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Relations are rebounding now—they’re key to solve Middle East peace and prevent Iranian proliferation

Indyk 7/2(Martin, vice president for foreign policy@the Brookings Institution, 2010, “U.S. and Israel: Diplomacy on the quiet”, *The Washington Post*, pg. A23, Lexis)jn

The current sturm und drang in U.S.-Israel relations cloaks a surprising development: President Obama and Prime Minister Binyamin Netanyahu are beginning to develop a constructive working relationship sensitive to the legitimate concerns of the other. Israel's Bureau of Statistics reported in May, for example, that in the first quarter of 2010 there were zero building starts in the West Bank settlements -- a demand Obama had made at the outset of his administration. Since Vice President Biden's embarrassing visit to Jerusalem in March, Netanyahu has quietly blocked new building tenders in East Jerusalem, demolitions of Palestinian housing and evictions of Palestinian residents there. Reciprocating, Obama recently announced an additional $205 million in military assistance to Israel to pay for the deployment of anti-rocket defense systems for Israeli border towns. Last month, Netanyahu praised the Obama administration for securing passage of the latest U.N. Security Council resolution ratcheting up sanctions on Iran's nuclear program. Indeed, for a year now, the Israeli and American national security establishments have been coordinating closely to thwart Iran's nuclear ambitions. Those who view Israel as a liability and long for a president who will impose peace on Israel will find this unwelcome news. But those who seek a breakthrough in the Middle East peace process and the effective curbing of Iran's nuclear ambitions -- including moderate Arab leaders -- should welcome what appears to be a recognition by Obama and Netanyahu that neither can achieve their purposes unless they work with, rather than against, each other. The flotilla incident was an important test of this newfound comity. Israel's bungled interception of the Mavi Marmara put Obama in an awkward position, forcing him to choose between condemning Israel, thereby winning brownie points with the Muslim world, and standing up for an embattled ally's right to defend itself. Working closely with Netanyahu -- they spoke at least three times on the phone during the crisis -- Obama forged an approach that prevented a rupture in Turkish-Israeli relations, headed off condemnation in the U.N. Security Council, shaped an investigation palatable to Israel and is easing the Gaza blockade closure in ways that meet the requirements of normal life for Gazans while honoring Israel's legitimate security concerns. However, Obama's protection of Israeli equities at a time when the rest of the world is busy remonstrating for Israel's tragic killing of militant protesters is not cost-free. The president's outreach to the Muslim world has been forfeited; the only thing that can compensate is serious movement to resolve the Palestinian problem. In this regard, Netanyahu's freezing of housing starts in the West Bank and avoidance of provocative actions in East Jerusalem helps set the stage. The Palestinian Authority's policing of the West Bank territory under its control to prevent violent attacks on Israelis begins to demonstrate that there is a responsible Palestinian partner. Moreover, the Arab League has formally endorsed Palestinian entry into "proximity talks" with Israel -- a mandate that it did not withdraw despite the Gaza crisis. Though few seem to have noticed, these factors combine to create the most conducive environment for peace negotiations since the outbreak of the second intifada in 2000. Yet in less than four months, unless progress is made on borders and security issues and direct negotiations commence, Netanyahu will come under heavy pressure to unfreeze settlement activity, and the Arab League mandate will be withdrawn. This cannot be in the interests of Netanyahu or Obama as one struggles to overcome international opprobrium and the other seeks a breakthrough on a "vital national security interest." The question remains whether they can overcome the mistrust that had permeated and poisoned their personal relationship and build a partnership for peace. Can Obama convince Netanyahu that he seeks his success as a peacemaker rather than the downfall of his right-wing coalition and that he means it when he says he is "determined to prevent Iran from acquiring nuclear weapons"? Can Netanyahu convince Obama that he is serious about achieving the two-state solution rather than playing for time until the American electoral cycle kicks in? In addition, can Netanyahu encourage Obama by doing his part to isolate Iran through entering peace negotiations with Syria and calming things down on Israel's northern front? Two simple human gestures could create an environment for testing these propositions. When Netanyahu comes to Washington next week, Obama should invite him alone to Camp David for an afternoon walk in the woods. For his part, since he models himself on Winston Churchill, Netanyahu needs to make a real effort to take Obama into his confidence, much as Churchill wooed Roosevelt in the run-up to America's entry into World War II. If they can build a common understanding for a path forward, Netanyahu should reciprocate by hosting Obama in Israel, where he can help the president begin the overdue process of rebuilding the Israeli people's trust in American steadfastness and erode their sense of embattled victimhood. As Churchill said, "To jaw-jaw is always better than to war-war." If Obama and Netanyahu can learn to "jaw-jaw," perhaps they can also achieve real peace.
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US Troop withdrawal from the Middle East would kill relations with Israel

Gold 10 (Dore, President of Jerusalem Center for Public Affairs, April 2010, 4 (23), http://www.jcpa.org/JCPA/Templates/ShowPage.asp?DBID=1&LNGID=1&TMID=111&FID=376&PID=0&IID=3655)KFC

The United States and Israel have been tied by mutual strategic interests for many years, and those interests will eventually trump the differences that we're seeing today. The major strategic interest that both countries share is the threat of Iran. The Iranian nuclear program is advancing steadily towards a point where it will cross the nuclear threshold in a military sense. Therefore, the restoration of U.S.-Israel cooperation and understanding is probably a greater imperative today than it ever was in the past. It is extremely important for both countries to bury their differences because the only ones who are smiling during this entire episode are the leadership in Iran, who are continuing to move toward a military nuclear program. There is one caveat to the idea that U.S.-Israel relations will get back on track in the near future. It is possible to discern a growing view, which has been reported in the Washington Post, that the Obama administration intends to put on the table its own plan for Middle East peace, based on a nearly full Israeli withdrawal to the 1967 lines, that most Israeli planners view as militarily indefensible. As the Palestinians see this scenario unfold, their incentive to re-enter negotiations will decline as they look forward to the prospect that an American peace plan will be imposed. An Obama plan for a complete Israeli retreat of this sort would not only deny the Jewish state "defensible borders," but would also divide Jerusalem, placing the Old City and its holy sites within Palestinian jurisdiction. If indeed there is such a plan being prepared, then the recent U.S.-Israel tensions over construction in east Jerusalem may only be Act I in a much longer drama that the two countries are about to face. Undoubtedly there are sober voices in the U.S. government today that would advise against the President taking such a course of action. But should he indeed advance a new division of Jerusalem, then in the months ahead the U.S. and Israel will be facing a serious crisis in their relationship, just as the military threats from Iran can be expected to worsen.

Prevents the most-likely scenario for nuclear escalation

Nawash 9 (Kamal M., attorney at Nawash Law Office, http://muslimmedianetwork.com/mmn/?p=3501) GAT

Once again the Palestinian/Israeli conflict spirals out of control. However, this particular battle has produced circumstantial evidence that the conflict has become more dangerous than ever before. Unless a permanent solution is found soon, the violence may increase in severity until the conflict ends tragically. In the latest fighting, Israel has bombed the HAMAS controlled city of Gaza for the stated reason of neutralizing HAMAS and stopping them from firing rockets into Southern Israel. As of the date of this article, approximately 900 Palestinians and 15 Israelis have been killed. HAMAS’ stated reasons for firing the rockets is to end the siege of Gaza by Israel which HAMAS alleges is preventing the free movement of people and goods and causing a humanitarian crisis. Israel denies the existence of a humanitarian crisis and refuses to end the siege of Gaza unless HAMAS recognizes Israel or is out power. In general, what makes the Palestinian/Israeli conflict so dangerous is that half the world, (three billion people (Jews, Christians & Muslims)) are emotionally, historically and religiously attached to the land known as Israel/Palestine. This fact was demonstrated in the last few days as demonstrations erupted in more than 95 countries around the world. Moreover, due to the affordability of satellite TV, in even the most underdeveloped countries, billions of interested people are exposed to 24 hour graphic coverage of this latest battle in Gaza. Western News stations like BBC and CNN no longer have a monopoly on reporting news. Many Middle Eastern TV stations have surpassed the reach of BBC, CNN and other western media. As to graphic images, dozens of news stations like Aljazeera have been broadcasting live and prerecorded graphic images of Palestinian babies blown up into pieces by the Israeli military. One particular gruesome scene that was played over and over again was that of a three year old little girl with her heart protruding out of her body after a bomb fell on her house. Another station, Al Alam, repeated the scene of four dead babies who were placed next to each other in the same refrigerator of a morgue because of the large number of dead in Gaza. The graphic and often emotional coverage of this latest battle is inspiring the fury of the masses which in turn are putting enormous pressure on their governments to join the fight on the side of the Palestinians. This conflict is much more dangerous than most people realize. For example, Egypt is receiving so much negative media coverage for not opening its border with Gaza that People throughout the Arab and Muslim world started calling for the overthrow of the Egyptian government and demonstrators attacked Egyptian embassies in several countries. The pressure on Egypt is so intense and ruthless that a shaken Egyptian president was forced to hold two press conferences to explain his government’s position and to distance Egypt from Israel. Similarly, the friendly nation20of Jordan came under so much pressure for not breaking diplomatic relations with Israel that King Abdullah held a publicity stunt in which he was seen donating blood for the people of Gaza and for the first time in recent memory he referred to Israel as the Enemy. Even the Saudi government was not immune from attacks and calls for the overthrow of the Saudi government. Media outlets repeated scenes of demonstrators burning the effigy of the King of Saudi Arabia with the Israeli flag wrapped around him for hundreds of millions of people to see. Saudi Arabia is perceived as a secret ally of Israel in the desire to destroy HAMAS and the refusal of the Saudi government to allow demonstrations against Israel only reinforced this belief. Whatever the truth, the Saudi government was so shaken by the attacks against it and the constant portrayal of the Saudi King wrapped in the Israeli flag that the official Saudi media began publicizing Saudi efforts to raise money for the people of Gaza. The conflict between Israel and the Palestinians is becoming extremely dangerous and can only be described as a ticking NUCLEAR <CONTINUED>
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<CONTINUED>

BOMB. Currently, only Israel has nuclear weapons in the Middle East. But Iran may also go nuclear and if that happens the Arabs will try to do the same. Without a doubt, there is no conflict on earth that has the same global impact as the Palestinian/Israeli conflict. Because of the potential for global instability, the entire world must do all it can to bring peace between the Palestinians and Israelis. The question is can this conflict be solved after many wars failed to end the conflict? The answer is YES but time is running out. Currently, there are four proposals to the Israel/Palestinian conflict and three have been attempted and failed. The first is that the Israelis and Palestinians continue fighting until one submits to the other, a plan that has been tried and failed. The second is a plan where both people separate by creating two separate countries. This plan is referred to as the two state solution and all attempts to implement it have failed. The third is to divide the Palestinian territories and place them under the control of Egypt and Jordan. This solution has been tried (1948-1967) and also failed because it did not address the core of the conflict. The fourth solution is based on integration of both Israelis and Palestinians in one nation and is the only solution that has proven successful. For the last 20 years the world has focused on the two state (two country) solution which has clearly failed. However, contrary to unanimous belief, neither the Palestinians nor the Israelis are to blame for the failure of the two state solution. The two state solution failed because the concept of creating two separate countries by dividing Israel/Palestine was and still is a difficult pill to swallow for Israelis & Palestinians. It is a fact that Israelis and Palestinians have religious, historical and emotional attachments to every square inch of the land that include s Israel and Palestine and neither side is eager to embrace permanent separation or “amputation” as described by Israeli novelist Amos Oz. Consequently, it is highly unlikely that permanent separation will lead to permanent peace. In light of the above facts some may think that a solution is impossible. NOT TRUE. The Palestinian/Israeli conflict can be solved as long as both sides give up the notion that they deserve exclusive control and rule over Israel/Palestine. In light of the attachments that both parties have for the same territory, the solution cannot be in separating but in finding a formula for living together. Many Israelis and Palestinians agree that Israel/Palestine is indivisible. Thus, the solution lies in uniting Israelis and Palestinians in one country while guaranteeing both sides equality and absolute security. What is being proposed here is the creation of two sovereign states similar to New York and New Jersey, joined together in a confederation to form one country. To illustrate further, after occupying the West Bank and Gaza in 1967, Israel could have annexed those territories into Israel by providing the Palestinians with Israeli citizenship. Israel did not do this and instead chose to treat the West Bank and Gaza as part of Israel without granting the Palestinians citizenship, equality or political participation. Legally, Palestinians were and continue to have the same status as American blacks in the 19th century. Israel did not integrate the Palestinians into Israel because Israelis were afraid that the Palestinians may one day outnumber the Jews and vote Israel out of existence. While this is a legitimate concern, Jews and Israelis who fear equality for Palestinians assume that granting the Palestinians equality would lead to the destruction of Israel. This is a false assumption. The world has produced many successful formulas for different people living together and sharing power and a formula can be found in this case. An example of a formula is the creation of a confederation of Israel/Palestine based on the principles of free trade and the free movement of labor and people. As to the national government, Israel and Palestine can each contribute 50% to the national parliament, a formula that would guarantee security, and eliminate political dilution from demographic changes and make certain that extremist become marginalized. The above formula is an example that gives Palestinians and Israelis most of what they want while allowing both people to be independent and secure. Moreover, with this solution, Jerusalem becomes a non-issue and borders become less relevant. As proof that integration can work, consider that Israel has one million Palestinians with Israeli citizenship who are often referred to as “Israeli Arabs.” It is important to note that they are not participating in violence. This is because Palestinians who are citizens of Israel have civil and political rights while the Palestinians in the West Bank and Gaza have nothing. Without a doubt most readers of this article will think that the author is naïve, idealistic, stupid, Zionists or trying to destroy Israel. We understand your beliefs. However, please ask yourself if Israel destroys Hamas or Islamic Jihad will there be peace between Israelis and Palestinians? Consider that Hamas was created in 1987. Before HAMAS was created, Israel fought five major wars and numerous other battles. Moreover, before HAMAS there were the PLO, Fatah, PFLP, PFLP-GC, 15 May Organization, Abu Ali Mustapha Brigades, Al-’Asifah, Arab Liberation Front, Force 17, Black Hand , Popular Front for the Liberation of Palestine – Special Command, Popular Resistance Committees, Popular Revolutionary Front for the Liberation of Palestine, Black September, Democratic Front for the Liberation of Palestine, Doghmush, Omar Ben al-Khatib Warriors, Palestinian Liberation Army, Palestinian Popular Struggle Front, Palestinian fedayeen, Swords of Truth, Rejectionist Front, among other organizations. Today most of the above organizations have been destroyed or just vanished. However, the conflict has not ended as the above organizations have been replaced by Hamas, Islamic Jihad, Holy Jihad Brigades, Izz ad-Din al-Qassam Brigades, Army of Islam, As-Sa’iqa, Tanzim, Al-Quds Brigades, among others. The point here is that even if Israel destroys HAMAS, the conflict between Israelis and Palestinians would not be solved and it would only be a matter of time before a new group forms to replace HAMAS. Israelis and Palestinians must realize that what they have done for the last 70 years will never bring peace to either Palestine or Israel under the best of circumstances. Under the worst of circumstances this conflict may lead to an all out nuclear war where millions will die and this is no longer an exaggeration. To summarize, Israel and its neighbors have fought numerous wars and no side has given up on their fundamental claims. For the last 20 years, both sides have tried to separate by creating two separate countries but this approach has failed because all sides have attachments to Israel and Palestine. The only solution that has a record of success is integration as demonstrated by the Palestinians who are citizens of Israel. If peace is not found then the day may soon come when the governments of the Middle East maybe overthrown by people who want to directly intervene on behalf of the Palestinians. If an uprising erupts throughout the Middle East then nuclear war may soon follow. Therefore, the choices are between total annihilation or equality for Palestinians and security for Israel. There are no other choices.
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U.S. Israeli relations stabilizing—key to Middle East Peace

Kershner 7/6(Isabel, Staff Writer@The International Herald Tribune, “Israel Moves to Improve Relations with U.S.”, *The International Herald Tribune*, Pg. 5, Lexis)jn

Israeli officials announced details Monday of the easing of its blockade of the Gaza Strip and the Israeli defense minister held a rare face-to-face meeting here with the Palestinian prime minister in a flurry of activity apparently intended to show diplomatic momentum ahead of the Israeli prime minister's meeting Tuesday with President Barack Obama. After a rocky few months in Israeli-American relations, officials on both sides seem eager to move to a smoother footing and to point to progress in the Israeli-Palestinian peace process, in which the Obama administration has invested heavily in both time and prestige. American-brokered indirect peace talks started in May after a year of efforts. Dan Shapiro, a senior Middle East adviser at the National Security Council, said Friday that in the weeks since the talks had begun, ''the gaps have been narrowed.'' The prime minister of Israel, Benjamin Netanyahu, said over the weekend that the ''main goal'' of his talks with Mr. Obama would be to advance to direct talks with the Palestinians, alongside security issues like Iran's nuclear program. Yossi Gal, director general of Israel's Foreign Ministry, said the ''significant steps'' taken by the Israeli government with regard to the Gaza Strip would also be raised. But Palestinian officials say little has actually been achieved so far and have tried to dispel any inflated notions of progress. ''What I see is all public relations,'' Saeb Erekat, the chief Palestinian negotiator, said by telephone Monday. Mr. Erekat added that Mr. Netanyahu held the key to moving toward direct talks, which would involve an Israeli commitment to resume negotiations from the point at which they ended under the previous Israeli government, in December 2008, and a freeze of all Israeli settlement construction, including in East Jerusalem - demands that the Netanyahu government rejects. There was no joint statement after the Israeli defense minister, Ehud Barak, and the Palestinian prime minister, Salam Fayyad, met at a Jerusalem hotel. Palestinian officials emphasized that the encounter had nothing to do with the political talks, but dealt only with technical issues impacting on Palestinian daily life. Israel said the men dealt with security and economic coordination for the West Bank, and with Palestinian Authority activity to prepare the Gaza border crossings to allow an expanded supply of civilian goods into the Palestinian coastal enclave. Mr. Netanyahu was originally supposed to meet Mr. Obama in early June. Mr. Netanyahu canceled that meeting, cutting short a trip abroad, after an Israeli naval commando raid on a Turkish boat of activists trying to breach the blockade of Gaza led to a violent confrontation and left nine activists dead. That raid outraged much of the world, severely strained Israel's relations with Turkey, an important regional ally, and became a catalyst for a serious re-examination by Israel of its policy toward Gaza, which is governed by the militant anti-Israeli group Hamas and is home to 1.5 million Palestinians.
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U.S. Israel relations are on shaky ground—Obama

Stakelbeck 7/7(Erick, CBN Analyst, 2010, “Obama, Netanyahu Assure Strong U.S.-Israeli Bond”, http://www.cbn.com/cbnnews/insideisrael/2010/July/Obama-and-Netanyahu-Mending-Relations/, accessed 7/7/10)jn

WASHINGTON - Despite talk of tension and a possible rift, both President Barack Obama and Israeli Prime Minister Benjamin Netanyahu say their countries 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. 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." "Our commitment to Israel's security has been unwavering," Obama added. Yet, behind the positive tone, difficult issues remain. On peace talks, both agree Israelis and Palestinians should move toward face-to-face negotiations. "We're committed to that peace. I'm committed to that peace," Netanyahu said. "This peace would change the lives of Israelis, Palestinians, and certainly would change our region." Still, the U.S. is pressuring Netanyahu to extend the 10-month freeze on West Bank construction to get the Palestinians to the table. Arab states are also being pressured. "I think it's very important that the Palestinians not look for excuses for incitement," Obama said. "That they are not engaging in provocative language (and) that, at the international level, they are maintaining a constructive tone."

