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\*\*Uniqueness\*\*

US-Israel Relations – Yes (1/

US-Israel relations are improving – Iran, cooperation, and NPT holding

Jon Ward, White House Reporter, 07/07/2010, “Netanyahu says reports of chill in U.S.-Israeli relations are ‘flat wrong’,” The Daily Caller, http://dailycaller.com/2010/07/06/netanyahu-says-reports-of-chill-in-u-s-israeli-relations-are-flat-wrong/

Israeli Prime Minister Benjamin Netanyahu said Tuesday that reports over the last year of a growing rift between the U.S. and Israel are “flat wrong,” following a meeting with President Obama at the White House. “The reports about the demise of the special U.S.-Israel relationship aren’t just premature. They’re just flat wrong,” Netanyahu said, sitting in the Oval Office to Obama’s left and speaking to reporters in English. “There’s a depth and richness of this relationship that is expressed every day. Our teams talk. We don’t make it public.” Netanyahu’s trip to Washington comes a week after Israel’s ambassador to the U.S., Michael Oren, was quoted by Israeli news outlets as having said that there is a “tectonic rift” between the two countries. Oren disputed the report. Obama also downplayed disagreements between himself and the Israel leader, though he did not deny that there have been some. “The press … enjoys seeing if there’s news there, but the fact of the matter is that I trusted Prime Minister Netanyahu since I met him before I was elected president,” Obama said. “There are going to be times when he and I are having robust discussions about what kind of choices need to be made. But the underlying approach never changes. And that is, the United States is committed to Israel’s security. We are committed to that special bond.” Obama also repudiated a story that appeared in the New York Times over the weekend that said a recently drafted nuclear nonproliferation agreement signed by the U.S. included language that would call on Israel to sign the nuclear non-proliferation treaty. Israel has traditionally not signed on to the NPT, since they do not acknowledge possessing nuclear weapons. But Obama said Tuesday that “there is no change” in the U.S. policy. “Israel has unique security requirements. It’s got to be able to respond to threats,” Obama said. “The United States will never ask Israel to take any steps to undermine their security interests.” A White House official confirmed that Obama’s comments were aimed at assuring the Israelis publicly that the Times story was wrong. On the topic of Iran, Netanyahu said that sanctions approved by Congress last week and signed into law late in the week “actually have teeth.” “They bite. The question is how much do you need to bite?” Netanyahu said. “That is something I cannot answer now, but if other nations adopted similar sanctions that would increase the effect.” U.S.-Israeli relations have been troubled since Obama took office, following the president’s insistence that Netanyahu agree to a freeze of all settlements in the West Bank and East Jerusalem. But both sides have made a concerted effort in recent months to repair the relationship, with at least part of the calculus being that an isolated Israel could increase the likelihood that they carry out a military strike against Iran’s nuclear program.

Despite earlier policy differences, relations are moving forward

Meredith Buel, 26 July 2010, “US-Israel Military Ties Strengthen,” Voice of America, http://www1.voanews.com/english/news/usa/US-Israel-Military-Ties-Strengthen-99258974.html

Since President Obama took office, he and Israeli Prime Minister Benjamin Netanyahu have had significant policy differences. The bond was severely strained when Israel announced the expansion of Jewish settlements in mostly Arab East Jerusalem during a visit by U.S. Vice President Joe Biden earlier this year . Another U.S.-Israeli meeting was postponed when a raid by Israeli commandos on an aid flotilla to Gaza led to the deaths of nine pro-Palestinian activists. The disagreements have not derailed indirect peace talks between Israel and the Palestinians. U.S. special envoy George Mitchell has continued his shuttle diplomacy between the parties in an effort to restart direct negotiations. In early July the two leaders met again and there appeared to be a significant improvement in relations.

US-Israel Relations – Yes (2/

No rift in relations – military cooperation over Iran

Justin Elliott, Salon reporter, Jul 15, 2010, “Despite "rift," U.S., Israel talking Iran attack,” Salon, http://www.salon.com/news/israel/?story=/politics/war\_room/2010/07/15/obama\_israel\_rift\_not\_on\_iran

To hear most media tell it before last week's meeting between Barack Obama and Benjamin Netanyahu, the only relevant question was whether a deep U.S.-Israel "rift" was temporary or permanent. But the idea of some kind of substantive schism between the two countries has always been a bit comical. As Bloomberg put it in an underappreciated piece last month, "Obama's Israel Policy Showing No Difference With Clinton-Bush." The latest evidence of the non-rift comes in this new Time story in which Joe Klein passes on spin he's getting from unnamed U.S. and Israeli government sources about the chances of a U.S. attack on Iran supposedly rising (emphasis ours): Other intelligence sources say that the U.S. Army's Central Command, which is in charge of organizing military operations in the Middle East, has made some real progress in planning targeted air strikes -- aided, in large part, by the vastly improved human-intelligence operations in the region. "There really wasn't a military option a year ago," an Israeli military source told me. "But they've gotten serious about the planning, and the option is real now." Israel has been brought into the planning process, I'm told, because U.S. officials are frightened by the possibility that the right-wing Netanyahu government might go rogue and try to whack the Iranians on its own. Hard to know what to make of this, especially as Klein opts not to let us in on which side is feeding him this information. But high-level military cooperation is a useful reminder that talk of a "rift" between the Obama and Netanyahu is pretty much bunk.

Israel relations are stable and strong – reassured in the squo

JTA, July 11, 2010, “U.S.-Israel ties strong, Bibi tells his Cabinet,” http://www.jta.org/news/article/2010/07/11/2739993/us-israel-relations-strong-netanyahu-tells-cabinet

The alliance between Israel and the United States is "stable and strong," Benjamin Netanyahu told his Cabinet. The Israeli prime minister briefed the Cabinet Sunday on his visit last week to the United States, where he met with President Obama, other senior American administration officials, media figures and Jewish community leaders. Netanyahu said the U.S. administration shared his belief that Israel and the Palestinian Authority "must proceed to direct talks in order to advance the peace process." The prime minister also said he thanked Obama for signing into law "aggressive U.S. sanctions" against Iran several days ago and expressed the hope that other countries would join in them. The two leaders discussed the recent Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty conference, Netanyahu said, and Obama "made it clear that American policy on these strategic issues has not changed and that the U.S. understands -- as the president put it -- that due to the size of the threats against it and given our history, the State of Israel is in a special situation."

US-Israeli relations are high – reports of tensions have been overplayed by the media

Erick Stakelbeck, CBN News Terrorism Analyst, 7-7-2010, “Netanyahu Meets with Gates, Wraps Up U.S. Visit,” http://www.cbn.com/cbnnews/insideisrael/2010/July/Obama-and-Netanyahu-Mending-Relations/

Both meetings come after friendly talks at the White House with President Barack Obama where -- despite reports of previous tension and a possible rift -- the two assured the U.S. and Israel have an "unbreakable" bond and are making progress on major issues in the Middle East. Netanyahu received a warm welcome at the White House Tuesday. It was a much different tone than the last meeting between the two in March, when photos were prevented and the prime minister used a side door to enter and exit. "Our relationship has broadened," Obama said. "I think it's time you and the first lady came to Israel," Netanyahu offered. CBN News Mideast Bureau Chief Chris Mitchell has more reaction to the meeting between President Obama and Prime Minister Netanyahu. Click play for his comments, following Erick Stakelbeck's report. Also, click here for additional analysis from CBN News Sr. Editor John Waage. The leaders went out their way to tout their relationship, both saying reports of tension between the U.S. and Israel were overplayed. "The reports about the demise of the special U.S.-Israel relationship aren't just premature, they're just flat wrong," Netanyahu told reporters. "There's a depth in this relationship that we express everyday."

US-Israel Relations – Yes (3/

US-Israel relationship tight as ever

Christian Science Monitor, 7-6-2010, “US-Israel relationship is as tight as ever, Obama and Netanyahu say”, <http://www.csmonitor.com/USA/Foreign-Policy/2010/0706/US-Israel-relationship-is-as-tight-as-ever-Obama-and-Netanyahu-say>

Yes, Israeli Prime Minister Benjamin Netanyahu and President Obama appear to be getting along fine, for now. They sought to present a united front to the world on Tuesday following a White House meeting, with both emphasizing the shared values that underlie the US-Israel relationship. .“The bond between Israel and the United States is unbreakable,” Mr. Netanyahu said. Mr. Obama, for his part, disagreed with the premise of a questioner who asked about a perceived coolness between the White House and Israel. “If you look at every public statement that I’ve made over the last year and a half, it has been a constant reaffirmation of the special relationship between the United States and Israel,” said the US president.

US-Israel relations best of Obama’s presidency

Barry Rubin, Professor @ IDC in Israel, 7-24-2010, “Briefing in a Minute: The Middle East Right Now”, GLORIA, <http://www.gloria-center.org/blog/2010/07/briefing-minute-middle-east-right-now>

--Israel will deploy Iron Dome defense against rockets, mainly from the Gaza Strip, in November. --EU "foreign minister" Ashton and--separately--Turkey and Syria--call for complete end of any blockade on the Gaza Strip. Ha! Great minds think alike. Why shouldn't Hamas have all the weapons it wants? --Syria bans face veils in universities. Promoting revolutionary Islamism is fine as a foreign policy campaign but we wouldn't want them to take over our country and shoot the rulers, right? --U.S.-Israel relations are quite good, the best at any time during the current presidency, and this could be expected to continue into early 2011 at least. --The U.S. government has upgraded the Palestinian Authority representatives in the United States to the level of a general delegation, allowing them to fly the Palestinian flag in Washington DC. If this had come after the PA accepted direct negotiations with Israel that might have been understood. But once again we see the fatal pattern: first give a unilateral concession in hope that the other side will reciprocate. Shall I list the occasions on which that approach has failed during the last 18 months? You can develop your own list. That's not the way to do foreign policy.

