet to share their expertise. American police officers on tour often visit the network of 400 cameras which blankets the Old City of Jerusalem operated by the Israeli company Mabat (“gaze” in Hebrew), and the head of the Israeli national police toured the New York camera network with former NYPD commissioner Raymond Kelly.

These meetings between US and Israeli law enforcement have brought some of Israel’s surveillance technologies back to the United States. Following visits to Israel by the Atlanta Police, the department created a Video Integration Center, collecting and monitoring footage from the city’s system of thousands of public and private 24-hour surveillance cameras. The department reported that the center is modeled after the command and control center in the Old City of Jerusalem and mimics Israeli methods to proactively monitor crime.

These exchanges create opportunities for Israeli security corporations that manufacture and market networked surveillance to obtain deals and contracts in the United States. In Baltimore, a camera network for the Citiwatch program is operated by the Israeli company Nice Systems. Another Israeli company Cellebrite, that provides technology to collect data from cell phones, has contracts with police departments and law enforcement agencies in at least 20 states. Nice Systems and Israeli company Verint, which was contracted by the National Security Administration for communication line tapping, have contracts with the LAPD. The LAPD has also expressed interest in the HoverMast drone.

“In the old part of the city, they can follow you anywhere…it was like Star Wars compared to what we do”

Maine State Police Col. Robert Williams discussing Jerusalem after his trip to Israel in 2013
by the Israeli company Spy Sapience, that can intercept wireless communications and is capable of facial recognition.

US law enforcement officials express admiration for the fluid flow of information in Israel between all levels of government and private industry, and supported embracing and tightening the relationship between private security companies and the government in the US. With 70 percent of the US intelligence budget already with private contractors, and the “revolving door” between high-ranking NSA offices and private contractor executive positions, corporate interests already influence US government surveillance practices.

In Israel, which has more surveillance companies per capita than any other country, private industry is seen as advancing the national agenda. Israelis celebrate private industry’s close collaboration with their government, and express their willingness to hand over private information in the name of security. As a state that maintains an all-encompassing surveillance apparatus upheld jointly by the government and private corporations, the Israeli security model requires disregard for freedom of expression and privacy in the face of the security imperative.

Online surveillance already has serious consequences for communities of color and activists in the United States, who are disproportionately targeted by their local police departments. The ACLU and the Center for Media Justice have criticized police across the country, including departments in Oakland, Baltimore, Ferguson, and Boston, for contracting tech companies to use software to surveil and profile local residents based on religion, race, and political affiliation. In particular, activists participating in efforts to combat Islamophobia, as well as activists in the Black Lives Matter movement, and in the movement to stop the Dakota Access Pipeline have been tracked, questioned, and sometimes arrested and charged based on their political expression and affiliations on social media. Since the declaration of the War on Terror, police have routinely surveilled and obstructed activities protected under the First Amendment in at least 36 states.

Israel does not prioritize protections of citizen privacy and technology-based communication and expression, and over the last decade has extended its use of surveillance technologies from Palestinians to the population at large. Israel maintains the broadest police database of citizen contact

---

Israel security cameras in the East Jerusalem neighborhood of Silwan, 2016. (Activestills)
information and the only biometric database of citizen fingerprints among Western democracies, and has been criticized for privacy violations and putting citizens at risk. US civil liberties organizations have been actively campaigning against precisely this type of all-encompassing collection of mass data that is lauded by US delegates when they return from Israel. Civil liberties groups argue for greater transparency and limits on technologies that serve police surveillance due to their severe infringement on privacy rights and the Constitution.

ACLU attorneys have expressed concern that the coupling of spy technology with weakened police guidelines “represents a step backward to the [1970s-era] collection of information about individuals and their whereabouts without reasonable suspicion that they’re involved in criminal activities.” As journalist Glenn Greenwald has shown, in the current era where so many of life’s personal and political functions are carried out online, employing the internet as a mass surveillance system subjects us all to unprecedented government scrutiny. 21

INfiltrATION

Since its establishment, Israel has deployed infiltrator units to surveil Palestinians in the Occupied Territories as well as within the 1948 borders. IDF units, termed Mista’rvm (‘Arabized’ individuals in Hebrew), are currently deployed to gather information on Palestinian protests and political activity, and serve as agent provocateurs to incite violence and carry out arrests and extra-judicial killings. 22 After the Israeli police admitted that it deploys its own Mista’rvm units targeting Palestinian citizens, Adalah, the Legal Center for Arab Minority Rights in Israel, charged that the very existence of a police unit designed to target Palestinian citizens is “liable to encourage discriminatory, racist policing.” American police delegations observe Israeli forces in their routine containment of Palestinian protests, where they have the opportunity to observe Mista’rvm in action.

US police surveillance also does not stop at data collection and video monitoring, and some of its practices have been shaped by Israeli infiltration of Palestinian communities. An Associated Press investigation exposed NYPD’s “Demographics Unit” spying on daily life in Muslim communities in New York City. Informants known as “mosque crawlers” were deployed to visit mosques, bodegas, and student organizations, and kept extensive dossiers on individuals and locations of Muslim communities. Laurence Sanchez, a CIA officer who worked to establish the program, acknowledged that the founding team drew inspiration from Israeli practices in the Occupied Palestinian Territories. 23 The Israeli press was also quick to intuitively call the NYPD’s demographics unit the New York version of Mista’rvm.
Resonance with Israeli logic is also evident in NYPD’s 2007 report *Radicalization in the West: The Homegrown Threat*, which suggests that predominantly Muslim communities in the United States need to be monitored as “enclaves” for radicalization and as “incubators” for potential terrorists. JINSA initially praised the report, and the ADL gave a lifetime service award to the head of the NYPD’s intelligence unit who trained in Israel, Thomas Galanti. ADL former director Abraham Foxman explicitly justified surveillance of Muslims:

> “Just like after 9/11, America is now questioning where the balance is between security and freedom of expression: should we follow the ethnic communities? Should we be monitoring mosques? This isn’t Muslim-baiting—it’s driven by fear, by a desire for safety and security.”

Yet US law enforcement continue to regularly meet with the Israeli military and Shin Bet to discuss human intelligence methods such as the use of informants and infiltrating protests with undercover officials. After participating in domestic Israeli-led training exercises and upon their return from delegations to Israel, police officers have stated their intent to implement Israeli human and electronic intelligence in their investigations of gangs and organized crime. Across the country, police departments add young men of color to gang databases based on dubious criteria and unsubstantiated allegations, subjecting them to unwarranted scrutiny and, increasingly, to deportation. The NYPD’s spying on political activity continues beyond the ostensibly suspended Demographics Unit, sending undercover officers to infiltrate Black Lives Matter protests, and collecting multimedia records of protestor identities, activities, and text messages.

Echoing the rhetoric of the NYPD’s report on American Muslims, the FBI and Department of Homeland Security justified their surveillance of Black Lives Matter activists across the country. The agencies referred to these activists as “Black Identity Extremists” and “domestic terrorists,” and defined them as a threat to national security. These practices reflect the increasing use of security rhetoric to justify the surveillance and infringement of rights of US citizens and residents based on their race and political positions, a practice already fully institutionalized in Israel.

But civil rights groups and community organizations disagreed, denounced the demographics unit and criticized the report’s racist claims used to justify the sweeping surveillance of Muslim communities. Public condemnation and a lawsuit by the ACLU and the CUNY’s Clear Project prompted the city to officially suspend the program in 2014, and the settlement approved in 2017 prohibited racially motivated surveillance and infiltration by the police. In the United States, there is consistent pushback and an attempt to hold police accountable to constitutional protections from surveillance based on race.
Like Palestinians who are arbitrarily defined as security threats and put on the Shin Bet’s list, people of color and racial justice activists in the United States are subjected to systematic surveillance and can be placed on gang databases or government watch lists with little recourse or opportunities to hold the state accountable. The relationships fostered between the US law enforcement and Israeli military, police, and intelligence agencies normalize invasive surveillance that infringe upon civil liberties and human rights. Countering the efforts of civil rights organizations and movements, groups such as JINSA and the ADL continue to uphold Israel’s use of surveillance in its military rule of Palestinians as a model for US law enforcement. In the name of security, the promoters of trainings with Israel call for putting entire communities and social movements under a tight watch and subjecting many American citizens and residents to expanded, unchecked, and invasive scrutiny that renders us all profoundly unsafe.
To date, thousands of law enforcement officials from across the country have been sent to Israel to meet with military and police forces, and thousands more have participated in conferences, trainings, and workshops with Israeli personnel.