U.S. Israel relations are fragile but repairing

Rosenberg 7/7(Joel, 2010, Author, “ON DEFENSE, OBAMA TRIES TO IMPROVE U.S.-ISRAELI RELATIONS: CIA Director Panetta says sanctions won’t stop Iran from getting the Bomb; Chairman of the Joint Chiefs agrees”, http://flashtrafficblog.wordpress.com/2010/07/07/on-the-defensive-obama-tries-to-improve-u-s-israeli-relations/, accessed 7/7/10)jn

 President Obama wasted the past 14 months. He has treated Netanyahu like he was the head of BP oil rather than the leader of our most faithful friend and ally in the epicenter. Thus, President Obama came into the Oval Office meeting yesterday on defense. Jewish support for him in the U.S. has plummeted over the past year as the White House and State Department have treated Israel with unprecedented hostility. Fewer than 1-in-10 Israelis believe President Obama is pro-Israel because of the administration’s long string of deeply unfriendly statements and actions.  By sharp contrast, Congress has been impressively bipartisan in its strong support of Israel and in its criticism of the White House for being so antagonistic towards Israel generally and Netanyahu in particular.  The good news: President Obama and his team seem to have gotten the message and changed their tune. In public, at least, the administration is trying to repair the damage they have done and reaffirm the importance of strong and healthy U.S.-Israel relations.

UQ – Relations High

Relations high—multiple reasons

Martin 10(Patrick, Globe and Mail Analyst, July 7, “Obama, Netanyahu thaw relations in Washington; Meeting a triumph for Israeli PM as President touts 'unbreakable' bond between countries”, *The Globe and Mail(Canada)*, Pg. A11)jn

Reports of the death of the Israel-United States relationship were exaggerated, it seems, if Tuesday's summit in Washington between Israeli Prime Minister Benjamin Netanyahu and U.S. President Barack Obama is any indication. Pressure from members of the Democratic caucus, who face midterm elections this fall and worry they may lose Jewish support, apparently proved to be the elixir. Senior Israeli officials have said for several days that Mr. Obama recognized he had gone too far in alienating their Prime Minister. Israel's move to allow more goods into Gaza helped create conditions for a diplomatic thaw. In their 90-minute tête-à-tête, and 20 minutes before a pool of journalists, the two men dispelled any notion of a serious rift. Reports of tensions between them were "flat wrong," Mr. Netanyahu insisted. The Israeli leader had good reason to be generous. While his March 23 meeting with Mr. Obama had proven an embarrassment, as the Israeli leader was denied any of the fanfare that usually accompanies such a meeting (apparently payback for the embarrassment of Vice-President Joe Biden on a visit to Jerusalem a few days before), Tuesday's summit was a triumph for Mr. Netanyahu. He got the three Rs he was seeking: respect that had been lacking at their previous meeting; recognition that Israel had made efforts to advance the peace process; and reassurance that Mr. Obama would not allow Iran - which Mr. Netanyahu described as "the greatest new threat on the horizon" - to acquire nuclear weapons. On the matter of personal relations between the men, Mr. Obama said he has "trusted Prime Minister Netanyahu since I met him before I was elected President," and while they may have "robust discussions," the special bond between the countries is "unbreakable." On the subject of Iran, which Mr. Obama listed second in order of importance and the Israeli leader listed first, Mr. Netanyahu welcomed the economic sanctions against Iran recently agreed on at the United Nations Security Council, and praised the tougher U.S. sanctions that became law last week. "I think the sanctions the President signed the other day actually have teeth. They bite," said Mr. Netanyahu, adding that "if other nations adopted similar sanctions, that would increase the effect." Mr. Obama reassured the Israeli on another matter too: the agreement at a recent meeting of signatories to the nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty to move toward agreement on a nuclear-free Middle East. It is widely believed that Israel possesses nuclear weapons, though the Israeli government will neither confirm nor deny this assertion. It's an arrangement that suits Israel just fine, even if it is an irritant for others in the region. While the United States voted for the measure to establish a nuclear-free Middle East, Mr. Obama reassured Mr. Netanyahu Israel has nothing to worry about. "We strongly believe that given its size, its history, the region that it's in and the threats that are levelled against it, that Israel has unique security requirements," the President said. "It's got to be able to respond to threats or any combination of threats in the region." "The United States," he added, "will never ask Israel to take any steps that would undermine their security interests." On the perennial matter of the Israeli-Palestinian peace process, Mr. Obama lauded Israel's new policy to permit many more products into the besieged Gaza Strip, and he spoke in praise of the Netanyahu government's current moratorium on the construction in Jewish settlements in the West Bank. He said that restraint "has been conducive to the prospects of us getting into direct talks" between Israeli and Palestinian leaders.

UQ – Relations High

U.S.-Israeli relations high—cooperation

Cornwell 10(Rupert, Analyst@The Independent, March 23, “Netanyahu meets Obama for crisis talks to defuse tensions; Issue of new settlements remains a thorn in side of relations between the allies”, *The Independent*, pg. 28, Lexis)jn

In a speech to AIPAC yesterday, Hillary Clinton, the Secretary of State, warned that new settlements on land claimed by the Palestinians threatened peace prospects and undercut Washington's ability to broker an end to the conflict. The East Jerusalem plan in particular exposed differences that "others" could exploit, she noted, in a thinly veiled reference to Iran. "We objected to this announcement because we are committed to Israel and its security, which we believe depends on a comprehensive peace," Mrs Clinton said - adding it was an ally's duty to "tell the truth when needed". Her remarks were greeted coolly, in marked contrast to the loud applause when she talked tough against the regime in Tehran. A nuclear-armed Iran, she said, was unacceptable. "It is unacceptable to the US. It is unacceptable to Israel. It is unacceptable to the region and the international community." She pledged that the US would seek "sanctions that will bite". A day before Mrs Clinton spoke, Iran's supreme leader Ayatollah Ali Khamenei brushed off Mr Obama's latest message that Washington's offer of better relations was still on the table. Instead, the Ayatollah accused the US of plotting to overthrow the clerical regime. During his stay, the Israeli premier will meet Mrs Clinton, and have dinner with Mr Biden, whose unhappy visit to Israel had been intended to cap agreement between Israel and Palestine to restart indirect "proximity" talks, indirect contacts channelled through the US Middle East envoy, the former senator George Mitchell. Mr Netanyahu has made concessionary gestures, including a profession of willingness to include preliminary discussion of key points, such as the status of Jerusalem and the right to return of Palestinian refugees, in the proximity talks. But in remarks before his departure for the US, the Prime Minister did not give an inch on East Jerusalem. His policy was that of every Israeli premier since 1967: "from our point of view, construction in East Jerusalem is like construction in Tel Aviv". The friction between the two countries has caused increasing concern both in Israel and in the Jewish community here - on its liberal and conservative wings. "Our commitment to Israel and its security now and in the future, is rock-solid and for ever," Mrs Clinton told AIPAC. But doubts are starting to gnaw, especially in Israel, a country Mr Obama has yet to visit as President, and which suspects that he is less instinctively supportive of the Jewish state than any of his predecessors.

UQ – Relations High

U.S. Israeli relations are stabilizing now

Stahl 7/8(Julie, CBN Correspondent, 2010, “U.S., Israel Mend Ties, Focus on Iran”, http://www.cbn.com/cbnnews/insideisrael/2010/July/US-Israel-Mend-Ties-Focus-on-Iran/, accessed 7/8/10)jn

President Barack Obama told Israeli TV that Israel is right to be skeptical about the peace process. Obama is striking a friendlier tone after his meeting this week with Israeli Prime Minister Benjamin Netanyahu. Also, at this pivotal time in U.S.-Israel relations, three U.S. senators also met with senior Israeli and Palestinian leaders this week. The meeting between President Obama and Prime Minister Benjamin Netanyahu put the strained relations between the U.S. and Israel behind them, according to Sens. Joe Lieberman, I-Conn., John McCain, R-Ariz., and Lindsey Graham, R-S.C. "I think we can say with some encouragement that the relationship between the United States and Israel is back on track," Lieberman said. Despite the difficulties between the White House and Israel, the senators say military and intelligence ties remained strong and Congress was always supportive of the Jewish state. "The Congress has Israel's back and please never misunderstand that, whatever relationship problems we've had in the past, they've never seeped over to the Congress," Graham said. "The Congress has been united in our view of protecting one of our best allies in the world and that's the State of Israel." Yet they agreed the overriding concern in the region is Iran's nuclear buildup. "The Iranians continue to express their commitment to development of nuclear weapons, which obviously has the most serious consequences both for the State of Israel, the United States of America, peace in the world and stability in the entire region," McCain said. As a result, everyone is worried. "In our conversations, not just with Israel but equally with our allies in the Arab world, there is profound and intense anxiety about what will happen to them if Iran attains nuclear capacity and uses that nuclear power to extend its hegemonic ambitions throughout the region," Lieberman added. The senators believe recent stepped up sanctions should be given a chance to take hold against Tehran. Nevertheless, the military option for stopping Iran's nuclear ambition should remain on the table. And if a military action is necessary, it should strike a serious blow to Iran's military power. "I think it would be in the world's interest to make sure this regime's ability to strike back is neutered," Graham added. "There should not be a plane that can fly, a ship that can float and their Revolutionary Guard should be greatly diminished." With Israel-U.S. ties seemingly on the mend, the Middle East and the rest of the world waits to see how events concerning Iran will unfold.

UQ – Relations Brink

Obama has weakened the foundations of U.S. Israeli relations—they are on the brink now

The Economist 6/5(U.S. Edition, 2010, “Not quite as it was; America and Israel”, Lexis)jn

Support remains strong but is no longer unquestioning FROM Barack Obama's point of view, the timing could not have been worse. The administration has been pushing hard in the Security Council for new sanctions against Iran and had invested heavily in the Israeli-Palestinian "proximity talks" brokered by Mr Obama's special envoy, George Mitchell. Both of these efforts are now in jeopardy. Moreover, the Israeli raid came soon after Mr Obama had decided to rescue America's relations with Israel from the ditch into which they fell in March, when Israel announced plans for a Jewish suburb in occupied East Jerusalem just as the proximity talks were about to begin. During that confrontation Mr Obama asked Binyamin Netanyahu to freeze Jewish settlement in Jerusalem, an undertaking the Israeli prime minister refused to give. Mr Netanyahu received a frosty reception at the White House in March. But for one reason or another the Obama administration decided several weeks ago that it was time to make up. Mr Netanyahu was invited back and was supposed to drop by this week. After the raid he flew directly home to Israel from a visit to Canada. Whatever the private thoughts of Mr Obama, America has refused to join the international outcry against its wayward ally. In New York American diplomats ensured that a special meeting of the UN Security Council did not condemn Israel and called only for an impartial investigation of the facts. In a telephone call with Turkey's enraged prime minister, Mr Obama was cautious. He expressed his condolences and affirmed the need to provide humanitarian assistance to the people of Gaza—but, according to a White House summary of the conversation, "without undermining Israel's security". As ever, domestic politics have played a part in shaping Mr Obama's responses. Israel's friends on Capitol Hill have pushed back hard since the March spat. A letter affirming the value of a close relationship with Israel was signed by 334 of the 435 members of the House, and a similar one by 76 of the 100 senators. Despite the emergence of J Street, a feisty and doveish pro-Israel lobby, AIPAC, the American Israel Public Affairs Committee, has far more muscle and is not afraid to flex it. Even in Congress, however, support for Israel is not rock solid, and is showing signs of change. Dan Senor, a senior fellow at the Council on Foreign Relations, noted recently that there were "real divisions" among congressional Democrats over Israel, "and those divisions are widening and cementing in ways not seen in decades". For most Republicans, on the other hand, supporting the Jewish state remains, literally, an article of faith. With mid-term congressional elections due in November and the Democrats braced for a drubbing, this would be a tricky time for Mr Obama to pick a fresh fight with Israel. That may be why, since early May, the White House has been labouring to correct what Rahm Emanuel, Mr Obama's chief of staff, has described as the administration's flawed "messaging". A posse of senior officials have stressed that the ties to Israel are unbreakable. That said, the influence of domestic politics can be exaggerated. Despite the pre-flotilla thaw, Mr Obama has made it abundantly clear in recent months that Israel can no longer take American support for granted. He seems genuinely to believe that the United States can and should bring about a two-state solution in Palestine. Mr Netanyahu says that is his aim too, but in his case there are strong reasons to doubt whether he is sincere. So long as both leaders remain in office, with their convictions unchanged, that will be a recipe for growing estrangement.

U.S. Israeli relations are tense—middle east peace and East Jerusalem conflict

MacAskill 10(Ewen, Analyst@The GuardianApril 10, “International: Netanyahu pulls out of Washington nuclear weapons summit: Obama considers plan B for Middle East settlement: Relations between Israel and US deteriorate”, *The Guardian*, pg. 26, Lexis)jn

Relations between Israel and the US took another turn for the worse yesterday after the Israeli prime minister, Binyamin Netanyahu, cancelled a trip to Washington next week amid reports that Barack Obama's administration is seriously considering a Plan B for a Middle East peace settlement. An Obama administration official said that the preference is still for talks between Israel and the Palestinians but admitted that if that failed, it will look at alternative options, including Obama setting out his own Middle East proposal for a comprehensive peace deal. A group of senior foreign advisers, including former national security advisers Brent Scowcroft and Zbigniew Brzezinski, who give informal advice to the White House at regular meetings, recommended recently that if the attempts to get the Israeli-Palestinian talks under way continued to be stalled, the US should impose its own plan. Netanyahu had been dithering over whether to attend a 47-nation summit in Washington next week to discuss nuclear weapons proliferation. His office announced in the middle of the week that he would be attending but on Thursday reversed this. His deputy, Dan Meridor, is to attend in his place. An Israeli official said it was because Turkey and Egypt and other Muslim nations intended to raise questions about Israel's nuclear weapons. Relations between Netanyahu and Obama have been tense because the Israeli prime minister refuses to provide concrete assurances that Israel will stop building Jewish settlements in East Jerusalem, a Palestinian pre-condition for beginning talks.

UQ – Relations Brink

Israeli relations on the brink—NPT and Peace Talks

Spillus 10(Alex, Staffwriter@the Daily Telegraph, April 10, “Netanyahu snubs Obama's summit on nuclear arms”, *The Daily Telegraph*, pg. 14, Lexis)jn

BENJAMIN NETANYAHU, Israel's prime minister, has pulled out of the Washington summit on nuclear security next week, threatening to widen the rift with President Barack Obama. Israeli officials said Mr Netanyahu decided to send a deputy prime minister in his place after reports that Middle Eastern neighbours Egypt and Turkey would single out Israel's undeclared nuclear programme for criticism. The White House tried to downplay the cancellation, but was privately angered at a public snub by Mr Netanyahu of a showpiece event that Mr Obama views as crucial to his pursuit of global non-proliferation. "We obviously would like to have the prime minister but the deputy prime minister will be leading the delegation and it will be a robust Israeli delegation," said Gen Jim Jones, the US national security adviser, as Mr Obama returned from Prague where he had signed a revised nuclear arms reduction treaty with Russia. Gen Jones said "we'll be sorry" that Mr Netanyahu would not be attending, but asserted that the relationship between the US and Israel was "ongoing and fine and continuous". But relations between the two allies have been fraught for several weeks since Israel announced it was building more settler homes in East Jerusalem, a move that wrecked the resumption of peace talks with the Palestinians. The timing of the announcement could not have been more humiliating for the White House: it was made in contravention of Washington's explicit wishes to stop settler building in areas seized by Israel in the 1967 Six Day War and came during a visit by Vice-President Joe Biden that was intended to revive peace negotiations. At the time, Michael Oren, the Israeli ambassador to the US, said relations between the two allies had reached a 35-year low. Mr Netanyahu then received a dressing down from the US president when he was in Washington to attend the annual conference of a pro-Israel lobbying group. Mr Netanyahu returned from those talks to a wave of derision in the Israeli press, with the disagreement over settlement construction unresolved and his Right-wing coalition under threat. He has since failed to produce a response to US demands aimed at paving the way for fresh negotiations with the Palestinians. Analysts said the Israeli leader was looking for an opportunity to offer a retort to Mr Obama. "It is more connected to Israel's relations with the US. It was a mistake to go to Washington last time and they learned the lesson," said Efraim Inbar, the director of the Begin-Sadat Centre for Strategic Studies. "Because Israel has not answered Obama's demands, why expose him to more pressure and have Obama treat him badly again?" An Israeli official said the prime minister decided to cancel "after learning that some countries including Egypt and Turkey plan to say Israel must sign" the nuclear non-proliferation treaty. Israel has not admitted possessing nuclear weapons, preferring a policy of "ambiguity".

Israeli relations are on a brink—they are the lowest they’ve been in decades

Macintyre and MacLeod 10(Donald and Hugh, Staff Writers@The Independent, March 16, “Obama runs out of patience with Israel; Settlement issue provokes 'biggest crisis in relations for 35 years'”, *The Independent*, Pg. 1, Lexis)jn

The Israeli Prime Minister Benjamin Netanyahu yesterday strongly defended Jewish settlement construction in East Jerusalem in the face of US pressure and what one of his own top diplomats described as the worst crisis in relations with Washington for more than three decades. A defiant Mr Netanyahu appeared to be digging in despite clear indications that the Obama administration is now demanding the scrapping of plans for 1,600 new Jewish homes, whose announcement overshadowed last week's visit to Israel by the US Vice-President Joe Biden. Mr Netanyahu's stance appeared to guarantee, after a highly charged week, the protraction of a stand-off in which a full-scale diplomatic row blew up at the start of Mr Biden's visit and appeared to abate at the end of it. But it was then reignited by demands from Hillary Clinton and an angry White House that Israel make amends for the "insulting" announcement just as indirect negotiations with the Palestinians had finally been arranged. The US is now said to be demanding substantive concessions from Israel after a warning by the Palestinian President Mahmoud Abbas that he would not take part in talks if the
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Relations are on the brink—multiple reasons

Blomfield 6/28(Adrian, Staff Writer@The Daily Telegraph, 2010, “Israel has suffered a tectonic rift'with US says envoy”, *The Daily Telegraph*, pg 13, Lexis)jn

A SENIOR Israeli diplomat has warned that the Jewish state is drifting away from the United States after a "tectonic rift". 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 that the two could lay to rest a row that erupted in March but the new comments have raised fears of long-term damage. Michael Oren, Israel's ambassador to Washington, told colleagues in Jerusalem that they were facing a potentially irrevocable estrangement. Sources said Mr Oren told the meeting: "There is no crisis in Israel-US relations because in a crisis there are ups and downs. [Instead] relations are in a state of tectonic rift in which continents are drifting apart." Mr Oren's pessimism stands in contrast to public declarations in both Jerusalem and Washington that differences between the two states are simply "disagreements" between allies. The ambassador told the Jerusalem Post newspaper last week that US-Israel ties were stronger than many observers believed. Mr Netanyahu's visit to the White House next Tuesday is likely to be cloaked in civility, unlike his previous encounter with Mr Obama in March, when he was given a stern dressing-down and denied permission to hold a joint press conference. The Israeli prime minister could even be invited to Camp David, the presidential retreat in Maryland. But the show of unity is being seen as a sop to members of Mr Obama's party, who fear angering Jewish American voters before November's midterm elections, rather than as a sign of rapprochement. Israeli officials expect a sterner private reception for their prime minister, who is yet to be forgiven for the perceived humiliation of Joe Biden, the American vicepresident, during a visit to Israel in March. Mr Oren claimed that attempts to gain leverage over President Obama through some of his "pro-Israel" aides had failed. Instead, Mr Obama is understood to hold Mr Netanyahu at least partly responsible for the lack of progress in talks between Israel and Palestine.