US-Israel Security Relations – Yes

US-Israel security and military ties are stronger than ever – new weapons funding

Meredith Buel, 26 July 2010, “US-Israel Military Ties Strengthen,” Voice of America, http://www1.voanews.com/english/news/usa/US-Israel-Military-Ties-Strengthen-99258974.html

While much public attention has been focused on diplomatic disputes between Israel and the United States during the past 18 months, Obama administration officials say military and security ties between the two countries are stronger than ever. Earlier this month the Israeli military said it successfully tested a system that can shoot down incoming rockets. Called "Iron Dome," the system is designed to protect Israeli communities from rockets fired from Lebanon and Gaza. The Obama administration is asking Congress to approve $205 million to support Iron Dome in the latest example of the strengthening military cooperation between the U.S. and Israel. Andrew Shapiro is assistant secretary of state for political-military affairs. "Hezbollah has amassed tens of thousands of short and medium-range rockets on Israel's northern border," said Andrew Shapiro. "Hamas has a substantial number in Gaza. And even if these are still crude, they all pose a serious danger." The Iron Dome system will help neutralize the threat from Hezbollah in Lebanon and Hamas in the Gaza Strip. The two Islamic militant groups have bombarded Israel with incoming rockets in the past, exposing a strategic vulnerability. The United States is also providing Israel with hundreds of millions of dollars for longer-range missile-defense programs known as Arrow and David's Sling, that would defend against weapons such as Iran's Shahab ballistic missile.

A2: Efforts to Increase Relations Now

Current efforts at improving relations will be lost in fervor around the Gaza flotilla incident

Glenn Kessler Washington Post Staff Writer ‘Israeli assault complicates efforts to improve relationship with U.S.’ May 31, 2010 http://www.turkishpress.com/news.asp?id=352265

The worldwide condemnation of the deadly Israeli assault on the Gaza aid flotilla will complicate the Obama administration's efforts to improve its tense relations with Jerusalem and likely will distract from the push to sanction Iran over its nuclear program. The timing of the incident is remarkably bad for both Israel and the United States. Prime Minister Binyamin Netanyahu and President Obama were scheduled to meet Tuesday in Washington as part of a "kiss and make up" session; the United Nations, meanwhile, was set to begin final deliberations on Iran in the weeks ahead. Now the White House talks have been scrubbed, Israel's actions were the subject of an emergency U.N. Security Council meeting Monday, and the administration increasingly faces a difficult balancing act as Israel's diplomatic isolation deepens. In contrast to forceful statements from European, Arab and U.N. officials -- and impromptu demonstrations from Athens to Baghdad -- the White House responded to the assault Monday only by saying that Obama had held a phone conversation with Netanyahu in which the prime minister expressed "deep regret at the loss of life" and "the importance of learning all the facts and circumstances around this morning's tragic events." Even before Monday's incident, Israel was on shaky diplomatic ground. After the government was accused of using forged foreign passports in an assassination of a militant in Dubai, Britain expelled an Israeli diplomat in March. Australia did the same last week. The latest furor may have caused irreplaceable harm to Israel's relations with Turkey -- a Muslim state with which Israel has long had close ties --because so many of the dead are Turkish nationals. "This is terrible for Israel-Turkey relations," said Namik Tan, the Turkish ambassador to the United States, who served as ambassador to Israel from 2007 through 2009. "I am really saddened by it." Tan said Israel's actions demanded condemnation from every country in the world, because the flotilla incident took place in international waters and because it involved civilians on a humanitarian mission. But he said the Obama administration's initial statement was wanting. "We would have expected a much stronger reaction than this," he said. Turkish Foreign Minister Ahmet Davutoglu will be in Washington Tuesday to discuss Iran with Secretary of State Hillary Rodham Clinton, but Turkey's fury at the Gaza incident will inevitably top the agenda. Daniel Levy, a former Israeli peace negotiator now at the New America Foundation in Washington, said it's not the first time Israel has done itself a disservice. "Israel constantly claims it wants the world to focus on Iran, but then it ends up doing something that gets everyone to focus on itself," he said.

More evidence – we’re on the brink of long term relations loss despite current efforts

Adrian Blomfield Journalist US-Israeli relations suffer 'tectonic rift' 27 Jun 2010 http://www.telegraph.co.uk/news/worldnews/middleeast/israel/7857487/US-Israeli-relations-suffer-tectonic-rift.html

Barack Obama met Benjamin Netanyahu in the Oval Office. The sobering assessment comes a week before Benjamin Netanyahu, the Israeli prime minister, meets President Barack Obama at the White House. There had been hope the two could lay to rest a row that erupted between the two allies in March but the new comments have raised fears of long-term damage. Michael Oren, Israel's ambassador to Washington, told foreign ministry colleagues at a private briefing in Jerusalem that they were facing a long and potentially irrevocable estrangement.

\*\*Links\*\*

ME Withdrawal Link

Weakening of US military presence in Iraq leads to Israeli arms buildup and Iran strikes

Jim Hoagland, Staff Writer for the Washington Post, March 1, 2009 “A Perilous Pivot,” The Washington Post, http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/content/article/2009/02/27/AR2009022702293\_pf.html

The president is clear that he intends to order all U.S. combat troops from Iraq before the 2010 U.S. midterm elections. And diplomats and analysts in touch with the White House increasingly suspect that the Obama team hopes for major reductions in Afghanistan before this four-year presidential term ends -- even absent major progress. Let's hope things go well and permit these withdrawals. But either way, Obama's reformulation of U.S. vital interests in Med-Ind should take into account the unintended consequences of burden-shedding: -- Security in this turbulent region is not a zero-sum game for Americans alone. It cannot be measured only in reduced U.S. spending or casualties, however welcome such reductions are. Israel, Saudi Arabia, Egypt and other American allies in this region -- as well as Europe and Japan -- will react to any whittling away of American commitments by building up their military capabilities and ambitions. -- That buildup would include beneficial results for Americans. But it would not be focused on the terrorist networks that target the United States. It would be focused on Iran and its suspected nuclear weapons program and subversion of other governments in the region. One immediate consequence of an attenuated long-term U.S. presence would be to raise greatly the odds of an Israeli military strike on Iran before the end of 2010. -- An American drawdown would also intensify the threat of nuclear proliferation across the Arab world -- especially if pulling back the U.S. military shield that has been in place since 1991 comes in the context of Obama's promised engagement with Iran. A sudden Iranian-U.S. rapprochement would be seen by Arabs and Israelis alike as part of American exit strategy from the region's multiple conflicts.

US presence in the Middle east is a cucial element of the US-Israel relationship

John Rash, March 24, 2010, “John Rash: U.S.-Israel relations also about Iraq, Afghanistan,” Star Tribune, http://www.startribune.com/opinion/commentary/89062212.html

But it's not just settlements that are unsettling the bond between America and Israel. In fact, it's not just about Israel and Palestine. It's also about Iraq and Afghanistan, where U.S. troops already face lethal threats. The connection was made clear by Gen. David Petraeus, chief of the U.S. Central Command, who recently reported that the Israeli-Palestinian conflict "foments anti-American sentiment due to a perception of U.S. favoritism toward Israel." The link is also the subject of an influential article in a recent edition of Foreign Policy magazine by Mark Perry, who said in an interview on public radio's "The World" that "anything that happens in Jerusalem, anything that happens to Arabs or Muslims, is watched very closely across the region. American soldiers are basically walking point on the war on terrorism, so any time there's a settlement announcement in Jerusalem it has an impact on them."

Iraq Withdrawal Link

Israeli perceives the plan as weakening their security

Aswat al-Iraq, 7-9-2010, “Israel worried about U.S. withdrawal from Iraq,”

Israeli Prime Minister Benjamin Netanyahu expressed worry on Thursday over Israel’s security after the withdrawal of U.S. troops from Iraq, according to the Investor’s Business Daily (IBD). Netanyahu told US Defense Secretary Robert Gates that Israel is concerned about the consequences of the US’ planned drawdown of troops from Iraq next year. Netanyahu, who met with Gates during his visit to Washington, said he is concerned about the creation of an “eastern front” in the wake of the Iraq pullout. The two officials met at Blair House, the official presidential guest house.

The plan weakens Israeli’s border security

Haaretz, Israeli Newspaper, 7-8-2010, “Netanyahu: U.S. pullout from Iraq could leave Israel vulnerable,” http://www.uruknet.info/?hd=&l=e&p=m67742&size=1

Any future peace deal with the Palestinians must provide for the security must allow Israel to maintain defenses against an attack from the east, Prime Minister Benjamin Netanyahu said in Washington on Wednesday. Speaking after a meeting with U.S. Defense Secretary Robert Gates, Netanyahu said that a final status agreement must provide for the possibly of renewed hostilities on Israel's eastern border following an American withdrawal from Iraq.