This chapter explores how US law enforcement delegations are trained by Israeli military, police, and intelligence agencies in Israeli tactics of counterterrorism, which by definition requires honing methods of racial profiling. Against the important civil rights gains scaling back the violent invasion of police into communities of American citizens and residents, the War on Terror has re-centered the military and police as the only institutions able to provide security. Israel is heralded as a nation that keeps its citizens safe in the face of perpetual threat, but Israel’s security regime is designed to subjugate Palestinians, and relies on systematic racial differentiation between Palestinians and Israeli Jews – that constitutes Apartheid.

This report documents how Israeli trainings serve to legitimate marking Black and Brown people as suspect, particularly Arabs and Muslims, and help refine police policies, tactics, and technologies of systematic racial profiling and state violence targeting communities and social movements that seek racial justice.

**ISRAELI RACIAL PROFILING**

The very structure of Israel’s military rule over the Palestinian people and their lands is premised on a racial distinction between Jewish Israelis and Palestinians, including Palestinian citizens of Israel, Palestinians living in the occupied West Bank, Gaza, and East Jerusalem, and Palestinian refugees in the diaspora. Military rule in Israel is as old as the state itself; it governed Palestinian citizens of Israel from the state’s establishment in 1948 until 1966, and Palestinians of the West Bank, Gaza, and East Jerusalem from 1967 to the present.

Israel’s maintenance of two legal systems in the same territory in which religion and ethnicity are the basis for determining which legal system one is accountable to, is defined as an Apartheid system under international law. It is a system of institutionalized racial profiling on a national scale, in which Palestinians are policed, tried, and punished differently than Jewish Israelis. Israeli military rule positions Palestinians as enemy suspects, and defines any opposition to the occupation as a criminal offense, usually “terrorism.”27
In 1967, the Israeli government consolidated their rule of Palestinian territory by proclaiming that the IDF would take over the powers of government, legislation, and administration to preserve security and public order. Israel’s military Order Concerning Security Provisions (OCSP) set forth the laws governing the arrest and detention of Palestinian civilians, the determination of offenses and penalties, and the legal procedures in the military courts. This military court system is the “institutional centerpiece” of Israel’s rule over the Palestinians. It serves to normalize Palestinians’ status as “foreign civilians” of territory under Israeli control and to bolster the making of a permanent occupation. As a pillar of Israel’s enduring governance, the OCSP criminalizes Palestinian civic and political life, defining affiliation with most political parties or any display of Palestinian aspirations for self-determination as “Hostile Terrorist Activity” and “Disturbances of the Peace.”

To contain Palestinian resistance to its occupation, Israel operates under a declared state of emergency, renewed on an annual basis from its founding to the present moment. In the Occupied Palestinian Territory, Israel operates its rule as a counterinsurgency campaign. Under the imperative of national security, the OCSP grants complete authority to soldiers to search, detain, and arrest any Palestinian, seize their goods, and enter their property without a warrant or cause beyond the soldier’s belief that they are prejudicial to public order and safety. The IDF and military courts work in tandem to prosecute and imprison Palestinians suspected of “security violations and other crimes.” The result has been the well-documented violation of Palestinian human and civil rights through systemic targeted policing, arrest, and incarceration.

The profiling of Palestinians in the Occupied Territory extends to Palestinian citizens of Israel, who have been marked as suspects of “terrorism” and profiled as a population prone to violent crime. This manifests in the systematic profiling, excessive and often lethal use of force deployed against them with impunity, and their disproportionate incarceration, despite their citizenship status. Because Israel has operated a military rule based on racial distinction since its establishment, racial profiling by police within the Jewish Israeli community has also long been endemic. The first Jewish Israeli targets of discriminatory policing were immigrants from Arab and North African
states, termed Mizrahim in Zionist rhetoric. Unlike their Ashkenazi (Jews of European descent) counterparts, Mizrahi immigrants in the 1940s and 50s were not permitted to settle in the central cities or live in housing they could eventually come to own. Instead, the Israeli police were deployed to compel Mizrahi immigrants to remain in the transient camps and later development towns established in the undesirable and remote periphery of Israel, as a means to expand the state territory and prevent Palestinian return.35

The ongoing and systematic discrimination resulting in the lack of access to resources, the denial of basic liberties, and the subject to prejudicial police violence sparked the Mizrahi Black Panther movements that demanded full civil rights that their Ashkenazi counterparts enjoyed. These activists accused Israel of using the same racist violence typically directed towards Palestinians and applying it to Mizrahi Jews.36 As Jews of Arab origin and as a population labeled prone to crime, Mizrahim continue to be subject to disproportionate policing and incarceration37 that the Israeli courts persistently refuse to acknowledge. Israeli policing in the Occupied Territory assumes functions that are traditionally military, a process reinforced by personnel transfers between the military and the police, and the overlapping work of the two agencies. The coalescing of military and policing expertise is also evident in the use of racial profiling tactics by the police on Israeli citizens.38 Israel’s Police Commissioner Roni Alsheich, former deputy head of the Shin Bet who oversaw the torture of Palestinians deprived of civil rights, openly legitimizing the use of racial profiling by the Israeli police.

Israel’s use of racial distinctions to police the Occupied Territory structures how it polices its own citizens. Just as Israel’s definition of terrorism is based on the racial distinction between occupied Palestinians and Jewish Israelis, the Israeli definition of criminality is based on distinctions between Israeli and Palestinian citizens as well as between Jewish ethnic groups.

Israel’s routine racial profiling is revealed by open statements by police officers about their use of race as the sole criteria for searches and questionings, and by both government and independent data demonstrating disproportionate targeting of Ethiopian, Palestinian and Bedouin citizens in public space and in the legal system.39 Ethiopian activists for racial justice report heavy police presence in their neighborhoods, harassment, arrests without cause, false accusations and indictments about assaulting police officers, and the denial of due process.40

“When a police officer meets a suspect from a community that is involved in crime, naturally his mind suspects him more than if it were someone else.”

Roni Alsheich, Israeli Police Commissioner
The Israeli legal system, military rule, and law enforcement, are structurally predicated on the racial distinction between Palestinians and Israeli Jews, creating a hierarchical structure where rights are differentially conferred based on race. Palestinians living in the Occupied Territory are deprived of most civil and human rights including access to a fair trial, and are indiscriminately labeled as terrorist suspects by the Israeli military and military court system that rule them. Palestinian and Bedouin citizens of Israel are by extension marked as a population suspect of terrorism and violent crime, are overly policed, and seen as legitimate targets of state violence. Among Israeli Jewish citizens, Mizrahi and Ethiopian Jews are disproportionately targeted by the police and incarcerated, and subject to police violence with limited legal recourse.

RACIAL PROFILING IN AMERICAN POLICING

Throughout US history and especially since the launch of the War on Terror nearly two decades ago, the American government has embraced a state of permanent war that legitimates virtually all measures that purport to protect its citizens. This security doctrine blurs the legal and practical separation between police and military, domestic and foreign, war and peace. But in the context of the history of racial formation in the United States, policing has always been a form of civil warfare.

From the Frontier Wars to Iraq, from the American inner city to Vietnam, the US government has long understood its domestic policing and foreign warfare as a single project. Related to its operations overseas, the United States militarized policing has predominantly targeted Black and Brown communities and activists within its own border.