U.S. Israeli relations are on the brink

Kessler 10 (Glenn, 3/24/2010, http://today.msnbc.msn.com/id/36013485/ns/world\_news-washington\_post/)KFC

The two-week-old dispute between Israel and the United States over housing construction in East Jerusalem has exposed the limits of American power to pressure Israeli leaders to make decisions they consider politically untenable. But the blowup also shows that the relationship between the two allies is changing, in ways that are unsettling for Israel's supporters. President Obama and his aides have cast the settlement of the Israeli-Palestinian conflict, not just the relationship with Israel, as a core U.S. national security interest. Gen. David H. Petraeus, the head of the military's Central Command, put it starkly in recent testimony on Capitol Hill: "The conflict foments anti-American sentiment due to a perception of U.S. favoritism toward Israel." His comments raised eyebrows in official Washington — and overseas — because they suggested that U.S. military officials were embracing the idea that failure to resolve the conflict had begun to imperil American lives. Visiting Israeli Prime Minister Binyamin Netanyahu received warm applause at the American Israel Public Affairs Committee (AIPAC) conference on Monday night when he bluntly dismissed U.S. demands to end housing construction in the disputed part of Jerusalem. He was greeted as a hero when he visited Capitol Hill on Tuesday. But the administration has been strikingly muted in its reception. No reporters, or even photographers, were invited when Netanyahu met with Secretary of State Clinton Hillary Rodham Clinton and Vice President Biden on Monday or when he met with Obama on Tuesday night. There was no grand Rose Garden ceremony. Official spokesmen issued only the blandest of statements. The cooling in the U.S.-Israel relationship coincides with an apparent deepening of Israel's diplomatic isolation. Anger has grown in Europe in the wake of Israel's suspected misuse of European passports to kill a Palestinian militant in Dubai, the United Arab Emirates. On Tuesday, British Foreign Secretary David Miliband announced the expulsion of a senior diplomat over the incident , an unusually drastic step for an ally. Relations with Turkey, a rare Muslim friend of Israel for decades, have hit a new low.

Link—Middle East

US Israel relations are best when the US is protecting Israel with troops

Black 10 (Ian, Middle East editor, guardian.co.uk, 15 March 2010, http://www.guardian.co.uk/world/2010/mar/15/us-israel-dispute-history)KFC

President Gerald Ford then embarked on a "reassessment" of US policy, expressing "profound disappointment" over Israel's attitude in negotiations with Egypt. For six months the US refused to conclude new arms agreements with Israel. Rabin called it "one of the worst periods in American-Israeli relations". Ford came under pressure from Jewish and pro-Israel groups at home and Israel eventually relented, allowing the pullback to take place. That paved the way for Anwar Sadat's initiative in 1977, which culminated in the Camp David accords brokered by President Jimmy Carter, and the 1979 peace treaty. It also led the way for a second disengagement of forces on the Golan Heights, an arrangement that has held to this day. Other crises followed. In 1981 Israel and lobby groups worked hard but failed to torpedo a sale of US-made Awacs surveillance aircraft to Saudi Arabia, then as now a key Arab ally of the US. The Israeli prime minister, Menachem Begin expressed "profound regret and unreserved opposition" to the proposal, triggering rare anger in Washington, where the administration delayed the delivery of military aircraft to Israel. President Ronald Reagan suspended a strategic co-operation agreement after Israel annexed the part of the Golan Heights it still occupied. In 1982 the US was accused of giving Israel a "green light" to invade Lebanon and destroy the PLO. Differences emerged over Israel's use of US-supplied military equipment and the siege of Beirut. Israel rejected Reagan's September 1982 Middle East peace plan, but that appeared to have no negative effect on US friendship and support for Israel. There were also ructions over the case of Jonathan Pollard, a US intelligence analyst who was convicted of spying for Israel in 1987. The next low point came in 1991, in the wake of the Gulf war, when the Likud prime minister, Yitzhak Shamir, requested $10bn in US loan guarantees to help absorb Soviet and Ethiopian Jewish immigrants. There was a showdown when Bush withheld the guarantees in response to Shamir's intransigence over settlements in the occupied territories. The freeze ended in 1992 when Rabin's newly elected Labour-led coalition approved a partial housing construction freeze in the territories – the very same issue at the heart of the current US-Israeli friction. In recent years US relations with Israel were probably at their smoothest and most uncritical during the two terms of President George W Bush, covering the 9/11 attacks and the invasion of Iraq. The US effectively backed Israel over the 2006 war against Hizbullah in Lebanon and the war against Hamas in Gaza in late 2008 and early 2009. But Bush urged Netanyahu's predecessor, Ehud Olmert, not to attack Iran and to give diplomacy and sanctions time to deal with the Islamic republic's nuclear programme. Both Israeli leaders seem to have agreed.

Link—Middle East

The US’s presence in the Middle East protects Israel

Albright 8 (Scott, Apr 17, 2008, <http://israel.suite101.com/article.cfm/obama_promises_to_defend_israel)KFC>

Presidential hopeful Barack Obama defended the United States' policy to support Israel during a debate with democratic opponent Hillary Clinton in Philadelphia. The debate was held the same day Reuters cameraman Fadel Shana was killed in Gaza, Wednesday, April 16. Reports indicate that Shana was killed by a blast of darts, or flechettes, released from a projectile which exploded after an Israeli tank was seen firing toward the journalist. Neither Obama or Clinton mentioned the journalist's death during the debate, but both said they would support Israel if elected president. "An attack on Israel is an attack on our strongest ally in the region," Obama said during the April 16 democratic debate aired on ABC. The statement came after ABC's George Stephanopoulos asked the two democrats if it should be U.S. policy to treat an attack on Israel as if it were an attack on the U.S. Obama did not give specifics as to how he would respond to an attack on Israel, but he did say that the U.S. would "take appropriate action." Obama stated that it was unacceptable to allow Iran to continue its nuclear weapons program and military support for Hezbollah and Hamas during the debate. Shana was killed after reported fighting between Hamas and Israeli soldiers had occured earlier in the day. Reuters news reported that Israeli troops killed 17 Palestenians, after three Israeli soldiers were killed in clashes in the Hamas controlled enclave. The news agency reported that fighting had ceased when Shana was killed. Some online bloggers believe the person who fired on Shana thought he was a threat because he was holding a television camera that could have looked like a weapon. Other bloggers have said that it was impossible to mistake Shana as anything but a reporter because his vehicle was clearly marked and because Israeli optics are too powerful for the soldiers using them to not be able to clearly identify their target. The Bush administration has labeled Hamas and Hezbollah as Iranian backed terrorist groups. The administration openly disapproved ex-president Jimmy Carter's visit to the region where he has met with Hamas leaders in hopes of opening dialogue between rivaling factions. As U.S. president, Obama said he would take no options off the table to keep Iran from obtaining nuclear weapons. He said the carrot and stick approach was a possible route in preventing the Iranian nation from becoming a nuclear power.

Israel is dependent on U.S. counter to Iran—key to relations

Indyk 10(Martin, April 19, Vice President and Director, Foreign Policy@Brookings, “When Your Best Friend Gets Angry”, http://www.brookings.edu/opinions/2010/0419\_israel\_iran\_indyk.aspx, accessed 7/8/10)jn

At the heart of this disagreement lies a dramatic change in the way Washington perceives its own stake in the game. It actually began three years ago when Secretary of State Condoleezza Rice declared in a speech in Jerusalem that U.S. “strategic interests” were at stake in resolving the Israeli-Palestinian conflict — a judgment reiterated by Obama last week when he said resolving the Arab-Israeli conflict is a “vital national security interest” for the United States. In other words, this is no longer just about helping a special ally resolve a debilitating problem. With 200,000 American troops committed to two wars in the greater Middle East and the U.S. president leading a major international effort to block Iran’s nuclear program, resolving the Israeli-Palestinian conflict has become a U.S. strategic imperative. Ironically, as the U.S. position has evolved in this direction, Israeli attitudes have evolved in another. To many Israelis, especially those in Netanyahu’s right-wing coalition, peace with a divided Palestinian polity seems neither realistic nor particularly desirable. Given Israel’s dependence on the United States to counter the threat from Iran and to prevent its own international isolation, an Israeli prime minister would surely want to bridge the growing divide. Yet the shift in American perceptions seems to have gone unnoticed in Jerusalem. Hence Netanyahu’s surprise when what he saw as merely a matter of a poorly timed announcement during Vice President Biden’s visit drew a stinging rebuke from Washington.

Iraq withdraw strains U.S. Israeli relations

Middle Eastern Newsline 5(April 12“US-Israeli Relations at Lowest Point in Years”, http://www.infowars.com/articles/world/israel\_us\_relations\_at\_low\_point.htm, accessed 7/8/10)

President George Bush hosts Prime Minister Ariel Sharon as U.S.-Israeli relations have dropped to their lowest point in years. U.S. officials said relations between Jerusalem and Washington have been strained at both the defense and political levels. They said the Bush administration has been increasingly estranged from the Israeli government amid repeated misunderstandings between leaders, rising U.S. skepticism over Israel's ability to withdraw from the Gaza Strip and northern West Bank and the growing perception that Israel has hampered U.S. policy goals in the Middle East. "The administration wants to focus its Middle East policy on a military exit from a democratic Iraq," a U.S. official said. "This goal requires significant international cooperation and that's where Israeli policy has been seen as a hindrance." Officials, congressional sources and Western diplomats portray Bush's relationship with Sharon as strained. They said Bush has sought to avoid meeting or maintaining direct contact with Sharon, regarded by the White House as unreliable and lacking in vision.

Link—Middle East

Israel hates Middle East withdrawal – it would be a massive concession to Arab nations

Zunes 5 (Stephen, Prof of IR at Univ of San Francisco, <http://www.aztlan.net/tenthings.htm>) GAT

The United States maintains an ongoing military presence in the Middle East, including longstanding military bases in Turkey, a strong naval presence in the eastern Mediterranean and Arabian Sea, as well as large numbers of troops on the Arabian Peninsula since the Gulf War. Most Persian Gulf Arabs and their leaders felt threatened after Iraq’s seizure of Kuwait and were grateful for the strong U.S. leadership in the 1991 war against Saddam Hussein's regime and for UN resolutions designed to curb Iraq's capability to produce weapons of mass destruction. At the same time, there is an enormous amount of cynicism regarding U.S. motives in waging that war. Gulf Arabs, and even some of their rulers, cannot shake the sense that the war was not fought for international law, self-determination and human rights, as the senior Bush administration claimed, but rather to protect U.S. access to oil and to enable the U.S. to gain a strategic toehold in the region. The ongoing U.S. air strikes against Iraq have not garnered much support from the international community, including Iraq's neighbors, who would presumably be most threatened by an Iraqi capability of producing weapons of mass destruction. In light of Washington’s tolerance -- and even quiet support -- of Iraq’s powerful military machine in the 1980s, the United States' exaggerated claims of an imminent Iraqi military threat in 1998, after Iraq’s military infrastructure was largely destroyed in the Gulf War, simply lack credibility. Nor have such recent air strikes eliminated or reduced the country’s capability to produce weapons of mass destruction, particularly the most plausible threat of biological weapons. Furthermore, only the United Nations Security Council has the prerogative to authorize military responses to violations of its resolutions; no single member state can do so unilaterally without explicit permission. Many Arabs object to the U.S. policy of opposing efforts by Arabs states to produce weapons of mass destruction, while tolerating Israel’s sizable nuclear arsenal and bringing U.S. nuclear weapons into Middle Eastern waters as well as rejecting calls for the creation of a nuclear-free zone in the region. In a part of the world which has been repeatedly conquered by outside powers of the centuries, this ongoing U.S. military presence has created an increasing amount of resentment. Indeed, the stronger the U.S. military role has become in the region in recent decades, the less safe U.S. interests have become.

Israeli fear of rejectionist states is appeased through US troop presence in the Middle East

Martin 3 (L.G., Middle East Specialist at the Strategic Studies Institute, Summer 2003. <http://www.strategicstudiesinstitute.army.mil/pdffiles/PUB104.pdf>) GAT

Israel’s perceptions of its own national security threats are weighted heavily towards a strategic and military calculus. Israel’s experience with the Arab world since its war of independence in 1947-48 has been unremitting hostility punctuated by wars and terrorist attacks. This hostility has been interrupted by quiet on its western flank since the 1979 Camp David Accords, by the cold peace with Egypt, and since the 1994 peace treaty with Jordan, quiet on its eastern flank. Quiet without a peace treaty also has existed on Israel’s northern border with Syria―but not its northern border with Lebanon. However, espousals of intentions to eliminate the “Zionist state”by the so-called “rejectionist”states, primarily Iran and Syria (and previously Iraq), and their development of WMD, which may have a range of delivery systems from terrorists to missiles, have stimulated Israel’s existential need to continue developing WMD to enhance its deterrent capability, as well as the Arrow anti-missile system that it has jointly developed with the United States. 12 Concern over the growing military capabilities of the rejectionist states also stimulates Israel’s desire for technologically advanced conventional weaponry to offset the conventional superiority of the combined forces of its regional Arab and Iranian enemies. However, less visible and more complex nonmilitary threats to Israel’s national security go underemphasized in this strategic and military calculus. 13 Paying for a strong defense puts a substantial strain on the Israeli economy. The economy is challenged to overcome the lack of natural resources such as water, and must expend valuable financial resources for the generation of desalinated water or to purchase water from Turkey. 14 Moreover, Israel lacks its own secure sources of energy, gas and oil supplies that are critical for its developing economy. 15 For all these reasons, Israel looks to its close U.S. alliance for strategic and military assistance, as well as for economic assistance that is indispensable for its national security. 16

Link—Iraq

**Israel feels like their security will be threatened once we pull out of Iraq**

Ravid 7/7 (Barak, writer for Haaretz, http://pascasher.blogspot.com/2010/07/netanyahou-un-retrait-des-troupes-dirak.html) GAT

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. The prime minister's comments appear to indicate that even after a withdrawal from Palestinian territory, he would insist on maintaining an Israeli military presence along the Jordan Valley, which forms the border between Jordan and the West Bank. Netanyahu also told Gates that any peace settlement must include safeguards to prevent the transfer of rockets and other weapons into a future Palestinian state. In his meeting with Netanyahu earlier in the day, U.S. President Barack Obama promised he would not force Israel into taking any steps that compromised its national security.

Iraq withdraw strains U.S. Israeli relations

Middle Eastern Newsline 5(April 12“US-Israeli Relations at Lowest Point in Years”, http://www.infowars.com/articles/world/israel\_us\_relations\_at\_low\_point.htm, accessed 7/8/10)

President George Bush hosts Prime Minister Ariel Sharon as U.S.-Israeli relations have dropped to their lowest point in years. U.S. officials said relations between Jerusalem and Washington have been strained at both the defense and political levels. They said the Bush administration has been increasingly estranged from the Israeli government amid repeated misunderstandings between leaders, rising U.S. skepticism over Israel's ability to withdraw from the Gaza Strip and northern West Bank and the growing perception that Israel has hampered U.S. policy goals in the Middle East. "The administration wants to focus its Middle East policy on a military exit from a democratic Iraq," a U.S. official said. "This goal requires significant international cooperation and that's where Israeli policy has been seen as a hindrance." Officials, congressional sources and Western diplomats portray Bush's relationship with Sharon as strained. They said Bush has sought to avoid meeting or maintaining direct contact with Sharon, regarded by the White House as unreliable and lacking in vision.
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Israel worries that any lack of US deterrence would gravely effect Israel

Susser 4 (Leslie, April 15, 2004, http://www.jewishjournal.com/world/article/israel\_worried\_about\_us\_iraq\_withdrawl\_20040416/)KFC

As Shiite and Sunni resistance to the American presence in Iraq intensifies, Israel's defense establishment is worried that a U.S. withdrawal under fire could have devastating consequences for the battles against weapons of mass destruction and global terrorism. And Israel could be one of the big losers: Israeli officials believe a loss of American deterrence would encourage Iran to continue its nuclear weapons program, and its support for terrorism could lead to a hardening of Syrian and Palestinian attitudes against accommodation with Israel and could spark more Palestinian and other terrorism directed against Israeli targets. Without American deterrence and a pro-Western Iraq, the officials say, Israel might have to rethink its attitude on key issues like the concessions it can afford to make to the Palestinians, its readiness for a land war on its eastern front and the size of its defense budget. But there is an opposing, minority view in Israeli academic and intelligence circles: The quicker the Americans leave, this view holds, the quicker the Iraqis will have to get their act together. And once they do, they will not necessarily pose a threat to Israel or the West. Israeli Defense Minister Shaul Mofaz summoned a meeting in early April of Israeli intelligence services and other branches to discuss the implications for Israel of the unrest in Iraq. Some of the analyses were bleak. When the United States launched a war on Saddam Hussein's regime in March 2003, Israeli military planners hoped for several significant gains.

Israel is worried about the Iraq troop withdrawal

Palestine Note 7/7 (7 Jul 2010, http://palestinenote.com/cs/blogs/topnews/archive/2010/07/07/israel-worried-about-iraq-pullout.aspx)KFC

New York - Israel's Prime Minister, Benjamin 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. According to Israel's Ynet news site, "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." Officials traveling with Netanyahu told AFP that in the event of direct peace talks with the Palestinians, "Israel would want assurances that a Palestinian state would not be able to smuggle in heavy weaponry, such as rockets." News reports also also state that US officials also handed Netanyahu a letter permitting civilian nuclear cooperation between the two countries, even though Israel has not signed on to the Nuclear Nonproliferation Treaty (NPT). After meeting with Netanyahu at the White House on Tuesday, US President Barack Obama contradicted reports that the US was pushing Israel to join the NPT, a step that would require it to acknowledge its clandestine nuclear arsenal. Following his meeting with Gates, Netanyahu flew to New York to meet with United Nations Secretary-General Ban Ki-moon. According to reports, Ban pressed Netanyahu to lift its blockade of the Gaza Strip, talks with the Palestinian Authority, and the UN's inquiry into Israel's deadly attack on the Gaza-bound aid flotilla in May. Israel is proceeding with its own internal probe of the incident, which left nine Turkish civilians dead, but the UN is appointing an independent panel of inquiry of the matter.

**Israel has a large influence on US troop withdrawal – and they are not happy**

**Downing 8** (Brian M, Jun 11, 2008, http://www.atimes.com/atimes/Middle\_East/JF11Ak01.html)KFC

Fearful that Iran might march west or at least incite the Shi'ites of Saudi Arabia and those in other Sunni states, the Saudis wish the US to stay in the region, indefinitely, as a guardian against Iran. Israel is also worried. It is not just the fear of an Iran with nuclear weapons; Israel also fears the expansion of Iranian influence in Lebanon, where Hezbollah is probably closer to Iran's Quds Force than ever. Iran has even gained influence with Hamas - a Sunni group - in Palestine. The Saudis and pro-Israel groups are exerting pressure on the US to maintain its troops in Iraq. Each of those groups wields considerable influence throughout Washington. Combined, their influence will be very difficult to overcome. The US military will also oppose large-scale withdrawal. The generation of officers who learned hard lessons in Vietnam are almost all gone now, leaving successors who are only vaguely wary of foreign quagmires. The torch has been passed to a new generation that believes in one main lesson from Vietnam: future wars must be seen through. The military thinks it has turned a corner in Iraq and that General David Petraeus' troop "surge" is working well.