Immediate withsdrawal ensures a link

Shmuel Rosner, Chief U.S. Correspondent, 8-8-2007, “Top Democrat: Our policy on Iraq won't imperil Israel, leave chaos,” Haaretz, http://www.haaretz.com/news/top-democrat-our-policy-on-iraq-won-t-imperil-israel-leave-chaos-1.227046

Hoyer was responding to statements by Prime Minister Ehud Olmert some months ago, in which he expressed opposition [to]American withdrawal from Iraq. Olmert warned against a hasty withdrawal that may undermine the balance of power in the Middle East and endanger the moderate regimes in the region. "Those who are concerned for Israel's security, for the security of the Gulf States and for the stability of the entire Middle East should recognize the need for American success in Iraq and responsible exit," Olmert said in remarks to the American Israel Public Affairs Committee (AIPAC) in March 2007.

Israel is concerned over U.S. withdrawal from Iraq

ABNA middle ease news agency 07/09 http://abna.ir/data.asp?lang=3&id=194961

BAGHDAD / Iraq: Israeli Prime Minister Benjamin Netanyahu expressed worry on Thursday over Israel’s security after the withdrawal of U.S. troops from Iraq, according to the Investor’s Business Daily (IBD). Netanyahu told US Defense Secretary Robert Gates that Israel is concerned about the consequences of the US’ planned drawdown of troops from Iraq next year. Netanyahu, who met with Gates during his visit to Washington, said he is concerned about the creation of an “eastern front” in the wake of the Iraq pullout. The two officials met at Blair House, the official presidential guest house.“Gates and Netanyahu discussed Israel’s security measures in the frame of a permanent agreement with the Palestinians, and addressed ways to prevent the infiltration of rockets, missiles and other weapons into the territory of the future Palestinian state.”

\*\*Impacts\*\*

US-Israeli Relations Good – Heg

Breakdown in Relations destroys US heg and regional stability, causing war and oil shocks

Dr. Martin Kramer is The Washington Institute's Wexler-Fromer Fellow and author of its best-selling monograph. An authority on contemporary Islam and Arab politics, Dr. Kramer earned his undergraduate and doctoral degrees in Near Eastern Studies from Princeton University. During a twenty-five-year career at Tel Aviv University, he directed the Moshe Dayan Center for Middle Eastern and African Studies; taught as a visiting professor at Brandeis University, the University of Chicago, Cornell University, and Georgetown University; and served twice as a fellow of the Woodrow Wilson International Center for Scholars in Washington. Currrently, Dr. Kramer is a senior fellow at the Shalem Center in Jerusalem and at the Olin Institute, Harvard University. “The American Interest” in Azure. Fall 2006. http://www.washingtoninstitute.org/templateC06.php?CID=980

My answer, to anticipate my conclusion, is this: United States support for Israel is not primarily the result of Holocaust guilt or shared democratic values; nor is it produced by the machinations of the 'Israel Lobby.' American support for Israel -- indeed, the illusion of its unconditionality underpins the pax Americana in the eastern Mediterranean. It has compelled Israel's key Arab neighbors to reach peace with Israel and to enter the American orbit. The fact that there has not been a general Arab-Israeli war since 1973 is proof that this pax Americana, based on the United States-Israel alliance, has been a success. From a realist point of view, supporting Israel has been a low-cost way of keeping order in part of the Middle East, managed by the United States from offshore and without the commitment of any force. It is, simply, the ideal realist alliance. In contrast, the problems the United States faces in the Persian Gulf stem from the fact that it does not have an Israel equivalent there, and so it must massively deploy its own force at tremendous cost. Since no one in the Gulf is sure that the United States has the staying power to maintain such a presence over time, the Gulf keeps producing defiers of America, from Khomeini to Saddam to Bin Laden to Ahmadinejad. The United States has to counter them, not in the interests of Israel, but to keep the world's great reserves of oil out of the grip of the West's sworn enemies. Allow me to substantiate my conclusion with a brief dash through the history of Israel's relationship with the United States. Between 1948 and 1967, the United States largely adhered to a zero-sum concept of Middle Eastern politics. The United States recognized Israel in 1948, but it did not do much to help it defend itself for fear of alienating Arab monarchs, oil sheikhs, and the 'Arab street.' That was the heyday of the sentimental State Department Arabists and the profit-driven oil companies. It did not matter that the memory of the Holocaust was fresh: The United States remained cautious, and attempted to appear 'evenhanded.' This meant that the United States embargoed arms both to Israel and to the Arabs. So Israel went elsewhere. It bought guns from the Soviet bloc, and fighter aircraft and a nuclear reactor from France. It even cut a deal with its old adversary Britain at the time of the Suez adventure in 1956. Israel was not in the U.S. orbit, and it did not get significant American aid. Nevertheless, the radical Arab states gravitated toward the Soviet Union for weapons and aid. Israel felt vulnerable, and the Arab countries still believed they could eliminate Israel by war. In every decade, this insecurity indeed produced war: 1948, 1956, 1967, and 1973. The United States was not invested heavily enough to prevent these wars; its diplomacy simply kicked in to stop them after the initial energy was spent. Only in June 1967, with Israel's lightning victory over three of its neighbors, did the United States begin to see Israel differently, as a military power in its own right. The Arab-Israeli war that erupted in October 1973 did even more to persuade the United States of Israel's power. Although Egypt and Syria launched a surprise attack against Israel, Israel bounded back to achieve what military analysts have called its greatest victory, repulsing an enemy that might have overwhelmed a less determined and resourceful people. It was then that the United States began to look at Israel as a potential strategic ally. Israel appeared to be the strongest, most reliable, and most cost-effective bulwark against Soviet penetration of the Middle East. It could defeat any combination of Soviet clients on its own, and in so doing, humiliate the Soviet Union and drive thinking Arabs out of the Soviet camp. The 1973 war had another impact on American thinking. Until then, Arab-Israeli wars did not threaten the oil flow, but that war led to an Arab oil embargo. Another Arab-Israeli war might have the same impact or worse, so the United States therefore resolved to prevent such wars by creating a security architecture -- a pax Americana. One way to build it would have been to squeeze Israel relentlessly. But the United States understood that making Israel feel less secure would only increase the likelihood of another war and encourage the Arab states to prepare for yet another round. Instead, the American solution was to show such strong support for Israel as to make Arab states despair of defeating it, and fearful of the cost of trying. To this purpose, the United States brought Israel entirely into its orbit, making of it a dependent client through arms and aid. That strategy worked. Expanded American support for Israel persuaded Egypt to switch camps and abandon its Soviet alliance, winning the Cold War for the United States in the Middle East. Egypt thus became an American ally alongside Israel, and not instead of Israel. The zero-sum theory of the Arabists -- Israel or the Arabs, but not both -- collapsed. American Middle East policy underwent its Copernican revolution. Before 1973, the Arab states thought they might defeat or destroy Israel by some stroke of luck, and they tried their hand at it repeatedly. Since 1973, the Arab states have understood not only that Israel is strong, but that the United States is fully behind it. As a result, there have been no more general Arab-Israeli wars, and Israel's Arab neighbors have either made peace with it (Egypt, Jordan), or kept their border quiet (Syria). The corner of the Middle East along the eastern Mediterranean has been free of crises requiring direct American military intervention. This is due to American support for Israel -- a support that appears so unequivocal to the Arabs that they have despaired of overturning it.

US-Israeli Relations Good – Heg

US-Israeli relations are key to intelligence

Dore Gold, the eleventh Rep of Israel to the United Nations, An Israeli response to the Walt-Mearsheimer claim, 9/2/2007. http://www.aish.com/jewishissues/middleeast/Understanding\_the\_U.S.-Israel\_Alliance.asp

Much of the U.S.-Israel strategic relationship is classified, particularly in the area of intelligence sharing. There are two direct consequences from this situation. First, most aspects of U.S.-Israel defense ties are decided on the basis of the professional security considerations of those involved. Lobbying efforts in Congress cannot force a U.S. security agency to work with Israel. And the intelligence cooperation between the two countries has been considerable; much of it preceded the solidification of the U.S.-Israel defense relationship in the 1980s. It was Israeli intelligence which obtained the exact text of the secret February 1956 speech by Soviet leader Nikita Khrushchev to the Twentieth Congress of the Communist Party, in which he denounced the past policies of his predecessor, Joseph Stalin. The Israelis passed Khrushchev's address on to the CIA. 24 "The ability of the U.S. Air Force... to defend whatever position it has in NATO owes more to the Israeli intelligence input than it does to any single source of intelligence." -- General George F. Keegan In August 1966, the Mossad succeeded in recruiting an Iraqi pilot who defected and flew a Soviet MiG 21 to Israel, which shared its intelligence on the new Soviet aircraft, about which little was previously known, with the U.S. The information obtained about the MiG 21 not only helped the Israeli Air Force less than a year later in the 1967 Six-Day War, but would be extremely valuable to the U.S., as well, since the MiG 21 became the workhorse of the North Vietnamese Air Force in the years ahead. Indeed, it became common practice for Israel to furnish whole Soviet weapons systems - like 122 and 130-mm artillery and a T-72 tank - to the U.S. for evaluation and testing, influencing the development of U.S. weapons systems and battlefield tactics during the Cold War. 25 The value of this intelligence for the U.S has been enormous. General George F. Keegan, a retired U.S. Air Force intelligence chief, told Wolf Blitzer in 1986 that he could not have obtained the same intelligence "with five CIAs." 26 He went further: "The ability of the U.S. Air Force in particular, and the Army in general, to defend whatever position it has in NATO owes more to the Israeli intelligence input than it does to any single source of intelligence, be it satellite reconnaissance, be it technology intercept, or what have you." 27 Because many elements of the U.S.-Israel security relationship are normally kept secret, it is difficult for academics, commentators, and pundits to provide a thorough net assessment of the true value of U.S.-Israel ties. Thus, Israel is left working shoulder-to-shoulder with the U.S., even while finding itself caricatured by outside commentators as a worthless ally whose status is only sustained by a domestic lobby.