In the United States, anti-Black racism has always underwritten presumptions of criminality, from slave codes through post-abolition legislation that criminalized Blackness, to police profiling and incarceration of people of color. The law and order platform and the criminal justice system itself have framed America’s “crime problem” as a subset of the “Negro problem,” paving the way for a national consensus around the right to security from interpersonal but not state violence. This consensus enhanced the legitimacy of the state’s
monopoly on brutal and even lethal violence, which has been reinforced through the wars waged on social movements, crime, and drugs that were declared in the 1960s and remain in effect with no end in sight.46

In response to the civil rights struggles and popular insurrections of the 1960s, urban police departments across the nation responded with enhanced militarization and violent repression.47 The militarized state violence resulted in policies such as "zero tolerance" policing in New York City, and in exponential growth in incarceration in California, which quickly spread throughout the nation and has had long lasting consequences for millions of Black, Brown, and poor Americans.48

In parallel, there were efforts by some police departments at community outreach initiatives, minority-hiring programs, and trainings on racial sensitivity. But these reformist police programs did not gain significant traction, and beginning in the late 1960s the "colorblind" approach to policing became the new common sense.49 This paved the way for ostensibly "race-neutral" policing theories such as "Broken Windows," which considered low-level disorder as an indication of crime. Broken Windows informed the doctrine of "community policing," which facilitated residents taking responsibility for their neighborhoods to prevent disorder and criminality.50

But Broken Windows and community policing blamed American urban decay on the behavior and values of poor, primarily Black, residents, and ignored the state’s structural abandonment in the form of massive cuts to housing, health, and environmental protections, and the absence of essential services, jobs, and legal protections.51 Community policing has thus been widely criticized by activists, scholars, and civil rights organizations for expanding the horizon for police action both nationally and globally, and for targeting Black and Brown residents with surveillance, harassment, and arrest in an effort to control their behavior.52

The arsenal of community policing includes policies such as stop-and-frisk, and programs such as Compstat that implement big-data based "predictive policing" in neighborhoods deemed disorderly. In practice, by expanding police authority to stop, question, and search individuals without enforcing legal standards of "reasonable suspicion" or "probable cause," stop-and-frisk became a central mechanism of racial profiling targeting young Black and Latino men.53
TWO WAY EXCHANGES: BROKEN WINDOWS COMES TO ISRAEL

Israeli counterterrorism trainings for US law enforcement officers were solidified after 9/11 through delegations, conferences, and the establishment of an NYPD branch near Tel Aviv. But exchanges between US and Israeli law enforcement predate the War on Terror and have long been multi-directional.[1] In the late 1990s, Israeli Police Commissioner Yehuda Vilek imported NYPD’s CompStat technology and community policing initiatives. Vilek was thoroughly impressed with the NYPD, calling them “the best there is,” and praised CompStat for helping lower crime rates. Other top-ranking officials in the Israeli police endorsed community policing and declared the right to be free of crime as “the first civil right.” Yet both government assessments and academic research[2] revealed that efforts to implement community policing were met with limited success in Israel.[3] These initiatives failed to improve police-community relations in Israel, particularly with Palestinian citizens and other minorities. The failure was largely explained by the Israeli police’s militaristic orientation; its counterterrorism tactics, which are not transparent or accountable; and its assumption that large groups of citizens are suspects.

The main tool from the arsenal of Broken Windows policing that Israel codified under law within its own borders is stop-and-frisk. In November 2015, the Israeli Security Cabinet authorized a stop-and-frisk policy that officially authorized police to conduct searches without probable cause. In 2016 it was made law, enabling police to declare entire areas under threat of terrorism and to search people without the need for reasonable suspicion. The law was harshly criticized by the Association for Civil Rights in Israel who warned that it is likely to be "selectively enforced against minorities including Arabs or dark-skinned men." It was also met with extensive opposition by Knesset members, with MK Jamal Zahalka warning.

“This law sends a message to police officers: do whatever you want. There is no need for any criteria and everything can be approved retroactively.”

The policy was primarily applied to young Palestinian men, particularly in East Jerusalem, who are routinely detained, searched, and humiliated. Though the law was suspended in January 2018, the practices of blatant racial profiling that it legally codified persist.

[1] Central supporters of Israel in the United States have also consistently endorsed Broken Windows and community policing. NYPD Commissioner William Bratton received repeated praises and a lifetime service award from the Anti-Defamation League.


[3] Israel was shown to be low ranking in citizen confidence in the police.
The policies, practices, and technologies of Broken Windows and community policing have been challenged by civil rights organizations, social movements, and community based coalitions, demanding an end to police harassment, entrapment, and violence and to racial profiling that infringes on constitutional rights and equal protection.54 Yet Broken Windows and community policing have spread across the United States and the world,55 also reaching the Israeli national police that tried to adopt some of its policies and technologies. In parallel, the racial profiling foundational to Broken Windows and community policing continues to be reinforced in the United States by trainings of American law enforcement with the Israeli military, police and intelligence agencies.

RACIAL PROFILING: AMERICAN POLICY, ISRAELI TACTICS

In Israel, there is little meaningful separation between coercive state apparatuses: the military and police share information, personnel, units, tactics, and, in many cases, jurisdictions. Israeli “inter-agency coordination” is advertised for US delegates as one of the most important attributes of successful prevention of and response to terror, and is extensively covered in all trainings the delegates receive.

These “counterterror” trainings set up direct parallels between the Palestinians and those who are believed to threaten American safety, bolstering the idea of a US-Israeli alliance against Muslims and Arabs. Former JINSA chairman Mark Broxmeyer declared that in facing terrorism the

WHAT US LAW ENFORCEMENT SAY AFTER TRAINING IN ISRAEL

“There are countries out there and religious leaders and political leaders that wake up every day trying to kill Americans and trying to kill Israelis and others to be sure, so from that standpoint you carry that passion and reality back home”
- Sheriff Jeff Wiley, Ascension Parish, LA, after his delegation visit in 2005

“We [Israel and the US] are much more alike than dis-alike. As civilized nations, we are all confronted with, in many cases, the same enemy: The ever-growing threat of terrorism and other major criminal elements" - Horace Frank, commander of the LAPD Information Technology Bureau, after his delegation visit in 2014
US law enforcement community "is on the front lines of this war" and are the "first line of defense." This messaging is effectively received by US law enforcement who, upon returning from Israel, contend that the exchange of "techniques and attitudes" is key to winning the War on Terror.56 Israeli trainings in counterterrorism reinforce for US law enforcement that they are combatants, and encourages a highly militarized discourse that legitimizes institutionalized racial profiling as a tool of counterterror policy in the current state of war.

What American law enforcement see in Israeli policing is the official policy of marking entire populations as suspect, a model that is in direct opposition to efforts to end the racial profiling that has long been constitutive of American policing.

PUBLIC SPACE
The Israeli trainings introduce ideas from the realm of homeland security into the practices of everyday policing. Upon their return home to the streets they patrol, US law enforcement begin to link acts of terrorism to petty crime.57 John Gaissert, former Chief of Police of Commerce, GA, explained that in Israel he learned that "terrorists commit small crimes before they commit big ones." Domestic deterrence efforts, Gaissert suggested, should operate accordingly and detect "traffic violations, criminal trespass, false identification or giving false information" as indicators of imminent terrorism. New Jersey State Police’s counterterrorism bureau chief Stephen Serrao similarly reported learning from Israel about how he might use routine traffic stops to turn up "terrorism clues" such as "forged documents or other suspicious details."

American officers report that they were taught by Israeli officials about integrating and fluidly moving between military and police doctrines in their daily activities. In the Israeli trainings, there is continual slippage between the everyday policing of Israeli citizens and the totalizing military control over Palestinian life in the Occupied Territories, between repressing resistance and combating terror. The discriminatory obstruction of the movement of Palestinian civilians was described by a delegate as the practice of "stopping vehicles with terrorists." Following their training, US officers adopt Israel’s reframing of systematic profiling by stopping vehicles based on the race of the passengers as a national security imperative. This dangerous reframing legitimizes the use of racial profiling in everyday policing of public space in the United States under the banner of counterterrorism.58

Some of the American delegates explicitly articulated their ideas about the links between race, terrorism, and violent crime when returned home. Police Chief Barnett Jones of Sterling, MI, learned during his visit to Israel not only about methods to detect terrorists, but also about the racial characteristics of his potential suspects. After learning about Israeli activities on the front line of the War on Terror, he
expressed concern about the growing numbers of Arab and Muslim residents in Michigan, stating: “The reality is we have a large population in our community that immediately become suspect... for me to sit here and say, 'I'm not concerned' would be wrong, but for me to sit here and say, 'Yes I’m concerned' would also be wrong.”