Link—Afghanistan

Israel is worried about US withdrawal and the troop presence in Afghanistan

Krieger et. al. 7/7 (Hilary Leila, Herb Keinon, Khaled Ab, 07/07/2010, http://www.jpost.com/International/Article.aspx?id=180751)KFC

In addition, after over seven years – since the US invasion of Iraq – in which Israel has paid relatively little attention to threats from the east, the prospect of an American troop withdrawal from Iraq in the near future has given rise in Jerusalem to renewed concern – and strategic planning – for the day after a US redeployment. According to Israeli government sources, at the meeting with Gates – also attended by Adm. Michael Mullen, the chairman of the US Joint Chiefs of Staff – Netanyahu received a briefing on the situation in Iraq and Afghanistan. One of Jerusalem’s concerns is that regional alliances that the US was hoping to build with moderate Arab countries such as Egypt, Saudi Arabia and Lebanon could conflict with the American policy of maintaining Israel’s military edge.

US withdrawal for Afghanistan would further destroy relations with Israel

Wiener 6/2 (Robert, NJJN Staff Writer, June 2, 2010, http://njjewishnews.com/article/statewide/times-editor-warns-against-withdrawal-from-afghanistan)KFC

The editorial page editor of The New York Times warned the audience at a Livingston synagogue May 26 that American withdrawal from Afghanistan would have drastic consequences unless Islamic fundamentalism is clearly defeated. In a far-reaching, hour-long address from the pulpit of Temple B’nai Abraham, Andrew Rosenthal predicted that “the Taliban would take over Afghanistan again and return it to the state it was in before, where women are stoned to death for going outside without their husbands….” If American troops are withdrawn, he said, “Within a year or two or three it is going to be a place where people like Osama bin Laden can be happy and safe and do the terrible things they want to.” The Montclair resident said withdrawal of American troops would also lead to “an extremist Islamist takeover of Pakistan,” where “half of the government is in cahoots with the Taliban and the other half doesn’t know what to do about the first half…. You will have 30 or 40 nuclear weapons in the hands of an extremist jihadist organization, and I don’t think the Indian government will sit still for it.” In a talk billed as “From the Tea Party to Tehran,” the editor also addressed the threat from a nuclear Iran and the notion that Israel might stage a preemptive attack. That, he said, “would be an extremely bad idea.” One reason the Obama administration “is trying to repair its relationship with the Israeli government,” Rosenthal said, “is because they are worried about what is going on with Iran and they want to be in the conversation with Israel if Israel decides to attack, primarily to get them to stop.”

Link—Magnifier

Any disagreement in foreign policy spills over—empirically proven

Makovsky 10(David, Fellow@The Washington Institute, April 13, “Obama and Netanyahu Can't Afford to Disagree”, http://www.washingtoninstitute.org/templateC06.php?CID=1448, accessed 7/8/10)jn

Yet, it is hard to be hopeful for a variety of reasons. They relate to differences of outlook between them in three key areas: the relationship between vision and trust, different attitudes toward timing and different approaches to the nexus between policy and politics. First, there is a paradox between vision and trust. For cerebral Obama, who does not bond with foreign leaders instinctively, the one way to build trust is to share a common strategic vision. This is not unique to the U.S. president. The history of American-Israeli relations illustrates that when the United States and Israel agree on a common strategic vision, as they did during the period of Ehud Barak, Ariel Sharon and Ehud Olmert, Washington is less focused on where they differ. The corollary is when they don't share a common direction, the United States is hard-nosed on the differences, as it was during when George Bush Sr. was opposite Yitzhak Shamir.

Link—Israeli Perception

Israel worries that any lack of US deterrence would gravely effect Israel

Susser 4 (Leslie, April 15, 2004, http://www.jewishjournal.com/world/article/israel\_worried\_about\_us\_iraq\_withdrawl\_20040416/)KFC

As Shiite and Sunni resistance to the American presence in Iraq intensifies, Israel's defense establishment is worried that a U.S. withdrawal under fire could have devastating consequences for the battles against weapons of mass destruction and global terrorism. And Israel could be one of the big losers: Israeli officials believe a loss of American deterrence would encourage Iran to continue its nuclear weapons program, and its support for terrorism could lead to a hardening of Syrian and Palestinian attitudes against accommodation with Israel and could spark more Palestinian and other terrorism directed against Israeli targets. Without American deterrence and a pro-Western Iraq, the officials say, Israel might have to rethink its attitude on key issues like the concessions it can afford to make to the Palestinians, its readiness for a land war on its eastern front and the size of its defense budget. But there is an opposing, minority view in Israeli academic and intelligence circles: The quicker the Americans leave, this view holds, the quicker the Iraqis will have to get their act together. And once they do, they will not necessarily pose a threat to Israel or the West. Israeli Defense Minister Shaul Mofaz summoned a meeting in early April of Israeli intelligence services and other branches to discuss the implications for Israel of the unrest in Iraq. Some of the analyses were bleak. When the United States launched a war on Saddam Hussein's regime in March 2003, Israeli military planners hoped for several significant gains.

Link—Israeli Perception

Withdrawal from the Middle East would further the Israeli paranoia

Shavit 6/24 (Ari, writer for Haaretz, http://www.haaretz.com/print-edition/opinion/ignoring-the-tsunami-1.297986) GAT

Things have never been better: The number of millionaires in the country soared by 43 percent between 2008 and 2009, with 2,519 new ones joining the 5,900 we already had, for a total of 8,419 Israeli millionaires. Their total net assets rose by about 41 percent, from $30.1 billion at the end of 2008 to $42.4 billion at the end of 2009. No wonder it's impossible to find a luxury apartment to buy or to reserve a table at a top restaurant in Tel Aviv, or that tickets for "Nabucco" were so hard to get. Never was so much owned by so few Israelis. Never has life been so good here for so wealthy an elite, as the country is poised at the brink of the abyss. Things have never been worse. The superpower under whose patronage we shelter is becoming increasingly weak and increasingly distant. As a result of these two mutually amplifying processes the Middle East is becoming unstable. There is no one to stop Iran's rise or Turkey's growing extremism, or to provide security for the moderates in Egypt, Saudi Arabia, Jordan and Palestine. The states to the east fear the U.S. withdrawal from Iraq, while those to the north are building up their forces in anticipation of a nuclear Iran. And a firestorm of hatred for Israel raging throughout the world. Israel's legitimacy as well as its deterrence are eroding. It's no wonder that the national security adviser is nostalgic for the first term of Prime Minister Benjamin Netanyahu, or that the army chief of staff pines for the days when Ehud Barak was chief of staff. The geostrategic situation is grave. And we are partying on the beach while ignoring the tsunami already visible on the horizon. Never has the gap between our economic and international situations, or between the state of our consciousness and our security situation, been greater. Not even in the days leading up to the Yom Kippur War were we in such a deep state of denial. Everything's great: Inside Israel the economy is booming, there is general jubilation - la dolce vita at its sweetest. But all around, the siege is tightening. No reasonable remedy is in sight for the twin threats of missiles and of a nuclear Iran, nor does an end to the Israeli-Palestinian conflict appear imminent. While 8,419 millionaires increase their own capital using Israel's uniquely excellent human capital, millions of Arabs and Muslims wondering whether the Jewish state will last. They see a declining West that turns its back to Israel and a rising East that challenges Israel. They see an Israel that repeatedly demonstrates shortsightedness. Many of our neighbors are starting to have secret, dangerous thoughts. Israel is not weak. If any of its neighbors makes a mistake, it will receive a knockout punch. But if there is a government in Jerusalem it must make every effort to stop the decline, to revive the peace with Egypt and with Jordan, to leave no stone unturned on the Syrian track, to expedite the territorial division, to create a common forum for cooperation with the United States and with the moderate Arab states, and to create a stabilizing process to counterbalance the destabilizing process that threatens the Middle East. The government understands everything but does nothing. Its inaction constitutes negligence, as does Kadima's unwillingness to let the government change its shape and its course. Netanyahu's foot-dragging on the one hand and Tzipi Livni's pettiness on the other perpetuate a catastrophic paralysis. The Israeli public will not take to the streets. It is exhausted and confused and despairing. But the economic elite, the 8,419 Israelis who became so much richer last year, can bring about change. If they were to use their wealth and influence to demand that Netanyahu, Barak and Livni join hands, they would very likely succeed. It's time for those who have benefited greatly from living here to accept responsibility. Given the gravity of Israel's situation, wealth is not only privilege, but also obligation.

Withdrawal shatters America’s commitment to Dual Containment – this is key to Israeli perception of security

Martin 3 (L.G., Middle East Specialist at the Strategic Studies Institute, Summer 2003. <http://www.strategicstudiesinstitute.army.mil/pdffiles/PUB104.pdf>) GAT

Israel has also benefited indirectly from other policies of the United States in the Middle East. These have included the “dual containment”policy that the United States has maintained against Iraq and Iran, designed to retard, and in Iraq’s case eliminate, long-term development of WMD. The U.S. war with Iraq in 2003 has emasculated Iraq’s ability to threaten its neighbors, including Israel. The United States supplies substantial economic and military assistance to Egypt, principally to bolster Egypt’s incentives to maintain the peace treaty with Israel. 32 A similar policy underscores U.S. support for Jordan: U.S. economic and military assistance to Jordan encourages a closer Jordanian-Israeli relationship. Furthermore, America’s post-9/11 policy of rooting out Islamist terrorism globally gives added legitimacy, at least in the view of the Sharon administration, to his policies of violent responses to Palestinian suicide bombings within Israel and attacks in the Occupied Territories.

Link—Israeli Perception

Withdrawal would cause a crisis in perception of the US – this leads to Israel to become paranoid from loss of power

Machtiger et al 10 (Rachel, Shmuel Bar, Shmuel Bachar, researchers for the 10th Annual Herzliya Conference, http://www.herzliyaconference.org/\_Uploads/3032TrendUS\_transedit.pdf) GAT

In the light of his regional policy since assuming office, President Obama is perceived in the region as an enigmatic president and an appeaser towards Iran. The policy of the administration to date raises serious questions among the allies of the US whether this administration will uphold the traditional commitment of the US to their security. The American withdrawal from Iraq, whether it will take place during 2010 or later, is perceived as fraught with danger of boosting the strength of Iran on one side and Al-Qaeda on the other. In the eyes of the Sunni countries in the region, increasing Iranian involvement in the Shiite government in Iraq will be the manifestation of their worst expectations. The growing anxiety among the Gulf States in light of "the Shiite threat", portrayed by Iran, may bring a renewal to the alliance between these regimes and some of the radical Islamic elements based on both parties’ anti-Shiite "platform". However, these regimes will not be able to restrain the radical elements from limiting their activities solely against Shiite and to avoid action against the Western Israeli "infidel”. The image in the region of American power and of American support for and strategic understanding with Israel will affect Israeli deterrence towards other countries. True, no party in the region holds any doubt about US military capabilities; it is the willingness to use these capabilities which is suspect. The administration might seek to balance this image by selling advanced weapons to Arab countries threatened by Iran, as it has already begun to do in Saudi Arabia, Egypt and some of the Arab Gulf States. However, from the point of view of Israeli interests, reinforcement of these countries’ strategic capabilities – ostensibly against Iran – will have a negative effect on Israel’s military advantage.

Withdrawal causes a failure in Israel’s deterrent image – leads to Israel paranoia

Machtiger et al 10 (Rachel, Shmuel Bar, Shmuel Bachar, researchers for the 10th Annual Herzliya Conference, http://www.herzliyaconference.org/\_Uploads/3032TrendUS\_transedit.pdf) GAT

The image of American power in the region is an important component of Israel's own deterrent image. This is expressed in the very image of American capacity to act in the region to support its allies and in the assumption of a strategic alliance and special relationship between the US and Israel. The erosion of the image of American power is not due to the perception of American capabilities per se, but to the perception of willingness of the US to act in the region to support its allies. Erosion of the image of support for allies in general and for Israel in particular, will have a detrimental effect on Israel’s deterrence. The administration may attempt to balance the erosion of its own image by selling advanced weapons to Arab countries threatened by Iran – a step already initiated vis-à-vis Saudi Arabia, Egypt and some of the Arab Emirates. However, for Israel strengthening the image of the US in this way will have an adverse effect on Israel’s own strategic advantage, particularly in circumstances in which the stability of the regimes in these countries may be in question and there exists a possibility of extremist regimes coming to power.

Impact – Tech Sharing (1/2)

**Having good relations with Israel is key to intelligence and technology sharing**

Glick 4/23 (Caroline B., senior fellow at Center for Security Policy, <http://www.jewishworldreview.com/0410/glick042310.php3>) GAT

Israel's status as the US's most vital ally in the Middle East has been so widely recognized for so long that over the years, Israeli and American leaders alike have felt it unnecessary to explain what it is about the alliance that makes it so important for the US. Today, as the Obama administration is openly distancing the US from Israel while giving the impression that Israel is a strategic impediment to the administration's attempts to strengthen its relations with the Arab world, recalling why Israel is the US's most important ally in the Middle East has become a matter of some urgency. Much is made of the fact that Israel is a democracy. But we seldom consider why the fact that Israel is a representative democracy matters. The fact that Israel is a democracy means that its alliance with America reflects the will of the Israeli people. As such, it remains constant regardless of who is power in Jerusalem. All of the US's other alliances in the Middle East are with authoritarian regimes whose people do not share the pro-American views of their leaders. The death of leaders or other political developments are liable to bring about rapid and dramatic changes in their relations with the US. For instance, until 1979, Iran was one of the US's closest strategic allies in the region. Owing to the gap between the Iranian people and their leadership, the Islamic revolution put an end to the US-Iran alliance. Egypt flipped from a bitter foe to an ally of the US when Gamal Abdel Nasser died in 1969. Octogenarian President Hosni Mubarak's encroaching death is liable to cause a similar shift in the opposite direction. Instability in the Hashemite kingdom in Jordan and the Saudi regime could transform those countries from allies to adversaries. Only Israel, where the government reflects the will of the people is a reliable, permanent US ally. America reaps the benefits of its alliance with Israel every day. As the US suffers from chronic intelligence gaps, Israel remains the US's most reliable source for accurate intelligence on the US's enemies in the region. Israel is the US's only ally in the Middle East that always fights its own battles. Indeed, Israel has never asked the US for direct military assistance in time of war. Since the US and Israel share the same regional foes, when Israel is called upon to fight its enemies, its successes redound to the US's benefit. Here it bears recalling Israel's June 1982 destruction of Syria's Soviet-made anti-aircraft batteries and the Syrian air force. Those stunning Israeli achievements were the first clear demonstration of the absolute superiority of US military technology over Soviet military technology. Many have argued that it was this Israeli demonstration of Soviet technological inferiority that convinced the Reagan administration it was possible to win the Cold War. In both military and non-military spheres, Israeli technological achievements - often developed with US support - are shared with America. The benefits the US has gained from Israeli technological advances in everything from medical equipment to microchips to pilotless aircraft are without peer worldwide

Technological innovation key to hegemony

Segal 4 (Adam, senior fellow at Council on Foreign Relations, http://www.foreignaffairs.com/articles/60260/adam-segal/is-america-losing-its-edge) GAT

The United States' global primacy depends in large part on its ability to develop new technologies and industries faster than anyone else. For the last five decades, U.S. scientific innovation and technological entrepreneurship have ensured the country's economic prosperity and military power. It was Americans who invented and commercialized the semiconductor, the personal computer, and the Internet; other countries merely followed the U.S. lead. Today, however, this technological edge-so long taken for granted-may be slipping, and the most serious challenge is coming from Asia. Through competitive tax policies, increased investment in research and development (R&D), and preferential policies for science and technology (S&T) personnel, Asian governments are improving the quality of their science and ensuring the exploitation of future innovations. The percentage of patents issued to and science journal articles published by scientists in China, Singapore, South Korea, and Taiwan is rising. Indian companies are quickly becoming the second-largest producers of application services in the world, developing, supplying, and managing database and other types of software for clients around the world. South Korea has rapidly eaten away at the U.S. advantage in the manufacture of computer chips and telecommunications software. And even China has made impressive gains in advanced technologies such as lasers, biotechnology, and advanced materials used in semiconductors, aerospace, and many other types of manufacturing. Although the United States' technical dominance remains solid, the globalization of research and development is exerting considerable pressures on the American system. Indeed, as the United States is learning, globalization cuts both ways: it is both a potent catalyst of U.S. technological innovation and a significant threat to it. The United States will never be able to prevent rivals from developing new technologies; it can remain dominant only by continuing to innovate faster than everyone else. But this won't be easy; to keep its privileged position in the world, the United States must get better at fostering technological entrepreneurship at home.

Impact – Tech Sharing (2/2)

**Hegemony is crucial to preventing great power nuclear war**

**Khalilzad** **95** (Zalmay, Current US Ambassador, “The Washington Quarterly, Vol 18, No 2, pg. 84, spring) GAT

<Under the third option, the United States would seek to retain global leadership and to preclude the rise of a global rival or a return to multipolarity for the indefinite future. On balance, this is the best long-term guiding principle and vision. Such a vision is desirable not as an end in itself, but because a world in which the United States exercises leadership would have tremendous advantages. First, the global environment would be more open and more receptive to American values -- democracy, free markets, and the rule of law. Second, such a world would have a better chance of dealing cooperatively with the world's major problems, such as nuclear proliferation, threats of regional hegemony by renegade states, and low-level conflicts. Finally, U.S. leadership would help preclude the rise of another hostile global rival, enabling the United States and the world to avoid another global cold or hot war and all the attendant dangers, including a global nuclear exchange. U.S. leadership would therefore be more conducive to global stability than a bipolar or a multipolar balance of power system.

[Any hege terminal impact can be used in place of K-Zad]

Impact - Democracy Module (1/1)

Relations with Israel key to promotion of democracy and peace

ADL 6 (Anti Defamation League

http://www.adl.org/israel/advocacy/how\_to\_respond/us\_israel\_relations.asp?xflag=1) GAT

The United States is a longstanding strong ally of Israel based on shared democratic values and strategic interests including the rejection of terrorism and violence. The United States has a great interest in the stability of the Middle East, a region that is afflicted by extremists who violently oppose the U.S., Israel and democracy, rogue states with large military arsenals which include non-conventional weaponry, and other authoritarian regimes. Bolstering and supporting peace, stability and democracy in the region through relations with Israel is in America’s strategic interest. Indeed, public opinion polls have consistently demonstrated that Americans of all backgrounds support strong U.S.-Israeli relations and view Israel as a key ally of the United States.

Democracy key to preventing inevitable extinction

Diamond 95 (Larry, senior research fellow at Hoover Institution, A Report to the Carnegie Commission on Preventing Deadly Conflict, December 1995, p. 6) GAT

This hardly exhausts the lists of threats to our security and well-being in the coming years and decades. In the former Yugoslavia nationalist aggression tears at the stability of Europe and could easily spread. The flow of illegal drugs intensifies through increasingly powerful international crime syndicates that have made common cause with authoritarian regimes and have utterly corrupted the institutions of tenuous, democratic ones. Nuclear, chemical, and biological weapons continue to proliferate. The very source of life on Earth, the global ecosystem, appears increasingly endangered. Most of these new and unconventional threats to security are associated with or aggravated by the weakness or absence of democracy, with its provisions for legality, accountability, popular sovereignty, and openness. The experience of this century offers important lessons. Countries that govern themselves in a truly democratic fashion do not go to war with one another. They do not aggress against their neighbors to aggrandize themselves or glorify their leaders. Democratic governments do not ethnically "cleanse" their own populations, and they are much less likely to face ethnic insurgency. Democracies do not sponsor terrorism against one another. They do not build weapons of mass destruction to use on or to threaten one another. Democratic countries form more reliable, open, and enduring trading partnerships. In the long run they offer better and more stable climates for investment. They are more environmentally responsible because they must answer to their own citizens, who organize to protest the destruction of their environments. They are better bets to honor international treaties since they value legal obligations and because their openness makes it much more difficult to breach agreements in secret. Precisely because, within their own borders, they respect competition, civil liberties, property rights, and the rule of law, democracies are the only reliable foundation on which a new world order of international security and prosperity can be built.