Effective intelligence is the critical lynch pin for hegemony and preventing terrorist attacks.

Lee H. Hamilton, vice chairman of the 9/11 Commission currently serves on the President's Homeland Security Advisory Council, Challenges for Intelligence in American Democracy, 2004 http://www.wilsoncenter.org/about/director/docs/Hamilton\_intelamerdem.doc

Good intelligence is essential to our national security. A superpower like the United States simply cannot survive without it. As a heavy consumer of intelligence and an observer of the intelligence community for decades, I hold the men and women of our intelligence agencies in high regard. They are highly talented people. They are dedicated to their work and their country. They are called upon to do a difficult, and sometimes dangerous, job with the knowledge that good work rarely receives outside recognition. The work of the intelligence community played a key role in our victory in the Cold War. And on September 11, 2001, we all learned that the mission for the intelligence community is as vital and urgent as it has ever been. Intelligence is the most important tool that we have in preventing terrorist attacks – at home and abroad. Better intelligence is everybody’s favorite solution to preventing terrorism. And intelligence is also a crucial component of our work to curb weapons proliferation. The stakes could not be higher. Policymakers simply must be able to trust that they have the best possible intelligence as they deal with these new threats. Good intelligence does not guarantee good policy, but poor intelligence can ensure bad policy. If a policymaker has quality intelligence, issues are framed; decisions are clearer; and consequences can be anticipated.

US-Israeli Relations Good – Lashout

US-Israeli relations are key to regional and global stability

Glenn Kessler, Washington Post Staff Writer, Bush Says U.S. Would Defend Israel Militarily The Washington Post, 2/2/2006

President Bush said yesterday the United States would defend Israel militarily if necessary against Iran, a statement that appeared to be his most explicit commitment to Israel's defense. In an interview with Reuters, Bush said he is concerned about Iranian President Mahmoud Ahmadinejad's "menacing talk" about Israel, such as his comments denying the Holocaust and saying Israel should be wiped off the map. "Israel is a solid ally of the United States. We will rise to Israel's defense, if need be. So this kind of menacing talk is disturbing. It's not only disturbing to the United States, it's disturbing for other countries in the world, as well," Bush said. Asked whether he meant the United States would rise to Israel's defense militarily, Bush said: "You bet, we'll defend Israel." The Jewish state sought some sort of military alliance with the United States shortly after it was founded in 1948, but was rebuffed by several presidents, partly out of fear of offending Arabs. Since then, Israel has established the principle of securing its own defense, including a nuclear deterrent, backed by large weapons sales by the United States. Past presidents have spoken elliptically about helping Israel, a close ally, in a conflict. The United States has no military alliance with Israel, though President Bill Clinton dangled the prospect of a military alliance as part of a final peace deal, said Dennis Ross, a senior Clinton adviser on the region. Ross said he could not recall a president ever saying so clearly the United States would come to Israel's defense. But he said it is a "logical extension" of existing policy, because Israel has never before faced the threat of a foe with a possible nuclear weapon. "This proves once again the United States is the best friend and ally of Israel," said Israeli Ambassador Daniel Ayalon. "We are very proud of this special relationship, which is the cornerstone of stability in the Middle East, for the mutual benefit of Israel, the U.S. and all peace-loving countries in the region and beyond."

Perceptions of threats cause Israel to adopt a hostile defense posture and preemptively strike its enemies

Gabriel Schoenfeld is the senior editor of Commentary, Commentary, December 1998. Lexis

Now, once again, the question has arisen of what forcible steps Israel might take in order to deny nuclear weapons to its enemies. This past September, Ephraim Sneh, a general in the Israeli army reserves and a leading member of the opposition Labor party, spoke publicly of the possibility that the IDF might be compelled to "deliver a conventional counterstrike or preemptive strike" against Iranian atomic facilities. This was not long after Teheran tested its Shahab-3 missile--to the yawns of the international community--and then displayed the missile in a military parade with banners draped from it reading, "Israel should be wiped from the map"--to still more yawns by the international community. Sneh was roundly criticized at home for his remarks, not because he was wrong but because, as Uzi Landau, the chairman of the Knesset's foreign-affairs and security committee, explained, "unnecessary chatter" could heighten the likelihood of Israel's being targeted for attack. But whether or not Sneh should have spoken out, the option he referred to may be less viable than it once was. Both Iran and Iraq have already taken measures--concealment, dispersion, hardening, surface-to-air defense--to ensure that the feat performed by Israel's air force in 1981, and for which it was universally condemned at the time, including by the United States, could not easily be repeated. If preemption is largely ruled out as an option, what then? To reduce its vulnerability--enemy missiles can arrive within ten minutes from firing--Israel may well be compelled to adopt a "launch-on-warning" posture for both its conventional and nuclear forces. For the purpose of considering this eventuality, we may assume that Israel has indeed developed a secure retaliatory force of the kind Tucker saw as essential to stability. Even so, however, this would not offer much reassurance. Unlike its neighbors, and unlike the U.S., Israel is a tiny country, and in a nuclear environment it would not have the luxury of waiting to assess the damage from a first strike before deciding how to respond. Thus, in any future crisis, at the first hint from satellite intelligence or some other means that a missile fusillade was being prepared from, say, Iran or Iraq, Israel, to protect its populace, would have to punch first. And it would have to strike not only at missile sites, some of which it might well miss, but at a broader range of targets--communications facilities, air bases, storage bunkers, and all other critical nodes--so as to paralyze the enemy and thus rule out the possibility of attack. These are the implications of launch-on-warning. Clearly, such a posture presents grave problems. Lacking secure second-strike forces of their own, and aware that Israel would no doubt try to hit them preemptively, Iran and Iraq would be under tremendous pressure to launch their missiles first--to "use them or lose them." In other words, what this scenario leads to is the prospect of both sides' moving to a permanent position of hair-trigger alert. It is a nightmarish prospect. The possibility that nuclear war might break out at any moment--by accident, miscalculation, or design--would inevitably place

Israeli Strikes Bad – Laundry List

( ) Israeli strikes lead to all out Mideast nuclear war

Claude Salhani, foreign editor and a political analyst with United Press International, 9-13-2004, “Four Day War”, The American Conservative, http://www.amconmag.com/2004\_09\_13/article.html

Israel is unlikely to accept Iran’s word that its nuclear program is meant solely for peaceful purposes and aimed at developing commercial energy. The possibility of decisive military action is, indeed, high. What follows is the unfolding of a worst-case scenario, an imaginary yet all-too-possible depiction of how events might develop if Israel were to attack Iran’s nuclear facilities. Day One: Wednesday In a pre-dawn raid, undisclosed numbers of Israeli warplanes, taking off from military airbases in the Negev, destroy Iran’s main nuclear facility at Bushehr. Israel’s armed forces have released no details, but it is believed the planes flew over parts of Jordan, northern Saudi Arabia, and Iraq, refueling in mid-air before reaching their target. Military analysts speculate that the planes must have refueled somewhere over Iraq. During the one-hour raid, Iran claims to have shot down “several” Israeli fighters. Television images show pilots being lynched by furious mobs before Iranian authorities could reach them. The after-effects of the raid shake the Arab and Islamic world. Millions take to the streets demanding immediate action against Israel. In planning the attack, Israel weighed the threats of Arab and Muslim reaction. The only other nuclear threat, and a possible danger to Israel, is Pakistan. Israel considered striking Pakistan’s nuclear sites, too, but Indian intelligence reports that Pakistan lacks long-distance delivery for its warheads. Bombay is the farthest they can reach. Additional reassurance from American intelligence convinced Israel that as long as Musharraf remains in power, Pakistan does not represent an imminent threat. The decision was made not to hit Pakistan. Day Two: Thursday Believing that Israel would never undertake such actions without U.S. approval, or at least a tacit nod from the American administration, Iran retaliates. Thousands of Revolutionary Guards are dispatched across the border into Iraq with orders to inflict as many casualties on American troops as possible. Fierce clashes erupt between coalition forces and Iranians. Within hours, more than 400 U.S. troops are killed, and many more wounded in heavy fighting. Iranian sleeper agents, who have infiltrated Iraq since the downfall of Saddam, urge Iraqi Shi’ites into action. They cut major highways and harass coalition troops, preventing reinforcements from reaching units under attack. Several helicopters are shot down. Tehran orders the Lebanese Shi’ite movement, Hezbollah, into action against northern Israel. Hezbollah launches scores of rockets and mortars against kibbutzim, towns, and settlements. Israel retaliates. Casualties are high on both sides of the frontier. Tension in the Middle East reaches a boiling point. In Washington, the Cabinet convenes in an emergency session. Massive demonstrations erupt all over the Arab and Islamic world. Crowds of gigantic proportions take to the streets, ransacking Israeli embassies in Cairo, Amman, and Ankara. American embassies in a number of other cities are burned. With police overwhelmed, the military is called in. Armies open fire, killing hundreds, adding to the outrage. Day Three: Friday Following Friday prayers across the Islamic world, crowds incited by fiery sermons in mosques from Casablanca to Karachi take to the streets in the worst protests yet. Government buildings are ransacked, and clashes with security forces result in greater casualties. Martial law is declared, and curfew imposed, but this fails to prevent further mayhem and rioting. Islamist groups call for the overthrow of governments and for immediate military action against Israel. In Saudi Arabia, Islamist militants engage in open gun battles with security forces in several cities. The whereabouts of the Saudi royal family are unknown. In Indonesia, Malaysia, Egypt, and a dozen other countries, crowds continue to run amok, demanding war on Israel. Day Four: Saturday A longstanding plan to overthrow Musharraf is carried out by senior Pakistani army officers loyal to the Islamic fundamentalists and with close ties to bin Laden. The coup is carried out in utmost secrecy. Pakistan’s intelligence service, the ISI—a long-time supporter of the fundamentalists—in agreement with the plotters, takes control of the country’s nuclear arsenal and its codes. Within hours, and before news of the coup leaks out, Pakistan, now run by pro-bin Laden fundamentalists, loads two nuclear weapons aboard executive Lear jets that take off from a remote military airfield, headed for Tel Aviv and Ashdod. Detouring and refueling in east Africa, they approach Israel from the south. The crafts identify themselves as South African. Their tail markings match the given identification. The two planes with their deadly cargo are flown by suicide pilots who, armed with false flight plans and posing as business executives, follow the flight path given to them by Israeli air traffic control. At the last moment, however, the planes veer away from the airfield, soar into the sky and dive into the outskirts of the two cities, detonating their nuclear devices in the process. The rest of this scenario can unfold in a number of ways. Take your pick; none are encouraging. Israel retaliates against Pakistan, killing millions in the process. Arab governments fall. Following days of violence, Syria, Jordan, and Egypt succumb to Islamist rebels who vow open warfare with Israel. The Middle East regresses into war, with the fighting claiming hundreds of thousands of lives. A much-weakened Israel, now struggling for its very survival, deploys more nuclear weapons, targeting multiple Arab capitals. The Middle East is in complete mayhem, as the United States desperately tries to arrange a cease-fire.