These ideas about the racial characteristics of terrorists are sometimes used to justify discriminatory policies towards other racial groups, with Chief of Police in Commerce, GA, John Gaissert warning of both Mexican cartels and Al Qaeda using the Mexican border to enter and commit violence in the United States. Advocating for tighter border control and for adopting the Israeli homeland security model, Gaissert stated that he learned from Israelis that the border is the “first line of defense.” Linking mundane violations, petty crimes, and border crossings to terrorism supports en masse racial profiling, especially when the racial characteristics of terrorists are already presumed.

PUBLIC TRANSIT

Some of the sites where the War on Terror has been most clearly waged through racial profiling are terminals of public transit and airports. Techniques of racial profiling in public transit is another topic of exchange between US law enforcement and transportation personnel and Israeli authorities. For Palestinians under Israeli military occupation, there is a codified system of Apartheid transportation that includes separate roads and vehicles. In 2015 Israel officially instituted, and has since unofficially continued, a policy of separate buses that forces Palestinian day laborers from the West Bank to ride separately from Israelis. Palestinian citizens of Israel also face profiling when using all terminals of public transportation, which have metal detectors and armed security guards at their entrances. Palestinians are singled out at central train and bus stations and asked by private guards who act as police to show their ID. They are then ordered to deboard public buses, and instructed not to occupy certain seats on trains following complaints by Jewish Israelis.

After their tours, US law enforcement delegates have reflected that Israelis are used to being regularly searched, and seem “willing to give up personal rights to a degree that Americans might not stand for.” But this is because Jewish Israelis are not the target of these searches and do not face discrimination, humiliation, and violence when attempting to use public transit.

In 2005, the ACLU filed a lawsuit against the NYPD for violating the Fourth Amendment with bag searches at subway stations instituted that same year. NYCLU condemned the policy as “unprecedented, unlawful, and ineffective,” for exposing millions of New Yorkers to unnecessary searches and paving the way for illegal racial profiling. Against these efforts of civil rights organizations, New York City Democratic Assemblyman and outspoken advocate for Israel Dov Hikind introduced
a bill to legalize the inclusion of race and ethnicity as criteria in identifying individuals to be “stopped, questioned, frisked, and/or searched” by law enforcement. Hikind stated that “there is a terrorist profile” and that the police should focus on searching people of “Middle Eastern descent.”

Though the NYPD officially pushed back against Hikind by declaring that such a policy would be illegal, the NYCLU successfully sued the NYPD for its systematic and unconstitutional racial profiling in subway searches just three years later. Proponents of Israeli security policies in American public transit continue to undermine these important gains for civil rights under the misleading banner of security for all.

AIRPORTS

US law enforcement delegations include a tour of Ben Gurion Airport, which is presented as “the gold standard,” and “one of the most secure airports in the world.” This is attributed to Israel’s notoriously tough passenger screening process, conducted by airport personnel trained by the Shin Bet who work with the Israeli intelligence as well as with armed undercover security officers.

But the core of Israel’s airport security is systematic racial profiling. In Israel, the official policy of racial profiling in airports is directly derived from its Apartheid legal and policing systems that separates Palestinians from Israelis before they even arrive to the airport compound. Ben Gurion Airport’s notorious protocols of racial profiling begin at the checkpoint miles before the airport, continue through selective questionings and tracking by undercover agents, and include searches and interrogations of Palestinians as well as of Arab and Muslim foreign nationals.

The chief of the IDF Ground Forces Command’s substances laboratory explicitly explained why the policies implemented at other airports worldwide, such as restrictions on liquids and full body scans, are unnecessary in Israel. At Ben Gurion procedures are simpler, the commander stated matter-of-factly, because “we use racial profiling, they don’t.” As Ha’aretz journalist Anshel Pfeffer noted, “To Israelis, the practice of picking people out based on racial stereotypes is so self-evident, there isn’t even a Hebrew term for it.”

Yet the issue gained traction after a 2006 report detailed the racial profiling of Palestinian citizens at Ben Gurion Airport. Palestinians reported that searches at Ben...
Gurion routinely include invasive interrogations, humiliating treatment, damage to equipment, delays that led to missed flights, and even confiscation of passengers’ baggage and shoes. The report led to a 2007 petition against the Airports Authority, the Shin Bet, and the Ministry of Transportation by the Association for Civil Rights in Israel (ACRI), who argued that race or nationality could not be used as criteria for inspection. The Israeli Supreme Court dismissed the case in 2015, citing continual improvements to airport security procedures, and refusing to rule on the legality of racial criteria for searches. Since the ruling, ACRI found that Palestinian passengers are still routinely profiled by Israeli airlines in foreign airports. At Ben Gurion recent cases included invasive and humiliating searches, sexual assault, and confinement with denial of access to restrooms.64

Israeli airport officials explain to US delegates how they use ethnic and racial characteristics to identify suspicious passengers, and how to screen and question these passengers, read their body language and verbal responses, and perform searches. Former TSA director Peter Neffenger testified at the House Homeland Security Committee that the agency has trained with Israel on behavioral detection and that its work has been greatly informed by Israeli airport security. Logan International Airport in Boston was the first of many US airports to contract New Age Security Solutions, headed by former head of security at Ben Gurion Airport Rafi Ron, to revamp its security system. Logan was also the first US airport to pioneer the Israeli inspired Screening Passengers by Observation Techniques (SPOT) program in 2003, which has since spread to airports nationwide. SPOT came under fire for being ineffective, wasteful, and facilitating discriminatory racial profiling at airports around the country.

““The definition of profiling for me has taken on a whole new meaning...it’s a continuous process of security versus a one-stop shop”

John Clark III, head of the Jacksonville Airport Authority, after his visit to Ben Gurion Airport

Since first implementing its post 9/11 policies such as SPOT, the TSA has been criticized by civil rights and racial justice organizations for their pervasive searches of Muslims, Arabs and Brown people at airports, under the title of random checks. Former TSA spokeswoman Ann Davis, justifying the use of discriminatory protocols in the United States, promised that the US implementation of Israeli practice would be less intrusive because Federal Authorities must adhere to constitutional protections against unreasonable searches and seizures. American delegates themselves also noted that the open and free reign of Israeli racial profiling cannot be entirely emulated in the United States due to legal restrictions. Steven Grossman, head of aviation at the Oakland International Airport, asserted that while “the Israelis are legendary for their security,” in the United States...
“profiling” is a “difficult word to use.”65 Even to TSA and airport personnel that engage daily in racial profiling, the overt adoption of Israeli airport security is an admission of an illegal practice that many Americans would not stand for.

“I think profiling is something that we’re going to have to start thinking about as a country... you look at Israel and you look at others, they do it and they do it successfully. And I hate the concept of profiling, but we have to start using common sense and we have to use our heads.”

President Donald Trump, during the 2016 Presidential race

The lauded Israeli security system is in fact an Apartheid regime that classifies the entire Palestinian populations as a threat. While the Israeli government uses race to justify treating Palestinians as enemy combatants and subjects them to a different system of laws, policing, and incarceration, the American government polices people of color, Muslims, and social justice activists in the United States as a homegrown counterinsurgency campaign. The intimate relationship between US law enforcement and transportation security agencies and Israeli military, police, and intelligence agencies normalizes militarized policing, infringing on civil and human rights.

Countering the efforts of civil rights organizations and movements, groups such as JINSA and the ADL continue to uphold Israel’s Apartheid regime as a model for US law enforcement, while these policing and legal systems are officially based in racial differentiation.

When taken to its inevitable conclusion, the Israeli logic of surveilling and treating populations as suspect based on their race warrants barring entire peoples altogether. Using Israel as an example legitimizes systematic racial profiling, criminalizing entire communities, and cruel and illegal immigration policies such as the Muslim ban that Trump has instituted as president.66
Over the last several decades, Israel has emerged as a global leader in enforcing security through containment of civil resistance, and as a prominent exporter of crowd-control weapons and technologies.