Impact - Israeli Strikes Module (1/2)

**Israel would be willing to launch a strike against Iran, but good relations with the US are keeping them from doing so**

Levinson 4/21(Charles, writer for Wall Street Journal, http://online.wsj.com/article/SB10001424052748703757504575194223689622084.html) GAT

The Israeli security establishment is divided over whether it needs Washington's blessing if Israel decides to attack Iran, Israeli officials say, as the U.S. campaign for sanctions drags on and Tehran steadily develops greater nuclear capability. Some senior Israeli officials say in interviews that they see signs Washington may be willing to live with a nuclear-armed Iran, an eventuality that Israel says it won't accept. Compounding Israeli concerns were U.S. statements this past weekend that underscored U.S. resistance to a military option. Defense Secretary Robert Gates on Sunday discussed a memo to National Security Adviser James Jones warning that the U.S. needed new strategies, including how to contain a nuclear Iran—suggesting that Iran could reach nuclear capability without any foreign military force trying to stop it. Adm. Mike Mullen, chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, reiterated Sunday the U.S. position that a military strike against Iran is a "last option." Israel says it supports the U.S.-led push for new economic sanctions against Iran. But Israeli officials have increasingly voiced frustration over the slow pace of diplomatic efforts to get sanctions in place. Relations between the two allies have soured in recent weeks, with Prime Minister Benjamin Netanyahu's government pushing back against Obama administration pressure to freeze building in Jewish areas of East Jerusalem, which Washington says is counterproductive to its Mideast peace efforts. In another sign of a split, Israeli officials say they believe Iran—whose president has called for the destruction of Israel—could develop a warhead to strike the country within a year if it decides to, though outside experts say such capability is years away. Tehran says its nuclear program is for peaceful uses. Such divisions have played into fears in Israel that if Washington's sanctions effort fails, the Israeli and American positions on Iran could rapidly diverge—and Israel, if it chooses to attack Iran, would have no choice but to do so on its own. U.S. commanders say an attack would invite retaliation by Iran against American military interests in the region, or wider terrorist attacks by Iranian proxies Hezbollah and Hamas. Adm. Mullen said Sunday a strike could have "unintended consequences," and has long warned it could destabilize the region at a time the U.S. has troops in Iraq and Afghanistan, which neighbor Iran. A senior U.S. official said the U.S. has stated to Israel its opposition to unilateral Israeli action, but that there were still fears within the administration that Israel could strike Iran despite Washington's objections. Military Options View Interactive If Israel chooses to attack nuclear facilities in Iran against Washington's objections, politics will play a role in military strategy. Some Israeli officials worry a unilateral strike would cause a break with Washington that would threaten Israeli national interests even more than a nuclear-armed Iran. Israel's track record of coordinating such strikes with the U.S. is mixed. The country caught the U.S. by surprise with its attack on Iraq's Osirak reactor in 1981. When Israel attacked a suspected Syrian nuclear facility in 2007, Washington was given advanced warning, according to U.S. officials at the time. The decision of whether to strike Iran ultimately rests with the prime minister, Mr. Netanyahu. In the past, however, senior military commanders have had significant say in such decisions. A spokesman for Israel's Ministry of Defense declined to comment on internal deliberations concerning Iran. There are a number of routes Israeli attack jets can fly to attack Iran. They all would require Israeli planes to fly through U.S.-controlled airspace in Iraq or through the airspace of U.S. allies such as Saudi Arabia or Turkey, which could cause serious political consequences for Israel. Many Israeli military experts say Israel can easily cope with any military retaliation by Iran in response to a strike. Iran's medium-range rockets would cause damage and casualties in Israel, but they aren't very accurate, and Israel's sophisticated missile-defense system would likely knock many out midflight. Israel has similarly proved it can handle attacks against Israel by Hezbollah and Hamas. Israel also hosts a contingent of U.S. troops attached to a radar system to help give early warning against incoming rocket attacks. More worrying to Israeli strategic planners examining possible attack scenarios is the possibility that Iran would respond to an Israeli attack by ramping up support to groups battling U.S. troops in Iraq and Afghanistan, according to recently retired officials familiar with the military's thinking on Iran. If American soldiers start dying in greater numbers as a result of an Israeli unilateral attack, Americans could turn against Israel. Iran could also disrupt the world's oil supply by cutting off exports through the Persian Gulf, roiling international oil markets. "What will Americans say if Israel drags the U.S. into a war it didn't want, or when they are suddenly paying $10 a gallon for gasoline and Israel is the reason for it," says retired Brig. Gen. Shlomo Brom, former director of the Israeli army's Strategic Planning Division. Former senior members of Israel's defense establishment have weighed in recently on both sides of the debate. "We don't have permission and we don't need permission from the U.S.," says Ephraim Sneh, who served as deputy minister of defense under former Prime Minister Ehud Olmert. But Maj. Gen. Giora Eiland, a former national security adviser, says Israel wouldn't jeopardize its relationship with the U.S. by launching a military strike against Iran without an American nod. Late last month, Israeli Defense Minister Ehud Barak seemed to acknowledge publicly the opposing viewpoints inside the administration. "Only we have the exclusive responsibility when it comes to the fate and security of Israel, and only we can determine the matters pertaining to the fate of Israel and the Jewish people," Mr. Barak said. "But we must never lose sight of how important these relations are, or the ability to act in harmony and unity with the United States."

Impact - Israeli Strikes Module (2/2)

**If Israel attacks Iran, a rapidly escalating war would break out in the Middle East and would engulf all the great powers**

Trabanco 9 (Jose M. A., writer for Global Research, <http://www.globalresearch.ca/index.php?context=va&aid=11762>) GAT

In case of an Israeli and/or American attack against Iran, Ahmadinejad's government will certainly respond. A possible countermeasure would be to fire Persian ballistic missiles against Israel and maybe even against American military bases in the regions. Teheran will unquestionably resort to its proxies like Hamas or Hezbollah (or even some of its Shiite allies it has in Lebanon or Saudi Arabia) to carry out attacks against Israel, America and their allies, effectively setting in flames a large portion of the Middle East. The ultimate weapon at Iranian disposal is to block the Strait of Hormuz. If such chokepoint is indeed asphyxiated, that would dramatically increase the price of oil, a very threatening retaliation because it will bring intense financial and economic havoc upon the West, which is already facing significant trouble in those respects. In short, the necessary conditions for a major war in the Middle East are given. Such conflict could rapidly spiral out of control and thus a relatively minor clash could quickly and dangerously escalate by engulfing the whole region and perhaps even beyond. There are many key players: the Israelis, the Palestinians, the Arabs, the Persians and their respective allies and some great powers could become involved in one way or another (America, Russia, Europe, China). Therefore, any miscalculation by any of the main protagonists can trigger something no one can stop. Taking into consideration that the stakes are too high, perhaps it is not wise to be playing with fire right in the middle of a powder keg.

Impact – Israel Strikes – UQ

No attacks on Iran in the status quo

Williams 10 (Dan, 1/31/10, Reuters, “Israel "responsible" on Iran, Obama adviser says,” http://www.reuters.com/article/idUSTRE60U1AL20100131) GAT

Israel and the United States are closely conferring about the Iranian nuclear program, U.S. National Security Adviser Jim Jones said in an interview published Sunday, calling Israel's conduct "responsible." Western governments fear that Iran wants to produce nuclear weapons but Tehran says the program is for peaceful purposes. Iran has vowed to respond to any unilateral Israeli strike over the nuclear program. The five permanent Security Council members -- the United States, Britain, France, Russia and China -- along with Germany have been negotiating with Iran, but U.S. officials say drafts of possible sanctions should circulate among the group soon. Jones said the United States and Israel are in close coordination over how to handle Iran. "We have very good dialogue with Israel, continual dialogue," he told The Jerusalem Post. "We're working very closely with them." Asked whether Washington was concerned about Israel trying to take on its arch-foe alone, Jones said: "Our Israeli partners are very responsible." Michael Oren, Israel's envoy to the United States, said last month the military option "was not a subject of discussion."

**Currently, strikes are an option but diplomacy seems to be prevailing**

Schneider 10 (Howard, writer for Washington Post, 1/1/10, http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/content/article/2009/12/31/AR2009123101934.html?hpid=moreheadlines) GAT

Israeli officials say they will support President Obama's move to impose sanctions on Iran as a next step in the standoff over the country's nuclear program, though the narrower measures being considered by the White House may fall short of the "crippling" restrictions advocated here. With the expiration of the United States' year-end deadline for Iran to resolve the issue, Israeli Prime Minister Binyamin Netanyahu is "focused on working with the international community to upgrade the pressure on Iran in a way that makes the Iranian regime know that its nuclear program is unacceptable, that they are going to pay a price that will make them rethink," said spokesman Mark Regev. Obama "has been successful in galvanizing an international coalition that many people were cynical about. We are on the same page." The endorsement is significant because it comes from a country that is considered the most likely to launch a military strike to prevent Iran from developing nuclear weapons. Iranian President Mahmoud Ahmadinejad's denial of the Holocaust and his anti-Israel rhetoric have led Netanyahu to draw parallels to the years preceding World War II, and Israeli officials have said that all options are open in preparing for what some here regard as an "existential" threat. Israelis were initially skeptical of Obama's decision to engage Iran diplomatically, worried it would lead to the same end as previous diplomatic overtures -- years of talks and ineffective resolutions while Iran continued its nuclear development. The events of the last few months, however, helped curb the doubts. Ongoing pro-democracy demonstrations in Iran have created the sense of a regime vulnerable to pressure, while revelations about the extent and nature of the country's nuclear program have broadened international support for action. Israeli officials and analysts say they understand the limits Obama faces in pushing more stringent measures through the U.N. Security Council, where China holds a veto and remains hesitant to act against the Islamic republic. But they also say Obama now shares their sense of urgency and will soon propose a meaningful set of restrictions on the Iranian leadership -- sticking to a rough deadline he mentioned in a meeting with Netanyahu in May. With European nations and, more importantly, Russia looking poised to go along, "Israel is a spectator, like most other countries in the international community," said Deputy Foreign Minister Daniel Ayalon. "We trust that Obama and the U.S. will lead." Along with the Israeli-Palestinian dispute, Iran has been at the core of U.S.-Israeli discussions since Obama and Netanyahu took office in early 2009. They began with an overlapping set of priorities -- Obama viewing establishment of a Palestinian state as key to curbing Iran's influence over Islamist radicals in the region, and Netanyahu viewing Iranian influence as a security threat that needed to be addressed for the conflict with the Palestinians to be resolved. Beyond the risk of an Iranian nuclear strike on Israel -- considered unlikely because of Israel's nuclear deterrent capacity and the possible U.S. response -- Netanyahu has argued that a nuclear Iran would destabilize moderate Arab states in the region and embolden Iran-supported groups such as Hamas and Hezbollah that sit on Israel's borders. Obama and Netanyahu seem to have reached an understanding, with some of Netanyahu's overtures to the Palestinians winning U.S. support and Obama's policy toward Iran gaining Israeli trust. Meanwhile, talk of an Israeli strike has been tempered by discussion of the complexity of such an operation and the likelihood that it would do little other than delay Iran's progress. "As long as Obama is engaged in some kind of diplomatic effort, Israel is going to wait and see how it plays out," said Emily Landau, director of the arms control program at Tel Aviv University's Institute for National Security Studies. "It is in Israel's interest for it to be dealt with diplomatically. The military option is only getting more and more difficult." Other options are being discussed. At a Jerusalem news conference this week, Canadian lawmaker and former justice minister Irwin Cotler announced an effort to try Iran on grounds that its actions and the statements of its leaders put it in violation of international treaties on genocide prevention.

Impact – Israel Strikes - UQ

Relations currently keep a strike on Iran in check, but it’s still an option

Haaretz Service 7/8 (http://www.haaretz.com/news/diplomacy-defense/obama-israel-won-t-attack-iran-without-coordinating-with-u-s-1.300793) GAT

U.S. President Barack Obama told Channel 2 News on Wednesday that he believed Israel would not try to surprise the U.S. with a unilateral attack on Iran. In an interview, to be aired Thursday evening, Obama was asked whether he was concerned Prime Minister Benjamin Netanyahu would try to attack Iran without clearing the move with the U.S., to which the president replied "I think the relationship between Israel and the U.S. is sufficiently strong that neither of us try to surprise each other, but we try to coordinate on issues of mutual concern." Obama spoke to Channel 2's Yonit Levy one day after what he described as an "excellent" meeting with Netanyahu at the White House. The two leaders met alone for about 90 minutes Tuesday evening, during which time they discussed the peace process with the Palestinians, the contested Iranian nuclear program, and the strategic understandings between their two countries on Tehran's efforts to achieve nuclear capabilities.

Impact – Israel Strikes – I/L

Good relations allows the US to prevent Israel from attacking Iran – it’s the only check

Parsi 9 (Trita, president of NIAC, http://www.huffingtonpost.com/trita-parsi/washington-can-give-an-is\_b\_373205.html) GAT

Only a few weeks after US-Iran diplomacy began in earnest, it seems to be heading towards a premature ending. Rather than tensions reduction, the world has witnessed the opposite. Iran is refusing to accept a fuel swap deal brokered by the IAEA, the IAEA has passed a resolution rebuking Iran, and Tehran has responded by approving a plan to build ten more nuclear facilities. With the potential end of at least this phase of diplomacy, fears of a disastrous Israeli attack on Iran are on the rise once more. But contrary to Washington's official line, America is capable of preventing Israel from initiating a war that would further destabilize the Middle East.  Conventional wisdom in Washington reads that the United States has little influence over Israel, particularly on the issue of Iran's nuclear program, since Israel maintains that it is an existential threat. Washington has utilized the perception of Israeli immunity to international pleas to pressure China to rebuke Tehran. According to the Washington Post, National Security Council officials recently traveled to Beijing and used the Israeli card to get the Chinese on board.  The Chinese were told that Israel regards Iran's nuclear program as an "existential issue and that countries that have an existential issue don't listen to other countries," according to a senior administration official. The implication was clear: Israel could bomb Iran, leading to a crisis in the Persian Gulf region and almost inevitably problems over the very oil China needs to fuel its economic juggernaut." It is questionable that the Chinese were moved by the notion that Israel cannot be influenced by the international community on this issue. Mindful of the strength of US-Israeli relations, it is hardly convincing that Washington cannot influence Israel's actions towards Iran. Indeed, there is an important precedent in which Washington successfully prevented Israel from taking military action even when Israel itself had been attacked. On August 2, 1990, almost a year after the fall of the Berlin Wall and the end of the Iron Curtain divide, Iraq invaded Kuwait. Within months, the George H. W. Bush administration carefully assembled a coalition of states under the UN flag and defeated the Iraqi army and restored Kuwait's ruling family, the House of Sabah. The Bush senior administration saw particular value in ensuring that the international coalition contained numerous Arab states. But to get the Arab's to join a war alongside the US and against another Arab power, Israel needed to be kept out of the coalition. This turned out to be a tricky issue, particularly when Saddam Hussein hurled thirty-four Scud missiles at Tel Aviv and other Israeli cities, in an obvious attempt to lure Israel into the war. Then-National Security Advisor, General Brent Scowcroft, told me in an interview that the United States told Israel "in the strongest possible words" that it needed to keep itself out of the Iraq operation because Israeli retaliation would cause the collapse of Washington's alliance against Iraq.For the government of Prime Minister Yitzhak Shamir, this was a very tough decision. Saddam's missile attacks damaged Israel's public morale; the country's otherwise lively and noisy capital quickly turned into a ghost town. Bush sent Undersecretary of State Lawrence Eagleburger to Israel to assure Israeli leaders that the United States was doing all it could to destroy the Iraqi missile launchers. But neither the Israel Defense Forces nor the Ministry of Defense was convinced. Instead, a feeling prevailed among Israel's leaders that Washington was untrustworthy and that it could not be relied upon when it came to Israel's existence. Bad blood was created between Israel and the United States, according to Efraim Halevi, the former head of the Mossad. Washington's protection of Israel was ineffective, and the image that Israel was relying on the United States for protection was hard to stomach for ordinary Israelis. Shamir's decision to accommodate the Americans was extremely unpopular, because it was believed that it "would cause irreparable damage to Israel's deterrent capabilities," Halevi told me. To make matters worse, people around Shamir felt that the United States did not reward Israel for, in their view, effectively enabling the coalition to remain intact by refusing to retaliate against Iraq. Just as Israeli retaliation against Iraq in 1991 would have been devastating for the US, an Israeli preventive attack against Iran today would spell disaster for US national security. In July 2008, Admiral Mike Mullen, the Chairman of the American Joint Chiefs of Staff, warned against any Israeli military action against Iran, saying that the Middle East would become "more unstable" and that it would put US forces under much stress, indicating that an Israeli attack on Iran would inevitably suck the US into war with Iran. "From the United States' perspective, the United States' military perspective, in particular, opening up a third front right now would be extremely stressful on us," Mullen told reporters. A year later, Mullen's line was echoed by Secretary of Defense Robert Gates, who warned that a military attack would only be a "temporary solution." "There's a lot of talk about a military effort to take out their nuclear capabilities, but, in my view, it would only be a temporary solution," Gates told reporters in September 2009. Beyond the impact an Israeli attack on Iran would have on US national security, the first casualty of war with Iran would be the Iranian pro-democracy movement. Having shown great courage in challenging the Ahmadinejad government, the last thing Iran's pro-democracy activists need is for Iran to get embroiled in a military confrontation with Israel and the US. Their struggle for democracy will be infinitely more difficult in the midst of war. Should diplomacy with Iran fail, and should Israel seek to attack Iran, America will have plenty of reasons to prevent such a disaster from taking place. And history shows that contrary to conventional wisdom, Washington has the ability to prevent Israel from taking actions that would endanger America.