Israeli Strikes Bad – Laundry List

Israeli strikes would escalate, destroy the world economy, and be comparatively worse than American strikes

Norman Podhoretz, Former editor of Commentary, Senior Fellow at the Hudson Institute, Presidential Medal of Freedom recipient, 1/23/2008, “Stopping Iran: Why the case for military action still stands,” The Wall Street Journal, http://online.wsj.com/article/SB120103739264407641.html?mod=googlenews\_wsj

What would happen then? In a recently released study, Anthony Cordesman of the Center for Strategic and International Studies argues that Mr. Rafsanjani had it wrong. In the grisly scenario Mr. Cordesman draws, tens of millions would indeed die, but Israel--despite the decimation of its civilian population and the destruction of its major cities--would survive, even if just barely, as a functioning society. Not so Iran, and not its "key Arab neighbors," particularly Egypt and Syria, which Mr. Cordesman thinks Israel would also have to target in order "to ensure that no other power can capitalize on an Iranian strike." Furthermore, Israel might be driven in desperation to go after the oil wells, refineries, and ports in the Gulf. "Being contained within the region," writes Martin Walker of UPI in his summary of Mr. Cordesman's study, "such a nuclear exchange might not be Armageddon for the human race." To me it seems doubtful that it could be confined to the Middle East. But even if it were, the resulting horrors would still be far greater than even the direst consequences that might follow from bombing Iran before it reaches the point of no return. In the worst case of this latter scenario, Iran would retaliate by increasing the trouble it is already making for us in Iraq and by attacking Israel with missiles armed with non-nuclear warheads but possibly containing biological and/or chemical weapons. There would also be a vast increase in the price of oil, with catastrophic consequences for every economy in the world, very much including our own. And there would be a deafening outcry from one end of the earth to the other against the inescapable civilian casualties. Yet, bad as all this would be, it does not begin to compare with the gruesome consequences of a nuclear exchange between Israel and Iran, even if those consequences were to be far less extensive than Mr. Cordesman anticipates. Which is to say that, as between bombing Iran to prevent it from getting the bomb and letting Iran get the bomb, there is simply no contest. \* \* \* But this still does not answer the question of who should do the bombing. Tempting as it must be for George Bush to sit back and let the Israelis do the job, there are considerations that should give him pause. One is that no matter what he would say, the whole world would regard the Israelis as a surrogate for the United States, and we would become as much the target of the ensuing recriminations both at home and abroad as we would if we had done the job ourselves. To make matters worse, the indications are that it would be very hard for the Israeli air force, superb though it is, to pull the mission off. Thus, an analysis by two members of the Security Studies Program at MIT concluded that while "the Israeli air force now possesses the capability to destroy even well-hardened targets in Iran with some degree of confidence," the problem is that for the mission to succeed, all of the many contingencies involved would have to go right. Hence an Israeli attempt could end with the worst of all possible outcomes: retaliatory measures by the Iranians even as their nuclear program remained unscathed. We, on the other hand, would have a much bigger margin of error and a much better chance of setting their program back by a minimum of five or 10 years and at best wiping it out altogether.

Israel uses CBWs and ethno bombs

John Steinbach, Nuclear Specialist, Center for Research on Globalization, March 2002, “Israeli Weapons of Mass Destruction: a Threat to Peace,” http://www.wagingpeace.org/articles/2002/03/00\_steinbach\_israeli-wmd.htm

Israel also possesses a comprehensive arsenal of chemical and biological weapons. According to the Sunday Times, Israel has produced both chemical and biological weapons with a sophisticated delivery system, quoting a senior Israeli intelligence official, "There is hardly a single known or unknown form of chemical or biological weapon . . .which is not manufactured at the Nes Tziyona Biological Institute.")(20) The same report described F- 16 fighter jets specially designed for chemical and biological payloads, with crews trained to load the weapons on a moments notice. In 1998, the Sunday Times reported that Israel, using research obtained from South Africa, was developing an "ethno bomb; "In developing their "ethno-bomb", Israeli scientists are trying to exploit medical advances by identifying distinctive a gene carried by some Arabs, then create a genetically modified bacterium or virus... The scientists are trying to engineer deadly micro-organisms that attack only those bearing the distinctive genes." Dedi Zucker, a leftist Member of Knesset, the Israeli parliament, denounced the research saying, "Morally, based on our history, and our tradition and our experience, such a weapon is monstrous and should be denied."

Israeli Strikes Bad – Extinction

Impact – Iran Strike causes nuclear escalation – ends the world

Jorge **Hirsch**, Professor of physics at the University of California San Diego, 2-20-20**06**, <http://www.antiwar.com/orig/hirsch.php?articleid=8577>