This chapter explores the training US law enforcement receives from the Israeli military, police, and intelligence agencies in Israeli methods and weapons for suppression of civil dissent and control of media coverage. Over the last several decades, Israel has emerged as a global leader in enforcing security through containment of civil resistance, and as a prominent exporter of crowd-control weapons and technologies. This expertise is of interest to the American government, whose War on Terror in Afghanistan, Iraq, and within the United States is waged through the pacification of civilian populations.

The Israeli military regime is a system of totalizing control over the Palestinian population, a system that does not tolerate opposition or dissent of any kind. When expressed, Palestinian popular resistance to the Israeli occupation is immediately faced with indiscriminate and brutal force by Israeli military and police. Through surveillance, racial profiling, and routine and increasingly lethal violence, including mass murder, Israel attempts to threaten and punish Palestinian activists, undercut community organizing, and destroy political alliances. Israel also works to censor and control both the Israeli and international media coverage of military and police actions, thereby containing criticism of this violence. This report documents that Israeli training of US law enforcement normalizes an unchecked use of violence in suppressing protests and all displays of citizen discontent, in tandem with state control over media coverage of their actions, gravely undermining constitutional and civil rights.

ISRAELI USE OF FORCE

Israel categorically forbids any form of Palestinian protest, and denies Palestinians living in the Occupied Territory the right to express their rejection of a military regime under which they cannot vote. Freedom of expression and assembly are recognized as fundamental human rights central to human dignity and to the promotion of other rights. Yet the Israeli government
sees Palestinians in Occupied Territory as an enemy population underserving of rights, and criminalizes virtually all vigils, marches, and demonstrations by labeling them “disturbances.”68 The IDF also regularly prosecutes Palestinians for violating Military Order 101, which prohibits demonstrations or any political activity involving ten or more people without a permit from the IDF, effectively denying Palestinians the ability to voice objections or demand changes from the government that rules them.69

Despite Israel’s prohibitions, Palestinians have always resisted colonization and oppression. Palestinians launched a general strike just two months after Israel established its military rule in the West Bank, Gaza, and East Jerusalem in 1967. Israel issued a military order defining all resistance to the occupation as insurgency and targeted activist leaders to defeat the strike.70 Israel has since continued to employ both military law and violence to undercut Palestinian demands for self-determination. In response to the First Intifada (uprising) that began in 1987, then Minister of Defense Yitzhak Rabin infamously ordered the military to “break the hands and legs” of Palestinian protestors. Military generals describe heeding this call and utilizing “all necessary means” to defeat the Palestinian resistance. Throughout the First Intifada, Israeli tactics included the use of live ammunition and unrestrained crowd-control weapons, resulting in beatings, severe injuries, and deaths, criticized widely by international human rights organizations.

Throughout the Second Intifada beginning in 2000, Israel continually expanded the criteria for open-fire orders, and applied wartime rules of engagement when facing civilian Palestinian protestors. Israel was condemned for its interrogations, torture, maiming, and killing of Palestinians in its effort to destroy the Palestinian movement for independence.

Israel’s construction of the separation barrier through West Bank villages, displacing residents from their lands and sources of livelihood, has generated ongoing civil resistance. Beginning in 2003 with the village of Budrus, a growing number of Palestinian popular committees across the West Bank have conducted unarmed demonstrations against Israeli land theft. These creative and democratically organized weekly civilian protests have spread to over 15 villages over 15 years, including Bil’in, Ni’lin, and El-Wallajeh. From the outset, Israel consistently and violently confronted these protests, employing military law and all
tactical and technological means in its arsenal to terminate them. The IDF routinely preemptively criminalizes these protests by declaring all processions, gatherings, and demonstrations “unlawful assembly,” attempting to disperse them even before they begin.

The IDF also physically bars the protests by declaring the entire village a closed military zone and sealing off access to the demonstration and also to residents’ businesses and homes.71 Once protests are underway, the IDF uses crowd-control measures and technologies,72 ranging from tear gas canisters, pepper-gas spray, and stun grenades to beating demonstrators with clubs and shooting them with rubber-coated metal bullets73 and in some cases live ammunition.74

Intifada throughout occupied Palestinian territory instigated mass protests among Palestinian citizens of Israel. In opposing their systemic discrimination by a state founded to protect the rights of Jewish Israelis, Palestinian citizens experienced the full force of Israeli state violence, including live ammunition. During protests in October 2001, the Israeli police killed 13 Palestinian citizens of Israel and wounded hundreds. The outcry over the infamous killing prompted a legal investigation, that was closed in 2008 holding none of the police officers accountable. Since this watershed case, the violent repression of protests organized by Palestinian citizens against their displacement and discriminatory treatment by the police has been ongoing, including protests staged by Bedouin communities against Israel’s repeated demolition of their villages. Most recently, a protest in Haifa by Palestinian citizens against Israel’s ongoing killings in Gaza was met with violent arrests that included threatening and beating a prominent advocate for Palestinian civil rights and breaking his leg while in custody.

The systematic violence directed toward Palestinians has also permeated the Jewish Israeli community, with police targeting Ethiopian citizens with impunity. After cases of police beating, repeated tasering, and allegations of deploying of lethal force against Ethiopian men made headlines, Ethiopian activists drew inspiration from US organizers and launched their own Black Lives Matter protests in 2015. These protests were met with the types of crowd-control measures usually reserved

Palestinian protest against the Separation Barrier in the village of Ni’lin, 2009. (Activestills)
for Palestinians, with police riding horses into demonstrators, beating and arresting activists, and shooting tear gas and water cannons in central Tel Aviv. The government response to the Ethiopian protests made clear that the state was utterly unwilling to tolerate any dissent concerning its systemic racism, even within the Jewish Israeli community. The most recent wave of peaceful protests of the Great Return March in Gaza that began on March 30, 2018, was met with devastating Israeli force. As thousands of Palestinians in Gaza marched unarmed to protest their confinement in unlivable conditions and demand the right of return to their lands, the Israeli military built an elevated land mass and stationed more than 100 snipers, tanks, and drones along the fence. Over the course of the following weeks over 166 protestors were shot dead, and more than 16,000 were injured or maimed. The IDF was accused of deliberately targeting Palestinian journalists’ bodies and equipment, killing two and injuring twelve, prompting condemnation from Palestinian civil society organizations, Reporters Without Borders, and other human rights groups. The IDF was also accused of deliberate targeting of medics attending to protestors, sparking condemnation from international organizations including Human Rights Watch and Defenders for Medical Impartiality. This illegal and inhumane Israeli violence has elicited condemnation by Palestinian, Israeli, and international human rights groups and calls for independent investigations by the United Nations.

**USE OF FORCE: US PRACTICE, ISRAELI TACTICS**

In the United States, there has never been a clear separation between military and policing projects, and many American residents and citizens have long been treated as enemy combatants. Many of the tactics and technologies used in American counterinsurgency campaigns abroad, from the Philippines to Vietnam to Iraq, have been directed at activists advocating for labor rights, civil rights, and US demilitarization. Militarized state violence against protestors resurfaced most recently in mainstream discourse in the wake of the police repression of the Movement for Black Lives in Ferguson, Baltimore, and across the nation. Unarmed protestors in the streets faced down police and the National Guard, both fully armed with riot gear including armored vehicles, tear gas, stun grenades, rubber bullets, and semiautomatic rifles.

When protesting deportations and police killings of Black and Brown people with impunity, activists in the United States are subjected to curfews, mass arrests, and further violence. These confrontations reflect not only utter disregard for Brown and Black lives, but demonstrate that entire populations in the United States are viewed as threats and as enemies, justifying the use of lethal force as a first resort. US law enforcement trainings with Israel model applying violence to contain protests, as well as the limiting of media coverage of the state’s use of force. By further
entrenching the belief that state violence is necessary for security, these trainings reinforce dangerous practices among American police that social movements have long worked to uproot.