Impact – Israel Strikes – Nuke War

**Brookings Institution simulation shows how an Israeli attack on Iran could erupt into a global conflict**

**Sanger 10** (David E., writer for New York Times, 3/21/10, <http://www.nytimes.com/2010/03/28/weekinreview/28sangerintro.html>) GAT

In 1981, Israel destroyed Iraq’s nuclear reactor at Osirak, declaring it could not live with the chance the country would get a nuclear weapons capability. In 2007, it wiped out a North Korean-built reactor in Syria. And the next year, the Israelis secretly asked the Bush administration for the equipment and overflight rights they might need some day to strike Iran’s much better-hidden, better-defended nuclear sites. Related Agencies Suspect Iran Is Planning Atomic Sites (March 28, 2010) They were turned down, but the request added urgency to the question: Would Israel take the risk of a strike? And if so, what would follow? Now that parlor game question has turned into more formal war games simulations. The government’s own simulations are classified, but the Saban Center for Middle East Policy at the Brookings Institution created its own in December. The results were provocative enough that a summary of them has circulated among top American government and military officials and in many foreign capitals. For the sake of verisimilitude, former top American policymakers and intelligence officials — some well known — were added to the mix. They played the president and his top advisers; the Israeli prime minister and cabinet; and Iranian leaders. They were granted anonymity to be able to play their roles freely, without fear of blowback. (This reporter was invited as an observer.) A report by Kenneth M. Pollack, who directed the daylong simulation, can be found at the Saban Center’s Web site. A caution: Simulations compress time and often oversimplify events. Often they underestimate the risk of error — for example, that by using faulty intelligence leaders can misinterpret a random act as part of a pattern of aggression. In this case, the actions of the American and Israeli teams seemed fairly plausible; the players knew the bureaucracy and politics of both countries well. Predicting Iran’s moves was another matter, since little is known about its decision-making process. —DAVID E. SANGER 1. ISRAEL ATTACKS Without telling the U.S. in advance, Israel strikes at six of Iran's most critical nuclear facilities, using a refueling base hastily set up in the Saudi Arabian desert without Saudi knowledge. (It is unclear to the Iranians if the Saudis were active participants or not.) Already-tense relations between the White House and Israel worsen rapidly, but the lack of advance notice allows Washington to say truthfully that it had not condoned the attack. 2. U.S. STEPS IN In a series of angry exchanges, the U.S. demands that Israel cease its attacks, though some in Washington view the moment as an opportunity to further weaken the Iranian government, particularly the Islamic Revolutionary Guard Corps. Telling Israel it has made a mess, Washington essentially instructs the country to sit in a corner while the United States tries to clean things up. 3. U.S. SENDS WEAPONS Even while calling for restraint on all sides, the U.S. deploys more Patriot antimissile batteries and Aegis cruisers around the region, as a warning to Iran not to retaliate. Even so, some White House advisers warn against being sucked into the conflict, believing that Israel's real strategy is to lure America into finishing the job with additional attacks on the damaged Iranian facilities. 4. IRAN STRIKES BACK Despite warnings, Iran fires missiles at Israel, including its nuclear weapons complex at Dimona, but damage and casualties are minimal. Meanwhile, two of Iran's proxies, Hezbollah and Hamas, launch attacks in Israel and fire rockets into the country. Believing it already has achieved its main goal of setting back the nuclear program by years, Israel barely responds. 5. IRAN SEES OPPORTUNITIES Iran, while wounded, sees long-term opportunities to unify its people - and to roll over its opposition parties - on nationalistic grounds. Its strategy is to mount low-level attacks on Israel while portraying the United States as a paper tiger - unable to control its ally and unwilling to respond to Iran. Convinced that the Saudis had colluded with the Israelis, and emboldened by the measured initial American position, Iran fires missiles at the Saudi oil export processing center at Abqaiq, and tries to incite Shiite Muslims in eastern Saudi Arabia to attack the Saudi regime. Iran also conducts terror attacks against European targets, in hopes that governments there will turn on Israel and the United States. 6. IRAN AVOIDS U.S. TARGETS After a meeting of its divided leadership, Iran decides against directly attacking any American targets - to avoid an all-out American response. 7. STRIFE IN ISRAEL Though Iran's retaliation against Israel causes only modest damage, critics in the Israeli media say the country's leaders, by failing to respond to every attack, have weakened the credibility of the nation's deterrence. Hezbollah fires up to 100 rockets a day into northern Israel, with some aimed at Haifa and Tel Aviv. The Israeli economy comes to a virtual halt, and Israeli officials, urging American intervention, complain that one-third of the country's population is living in shelters. Hundreds of thousands flee Haifa and Tel Aviv. 8. ISRAEL FIRES BACK Israel finally wins American acquiescence to retaliate against Hezbollah. It orders a 48-hour campaign by air and special forces against Lebanon and begins to prepare a much larger air and ground operation. 9. IRAN PLAYS THE OIL CARD Knowing that its ultimate weapon is its ability to send oil prices sky high, Iran decides to attack Dhahran, Saudi Arabia, an oil industry center, with conventional missiles and begins mining the Strait of Hormuz. A Panamanian-registered, American owned tanker and an American minesweeper are severely damaged. The price of oil spikes, though temporarily. 10. U.S. BOOSTS FORCES Unable to sit on the sidelines while oil supplies and American forces are threatened, Washington begins a massive military reinforcement of the Gulf region. 11. REVERBERATIONS The game ends eight days after the initial Israeli strike. But it is clear the United States was leaning toward destroying all Iranian air, ground and sea targets in and around the Strait of Hormuz, and that Iran's forces were about to suffer a significant defeat. Debate breaks out over how much of Iran's nuclear program was truly crippled, and whether the country had secret backup facilities that could be running in just a year or two.

Impact – Israel Strikes – Nuke War

An Israeli strike would lead to nuclear war and a massive flow of suffering refugees

Ronen 4/13 (Gil, reporter for Israel National News, http://www.israelnationalnews.com/News/news.aspx/136993) GAT

An official from Iran's Atomic Energy Organization announced Tuesday that the Islamic theocracy will “join the world nuclear club within a month in a bid to deter possible attacks on the country,” the Fars news agency reported. "No country would even think about attacking Iran after Iran's membership in the club," Deputy Head of IAEO Behzad Soltani said. Meanwhile, Dmitri Medvedev, President of Russia, said in an ABC interview that the situation with Iran is 'tragic' and speculated that an Israeli strike on Tehran could lead to nuclear war and a stream of refugees from Iran. Speaking with George Stephanopoulos on 'Good Morning America', Medvedev said: “I don't know what Iran wants... Are they pursuing the nuclear weapon or not? I don't know. But we should carefully monitor it. These steps to enrich by 20 percent in their own sites, despite that we offered to do it in Russia, France and Turkey. This could be considered as at least the desire to enter into conflict with the world community.” 'Very tragic' When Stephanopoulos noted that Iran is unveiling new centrifuges, Medvedev admitted: “In any case our attempts didn't bring success and this is tragic, especially that there were so many chances. We do have our own relationship with Iran, a very close one. We do have significant trade, we do work with Iran on energy, and we do deliver equipment to Iran. But we cannot watch without any concern how they develop their nuclear program.” “Sanctions should be effective and they should be smart,” he said. They should force or obligate the Iranian leadership to think about what's next. What could sanctions be? It could be trade, arms trade. It could be other sanctions... Sanctions should not be paralyzing. They should not cause suffering. Aren't we in the 21st century?” Nuclear war and refugees Regarding the possibility that Israel would strike Iran, Medvedev said: “It would be the worst possible scenario. Because any war means lives lost. Secondly, what does a war in the Middle East mean? Everyone is so close over there that nobody would be unaffected. And if conflict of that kind happens, and a strike is performed, then you can expect anything, including use of nuclear weapons. And nuclear strikes in the Middle East, this means a global catastrophe. Many deaths.” Asked if he thinks Israel will refrain from striking Iran, the Russian leader said: “I do have a good relationship with the President and Prime Minister of Israel. But those are independent people. And I would say that on many questions they are defending stubborn positions. Very tough. And the US has seen the proof of that lately... In many instances the Israeli position, including settlements, remained the same even after open and honest talk with America and we have spoken to them also. Why am I bringing it up? Because you can't imagine any scenario, with the Middle East it would be a gigantic human disaster, and not only for the Middle East. If something would happen in Iran, the people from that region would try to escape. Where would those people go? They would head toward our borders. They would go to Azerbaijan. Iran has many with roots from Azerbaijan.”

Timeframe: This month.

Klein 6/10 (Aaron, reporter for World Net Daily, http://www.wnd.com/?pageId=165353) GAT

The Egyptian government believes July will be a decisive month that may see an Israeli military strike against Iran's nuclear facilities, according to a senior Egyptian security official speaking to WND. The official said Egypt already has implemented security measures that take into account an Israeli strike against Iran within the next month or so. The Egyptian estimation could not be verified by officials in Jerusalem contacted by WND. Also, officials in the Palestinian Authority said they did not have any indication of a Middle East war in the summer. Mahmoud al-Zahar, Hamas chief in Gaza, told WND he believes a Middle East confrontation is likely, possibly in the next few months. The Egyptian security official, meanwhile, said his country bolstered security forces along the border with the Hamas-controlled Gaza, believing Iran will urge Hamas to retaliate against Israel during any war with the Jewish state. The security official said the Egyptian military has been placed on a general high alert. He said a decision two weeks ago to open the Egypt-Gaza border took into account the possibility of an Israeli military strike against Iran next month. He said during any future war between Israel and Iran, the Gaza-Egypt border will need to remain closed due to likely security threats from Gaza. Egypt opened the border amid international pressure against Israel to ease a so-called blockade of Gaza after nine violent activists on a Gaza-bound flotilla were killed when they attacked Israeli forces who had raided their ship. Egypt's estimation of a Middle East conflict may be particularly relevant since Israel has recently coordinated military training exercises with the Egyptian government. The drills were clearly aimed at Iran. Egypt last year granted Israel permission to conduct naval exercises off Egyptian coastal waters. The Egyptian estimation also took into account a United Nations vote yesterday to impose a fourth round of sanctions on Iran. Tehran immediately vowed to continue with its nuclear program. The sanctions, however, do not affect an air-defense-missile deal in which Russia is expected to sell its advanced S-300 missile systems to the Iranians. The sanctions also do not halt a Russian plan to construct possible new nuclear-power plants in Iran. Russian Foreign Minister Sergei Lavrov told reporters today his country was still in discussions to build new nuclear plants for the Iranians. Also today, Russia's Foreign Ministry said new U.N. sanctions against Tehran do not oblige Moscow to scrap its deal to deliver the S-300. The missile system could complicate any military action aimed at Iran's nuclear plants.

Impact - War on Terror (1/1)

U.S.-Israel ties are key to winning the War on Terror

Thompson 1 (Tommy, former governor of Wisconsin, http://www.ujc.org/page.html?ArticleID=24725) GAT

Tommy G. Thompson today called close U.S.-Israeli ties "essential" for the victory over terrorists and the vitality of democratic values in both countries and around the world. "Supporting Israel is absolutely essential to the security of the United States and to the advancement of freedom and democracy in our time," Thompson said at the closing session of the 2001 United Jewish Communities (UJC) General Assembly (GA) in Washington, DC. "It's not an overstatement to say that we are fighting the same spirit of tyranny today that we fought in the Second World War," the former Wisconsin governor continued. "And so much of that tyranny is committed under the pretext of religion. Many of you in this room understand and empathize with the suffering of those persecuted for their religious beliefs. And should Bin Ladin have his way, the Jewish people would be persecuted yet again. "While he might strike the Jewish state, he will not defeat it. On behalf of President Bush, I can tell you that America will stand with Israel - period. We cannot, and will not, let those who would hurt us, hurt our friends and allies, and hurt their own people, succeed." Thompson's remarks were delivered just hours after the UJC Delegates Assembly meeting at the GA adopted a resolution that, among other steps, condemns international terrorism, supports U.S. government efforts to defeat it, and condemns stereotyping and scapegoating of Muslim-Americans and Arab-Americans and calls on leaders of those groups to denounce anti-Semitic pronouncements.

Losing the war on terror leads to massive nuclear war

Easterbrook 1 (Greg, the New Republic, http://transcripts.cnn.com/TRANSCRIPTS/0111/01/gal.00.html) GAT

Terrorists may not be held by this, especially suicidal terrorists, of the kind that al Qaeda is attempting to cultivate. But I think, if I could leave you with one message, it would be this: that the search for terrorist atomic weapons would be of great benefit to the Muslim peoples of the world in addition to members, to people of the United States and Western Europe, because if an atomic warhead goes off in Washington, say, in the current environment or anything like it, in the 24 hours that followed, a hundred million Muslims would die as U.S. nuclear bombs rained down on every conceivable military target in a dozen Muslim countries

Impact - **Hegemony Module (1/2)**

US-Israel relations maintains regional hegemony

Zunes 2 (Stephen, Middle East Editor at Foreign Policy in Focus, http://www.fpif.org/articles/why\_the\_us\_supports\_israel) GAT

There is a broad bipartisan consensus among policymakers that Israel has advanced U.S. interest in the Middle East and beyond. Israel has successfully prevented victories by radical nationalist movements in Lebanon and Jordan, as well as in Palestine. Israel has kept Syria, for many years an ally of the Soviet Union, in check. Israel's air force is predominant throughout the region. Israel's frequent wars have provided battlefield testing for American arms, often against Soviet weapons. It has served as a conduit for U.S. arms to regimes and movements too unpopular in the United States for openly granting direct military assistance, such as apartheid South Africa, the Islamic Republic in Iran, the military junta in Guatemala, and the Nicaraguan Contras. Israeli military advisers have assisted the Contras, the Salvadoran junta, and foreign occupation forces in Namibia and Western Sahara. Israel's intelligence service has assisted the U.S. in intelligence gathering and covert operations. Israel has missiles capable of reaching as far as the former Soviet Union, it possesses a nuclear arsenal of hundreds of weapons, and it has cooperated with the U.S. military-industrial complex with research and development for new jet fighters and anti-missile defense systems.

Control of the Middle East is key to global hegemony

Naqvi 2 (M. B., writer for Defence Journal, http://www.defencejournal.com/2002/august/muddle.htm) GAT

Among other facts that are certain is the one that for the Americans the ME is also a first rate strategic jumping ground for the rest of the Asian continent, as the recent events have proved. It is something like a strategic base area. One has had occasion in this space to delineate the trajectory of American power that took off from the Persian Gulf and ME area. The second certain fact about the ME has already been noted that its inherent importance comprises two elements: one is the purely strategic nature of the area and control over it enables a power, in this case, the US to project itself as the last superpower and its position in this region enables it to act like one in other regions. Indeed this is what has happened since September 11. The second element is also important. It is the existence of oil, as noted. One of the world’s largest oil lakes is to be found under the sands of the Arabian deserts that still have a great role and potential for the future. Any power that controls this oil is able to coerce all other developed countries being able to interdict their oil supplies. Why does America maintain huge fleets in all the major oceans and seas? It is, narrowly speaking, to protect the oil lanes and to see that the oil trade remains peaceful and works according to the rules and ways that suit the US. But American leadership over Europe and Japan is also based, among other factors, on the oil weapon in the hands of the US Navy. Any power or group of powers that becomes defiant could conceivably face a threat to its interests; it can expect difficulties in its oil supplies from the Gulf. Japan can be brought to its knees in a matter of a week or so if the Gulf oil is denied to it.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  |  |  |

Impact - **Hegemony Module (2/2)**

**Collapse of US hegemony causes a multipolar vacuum leading to multiple scenarios for extinction**

**Ferguson 4** (Niall, Professor of History at New York University, “A world without power,” Foreign Policy 143, p. 32-39, July-August) GAT

So what is left? Waning empires. Religious revivals. Incipient anarchy. A coming retreat into fortified cities. These are the Dark Age experiences that a world without a hyperpower might quickly find itself reliving. The trouble is, of course, that this Dark Age would be an altogether more dangerous one than the Dark Age of the ninth century. For the world is much more populous--roughly 20 times more--so friction between the world's disparate "tribes" is bound to be more frequent. Technology has transformed production; now human societies depend not merely on freshwater and the harvest but also on supplies of fossil fuels that are known to be finite. Technology has upgraded destruction, too, so it is now possible not just to sack a city but to obliterate it. For more than two decades, globalization--the integration of world markets for commodities, labor, and capital--has raised living standards throughout the world, except where countries have shut themselves off from the process through tyranny or civil war. The reversal of globalization--which a new Dark Age would produce--would certainly lead to economic stagnation and even depression. As the United States sought to protect itself after a second September 11 devastates, say, Houston or Chicago, it would inevitably become a less open society, less hospitable for foreigners seeking to work, visit, or do business. Meanwhile, as Europe's Muslim enclaves grew, Islamist extremists' infiltration of the EU would become irreversible, increasing trans-Atlantic tensions over the Middle East to the breaking point. An economic meltdown in China would plunge the Communist system into crisis, unleashing the centrifugal forces that undermined previous Chinese empires. Western investors would lose out and conclude that lower returns at home are preferable to the risks of default abroad. The worst effects of the new Dark Age would be felt on the edges of the waning great powers. The wealthiest ports of the global economy--from New York to Rotterdam to Shanghai--would become the targets of plunderers and pirates. With ease, terrorists could disrupt the freedom of the seas, targeting oil tankers, aircraft carriers, and cruise liners, while Western nations frantically concentrated on making their airports secure. Meanwhile, limited nuclear wars could devastate numerous regions, beginning in the Korean peninsula and Kashmir, perhaps ending catastrophically in the Middle East. In Latin America, wretchedly poor citizens would seek solace in Evangelical Christianity imported by U.S. religious orders. In Africa, the great plagues of AIDS and malaria would continue their deadly work. The few remaining solvent airlines would simply suspend services to many cities in these continents; who would wish to leave their privately guarded safe havens to go there? For all these reasons, the prospect of an apolar world should frighten us today a great deal more than it frightened the heirs of Charlemagne. If the United States retreats from global hegemony--its fragile self-image dented by minor setbacks on the imperial frontier--its critics at home and abroad must not pretend that they are ushering in a new era of multipolar harmony, or even a return to the good old balance of power. Be careful what you wish for. The alternative to unipolarity would not be multipolarity at all. It would be apolarity--a global vacuum of power. And far more dangerous forces than rival great powers would benefit from such a not-so-new world disorder.

**Impact - Middle East Peace**

Peace process is succeeding now—relations key

Friedman 7/4(Matti, Staff Writer@The Associated Press, 2010, "Israeli PM: Need direct talks with Palestinians", http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/content/article/2010/07/04/AR2010070402687.html, accessed 7/8/10)jn

Israel's prime minister on Sunday endorsed a U.S. call for direct peace talks with the Palestinians, seeking to set a positive tone as he heads to the White House this week for talks with President Barack Obama. After a rocky meeting between the two leaders in March, both Israel and the U.S. are taking great pains to sound more upbeat this time around. But underlying the meeting is the fact that despite a year and a half of U.S. diplomacy, Israelis and Palestinians can't even agree on whether to sit down together to talk. Prime Minister Benjamin Netanyahu has long been calling for direct talks, but Palestinians have been wary of giving legitimacy to a hard-line Israeli government they view with suspicion. "I have been willing to meet Abu Mazen from the first day of this government," Netanyahu said Sunday at a session of the Israeli Cabinet, referring to Palestinian President Mahmoud Abbas, "and the time has come for him to be prepared to meet with us, because there is no other way to advance peace." "I hope this will be one of the results of the visit to Washington," Netanyahu said. Also on the agenda during Tuesday's meeting will be Israel's continuing response to the international outcry that followed the bloodshed aboard an international protest ship that to break the Israeli blockade of the Gaza Strip. Under U.S. pressure, Israel has agreed to ease the blockade to allow in more goods and construction materials - desperately needed to rebuild the war-torn area. Netanyahu said Sunday that finding a way to resume direct peace talks with the Palestinians will be his main goal. After months of efforts, the U.S. managed to persuade the Palestinians to begin indirect negotiations with Israel through White House envoy George Mitchell. The former U.S. senator and broker of the historic Northern Ireland peace accord hopes to bring the sides together for full-fledged negotiations by the fall. The Palestinians have demanded that Israel first freeze all construction in the West Bank and east Jerusalem - captured areas they claim as part of a future state. They also want Netanyahu to resume talks from where they broke off in December 2008 under his more dovish predecessor, Ehud Olmert. Netanyahu has refused these demands, though he has slowed settlement construction. Palestinian President Mahmoud Abbas said last week that Israel remains intransigent and that he saw no reason to talk face to face. "If (Netanyahu) wants direct talks, he knows he has the key," said Palestinian negotiator Saeb Erekat. Daniel Shapiro, a top official for the Middle East in the White House, said last week that Mitchell was making progress. "The gaps have narrowed," he said. "And we believe there are opportunities to further narrow those gaps, to allow the sides to take that next step to the direct talks. And so we're encouraged."