The U.S. has just declared that it will defend Israel militarily against Iran if needed. Presumably this includes a scenario where Israel would initiate hostilities by unprovoked bombing of Iranian facilities, as it did with Iraq's Osirak, and Iran would respond with missiles targeting Israel. The U.S. intervention is likely to be further bombing of Iran's facilities, including underground installations that can only be destroyed with low-yield nuclear bunker-busters. Such nuclear weapons may cause low casualties, perhaps only in the hundreds [.pdf], but the nuclear threshold will have been crossed. Iran's reaction to a U.S. attack with nuclear weapons, no matter how small, cannot be predicted with certainty. U.S. planners may hope that it will deter Iran from responding, thus saving lives. However, just as the U.S. forces in Iraq were not greeted with flowers, it is likely that such an attack would provoke a violent reaction from Iran and lead to the severe escalation of hostilities, which in turn would lead to the use of larger nuclear weapons by the U.S. and potential casualties in the hundreds of thousands. Witness the current uproar over cartoons and try to imagine the resulting upheaval in the Muslim world after the U.S. nukes Iran. - The Military's Moral Dilemma - Men and women in the military forces, including civilian employees, may be facing a difficult moral choice at this very moment and in the coming weeks, akin to the moral choices faced by Colin Powell and Dan Ellsberg. The paths these two men followed were radically different. Colin Powell was an American hero, widely respected and admired at the time he was appointed secretary of state in 2001. In February 2003, he chose to follow orders despite his own serious misgivings, and delivered the pivotal UN address that paved the way for the U.S. invasion of Iraq the following month. Today, most Americans believe the Iraq invasion was wrong, and Colin Powell is disgraced, his future destroyed, and his great past achievements forgotten. Daniel Ellsberg, a military analyst, played a significant role in ending the Vietnam War by leaking the Pentagon Papers. He knew that he would face prosecution for breaking the law, but was convinced it was the correct moral choice. His courageous and principled action earned him respect and gratitude. The Navy has just reminded [.pdf] its members and civilian employees what the consequences are of violating provisions concerning the release of information about the nuclear capabilities of U.S. forces. Why right now, for the first time in 12 years? Because it is well aware of moral choices that its members may face, and it hopes to deter certain actions. But courageous men and women are not easily deterred. To disobey orders and laws and to leak information are difficult actions that entail risks. Still, many principled individuals have done it in the past and will continue to do it in the future ( see [1], [2], [3], [4], [5], [6], [7], [8], [9].) Conscientious objection to the threat and use of nuclear weapons is a moral choice. Once the American public becomes fully aware that military action against Iran will include the planned use of nuclear weapons, public support for military action will quickly disappear. Anything could get the ball rolling. A great catastrophe will have been averted. Even U.S. military law recognizes that there is no requirement to obey orders that are unlawful. The use of nuclear weapons against a non-nuclear country can be argued to be in violation of international law, the principle of just war, the principle of proportionality, common standards of morality ([1], [2], [3], [4], [5]), and customs that make up the law of armed conflict. Even if the nuclear weapons used are small, because they are likely to cause escalation of the conflict they violate the principle of proportionality and will cause unnecessary suffering. The Nuremberg Tribunal, which the United States helped to create, established that "The fact that a person acted pursuant to order of his government or of a superior does not relieve him from responsibility under international law, provided a moral choice was in fact possible to him." To follow orders or to disobey orders, to keep information secret or to leak it, are choices for each individual to make – extremely difficult choices that have consequences. But not choosing is not an option. - America's Collective Responsibility - Blaming the administration or the military for crossing the nuclear threshold is easy, but responsibility will be shared by all Americans. All Americans knew, or should have known, that using nuclear weapons against a non-nuclear country like Iran was a possibility given the Bush administration's new policies. All Americans could have voiced their opposition to these policies and demand that they be reversed. The media will carry a heavy burden of responsibility. The mainstream media could have effectively raised public awareness of the possibility that the U.S. would use nuclear weapons against Iran. So far, they have chosen to almost completely hide the issue, which is being increasingly addressed in non-mainstream media. Members of Congress could have raised the question forcefully, calling for public hearings, demanding public discussion of the administration's plans, and passing new laws or resolutions. So far they have failed to do so and are derelict in their responsibility to their constituents. Letters to the president from some in Congress [1], [2] are a start, but are not likely to elicit a meaningful response or a change in plans and are a far cry from forceful action. Scientific organizations and organizations dealing with arms control and nuclear weapons could have warned of the dangers associated with the Iran situation. So far, they have not done so ([1], [2], [3], [4], [5], [6], [7], [8]). Scientists and engineers responsible for the development of nuclear weapons could have voiced concern [.pdf] when the new U.S. nuclear weapons policies became known, policies that directly involve the fruits of their labor. Their voices have not been heard. Those who contribute their labor to the scientific and technical infrastructure that makes nuclear weapons and their means of delivery possible bear a particularly heavy burden of moral responsibility. Their voices have barely been heard. - The Nuclear Abyss - The United States is preparing to enter a new era: an era in which it will enforce nuclear nonproliferation by the threat and use of nuclear weapons. The use of tactical nuclear weapons against Iran will usher in a new world order. The ultimate goal is that no nation other than the U.S. should have a nuclear weapons arsenal. A telltale sign that this is the plan is the recent change in the stated mission of Los Alamos National Laboratory, where nuclear weapons are developed. The mission of LANL used to be described officially as "Los Alamos National Laboratory's central mission is to reduce the global nuclear danger" [1] [.pdf], [2] [.pdf], [3] [.pdf]. That will sound ridiculous once the U.S. starts throwing mini-nukes around. In anticipation of it, the Los Alamos mission statement has been recently changed to "prevent the spread of weapons of mass destruction and to protect our homeland from terrorist attack." That is the present and future role of the U.S. nuclear arsenal, to be achieved through threat (deterrence) and use of nuclear weapons. References to the old mission are nowhere to be found in the current Los Alamos documents, indicating that the change was deliberate and thorough. It is not impossible that the U.S. will succeed in its goal. But it is utterly improbable. This is a big world. Once the U.S. crosses the nuclear threshold against a non-nuclear country, many more countries will strive to acquire nuclear weapons, and many will succeed. The nuclear abyss may turn out to be a steep precipice or a gentle slope. Either way, it will be a one-way downhill slide toward a bottomless pit. We will have entered a path of no return, leading in a few months or a few decades to global nuclear war and unimaginable destruction. But there are still choices to be made. Up to the moment the first U.S. nuclear bomb explodes, the fall into the abyss can be averted by choices made by each and every one of us.

Israeli Strikes Bad – Iran Prolif

Israeli strikes fail and lead to more rapid Iranian Proliferation

The Economist, “Bombs Away”, 7/21/07, nexis

Iran's nuclear targets are much further from Israel than was Iraq's Osiraq reactor, which Israeli aircraft destroyed in 1981. Most are more than 1,200km (750 miles) away, and Israel's aircraft would have to fly even farther to avoid Jordanian or Iraqi airspace. That, according to a study by Ephraim Kam of Israel's Institute for National Security Studies, would require refuelling on both the outward and return flights, adding to the danger of interception. Osiraq, moreover, was a single target. Since there would be many this time, the attacking force would have to be large. And to cause serious damage, the aircraft might have to attack more than once. Even a successful strike would not be the end of the story. For as the IAEA's Mr ElBaradei keeps saying, "you can't bomb knowledge." Iran would be likely not only to retaliate with its long-range rockets but also to begin at once to rebuild its nuclear capability, just as Iraq did with extra urgency after Israel's destruction of Osiraq. That might not take long, says Mr Kam: Iran has its own nuclear raw material and already possesses much of the relevant knowledge and technology. Having spent only three years building Natanz from scratch, it could probably rebuild it much faster with the experience it has gleaned. More worrying still is the possibility that Iran has secret nuclear sites outsiders do not know about: the existence of Arak and Natanz, remember, was not discovered until fairly recently. That could render an attack on the known ones pointless. And Mr Kam is surely right that an Israeli strike might unite Iran's people behind the regime and its nuclear aspirations.

Iranian nuclearization leads to WWIII

Pavel Felgenhauer, Defense Analyst and columnist in Novaya Gazeta, NO URANIUM FOR IRAN;

The Kremlin can't keep on maneuvering between radical Islam and the West, Defense and Security (Russia), 11/27/06, nexis

Iran will soon acquire a nuclear arsenal. Not only Israeli sources are saying so now; former nuclear energy minister Viktor Mikhailov maintains that it will happen within five to seven years, perhaps even earlier. Hence, a nuclear war in the Middle East, involving Iran and Israel, will be entirely possible. Many other countries would certainly be drawn into such a conflict - perhaps including the United States and Russia. In Tehran last week, Iranian President Mahmoud Ahmadinejad said that Iran will shortly launch a 60,000-centrifuge cascade for uranium enrichment. Mikhailov says that "Iran is capable of producing those centrifuges," and that it does have the science and technology "required to create nuclear weapons." Mikhailov knows what he's talking about; in the 1990s he took part in organizing the Bushehr nuclear power plant contract, and personally signed a protocol of intent for Russia to supply a uranium centrifuge system to Iran.

Iranian proliferation leads to miscalculation and nuclear conflict

Jim Krane, Associated Press Writer, Iranian Nukes could spawn Gulf arms race, Singapore elder statesman says, AP, 11/21/06, nexis

Lee, the island state's longtime prime minister, warned that an atomic Iran makes nuclear war more likely than during the Cold War, when Washington and Moscow understood the need to communicate their intentions to keep their nations secure. No such understanding exists between Israel and its Muslim enemies like Iran and Hezbollah, and miscalculations by both sides already resulted in a disastrous war last summer in Lebanon, he said.

Israeli Strikes Bad – Iraq Stability

Strikes lead to insurmountable destabilization of Iraq

Justin Logan, Foreign Policy Analyst at Cato, “The Bottom Line on Iran”, 12/4/06, http://www.cato.org/pubs/pas/pa583.pdf

In early 2006, U.S. intelligence warned of the most likely tactics Iran could employ: longrange missiles, secret commando units (presumably IRGC), and “terrorist allies planted around the globe.”33 In particular, both the political and the security situations in Iraq could become nightmarish if the United States were to attack Iran. In January, powerful Shi’ite cleric Moqtada al-Sadr announced that if Iran were attacked, Sadr would throw his support behind Iran.34 Sadr’s large militia, the Mahdi army, has clashed repeatedly with U.S. troops, and Sadr has become a major player in Iraq’s national politics; he demonstrated his political influence most recently by prompting tens of thousands of supporters to take to the streets of Baghdad in August to profess support for Hizbullah leader Hassan Nasrallah’s campaign against Israel by chanting “Death to America! Death to Israel!”35 According to former National Security Council official Kenneth Pollack, Iran’s Ayatollah Ali Khamenei has “allowed the [Iranian] intelligence services to deploy to Iraq in force and position themselves to fight a war there if necessary.”36 Pollack concluded that if Iran decided to ratchet up its activity inside Iraq, our troubles in that country would “increase dramatically, perhaps even insurmountably.”37 U.S. officials confirm this account, noting that Iranian agents have poured money and personnel into southern Iraq in an effort to create a “greater Iran.”38 England’s Chatham House think tank went so far as to argue that “Iran has superseded [the United States] as the most influential power in Iraq.”3

2NC – Strikes Impact O/Ws

**Israeli-instigated nuclear war is most devastating – it would cause enough nuclear fall out to create nuclear winter and counter-value targeting ensures comparatively greater death toll than that of the case**

Ian Hoffman, Staff Writer, December 12, 2006, “Nuclear Winter Looms, experts say”, MediaNews Group, Inc. and ANG Newspapers