SUPPRESSING PROTESTS

Despite sustained criticism from human and civil rights advocates, Israeli methods of quelling protests are on display for American police delegations through briefings and live demonstrations. US law enforcement participants describe exchanging ideas about how to suppress protests in their own cities and towns. San Diego Assistant Police Chief Walt Vasquez reported on "lots of discussions about crowd-control" tactics, and Brad Virgoe of the Orange County Sheriff’s Department described learning from his Israeli counterparts, who are "very proficient at dealing with large crowds on a moment’s notice." Maine’s State Police Chief Robert Williams saw clear parallels between the American and Israeli governments’ interest in containing "civil unrest," and was impressed with Israeli law enforcement expertise and their "vast amount of experience with identifying potential threats and neutralizing them."

The delegates thus returned home with technical know-how based in disregard for the right of Palestinians to oppose the Israeli occupation. This entails seeing protest not as a right, but rather as a security threat that must be dealt with through repressive police violence.

This framing normalizes a complete intolerance of protest – in defiance of the First Amendment.

As with surveillance technologies, joint trainings of US and Israeli military and police also help facilitate the sales and the transfer of crowd-control technologies between the two governments. The IDF arsenal contains weapons that have already become world famous, and have made their way to the United States. Other technologies are manufactured in the United States but used by Israel, where American law enforcement can witness the full force of their power. Multiple types of tear gas canisters constitute one such technology. Manufactured by American companies Combined Systems Inc. and Defense Technology Corp, and reportedly financed by the US military aid package to Israel, these tear gas canisters have been shot at Palestinian civilians across Gaza and the West Bank. During protests in West Bank villages, rubber and aluminum gas canisters are both manually thrown and shot at Palestinians, injuring protestors and killing activists.80

The US government has a long history of employing tear gas against its own citizens and has continued to use it despite signing the Chemical Weapons Convention Treaty banning tear gas and other chemical weapons in 1993.81 In the last few years alone, tear gas was heavily used by police in Oakland against Occupy demonstrations in 2011 as well as in Ferguson against protests for Black lives in 2014.
ISRAELI CROWD-CONTROL TECHNOLOGIES COME TO THE US

Developed by the Israeli Police in 2008, “Skunk” is another crowd-control measure tried on protestors in the West Bank and used in the US. It is a foul-smelling liquid meant to cause nausea that is sprayed at high pressure from a tanker onto protestors, where it lingers for days on clothing, skin, and in the air.[1] Both the Israeli police and the manufacturing company Odortec depict the product as a humane crowd-control technology. But Israeli human rights organization B’Tselem disputes this claim, reporting that Skunk is used by the IDF as a tool of collective punishment that is deliberately sprayed into stores, schools, houses, yards, and fruit orchards of communities whose members participate in demonstrations.

Based on its proven effectiveness in West Bank villages like Bil’in and Ni’lin, Israel markets Skunk to police units worldwide, including the United States. The American company Mistral Security reportedly began selling Skunk to US police departments, including the St. Louis Metropolitan Police, following the 2014 protests in Ferguson. In 2009 the Israeli police announced plans to develop Skunk for individual police officers, and Mistral Security currently sells Skunk spray canisters that can be manually operated. As a tool of state repression against forms of dissent, Skunk is advertised by Mistral Security as applicable to “border crossings, correctional facilities, demonstrations, and sit-ins.” During the Great Return March in Gaza tear gas and Skunk liquid were dropped from the sky with the use of drones, an example of one of Israel’s latest innovations to shut down Palestinian political expression.

[1] High pressure water hoses have been used by police forces around the world for decades, but the IDF replaced water with its original skunk formula.
Major David Pat, head of the IDF counterterrorism department, explains that because the IDF is primarily concerned with “routine security” and not traditional warfare, it is “compelled to use more non-lethal weapons that are legally sanctioned,” especially when facing "civilians and not combatants." The IDF is not alone in navigating the terrain of 21st century warfare, in which mass killing is no longer deemed acceptable. Yiftah Shapir from the Institute of National Security Studies contends that "military and police bodies all over the world are dealing with civil unrest, whether it is an occupied population or your [own] population." Shapir contends that while Israeli non-lethal measures can still kill Palestinians, their "success is not measured by the dead" but by their ability to meet the government’s goals. He cites the case of Bil’in demonstrator Mustafa Tamimi, who was shot and killed by a tear gas grenade, as a case of "failed use" of crowd-control measures because it triggered international condemnation.

Because current wars are fought over public opinion through the media, as Major Pat claims, the IDF continually develops non-lethal weapons and has become "among the leaders in the field." But contrary to Israeli rhetoric about the proportionate use and humane nature of its technologies, the intimidating, maiming, and sometimes deadly effect of these weapons on protestors is precisely their intent. Israel uses Occupied Palestinian Territory to test out its "non-lethal" weapons, capitalizing on the growing market for these technologies worldwide. The transfer of technologies and the training of US law enforcement by the Israeli military and police normalize the unrestrained use of force to suppress citizen expression.

MEDIA AND VIOLENCE

Israeli government and military censorship tightly control publications concerning the occupation of Palestine and, in particular, Israel’s use of force. In Palestinian territory, the Israeli military directly intervenes in journalistic work and collaborates with the Palestinian Authority to suppress critical coverage in Palestinian media outlets. The Palestinian Center for Development and Media Freedoms, MADA, has documented hundreds of cases of violations of media freedoms of Palestinian journalists in recent years -- from travel restrictions, confiscations of equipment, fines, and closures of media outlets, to interrogations, arrests, administrative detention and even killing. Within Israel, the IDF Spokesperson’s Unit yields tremendous power, and operates…
as Israel’s “largest public relations office,” and one of the largest in the world. The IDF’s measures to prevent leaks, and its backing by the Israeli Supreme Court, grant it an almost complete monopoly of information on “security affairs.”

Since its establishment, Israeli media has disseminated the national narrative and have normalized Israeli militarism. Israeli military correspondents are overwhelmingly compliant with the IDF censorship and the IDF spokesperson, acquiescing in order to receive live updates. Briefings from the military are crucial, as even journalists from centrist publications have lamented that “99 percent” of the material military correspondents publish comes directly from or is mediated by the military spokesperson. The IDF spokesperson’s monopoly on information poses difficulties for independent reporting on security issues. International journalists must also sign a form agreeing to comply with Israeli censorship to obtain a government press card.

The New York Times, among others, has admitted to altering its reporting in light of interventions by the Israeli military censor, despite acknowledging that “any censorship is a huge compromise.” All major news outlets are legally required to comply with the IDF censorship regarding topics and modes of coverage. The military censorship has recently admitted it intervenes in at least 20 percent of news items it reviews from Israeli outlets, and that it has completely censored a record high of at least 21 percent of news items it reviewed in 2017.

Beyond the censorship, the media and military in Israel are deeply entangled. Many prominent journalists and correspondents see their reporting as part of the “war effort,” and have declared that their patriotic allegiance to the military and to Israel trumps their professional journalistic obligations. The central path to journalism in Israel is through the IDF spokesperson unit and the military-run news outlets, and there is coordinated pack journalism and a silencing of subversive voices when it comes to security affairs. This is generally supported by the Israeli public, the majority of whom consistently express their approval of prioritizing security over freedom of expression.

Beginning with the very first official American officers’ delegation to Israel, trainings by Israeli officials included “coordination with the media.” US law enforcement delegates who underwent Israeli training were thoroughly impressed with the Israeli military and police’s handling of the media.
Following the shooting in San Bernardino, CA, local Sheriff John McMahon joined a delegation to Israel. Explaining his motivation, McMahon reported that his colleagues had learned “how to deal with the terrorist threat and how [the Israelis] get in front of the media right away.” Ted Sexton, former president of the National Sheriffs Association, said he learned “invaluable” strategies, including “how much to tell the media — enough to calm the public but not to tip off terrorists as to techniques.”

For US law enforcement, containing the threat of terrorism necessitates control over the media and their access to information. The ADL helps with this framing, with ADL regional director Tammy Gillies describing the training on the delegation she led as learning “about the role of media in times of crisis and the importance of the role of media vis-à-vis security.” These trainings encourage US law enforcement to adopt Israel’s view of the media as an arm of the government, responsible for working alongside it. In the United States, much of the media already operates as a tool of the state, justifying American wars overseas, aligning with police action at home, and underreporting state violence.