Relations key to the peace process

Feller 7/2(Ben, Staff Writer@The Associated Press, 2010, "Obama goal: prod direct Israeli-Palestinian talks", http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/content/article/2010/07/02/AR2010070203709.html, accessed 7/8/10)jn

Hoping for a breakthrough, President [Barack Obama](http://www.whorunsgov.com/Profiles/Barack_Obama) will try to accelerate the prospects of face-to-face peace talks between Israelis and Palestinians when he meets Tuesday with Israeli Prime Minister Benjamin Netanyahu, White House officials said Friday. Obama's latest personal venture into the vexing Mideast peace process comes as his special envoy, [George Mitchell](http://www.whorunsgov.com/Profiles/George_Mitchell), has shuttled for weeks between the two sides in search of common ground. The White House hopes to pivot from these so-called proximity talks to direct negotiations between the parties, and soon. "The gaps have narrowed," said Daniel Shapiro, senior Middle East director at the National Security Council, told reporters on Friday. "And we believe there are opportunities to further narrow those gaps, to allow the sides to take that next step to the direct talks. And so we're encouraged." The White House is billing that effort as the primary thrust of the Obama-Netanyahu meeting, one that will also cover efforts to halt Iran's pursuit of nuclear weaponry, conflict on the Gaza Strip and other regional security challenges. The session will be the fifth between the two leaders, and will be watched closely. This was the Netanyahu visit that was supposed to happen on June 1, but that sit-down got scuttled after Israel's deadly raid on May 31 on a flotilla aiming to break the Israeli blockade on Gaza. The raid caused an international uproar, injecting new tension into Israel's relations with the U.S. and other allies. Such setbacks have defined the back-and-forth Mideast peace effort for years. Yet in previewing the Netanyahu visit, White House national security officials sought to emphasize that US-Israeli cooperation is strong and that momentum is building. "In no way do we perceive a rift," Shapiro said when asked about the view that the relationship had weakened under Obama. Netanyahu has called for direct talks with Palestinians to begin again. Palestinian President Mahmoud Abbas told Israeli reporters this week that the borders of a future Palestinian state and security relations with Israel are the two issues on the table, and that if an agreement on them is reached, direct talks can resume. Obama, meanwhile, has committed to "spend a lot of time and energy and political capital" on keeping the two sides moving toward a breakthrough as he told Abbas in their own Oval Office meeting on June 9. He has called on Israelis to curb disputed settlement activity and to recognize progress on security on the part of the Palestinians. Obama says Palestinians must show more gains in security and must end incitement against Israel.

Impact - Middle East Peace

Relations are key to the Middle East peace process

Feller 7/6(Ben, Staff Writer@The Associated Press, 2010, "What Rift? Obama, Netanyahu Say Bond 'Unbreakable'", http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/content/article/2010/07/06/AR2010070600322.html, accessed 7/8/10)jn

Peace talks. Obama prodded for direct peace talks to resume between Israelis and Palestinians after weeks in which the U.S. has served as an indirect mediator. "I believe that Prime Minister Netanyahu wants peace. I think he's willing to take risks for peace," he said. Netanyahu said much the same about himself but unveiled no ideas on ending the standoff. Palestinian negotiator Saeb Erekat said Netanyahu must choose between settlements and peace. "We want to resume direct negotiations, but the problem is that the land that is supposed to be a Palestinian state is being eaten up by settlements," he told The Associated Press.

**Impact – Middle East Peace**

A successful Middle East peace process key to preventing conflict in the Middle East

Palmer 9 (Robert, writer for Street Insider, http://www.articlealley.com/article\_934971\_51.html) GAT

If not now, when? That was the question posed to President Barack Obama by Jordan's King Abdullah, who met with the President in Washington last week. He warned that unless headway was achieved in the dormant peace process, the Middle East could be heading toward renewed open conflict. Speaking to a group of Washington diplomats, pundits, politicians and journalists, the Jordanian monarch said he was truly worried by the prevailing trend developing in his region. "I do not want to talk about missed opportunities," King Abdullah said. "I want to focus on the urgency of not missing any more."

Instability in the Middle East could easily escalate to global thermonuclear war.

Steinbach 2 (John, DC Iraq Coalition, Centre for Research on Globalization, 3/3/02, <http://www.globalresearch.ca/articles/STE203A.html>) GAT

Meanwhile, the existence of an arsenal of mass destruction in such an unstable region in turn has serious implications for future arms control and disarmament negotiations, and even the threat of nuclear war. Seymour Hersh warns, "Should war break out in the Middle East again,... or should any Arab nation fire missiles against Israel, as the Iraqis did, a nuclear escalation, once unthinkable except as a last resort, would now be a strong probability."(41) and Ezar Weissman, Israel's current President said "The nuclear issue is gaining momentum(and the) next war will not be conventional."(42) Russia and before it the Soviet Union has long been a major(if not the major) target of Israeli nukes. It is widely reported that the principal purpose of Jonathan Pollard's spying for Israel was to furnish satellite images of Soviet targets and other super sensitive data relating to U.S. nuclear targeting strategy. (43) (Since launching its own satellite in 1988, Israel no longer needs U.S. spy secrets.) Israeli nukes aimed at the Russian heartland seriously complicate disarmament and arms control negotiations and, at the very least, the unilateral possession of nuclear weapons by Israel is enormously destabilizing, and dramatically lowers the threshold for their actual use, if not for all out nuclear war. In the words of Mark Gaffney, "... if the familar pattern(Israel refining its weapons of mass destruction with U.S. complicity) is not reversed soon- for whatever reason- the deepening Middle East conflict could trigger a world conflagration." (44)

Impact —Middle East Peace - NPT !

Israel’s signing of the NPT hinges upon the success of the Middle East peace process

NTI 7/7 (Nuclear Threat Initiative, http://www.globalsecuritynewswire.org/gsn/nw\_20100707\_1026.php) GAT

Efforts to place unique pressure on Israel over its presumed nuclear arsenal could scuttle plans for a 2012 meeting on establishing a nuclear weapon-free zone in the Middle East, U.S. President Barack Obama said yesterday (see GSN, June 11). The Nuclear Nonproliferation Treaty's 189 member nations agreed in May to schedule a 2012 conference "on the establishment of a Middle East zone free of nuclear weapons and all other weapons of mass destruction" (see GSN, June 1). The NPT review conference statement calls for the meeting "to be attended by all states of the Middle East." In a discussion yesterday with Israeli Prime Minister Benjamin Netanyahu, Obama "emphasized that the conference will only take place if all countries feel confident that they can attend, and that any efforts to single out Israel will make the prospects of convening such a conference unlikely," Agence France-Presse quoted a White House press release as saying. Obama said Washington would seek to address related issues at the planned conference, including all varieties of weapons of mass destruction as well as security matters and monitoring and compliance issues, Haaretz reported (Barak Ravid, Haaretz, July 6). The U.S. president also said he would resist possible attempts to highlight Jerusalem's nuclear program at the International Atomic Energy Agency General Conference scheduled for November. Israel is the only Middle Eastern state believed to hold nuclear weapons, though it refuses to confirm or deny the existence of its estimated 200-warhead stockpile. Jerusalem has linked willingness to join the Nuclear Nonproliferation Treaty or to consider a nuclear weapon-free zone to success in the Middle East peace process. Obama said he "reiterated" to Netanyahu that "no change in U.S. policy" had taken place on nuclear weapons in the Middle East. "We strongly believe that, given its size, its history, the region that it's in, and the threats that are leveled against us -- against it, that Israel has unique security requirements," Obama said. "It's got to be able to respond to threats or any combination of threats in the region. And that's why we remain unwavering in our commitment to Israel's security." The Israeli prime minister expressed gratitude to Obama for "reaffirming to me in private and now in public as you did the long-standing U.S. commitments to Israel on matters of vital strategic importance" (Agence France-Presse/Google News, July 6). Meanwhile, Washington has transferred to Jerusalem an undisclosed statement affirming nuclear ties between the two governments, Haaretz reported. The United States has allegedly agreed to make civilian nuclear materials and technology available to Israel, even though Jerusalem has not joined the Nuclear Nonproliferation Treaty, Israeli army radio reported (Ravid, Haaretz). Treaty member nations urged Israel to join the pact in their consensus document negotiated in May (AFP).

**Impact - A2: No Middle East Peace**

New momentum for peace—Israeli push

Komblut and Shear 7/7(Anne and Michael, Staff Writers@The Washington Post, 2010, “Obama and Netanyahu meet to thaw relations, discuss Middle East peace process", http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/content/article/2010/07/06/AR2010070601889.html, accessed 7/8/10)jn

Israeli Prime Minister Binyamin Netanyahu offered to take "concrete steps" toward advancing the moribund Middle East peace process, saying during a closely watched meeting at the White House on Tuesday that he expects direct negotiations with the Palestinians to begin in a matter of weeks. "I think it's high time to begin direct talks," Netanyahu told reporters in the Oval Office. His remarks came during a makeup session with President Obama, their first meeting since [Israel](http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-srv/world/countries/israel.html?nav=el) raided an aid flotilla heading toward Gaza, straining relationships in the region and further complicating efforts to move the peace talks to the next phase. Obama embraced the offer, also saying that direct talks should begin in "weeks," before a freeze on Israeli settlement construction, a condition of the talks, is set to end on Sept. 26. Several important deadlines are on the horizon: In addition to the expiration of the settlement moratorium, time is running out on the "proximity talks" between the Palestinians and Israelis, which are scheduled to last through September. And Turkey -- a onetime ally of Israel that has turned bitter since the flotilla raid, in which nine Turkish citizens were killed -- is poised to assume the leadership of the U.N. Security Council that month. On Tuesday, Obama and Netanyahu were eager to demonstrate unity. The visit -- Netanyahu's fourth since Obama took office -- was carefully staged as a counterpoint to the closed-door meeting the two leaders held in March. White House officials did not arrange for that earlier visit to be photographed, a diplomatic slight that reflected Obama's displeasure with Israel's plans, announced in March as Vice President Biden was visiting the region, to build 1,600 housing units in a disputed area of Jerusalem. This time, with camera shutters whirring around them, Obama sat alongside Netanyahu and challenged the notion of any rift between the allies. "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, that our commitment to Israel's security has been unwavering. And, in fact, there aren't any concrete policies that you could point to that would contradict that," Obama said. He acknowledged that Netanyahu has to make "difficult choices" and that the two have "robust discussions" from time to time. "But the fact of the matter is that I've trusted Prime Minister Netanyahu since I met him before I was elected president, and have said so both publicly and privately," Obama said.

Impact – NPT

Relations key to Middle East NPT—prevents Israeli first strike

Malin 6/8(Martin, Executive Director of the Project on Managing the Atom@The Belfer Center, 2010, "Four reasons the US could get Israel to talk about a Middle East free of weapons of mass destruction; It won't be easy, but without Israel, there can be no meaningful talks on creating a WMD-free zone in the Middle East", The Christian Science Monitor, Lexis)jn

Two days before the flotilla fiasco, a UN conference aimed at strengthening the Nuclear Nonproliferation Treaty endorsed a plan for ridding the Middle East of all nuclear, chemical, and biological weapons. Eliminating all such weapons in the Middle East would seem to be an impossibly ambitious goal. In fact, it is not ambitious enough. As planning for a 2012 region-wide conference to discuss a WMD-free zone begins, the United States must insist on linking it to a regional peace process. Why? Because Israel, which is widely believed to possess nuclear weapons, will not abandon its most powerful deterrent while some of its neighbors refuse to establish diplomatic relations. And without Israel's participation, there can be no meaningful talks on creating a WMD-free zone in the Middle East. Arab States and Israel have tried - and failed - to address these issues in tandem before. In the 1990s, following the Madrid peace conference, regional arms control and security talks collapsed when Egypt insisted that Israel's nuclear weapons be placed on the agenda. Israel refused, unwilling to let go of its policy of nuclear ambiguity. Why should we expect a different outcome this time? First, Israel - though still reluctant to engage in any discussion of its nuclear weapons - faces a looming strategic choice. Iran's advancing nuclear capabilities are threatening Israel's nuclear monopoly. Military action against Iran may forestall Iran's nuclear development, but is not likely to prevent it. A nuclear-capable Iran will require Israel to adopt an active, unambiguous nuclear posture - a dangerous and costly prospect that Israel would rather avoid. Israel has strong incentives to use regional security discussions to constrain Iran's nuclear development. Second, Arab states are nervous about Israeli-Iranian tension, fearing both the rise of a nuclear Iran and the consequences of US or Israeli military action against Iran. They will support the convening of regional talks that place limits on Iran, address long-standing territorial issues with Israel, and reduce the chances of another debilitating war in the region. Third, Iran has good reason not to spoil regional talks. Joining a regional process would present Iran with a clear chance to break free of its growing isolation and demonstrate its peaceful intentions if they are genuine. A negotiation involving Israel would also put Iran's rhetoric to a more rigorous test. And if Iran fails this test, it will face a more united regional coalition of states as a consequence. Finally, outside powers have bigger stakes in Middle Eastern stability than they did in the recent past. China and Russia have vital and growing energy and economic interests. France recently opened a military base in the Persian Gulf. The US has troops deployed in the heart of the region. Proliferation and war in the Middle East will affect every region of the world. The major powers understand the need for agreed-upon security rules to promote Middle East stability. Getting the parties to the negotiating table won't mean they'll see eye to eye. To prevent yet another failure of Middle East diplomacy, the US has a crucial role to play in the organization of the proposed 2012 conference. It must steer the parties of the region toward a process that is incremental and continuous, encouraging initially modest and reversible commitments to build confidence and security along the way. A conference to discuss a WMD-free zone is only the first step in a long process. Israel will need particular reassurance from the US to move forward. The scope of negotiations must be broad and include not only regional arms control and disarmament, but also nonproliferation and peace-process issues. The goal should be no less than a settlement of territorial disputes involving Israel, diplomatic relations between Israel and the rest of the region, and the creation of a zone free of chemical, biological, and nuclear weapons and their delivery systems. The results of negotiations must include a verification regime for monitoring compliance with disarmament commitments, and region-wide acceptance of the strongest possible safeguards to ensure that nuclear energy development in the Middle East remains peaceful.

Impact – NPT

Israel is key to the success of the NPT

Idiz 5/3 (Semih, writer for the Daily News, http://www.hurriyetdailynews.com/n.php?n=israel-remains-key-to-success-of-npt-summit-2010-05-03) GAT

The month-long United Nations conference on the Non-Proliferation Treaty, or NPT, opened in New York on Monday. Under great pressure from Washington and other European capitals it aims at forcing Iran to comply with Western demands on its nuclear program. The Barack Obama administration would clearly like to secure unanimity on this score among the participating nations, but is very unlikely to do so. The main sticking point remains the same, of course. More and more countries, particularly but not exclusively in the Middle East, are asking why Israel’s nuclear posture is not central to Western discussions about Iran if indeed the aim is for a nuclear-free Middle East. While Israel continues to remain ambiguous about whether it has nuclear weapons or not, this attitude is taken as confirmation by many that it actually does. The argument is a simple one. If Israel does not have such weapons then it should have no problems being a party to the NPT. If it insists on not signing the treaty then it is either using this issue politically, or is actually concerned that the NPT will monitor and limit its nuclear capabilities. Therefore, whether Israel actually has these weapons or not is politically irrelevant. What is relevant however is that as long as this stance of Israel’s continues, the international support for Washington over Iran will get weaker over time. Thus, while Western countries will be working hard to mount international pressure on Iran at the NPT summit, other countries will be doing the opposite and trying to increase international pressure on Israel. Turkey has already made its position clear with Prime Minister Recep Tayyip Erdoğan utilizing every opportunity presented to him to highlight Israel’s nuclear capabilities, which he takes to be a “fact” while terming reports that Iran is after nuclear weapons as no more than “gossip.” It is clear that there is a lot of dissatisfaction in Washington and Israel over this position from Turkey. What must be increasing the annoyance is that Erdoğan’s line of argumentation is spreading. Egypt, a key regional country, is also pursuing this line strongly today. As matters stand, Cairo has been using this argument for years anyway. Egyptian president Hosni Mubarak has gone even further by suggesting in 2007 that if nuclear disarmament, which includes Israel, cannot be secured for the whole region, his country may have little choice but to develop such weapons as well. This is precisely what the Obama administration does not want to hear. But it is caught between the horns of a very serious dilemma. After all, Turkey and Egypt – which are calling on Israel to sign the NPT – are key U.S. allies in a part of the world that is vital to American interests. Israel, on the other hand, is a country that it has to support come what may for a host of reasons, most of which are well-known to the world. In the meantime press reports indicate that there is further annoyance in Washington over Turkey and Brazil’s attempts to broker some kind of a deal between Iran and the West. This effort seems to have driven a wedge between the Western members of the Security Council and Russia and China. Just when Washington felt it was getting closer to getting the support of these two permanent members of the Security Council, Moscow and Beijing announced that they were willing to give non-permanent Security Council members Turkey and Brazil more time to see if the latter could indeed broker a deal with Tehran. It is clear that Moscow and Beijing, which are cool to sanctions against Iran, are buying time as a result of the Turkish-Brazilian initiative, which also provides breathing space for Iranian President Mahmoud Ahmadinejad, who is also expected to attend the NPT summit in New York. The general belief in the West is that Iran has no intention of complying with Western demands and is only using Turkey and Brazil. This remains to be seen, although there is evidence to suggest that it will be hard to get Iran to comply with any deal that meets the bottom-line demands of the West. It will be interesting to see, therefore, how Washington manages to juggle its way out of the current situation, which points more to an impasse at the NPT conference than a breakthrough. But what is clear is that it will have less leverage with each passing day of the conference as long as Israel is kept out of the discussions. Therefore the key to a Middle East free of nuclear weapons is not only Iran but also Israel. Iran is also relying on Israel to remain defiant on this score and it will not be disappointed in this since no Israeli politician, at a time when the country has been taken over by hard-line right-wingers, is in a position to take the country down the path of nuclear disarmament. One can also assume that this is why the Obama administration does not want to see Ahmadinejad in New York and is trying to dissuade him from coming. It is clear that Iran is not as alone in the world as the West would like to think, and Washington obviously does not want this fact to become apparent at a time when it is trying to orchestrate international pressure against Tehran.

Impact - NPT Solves Prolif

The perception of compliance to NPT obligations is crucial to stopping runaway proliferation

Dunn 9 (Senior vice president of Science Applications International Corp, Nonproliferation Review, Summer 09, 2(12), pp. 150-151) GAT

In the early 1960s, there was a growing fear that widespread proliferation of nuclear weapons was possibly unavoidable. President John F. Kennedy warned in 1963 that a world with many dozens of nuclear weapon states might emerge. This fear of runaway proliferation gave urgency to the negotiation of a nonproliferation treaty, not least because of the belief that growing worldwide use of nuclear power would place access to nuclear weapons material in the hands of many countries.21 Such warnings of runaway proliferation, however, could well have become a self-fulfilling prophecy. Fearful of a world of nuclear powers, many countries might have sought nuclear weapons lest they be left behind. Responding to such fears, the United States took actions to enhance the nuclear security of its European non-nuclear allies. In parallel, the United States, the Soviet Union, and many other countries joined together to create what became the nonproliferation regime. The NPT was and remains a key part of that regime. Steadily growing membership in the NPT after its opening for signature in 1968\*including critical countries in Europe and Asia\*provided a valuable symbol that demonstrated to many countries that runaway proliferation was not the wave of the future. So did the prospect of an international system of nuclear safeguards\*run by a then-new International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA)\*to prevent diversion of nuclear weapon materials from peaceful nuclear uses. In effect, partly because of more traditional security mechanisms and partly due to the growing NPT membership, early fears of a world of runaway global proliferation became a self-denying prophecy. Today, fears have again emerged that runaway proliferation could develop. It is often argued that the spread of nuclear weapons is at a ‘‘tipping point,’’ that there is a danger of ‘‘cascading’’ proliferation, and that we could be entering a ‘‘new nuclear age.’’22 In this context, however, widespread adherence to the NPT alone will not suffice to counter fears of nuclear weapon proliferation. Rather, the NPT’s contribution to countering fears of runaway proliferation will depend heavily on whether there is a widespread perception that countries are complying fully with their NPT obligations.