SAN FRANCISCO -- With superpower nuclear arsenals plummeting to a third of 1980s levels and slated to drop by another third, the nightmarish visions of nuclear winter offered by scientists during the Cold War have receded. But they haven't gone away. Researchers at the American Geophysical Union's annual meeting warned Monday that even a small regional nuclear war could burn enough cities to shroud the globe in black smoky shadow and usher in the manmade equivalent of the Little Ice Age. "Nuclear weapons represent the greatest single human threat to the planet, much more so than global warming," said Rutgers University atmospheric scientist Alan Robock. By dropping imaginary Hiroshima-sized bombs into some of the world's biggest cities, now swelled to tens of millions in population, University of Colorado researcher O. Brian Toon and colleagues found they could generate 100 times the fatalities and 100 times the climate-chilling smoke per kiloton of explosive power as all-out nuclear war between the United States and former Soviet Union. For most modern nuclear-war scenarios, the global impact isn't nuclear winter, the notion of smoke from incinerated cities blotting out the sun for years and starving most of the Earth's people. It's not even nuclear autumn, but rather an instant nuclear chill over most of the planet, accompanied by massive ozone loss and warming at the poles. That's what scientists' computer simulations suggest would happen if nuclear war broke out in a hot spot such as the Middle East, the North Korean peninsula or, the most modeled case, in Southeast Asia. Unlike in the Cold War, when the United States and Russia mostly targeted each other's nuclear, military and strategic industrial sites, young nuclear-armed nations have fewer weapons and might go for maximum effect by using them on cities, as the United States did in 1945. "We're at a perilous crossroads," Toon said. The spread of nuclear weapons worldwide combined with global migration into dense megacities form what he called "perhaps the greatest danger to the stability of society since the dawn of humanity." More than 20 years ago, researchers imagined a U.S.-Soviet nuclear holocaust would wreak havoc on the planet's climate. They showed the problem was potentially worse than feared: Massive urban fires would flush hundreds of millions of tons of black soot skyward, where -- heated by sunlight -- it would soar higher into the stratosphere and begin cooking off the protective ozone layer around the Earth. Huge losses of ozone would open the planet and its inhabitants to damaging radiation, while the warm soot would spread a pall sufficient to plunge the Earth into freezing year-round. The hundreds of millions who would starve exceeded those who would die in the initial blasts and radiation. Popularized by astronomer Carl Sagan and Nobel prize winners, the idea of nuclear winter captured the public imagination, though nuclear-weapons scientists found nuclear winter was virtually impossible to achieve in their own computer models without dropping H-bombs on nearly every major city. Scientists on Monday say nuclear winter still is possible, by detonating every nation's entire nuclear arsenals. The effects are striking and last five times or longer than the cooling effects of the biggest volcanic eruptions in recent history, according to Rutgers' Robock.

The US will get drawn in

Glenn Kessler, Washington Post, 2/2/2006, http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/content/article/2006/02/01/AR2006020102134.html

President Bush said yesterday the United States would defend Israel militarily if necessary against Iran, a statement that appeared to be his most explicit commitment to Israel's defense. In an interview with Reuters, Bush said he is concerned about Iranian President Mahmoud Ahmadinejad's "menacing talk" about Israel, such as his comments denying the Holocaust and saying Israel should be wiped off the map. "Israel is a solid ally of the United States. We will rise to Israel's defense, if need be. So this kind of menacing talk is disturbing. It's not only disturbing to the United States, it's disturbing for other countries in the world, as well," Bush said. Asked whether he meant the United States would rise to Israel's defense militarily, Bush said: "You bet, we'll defend Israel." The Jewish state sought some sort of military alliance with the United States shortly after it was founded in 1948, but was rebuffed by several presidents, partly out of fear of offending Arabs. Since then, Israel has established the principle of securing its own defense, including a nuclear deterrent, backed by large weapons sales by the United States. Past presidents have spoken elliptically about helping Israel, a close ally, in a conflict. The United States has no military alliance with Israel, though President Bill Clinton dangled the prospect of a military alliance as part of a final peace deal, said Dennis Ross, a senior Clinton adviser on the region. Ross said he could not recall a president ever saying so clearly the United States would come to Israel's defense. But he said it is a "logical extension" of existing policy, because Israel has never before faced the threat of a foe with a possible nuclear weapon. "This proves once again the United States is the best friend and ally of Israel," said Israeli Ambassador Daniel Ayalon. "We are very proud of this special relationship, which is the cornerstone of stability in the Middle East, for the mutual benefit of Israel, the U.S. and all peace-loving countries in the region and beyond."
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US-Israel Relations – No (1/2)

The U.S. and Israel are drifting apart

James Besser on Mon, 6/28/2010 - 11:47 James Besser is a respected Washington correspondent for NY Jewish Week whose reports appear in many other Jewish media outlets as well. ...http://www.thejewishweek.com/blogs/political\_insider/israeli\_ambassador\_michael\_oren\_us\_and\_

israel\_drifting\_apart

What to make out of yesterday's report in Ha'aretz that Amb. Michael Oren, meeting with Israeli diplomats in Jerusalem, said the U.S. and Israel are in a “tectonic rift” and drifting apart? Oren, who's been doing a lot of clarifying lately, denied the report which was based on anonymous sources – but a lot of them. I'm guessing the gist of the report is accurate – mostly because his comments are generally accurate. Let's look at the report piece by piece. Oren reportedly told assembled Israeli diplomats that there's no crisis in U.S.-Israel relations, but that “relations are in the state of a tectonic rift in which continents are drifting apart.” Both parts are probably accurate. Leaders in Washington and Jerusalem, for political and diplomatic reasons, have a strong interest in maintaining close strategic ties and avoiding unnecessary clashes over the stalled Middle East peace process. Both have worked hard in the past few months to ease the tensions that rocked the relationship earlier this year. But it's also clear that the Obama administration and the Netanyahu government are on different tracks, headed in different directions when it comes to the critical issues of the day, starting with Israeli-Palestinian peace. Oren, according to Ha'aretz, also “noted that contrary to Obama’s predecessors − George W. Bush and Bill Clinton − the current president is not motivated by historical-ideological sentiments toward Israel but by cold interests and considerations.” Well, that's casting the issue in a particularly negative light, but there's little question this president is much less inclined to take the view that whatever Israel does is OK by us and that Israeli interests never conflict with ours. Bush saw the world in start good-versus-evil terms, and Israel was on our side – on the side of good, and that's all he needed to know. President Obama sees a world full of nuance and a vastly complex nexus of U.S. interests that doesn't mesh at all with the black-and-while view that dominated the Bush administration. And Oren reportedly said that while his access to top administration officials remains good, Obama retains very tight control over this administration and is hard to influence, and that it is pretty much a “one-man show” at the White House. Check: true again. So where, exactly, was Oren wrong? Or was the problem in the Ha'aretz headline: “Envoy to Washington fears U.S.-Israeli relations in ‘tectonic rift,’ diplomats say,” and the generally negative spin of the story? Or was it just that Israel and its friends get very nervous about any hint that U.S. and Israeli interests aren't 100 percent in synch – when any historian can tell you no allies are ever in total agreement on every issue?

Relations are at historic lows

Matthew Weaver and Daniel Nasaw Political Journalist ‘Israel claims Jerusalem settlement plan would not harm Palestinians’ 3/15/10 http://www.guardian.co.uk/world/2010/mar/15/israel-us-crisis-ambassodor

US secretary of state Hillary Clinton with Israeli prime minister Binyamin Netanyahu The US secretary of state, Hillary Clinton, with the Israeli prime minister, Binyamin Netanyahu. New East Jerusalem settlement plans have severely damaged the peace process and US-Israeli relations. Photograph: Matty Stern/Handout/EPA The Israeli prime minister, Binyamin Netanyahu, stepped up the row over Jewish settlement plans in East Jerusalem today, saying they would not hurt the city's Palestinian residents. Speaking to Israel's parliament, Netanyahu said the construction of homes for Jews in the city's eastern sector "in no way" hurts Palestinians. His comments came after an admission by the Israeli ambassador to Washington that Israel's relations with the US are at their worst for 35 years. US officials are reported to have urged Israel to reconsider sudden plans to build 1,600 homes in the occupied area, after they were described by one of Barack Obama's closest aides as an "affront" to the US that could undermine peace efforts in the Middle East. Earlier, Netanyahu apologised for announcing the plans during a visit last week to Israel by the US vice-president, Joe Biden. "I recommend not to get carried away and to calm down," he said yesterday. But he refused to cancel the programme and his attempt to downplay the dispute was exposed today when Israel's ambassador to the US, Michael Oren, admitted that relations between the two countries had reached a historic crisis. "Israel's ties with the United States are in their worst crisis since 1975 … a crisis of historic proportions," Oren was quoted as saying in the Israeli media. Unnamed Israeli officials have told Associated Press that the US is pressing Israel to scrap the building project. Israel's foreign ministry has refused to comment on either report. Senior figures in the Obama administration have been unusually forthright in expressing frustration at the plans. On Friday Hillary Clinton, the secretary of state, said the announcement was "insulting", and yesterday David Axelrod, one of the architects of Obama's election victory, said the timing was "very destructive". Speaking on NBC's Meet the Press, he said: "This was an affront, it was an insult but most importantly it undermined this very fragile effort to bring peace to that region." The announcement last Tuesday that thousands of new homes were planned in Jewish settlements in East Jerusalem came on the eve of Biden's arrival in the region for discussions to restart "proximity talks" between Israel and Palestinians, with the US mediating. Almost immediately, the news prompted Palestinian leaders to pull out of the new round of talks. Israel has agreed to slow construction of settlements in the West Bank but has refused to halt building in East Jerusalem. Israel considers East Jerusalem, which it captured in the 1967 war, its sovereign territory and Netanyahu has spoken frequently in defence of settlements there.