Through joint trainings, Israel is held up as an example for US law enforcement in treatment of the media and of protesting civilians. As the right to protest is being eroded in the US and all over the world, it is critical to safeguard the fundamental freedoms of expression and assembly. The ADL and other facilitators of these exchanges continue to uphold Israel’s totalizing control and violent repression of resistance as a model for US law enforcement. In the name of security, they call for infringing upon the rights of American citizens and residents to express criticism of their government, mobilize collectively, and voice their opinions in the streets. In doing so, promoters of trainings with Israel actively work against decades of civil and human rights struggles and achievements in the United States, and preclude true safety for everyone.

While the US government has long surveilled, profiled, and repressed people of color and social movements both in the territorial United States and in its wars abroad, the post-9/11 era is defined by severe US government infringement of civil liberties and human rights in the name of national security. The War on Terror has broadened the domestic implementation of military tactics, methods, and technologies by law enforcement, which are used to target people of color, poor people, and the growing opposition to the violation of civil rights and dismantling of basic services. Defying this oppression, social movements and civil society organizations across the country remain determined in their continued struggle against ongoing violation of long fought for civil liberties.

This increasing encroachment on human and civil rights in the name of security is enhanced by US law enforcement’s training and technological trade with Israel. Ongoing exchanges with the Israeli military, police, and intelligence agencies have contributed to expanding surveillance, including comprehensive visual and online monitoring and heightened infiltration of entire social movements and communities; They have further advanced marking Black and Brown people as suspect, particularly Arabs and Muslims, and have helped to refine policies, tactics, and technologies of systematic racial profiling targeting these communities and social movements that seek racial justice; And they promote the suppression of protests in American streets by treating protestors as enemy combatants, and by controlling media coverage of this state violence. Upon their return, US law enforcement delegations implement practices learned from Israel’s use of invasive surveillance, blatant racial profiling, and repressive use of force that endanger us all.

Recent encounters of the Black Lives Matter movement with the police in Ferguson and across the country has led both Palestinian and Black activists to draw parallels between Palestine and the United States, and inspired activist delegation visits and exchanges of ideas and means of resistance. These activists build on a long and rich history of solidarity between US social movements and the Palestinian struggle for liberation. The movement for justice in Palestine in the United States has joined the movement for Black Lives, the movement at Standing Rock, and the movement for undocumented immigrants and against the Muslim Ban, to call for racial justice, human rights, and civil liberties for all.

The Deadly Exchange Campaign builds on this crucial work to demand that the American government end its violence in the name of security. We hope that local government nationwide heed the calls from communities across Palestine and the United States to help build a world with real safety that we all can inhabit with dignity.
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Jewish Voice for Peace is a national, grassroots organization inspired by Jewish tradition to work for a just and lasting peace according to principles of human rights, equality, and international law for all the people of Israel and Palestine. JVP has over 200,000 online supporters, over 70 chapters, a youth wing, a Rabbinic Council, an Artist Council, an Academic Advisory Council, and an Advisory Board made up of leading U.S. intellectuals and artists.

RAIA is a research organization committed to the movement for justice in Palestine in the United States, and dedicated to exposing the connections between US and Israeli state violence. RAIA investigates the coordination, collaboration, and exchange of technologies, weapons, and expertise between the US and Israel under the banner of counter-terrorism, and works towards real security for all people in Palestine and the United States.

Deadly Exchange is a Jewish Voice for Peace campaign to end US-Israel police partnerships. JVP believes civil rights organizations and Jewish communal institutions have no business participating in further endangering those in Trump and Netanyahu’s cross-hairs by dispatching police, ICE and FBI agents to trade tips with an occupying army.
Programs include the Anti-Defamation League’s National Counter-Terrorism Seminar and Advanced Training School; Jewish Institute for National Security Affairs’ Law Enforcement Exchange Program; and trainings and seminars by the Georgia International Law Enforcement Exchange, among others.


The 1033 Program, launched in the early 1990s in the context of the War on Drugs, authorizes the Department of Defense to transfer excess military equipment to local law enforcement agencies. The program was made permanent in 1996 under the Clinton Administration, and expanded to include support “counterterrorism activities.” There are few qualifications imposed on law enforcement agencies that participate in the 1033 Program; agencies receive the equipment for free and are required to use it within one year of receipt, creating incentives to both participate in the program and to use its equipment. As of 2017, the Pentagon has given over $5 billion in military equipment to local law enforcement since the program began. The extensive cache of military weapons includes rifles, grenade launchers, armored vehicles, and helicopters. According to the ACLU, local law enforcement agencies use both the military gear and DHS funds “ostensibly obtained for the purpose of fighting terrorism to conduct ordinary law enforcement activities.” The ACLU further found overwhelming evidence that the program was facilitating the militarization of police and that these weapons and tactics were regularly used to conduct operations with excessive and sometimes lethal force.

In Israel’s military occupation and military campaign throughout the Second Intifada and in the United States’ War on Terror, both countries reinterpreted International Humanitarian Law to legitimize their military agendas. Both Israel and the United States have adopted some of these interpretations from one another to legitimize detention, interrogation, torture and assassination (Lisa Hajjar, International Humanitarian Law and “Wars on Terror”: A Comparative Analysis of Israeli and American Doctrines and Policies,” Journal of Palestine Studies 36, no. 1 (Autumn 2006). In waging the War on Terror, the US government has also drawn on legal interpretations and tactics from its history of violence on the Western frontier and beyond its territorial borders (Nikhil Pal Singh, Race and America’s Long War (Oakland: University of California Press, 2017); Aziz Rana, The Two Faces of American Freedom (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2014); John Grenier, The First Way of War: American War Making on the Frontier, 1607-1814 (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2008); Alyosha Goldstein, ed., Formations of United States Colonialism (Durham: Duke University Press, 2014).
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15 // The Shin Bet recommendations are upheld by Israeli courts in 95 percent of cases (Yael Berda, Living Emergency).

16 // Yael Berda, Living Emergency.

17 // According to Addameer’s research, following Palestinian uprisings beginning in October 2015, Israel has increasingly targeted Palestinians on the grounds of “incitement” on social media and other online platforms. Since then, more than 400 Palestinians have been arrested by the IDF and Shin Bet for incitement based on information from the intelligence agencies, though no evidence was obtained that the expression in fact led to any violence. The Israeli military has relied on the military penal code for courts to issue sentences of several months to more than one year on incitement charges. Due to the absence of clear legal criminalization of online expression and lack of evidence, many of the arrested were placed under administrative detention in which the detainees are denied due process.

18 // Dareen Tatour is Palestinian poet whose poems posted on her social media led to her arrest in 2015. Despite being an Israeli citizen, she was accused of incitement to violence and placed in detention for three months, and under house arrest with no access to the internet throughout her trial. In 2018 she was convicted of incitement to violence and supporting terror due based on her posts on social media, and sentenced to five months in prison.

19 // Of the dozens of charges of incitement brought by police against Israeli citizens in 2015, an average 90 percent of the accused were Palestinian, in 2016 over 80 percent of those arrested for incitement were Palestinian.
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24 // The report mentions Israel multiple times, framing any Muslim criticism of Israeli violence against Palestinians as by definition extremist, irrational, and the result of indoctrination.

25 // The category of “Black Identity Extremists” has already been used to monitor, arrest, and even jail activists for racial justice. Black activist against police brutality Raken Balogun was monitored and later arrested for his Facebook posts criticizing the police. He spent five months in jail and was denied bail while US attorneys investigated him for “domestic terrorism,” attempting and ultimately failing to prosecute him as a threat to law enforcement.
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Lisa Hajjar, *Courting Conflict*.

Conviction rates of Palestinians in military courts averages at 99.7% (Lior Yavne, *Backyard Proceedings*). Since 1967, nearly 20% of Palestinians and 40% of male Palestinians have been arrested by Israel.