**Impact – Prolif Bad**

Widespread proliferation leads to nuclear war

Utgoff,’02 (Victo, PhD from Purdue University, Deputy Director for the Strategy, Forces, & Resources Division of the Institute for Defense Analysis Survival, 44(2), pp. 87-90) GAT

First, the dynamics of getting to a highly proliferated world could be very dangerous. Proliferating states will feel great pressures to obtain nuclear weapons and delivery systems before any potential opponent does. Those who succeed in outracing an opponent may consider preemptive nuclear war before the opponent becomes capable of nuclear retaliation. Those who lag behind might try to preempt their opponent's nuclear programme or defeat the opponent using conventional forces. And those who feel threatened but are incapable of building nuclear weapons may still be able to join in this arms race by building other types of weapons of mass destruction, such as biological weapons. Second, as the world approaches complete proliferation, the hazards posed by nuclear weapons today will be magnified many times over. Fifty or more nations capable of launching nuclear weapons means that the risk of nuclear accidents that could cause serious damage not only to their own populations and environments, but those of others, is hugely increased. The chances of such weapons falling into the hands of renegade military units or terrorists is far greater, as is the number of nations carrying out hazardous manufacturing and storage activities. Increased prospects for the occasional nuclear shootout Worse still, in a highly proliferated world there would be more frequent opportunities for the use of nuclear weapons. And more frequent opportunities means shorter expected times between conflicts in which nuclear weapons get used, unless the probability of use at any opportunity is actually zero. To be sure, some theorists on nuclear deterrence appear to think that in any confrontation between two states known to have reliable nuclear capabilities, the probability of nuclear weapons being used is zero.' These theorists think that such states will be so fearful of escalation to nuclear war that they would always avoid or terminate confrontations between them, short of even conventional war. They believe this to be true even if the two states have different cultures or leaders with very eccentric personalities. History and human nature, however, suggest that they are almost surely wrong. History includes instances in which states known to possess nuclear weapons did engage in direct conventional conflict. China and Russia fought battles along their common border even after both had nuclear weapons. Moreover, logic suggests that if states with nuclear weapons always avoided conflict with one another, surely states without nuclear weapons would avoid conflict with states that had them. Again, history provides counter-examples. Egypt attacked Israel in 1973 even though it saw Israel as a nuclear power at the time. Argentina invaded the Falkland Islands and fought Britain's efforts to take them back, even though Britain had nuclear weapons. Those who claim that two states with reliable nuclear capabilities to devastate each other will not engage in conventional conflict risking nuclear war also assume that any leader from any culture would not choose suicide for his nation. But history provides unhappy examples of states whose leaders were ready to choose suicide for themselves and their fellow citizens. Hitler tried to impose a 'victory or destruction' policy on his people as Nazi Germany was going down to defeat.' And Japan's war minister, during debates on how to respond to the American atomic bombing, suggested 'Would it not be wondrous for the whole nation to be destroyed like a beautiful flower?" If leaders are willing to engage in conflict with nuclear- armed nations, use of nuclear weapons in any particular instance may not be likely, but its probability would still be dangerously significant. In particular, human nature suggests that the threat of retaliation with nuclear weapons is not a reliable guarantee against a disastrous first use of these weapons. While national leaders and their advisors everywhere are usually talented and experienced people, even their most important decisions cannot be counted on to be the product of well-informed and thorough assessments of all options from all relevant points of view. This is especially so when the stakes are so large as to defy assessment and there are substantial pressures to act quickly, as could be expected in intense and fast-moving crises between nuclear-armed states. Instead, like other human beings, national leaders can be seduced by wishful thinking. They can misinterpret the words or actions of opposing leaders. Their advisors may produce answers that they think the leader wants to hear, or coalesce around what they know is an inferior decision because the group urgently needs the confidence or the sharing of responsibility that results from settling on something. Moreover, leaders may not recognise clearly where their personal or party interests diverge from those of their citizens. Under great stress, human beings can lose their ability to think carefully. They can refuse to believe that the worst could really happen, oversimplify the problem at hand, think in terms of simplistic analogies and play hunches. The intuitive rules for how individuals should respond to insults or signs of weakness in an opponent may too readily suggest a rash course of action. Anger, fear, greed, ambition and pride can all lead to bad decisions. The desire for a decisive solution to the problem at hand may lead to an unnecessarily extreme course of action. We can almost hear the kinds of words that could flow from discussions in nuclear crises or war. 'These people are not willing to die for this interest'. 'No sane person would actually use such weapons'. 'Perhaps the opponent will back down if we show him we mean business by demonstrating a willingness to use nuclear weapons'. 'If I don't hit them back really hard, I am going to be driven from office, if not killed'. Whether right or wrong, in the stressful atmosphere of a nuclear crisis or war, such words from others, or silently from within, might resonate too readily with a harried leader. Thus, both history and human nature suggest that nuclear deterrence can be expected to fail from time to time, and we are fortunate it has not happened yet. But the threat of nuclear war is not just a matter of a few weapons being used. It could get much worse. Once a conflict reaches the point where nuclear weapons are employed, the stresses felt by the leaderships would rise enormously. These stresses can be expected to further degrade their decision-

<CONTINUED>

Impact – Prolif Bad

<CONTINUED>

making. The pressures to force the enemy to stop fighting or to surrender could argue for more forceful and decisive military action, which might be the right thing to do in the circumstances, but maybe not. And the horrors of the carnage already suffered may be seen as justification for visiting the most devastating punishment possible on the enemy.'Again, history demonstrates how intense conflict can lead the combatants to escalate violence to the maximum possible levels. In the Second World War, early promises not to bomb cities soon gave way to essentially indiscriminate bombing of civilians. The war between Iran and Iraq during the 1980s led to the use of chemical weapons on both sides and exchanges of missiles against each other's cities. And more recently, violence in the Middle East escalated in a few months from rocks and small arms to heavy weapons on one side, and from police actions to air strikes and armoured attacks on the other. Escalation of violence is also basic human nature. Once the violence starts, retaliatory exchanges of violent acts can escalate to levels unimagined by the participants beforehand.' Intense and blinding anger is a common response to fear or humiliation or abuse. And such anger can lead us to impose on our opponents whatever levels of violence are readily accessible. In sum, widespread proliferation is likely to lead to an occasional shoot-out with nuclear weapons, and that such shoot-outs will have a substantial probability of escalating to the maximum destruction possible with the weapons at hand. Unless nuclear proliferation is stopped, we are headed toward a world that will mirror the American Wild West of the late 1800s.With most, if not all, nations wearing nuclear 'six-shooters' on their hips, the world may even be a more polite place than it is today, but every once in a while we will all gather on a hill to bury the bodies of dead cities or even whole nations. This kind of world is in no nation's interest. The means for preventing it must be pursued vigorously. And, as argued above, a most powerful way to prevent it or slow its emergence is to encourage the more capable states to provide reliable protection to others against aggression, even when that aggression could be backed with nuclear weapons. In other words, the world needs at least one state, preferably several, willing and able to play the role of sheriff, or to be members of a sheriff's posse, even in the face of nuclear threats. A world of proliferation eliminates all current checks on nuclear warfare (popular dissent, logic, alliances etc) ensuring innumerable nuclear conflict to magnitudes unimaginable in the status quo.

Impact – Egyptian Prolif (1/2)

Egypt is on the brink of pulling out of the NPT - They’ve protested before, and they want Israel to sign it

NTI 10 (Nuclear Threat Initiative Research Library, http://www.nti.org/e\_research/profiles/Egypt/Nuclear/) GAT

Meanwhile, as noted, Egypt's position vis-à-vis the nonproliferation regime has been two-fold since NPT ratification. While consistently leading efforts to establish a Middle East Nuclear Weapon-Free Zone (and since 1990 a WMD-Free Zone), Egypt has also protested key components of the nonproliferation regime for their lack of universality (i.e. because Israel remains outside the NPT and other treaties restricting weapons of mass destruction). Egypt has therefore refused to join the IAEA Additional Protocol and the Chemical Weapons Convention, and to ratify the Comprehensive Nuclear Test Ban Treaty, the African Nuclear Weapon-Free Zone (the Pelindaba Treaty), and the Biological and Toxin Weapons Convention.[25] At the 1995 NPT Review and Extension Conference, Egypt used the threat of blocking consensus on the indefinite extension of the treaty.[26

**Egyptian proliferation creates a nuclear arms race in the Middle East and creates instability**

Cristiani 6, (Dario, contributor to the Power and Interest News Report, http://www.gees.org/documentos/Documen-01740.pdf) GAT

Egypt, which has been damaged politically by the Israel-Lebanon crisis, has been the first country that has claimed officially that it is resuming nuclear research. The Egyptian announcement is also probably a hint for the Arab world as a whole, since Arabs criticized Cairo's position during the crisis in Lebanon strongly. This could be an Egyptian attempt to recover its central historical position in the Muslim world, which is rooted in its cultural power, its demographic hold and its strategic geographical position. Furthermore, during the last few weeks, Turkey has also announced its will to build three nuclear reactors. This scenario could lead other regional powers, such as Saudi Arabia and Syria, to revive their own nuclear programs. The development of an Iranian nuclear capability may have started a nuclear proliferation race in the region, which could pose a major challenge to overall stability in the Middle East At present, in the broader Middle East region, the right to develop nuclear energy is turning into a symbol of national independence because of the perception in the Islamic world that the West uses double standards against Muslim countries that want to gain nuclear energy technology; these detractors argue that Western attitudes toward the Israeli nuclear program have been a clear example of this hypocrisy. In these countries, the quest for nuclear energy is not tied only to the enlargement of their deterrence capabilities; it is also seen as a policy option to guarantee their national economic growth. It is clear, however, that at the same time that these states declare the will to pursue a civilian nuclear program, their research work also involves the ability to obtain at a later date the potential to create nuclear weapons. During the past few years, Egypt has been the prime example of this approach. While Egypt has called for a Middle East free of nuclear weapons, it has pursued a nuclear capability suspected of being both for civil and military purposes. In 2004, several international newspapers argued that Libya traded nuclear and missile technology and information with Egypt and that Libya has acted as an intermediary for Egypt with North Korea. Moreover, in early 2005, a dossier from the International Atomic Energy Agency (I.A.E.A.) said that it suspected that Egyptian nuclear experiments in 2001 could have been used in attempts to develop a nuclear weapon. According to the report, I.A.E.A. inspectors discovered elements of actinides and fission products near an Egyptian nuclear facility, which may be symptomatic of work on plutonium separation.

Impact – Egyptian Prolif (2/2)

Instability in the Middle East could easily escalate to global thermonuclear war.

Steinbach 2 (John, DC Iraq Coalition, Centre for Research on Globalization, 3/3/02, <http://www.globalresearch.ca/articles/STE203A.html>) GAT

Meanwhile, the existence of an arsenal of mass destruction in such an unstable region in turn has serious implications for future arms control and disarmament negotiations, and even the threat of nuclear war. Seymour Hersh warns, "Should war break out in the Middle East again,... or should any Arab nation fire missiles against Israel, as the Iraqis did, a nuclear escalation, once unthinkable except as a last resort, would now be a strong probability."(41) and Ezar Weissman, Israel's current President said "The nuclear issue is gaining momentum(and the) next war will not be conventional."(42) Russia and before it the Soviet Union has long been a major(if not the major) target of Israeli nukes. It is widely reported that the principal purpose of Jonathan Pollard's spying for Israel was to furnish satellite images of Soviet targets and other super sensitive data relating to U.S. nuclear targeting strategy. (43) (Since launching its own satellite in 1988, Israel no longer needs U.S. spy secrets.) Israeli nukes aimed at the Russian heartland seriously complicate disarmament and arms control negotiations and, at the very least, the unilateral possession of nuclear weapons by Israel is enormously destabilizing, and dramatically lowers the threshold for their actual use, if not for all out nuclear war. In the words of Mark Gaffney, "... if the familar pattern(Israel refining its weapons of mass destruction with U.S. complicity) is not reversed soon- for whatever reason- the deepening Middle East conflict could trigger a world conflagration." (44)

AFF—Non Unique

U.S. Israeli relations are low

Sherwood 10(Harriet, Staffwriter@The Irish Times, 6/28, "'Tectonic rift' in relations between Israel and US ally", Lexis)jn

RELATIONS BETWEEN Israel and its most staunch ally, the US, have suffered a tectonic rift , according to Israel s ambassador to Washington. Michael Oren briefed Israeli diplomats on the deterioration between the countries ahead of Israeli prime minister Binyamin Netanyahu s visit to the White House early next month. Mr Oren said the situation had moved beyond a crisis that eventually passes. There is no crisis in Israel-US relations, because in a crisis there are ups and downs, he told the diplomats in Jerusalem. Relations are in the state of a tectonic rift in which continents are drifting apart. His analysis will alarm Israel s political establishment, which is feeling isolated internationally and under pressure to take concrete steps over the blockade of Gaza and settlement building in the West Bank. Mr Oren said President Barack Obama made judgments about Israel on the basis of cold calculation, in contrast to predecessors George W Bush and Bill Clinton, who were motivated by historical and ideological factors. He suggested Mr [Obama](http://www.lexisnexis.com/us/lnacademic/search/XMLCrossLinkSearch.do?bct=A&risb=21_T9698950070&returnToId=20_T9698951796&csi=142626&A=0.0029389981132246223&sourceCSI=9369&indexTerm=%23PE000A0BO%23&searchTerm=Obama%20&indexType=P" \t "_parent) was less likely to be influenced by pro-Israel supporters inside or outside the White House. This is a one-man show, he was quoted as saying.

AFF—Non Unique—Housing Developments

Non Unique – The US and Israeli relations are dead – housing project

Lobe 10 (Jim, Asia Times, Mar 17, 2010, http://www.atimes.com/atimes/Middle\_East/LC17Ak01.html)KFC

While the ongoing public crisis was clearly sparked by the coincidence of Biden's visit and the East Jerusalem housing announcement - almost universally described by the mainstream US media as a "slap in the face" at the vice president and by extension at Obama himself - its seriousness appears to be rooted in what Biden told Netanyahu and other top Israeli officials in private. According to an account in Israel's mass-circulation Yediot Ahronoth newspaper, Biden "warned his Israeli hosts that since many people in the Muslim world perceived a connection between Israel's actions and US policy, any decision about construction that undermines Palestinian rights in East Jerusalem could have an impact on the personal safety of American troops fighting against Islamic terrorism". "This is starting to get dangerous for us," Biden reportedly said. "What you're doing here undermines the security of our troops who are fighting in Iraq, Afghanistan and Pakistan. That endangers us and it endangers regional peace.'"

AFF—No Link—Israel Doesn’t Care

Turn – Israel has no consideration for the status of US troops in the Middle East

Karon 10 (Tony, TIME.com, Mar 25, 2010, http://www.atimes.com/atimes/Middle\_East/LC25Ak02.html)KFC

A peace process that requires Israel and the Palestinians to reach a bilateral consensus on the distribution of land and power under the prodding of US matchmakers is a non-starter - and therefore unlikely to lead to a goal which is of increasing urgency in America's national interest. Arguably, it's increasingly important even for the Israelis, since the status quo has already eroded prospects for a two-state solution to the point where both sides may be consigned to an even longer and bitterer conflict. Hence, the necessity of correcting Biden: progress in the Middle East will not come until the US changes Israel's cost-benefit analysis for maintaining the status quo. The only Israeli leader capable of accepting the parameters of a two-state peace with the Palestinians, which are already widely known, is one who can convincingly demonstrate to his electorate that the alternatives are worse. Right now, without real pressure, without real cost, with nothing but words, there is simply no downside to the status quo for Israel. Until there is, things are unlikely to change, no matter the peril to US troops throughout the Middle East.

AFF—Link Turn—Withdrawal Helps Relations

U.S. Israel relations strained now—withdrawal solves

Haselkorn 10(Avigdor, Strategy Analyst, April 9, “Relations of Mutual Liability”, http://www.haaretz.com/print-edition/opinion/relations-of-mutual-liability-1.733, accessed 7/8/10)jn

The bottom line is that Middle Eastern radicals have been able to turn the tables on America, and indirectly, Israel as well. Instead of Iran and Syria feeling hemmed in by the expanded presence of U.S. forces on their borders, it is Jerusalem that is increasingly fearful of a multi-pronged attack. Rather than keeping regional radicals in check, the U.S. deployment has become a handicap for Israel. The setback for Israel is due to U.S. efforts to pacify Iraq and Afghanistan by co-opting local adversaries, coupled by the Obama administration's principal shift toward an "extended hand" policy vis-a-vis its regional enemies. In turn, any Israeli military initiative is viewed in Washington as "unhelpful," if not downright dangerous, as it may cause an Arab/Muslim backlash against America and endanger U.S. regional assets. Last September, Zbigniew Brzezinski, president Jimmy Carter's national security adviser in the 1970s, even went so far as recommending that U.S. pilots shoot down Israeli aircraft if they crossed into Iraq's airspace to attack Iran's nuclear facilities and refused to turn back. As a result of this approach, the U.S.-Israeli relationship today is one of mutual liability. Israel is increasingly perceived as a strategic liability in Washington, because its actions threaten to derail the courting of Arab/Muslim radicals deemed central to America's global "war" on terror. At the same time, the United States is a growing burden on Israel, given the Obama administration's efforts to deny it the strategic initiative that is vital for preserving its national security. In hindsight, the first Gulf War model, which saw the withdrawal of U.S. troops from Iraq as soon as the guns fell silent - even though Saddam Hussein remained in power, a move that was roundly criticized in Israel - was more in tandem with long-range Israeli security interests than the model of the second conflict. Ironically, Jerusalem and the Obama administration now share a desire to see the U.S. troops return home: The sooner America's soldiers leave Iraq, the quicker the two countries' security interests will become more compatible and bilateral relations will be more harmonious.

AFF—Relations Cause Terrorism

Our constant interaction with Israel has actually served to make our terrorism problem worse, not make it better

Mearsheimer and Walt 6 (John, Prof. of Poli. Sci. at Univ. of Chicago; Stephen, Prof. of International Affairs at Harvard; London Review of Books, Vol. 28, No. 6, pp. 3-12) GAT

Beginning in the 1990s, and even more after 9/11, US support has been justified by the claim that both states are threatened by terrorist groups originating in the Arab and Muslim world, and by ‘rogue states’ that back these groups and seek weapons of mass destruction. This is taken to mean not only that Washington should give Israel a free hand in dealing with the Palestinians and not press it to make concessions until all Palestinian terrorists are imprisoned or dead, but that the US should go after countries like Iran and Syria. Israel is thus seen as a crucial ally in the war on terror, because its enemies are America’s enemies. In fact, Israel is a liability in the war on terror and the broader effort to deal with rogue states. ‘Terrorism’ is not a single adversary, but a tactic employed by a wide array of political groups. The terrorist organisations that threaten Israel do not threaten the United States, except when it intervenes against them (as in Lebanon in 1982). Moreover, Palestinian terrorism is not random violence directed against Israel or ‘the West’; it is largely a response to Israel’s prolonged campaign to colonise the West Bank and Gaza Strip. More important, saying that Israel and the US are united by a shared terrorist threat has the causal relationship backwards: the US has a terrorism problem in good part because it is so closely allied with Israel, not the other way around. Support for Israel is not the only source of anti-American terrorism, but it is an important one, and it makes winning the war on terror more difficult. There is no question that many al-Qaida leaders, including Osama bin Laden, are motivated by Israel’s presence in Jerusalem and the plight of the Palestinians. Unconditional support for Israel makes it easier for extremists to rally popular support and to attract recruits.