US-Israel Relations – No (2/2)

Relations are in a downward spiral

Elise Labott, CNN Senior State Department Producer ‘Is the U.S. taking relations with Israel to the brink? Probably not’ March 16, 2010 http://www.cnn.com/2010/POLITICS/03/16/israel.us.analysis/index.html

Washington (CNN) -- Relations between the United States and Israel have been rocky at best since President Obama and Prime Minister Benjamin Netanyahu both took office, specifically over the U.S. demand for Israel to stop settlement activity and the Israeli refusal to do so. But Israel's announcement last week about a new settlement project in East Jerusalem and the U.S. reaction has sent the relationship into a significant downward spiral.

US-Israel Relations Resilient

US-Israeli relations are resilient

Aaron David Miller, public policy scholar at the Woodrow Wilson Center for Scholars and former adviser to six secretaries of state on Arab-Israeli negotiations, June 2010, “Obama, Israel & American Jews: The Challenge—A Symposium,” http://www.commentarymagazine.com/viewarticle.cfm/obama--israel---american-jews--the-challenge-a-symposium-15449?page=all

It’s true that the United States is going through a tough patch in the U.S.-Israeli relationship. Of the three worst periods of tension in that relationship, the current crisis still doesn’t approach 1956 (over Suez), 1975 (the reassessment of the second Sinai disengagement agreement), or 1991 (over housing loan guarantees and settlements). In these three cases, sanctions against Israel were either threatened or used. And while the current tensions are not just a bump in the road (and could even worsen), the U.S.-Israeli bond has proved remarkably resilient over the course of the last 60-plus years. The marriage of interests and ideology creates a powerful and enduring bond that links Israel and the United States together.

This is true even in the face of security disagreements

Ron Kampeas, JTA News Analyst, 6-1-2010, “Obama and Netanyahu: a few unfortunate incidents, or a clash of worldviews?,” http://jta.org/news/article/2010/06/01/2739401/obama-and-netanyahu-a-few-unfortunate-incidents-or-a-clash-of-world-views

"The incident -- to the extent that the details are known -- has shown that U.S.-Israel relations have proven resilient in the face of the first major international incident since the two parties worked to mend relations following the Jerusalem building-permit crisis in March," said an analysis published by the Washington Institute for Near East Policy, a pro-Israel think tank. It was referring to the March announcement of building starts in Jerusalem during a visit by Vice President Biden that triggered weeks of U.S.-Israel tensions. There may yet be room for disagreements between the Obama and Netanyahu governments arising from the flotilla incident: The Obama administration has demanded of Israel a "full and credible" investigation. In a conference call Tuesday with the Conference of Presidents of Major American Jewish Organizations, Yuli Edelstein, Israel's information minister, scoffed at the idea, saying that Israel had done nothing wrong. Ultimately, Beinart suggested, Israel might have no choice except to defer to U.S. foreign policy aims. Its handling of the flotilla incident was typical, he said, of how Netanyahu had alienated the very powers that might offset the need for Israel's dependence on the United States.

Israeli will acquiesce to US policy – reassurances mean they won’t lash out

Ron Kampeas, JTA News Analyst, 6-1-2010, “Obama and Netanyahu: a few unfortunate incidents, or a clash of worldviews?,” http://jta.org/news/article/2010/06/01/2739401/obama-and-netanyahu-a-few-unfortunate-incidents-or-a-clash-of-world-views

The question for Netanyahu's government is whether it has the capacity to defer to the strategic vision of the world's remaining superpower, said Ori Nir, the spokesman for Americans for Peace Now. The Obama administration sees advancing the peace process as a critical element of securing U.S. interests in the region, and Netanyahu's cooperation -- particularly on settlement policy -- has been halting, Nir said. He added, "There's a message being sent by the Obama administration, 'Come on, you are our ally, you are our friend, we perceive you as an ally, we act toward you as an ally, and when we assert over and over again that Middle East peace is in our overall interest, you are not doing your utmost to cooperate with that policy.’” It would not be the first time that Israel has deferred to discomfiting U.S. policies. In the early 1950s, David Ben-Gurion adopted President Truman's tough anti-communism stance, although it cost him the entree he longed for into the non-aligned movement. In the first Gulf War, Israel sacrificed a degree of deterrence, heeding the first President Bush's demand that it not retaliate against Saddam Hussein's Scud missile attacks. Some Israeli officials now say they downplayed concerns about what the second President Bush's Iraq War would cost U.S. deterrence in the region. Foxman told JTA that Israel would accommodate Obama's policies -- as long as it had the reassurance of unwavering U.S. support.

A2: Military Prescense Key to Relations

Other policy differences between Israel and the US trigger the link

Meredith Buel, 26 July 2010, “US-Israel Military Ties Strengthen,” Voice of America, http://www1.voanews.com/english/news/usa/US-Israel-Military-Ties-Strengthen-99258974.html

Since President Obama took office, he and Israeli Prime Minister Benjamin Netanyahu have had significant policy differences. The bond was severely strained when Israel announced the expansion of Jewish settlements in mostly Arab East Jerusalem during a visit by U.S. Vice President Joe Biden earlier this year . Another U.S.-Israeli meeting was postponed when a raid by Israeli commandos on an aid flotilla to Gaza led to the deaths of nine pro-Palestinian activists.

Deter Iran Link Turn

US withdrawal leads to more flexibility with Iran

World Tribune News reference ‘Israel closely tracking U.S. pullout from Iraq: Iran's 'enhanced' regional clout seen as threat’ August 21, 2009 http://www.worldtribune.com/worldtribune/WTARC/2009/me\_israel0668\_08\_21.asp

But other Israeli strategists have assessed that a U.S. military withdrawal from Iraq would grant Washington greater freedom of action toward Iran. The report said a U.S. withdrawal from a stable Iraq would enhance Washington's credibility in any negotiations with the Teheran regime. "So, Israel has an important interest in the potential outcomes of U.S. withdrawal from Iraq, although it does not have much ability to directly affect developments in the country," the report said.

Deterring Iran key to US-Israel relations

Glenn Kessler Washington Post Staff Writer ‘Despite diplomatic tensions, U.S.-Israeli security ties strengthen’ 7/16/10 http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/content/article/2010/07/15/AR2010071506268.html

U.S. officials portray the effort as a long-term investment designed to improve the prospects for peace and to make Israel feel less vulnerable to any threat posed by Iran. "A secure Israel is better able to make the tough decisions that will need to be made to make peace," said Andrew J. Shapiro, assistant secretary of state for political-military affairs.

US-Israel relations are based on detering Iran

Hilary Krieger and La Journalists ‘US: Proximity talks narrowed gaps’ 7/4/2010 http://www.jpost.com/International/Article.aspx?id=180332

“There is a fundamental connection in basic interests between the US and Israel in two areas. One, to stop Iran from acquiring nuclear weapons. And two, to achieve an immediate peace between the Palestinians and Israel,” said Netanyahu.

A2: Israeli Lashout

History proves Israel won’t jump the gun

Gerald Steinberg, professor of Political Science, Bar-Ilan University, MERIA, Middle East Review of International Affairs, Vol. 2, No. 4, November 1998, http://www.biu.ac.il/soc/besa/meria/journal/1998/issue4/jv2n4a7.html

Following the invasion of Kuwait, U.S. views abruptly changed, and assessments of the threat from Iraq closely coincided with the Israeli assessments and concerns. Prior to and during Desert Storm, the United States and Israel worked relatively closely (despite political differences over the peace process and personality differences at the top levels). Intelligence information was shared, and Israel agreed to act with restraint in response to missile attacks, in order to allow the United States to maintain the coherence of the coalition. The Israeli willingness to forgo both preemptive and retaliatory attacks after being hit repeatedly by missile warheads, and with the threat of chemical warheads, was unprecedented, (and was strongly opposed by Defense Minister Moshe Arens and other key officials) and was an important acknowledgment of the importance that Israel placed on maintaining a cooperative defense relationship with the United States. Although, for political reasons, Israel was formally excluded from the coalition in which the Saudis played a central role, it was an important silent partner in the alliance, and the restraint was, in itself, and important contribution.

Israel will not precipitate nuclear conflict

**National Journal**, 10-12-**02**, http://www.d-n-i.net/fcs/comments/c461.htm

Jack Spencer, defense policy analyst at the conservative Heritage Foundation, agreed that a retaliatory response by Israel is the most likely way a war in Iraq could go nuclear, although he doubted this would happen. And he agreed that President Bush has changed American policy on the use of nuclear weapons, but he hailed the shift as a good thing. "I do not think that the Israelis will respond to a chemical or biological attack with a nuclear weapon," Spencer said. "I don't know that they won't. If they got attacked-I'm not talking about a chemical attack where a thousand people die, but a devastating, unbelievable attack-then they might." An Iraqi attack that would trigger a nuclear response would have to be "so horrendous that people probably would not be able to question Israel's requirement and right to do so. "While it's not a popular view in the mainstream media today and among many in the left," Spencer continued, "the fact of the matter is that Israel shows unbelievable restraint given what they face every day with this terrorism. I think any country in the world would react far stronger than Israel has."