Israeli state data reveals that only 25% of those held in Israeli prisons are Jewish. Of the incarcerated Israeli citizen population 43% are Palestinian, more than twice their rate in the population.


Emmanuel Rosen and Ron Cahili, *Don’t Call Me Black*, (Tel Aviv: DocuDrama Ltd., 2008).


While comprising less than two percent of the state’s citizen population, Ethiopians make up 40 percent of some prisons. Ethiopians are indicted at twice their rate in the population, with minors prosecuted at four times and jailed at ten times their percentage in the population; Erella Shadmi, *Fortified Land: Police and Policing in Israel* (Israel: Hotsa’at ha-Ḳibuts ha-me’uḥad, 2012).

Mistrust and fear of harassment lead to few complaints filed by Ethiopians against the police, and police officers are rarely brought to justice since allegations of police violence are routinely dismissed.


Between 1964 and 1972, police violence ignited urban uprisings of African Americans in over 300 cities, resulting in 250 deaths, 10,000 serious injuries, and over 60,000 arrests, with majority Black casualties. Police and the National Guard turned Black neighborhoods into war zones, and employed tanks, machine guns, and tear gas to quell the protests (Robin D. G. Kelley, “Thug Nation”).

The state’s neoliberal backlash in response to the growing anti-capitalist and racial justice movements and the economic and social crisis of the 1970s and 80s took the form of an exponential growth in incarceration. The prison population grew from about 370,000 in 1970 to over 2.3 million in 2000, the majority Black and Brown and from marginalized populations deemed “surplus” (Ruth Wilson Gilmore, *Golden Gulag: Prisons, Surplus, Crisis, and Opposision in Globalizing California* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2007); Loïc J. D. Wacquant, *Prisons of Poverty* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2009); Elizabeth Hinton, *From the War on Poverty to the War on Crime*).
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Jordan T. Camp and Christina Heatherton, eds., *Policing the Planet*. 
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Jordan T. Camp and Christina Heatherton, eds., Policing the Planet.

ACLU data reveals that since the intensified implementation of stop-and-frisk in 2002, approximately 50 percent of those stopped are Black and 30 percent are Latino, and between 80-90 percent of those stopped are wrongfully suspected.

Jordan T. Camp and Christina Heatherton, eds., Policing the Planet.

Ibid; Loïc J. D. Wacquant, Prisons of Poverty.

Even FBI agents dedicated to homeland security declared that the Israeli perspective gave them a “renewed sense of urgency” with regards to the domestic war on terrorism.

Israeli law enforcement agents have repeatedly drawn parallels between policing aimed at warding off terror and preventing crime. Former head of the Shin Bet Avi Dichter claimed that there is an “intimate connection” between fighting crime and combating terrorism, because crime and terror are “two sides of the same coin.”

Some of the police officers returning from the delegations did express the reservation that not all counterterrorism methods used by Israel can be replicated in the United States. Chief Serrao acknowledged New Jersey police cannot demolish homes of alleged terrorists or operate checkpoints as is common practice in Israel, especially since NJ law enforcement has already come under criticism for using racial profiling in traffic stops.

The directors of security for the Metropolitan Transit Authority and officials from New York and New Jersey Port Authority were on the first official delegation to Israel, and have been followed by public transit representatives from across the country.

In 2009 the NYCLU filed a lawsuit on behalf of J. Sultan, a native New Yorker descent, who had been searched 21 times in 3 years. The court ruled in his favor, acknowledging the policy was not in fact random.

Israel has also exported some technological expertise to the United States. Verint and other Israeli companies have won contracts to run security systems at airports around the country.

Palestinian residents of the West Bank are generally barred from using Ben-Gurion at all, and must use the Jordanian land crossing to travel abroad.

Palestinians are asked to pull over to a side lane to have their vehicles searched based on their “Arab appearance” or on the city or town in which they state that they reside. This continues at the check in where Palestinians are profiled based on appearance and last name, given a different sticker on their passport to indicate their level of threat, and asked to be searched separately in a side room.

These logics of securing borders against a racial enemy have extended to foreign nationals who criticize Israeli policy or advocate for Palestinian rights. Over the last decade Israel has increasingly screened incoming passengers at Ben Gurion based on their political affiliations, culminating in 2017 with the banning of 20 organizations who advocate for Palestinian rights, including Students for Justice in Palestine, the American Friends Service Committee, and Jewish Voice for Peace. Most recently, interrogated prominent civil rights attorneys and faculty of law from the Center for Constitutional rights and banned them from entering the country.

Israel has a longstanding policy of checking passengers’ email and social media accounts to screen for advocates for Palestinian rights, before letting them enter Israel through Ben Gurion. In 2017 Trump announced he would implement a similar policy of requiring passengers to hand over passwords to the TSA and question them about their ideology as part of his “extreme vetting” of foreign nationals entering through US airports.

Mass criminalization based on race is also at the root of the Trump Administration’s Family Separation policy, that has been deemed a form of torture by Amnesty International.


Military Order 101 was issued in August 1967, and has remained in effect since. This order criminalizes civic activities, including: organizing and participating in protests, assemblies, or vigils, waving flags and other political symbols, and printing and distributing political material.

Neve Gordon, Israel’s Occupation (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2008).
BT’selem reports that the OCSP maintains that a closed area may be ordered only when “security needs or the necessity to maintain public order” require it, and the IDF claims these are necessary due to disturbances or violence during the demonstration, yet it issues them in some villages every week, clearly to prevent the demonstration from happening at all.

The IDF arsenal also includes collective punishment of protesting villages, including use of curfew, limiting access to the village, exposure of the entire village to hazardous crowd-control weapons such as tear gas and the “skunk,” interrogations, nightly raids, and routine arrests of children to leverage protestors to cease their political activities.

The IDF has been using these bullets since the late 1980s to disperse demonstrations in the Occupied Palestinian Territories. Since 2000, they have killed at least 18 Palestinians, including 12 minors.

The IDF also employs live ammunition, though this does not qualify as a crowd-control technology and gravely violates international law.

186 cases have been opened by the Department for the Investigation of Police over the past three years for illegal use of Tasers during police activity, but official data from the department make it clear that in no case has the police been indicted.

Adalah petitioned the Israeli Supreme Court on behalf of some of these protestors to urgently grant access to Ramallah hospitals to save their limbs. The IDF responded by petitioning the courts to refuse their request as punishment for participating in the protests. After prolonged deliberation over several days, the courts ruled in favor of the IDF and denied them access causing them permanent disability.

Nikhil Singh, Race and America’s Long War.


Robin D. G. Kelley, “Thug Nation.”

While considered “non-lethal,” the case of Jawaher Abu Ramah and her Bassem Abu Ramah from the village of Bil’in demonstrate that tear gas canisters when shot at close range and at a direct angle can injure and kill protestors, and that excessive inhalation of the gas can also be deadly.

Israel is the only country that has signed the convention but has yet to ratify it.

The IDF also regularly uses Combined Systems Inc. stun grenades against protestors, which Police in Ferguson also used.

Major Pat added that “One of the problems in the IDF and for armies in the world in general, is that combat soldiers are trained to kill and that is their occupation, and suddenly death is out of bounds.”

Major Pat referred to this as the “CNN effect.”

It currently comprises about 70 officers and about 300 soldiers, and has been termed It is one of the strongest, most significant and consensual institutions in the Israeli public, and the Military Advocate General is incredibly powerful and considered the spokesman of the State of Israel.

This was most recently evident in the Israeli media coverage of the Great Return March, which from right wing to liberal depicted Palestinian demands for freedom as a Hamas ploy, a provocation, and a violent show of force that compels the IDF to kill unarmed civilians.

These correspondents often join Israeli military units on their missions in Occupied Territory, where they provide PR for the military and work to elevate national morale.


Yoram Peri, “Intractable Conflict and the Media”; Alongside the military’s growing efforts to use social media platforms as a space to wage PR campaigns, Israeli citizens have been conscripted into “digital militarism,” using online communication platforms to sustain state violence and fervently deny the reality of Israeli occupation (Adi Kuntsman and Rebecca L. Stein, Digital Militarism: Israel’s Occupation in the Social Media Age (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 2015).
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