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Israeli Prime Minister Benjamin Netanyahu’s nephew Jonathan Ben-Artzi said it best in 2010[[1]](#footnote-1), QUOTE: “If Americans truly are our friends, they should shake us up and take away the keys, because right now we are driving drunk, and without this wake-up call, we will soon find ourselves in the ditch of an undemocratic, doomed state.” UNQUOTE. Please join us as we help Israel find its true path and fulfill its destiny as we affirm that The United States should significantly reform its policy toward one or more countries in the Middle East.

OBSERVATION 1. Our DEFINITIONS

**Significant**: “large enough to be noticed or have an effect” *(Merriam-Webster Online Dict. 2014* [*http://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/significant*](http://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/significant)*)*

**Policy**: “a high-level overall plan embracing the general goals and acceptable procedures especially of a governmental body” *(Merriam-Webster Online Dict. 2014* [*http://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/policy?show=0&t=1402599657*](http://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/policy?show=0&t=1402599657)*)*

OBSERVATION 2. INHERENCY: the policies of the Status Quo.

$3 billion per year in military aid to Israel.

Jeremy M. Sharp 2014. (Specialist in Middle Eastern Affairs, with Congressional Research Service) 11 Apr 2014 “U.S. Foreign Aid to Israel” <http://www.fas.org/sgp/crs/mideast/RL33222.pdf> (brackets added)

During his March 2013 visit to Israel, President Obama pledged that the United States would continue to provide Israel with multi-year commitments of military aid subject to the approval of Congress. The FY2014 Consolidated Appropriations Act (P.L. 113-76) provides the President’s full $3.1 billion request in FMF [foreign military financing] for Israel.

OBSERVATION 3. HARMS

HARM 1. Taxpayer rip-off, or Robin Hood in reverse. We’re borrowing money we don’t have to give to a country that doesn’t need it.

Sub-point A. The Link: Israel is a wealthy country – they should be aiding us

Doug Bandow 2012. (J.D. from Stanford; senior fellow at the Cato Institute, specializing in foreign policy and civil liberties; worked as special assistant to President Reagan ) The Case for Ending Aid to Israel 5 June 2012 <http://www.cato.org/publications/commentary/case-ending-aid-israel>

Israel does not need foreign aid—it is a wealthy nation with a booming hi-tech sector. Weaknesses elsewhere in the economy are largely self-inflicted through collectivist economic practices. Moreover, Israel is a regional military superpower. If anything, the transfers should run in the other direction. However, the Senate is considering legislation to extend $9 billion in loan guarantees and provide more military support. Rather than reflect warming ties, however, the extra cash indicates an election-year financial raid.

Sub-point B. The Impact: Every increase in the deficit hurts the US economy

Dr William Gale and Benjamin Harris 2011. (Gale - PhD in economics, Stanford Univ.; senior fellow at the Brookings Institution and co-director of the Urban-Brookings Tax Policy Center; former assistant professor in the Department of Economics at UCLA, and a senior economist for the Council of Economic Advisers under President George H.W. Bush; Harris - master’s degree in economics from Cornell University and a master’s degree in quantitative methods from Columbia University; senior research associate with the Economics Studies Program at the Brookings Institution) “A VAT for the United States: Part of the Solution” <http://www.taxanalysts.com/www/freefiles.nsf/Files/GALE-HARRIS-5.pdf/$file/GALE-HARRIS-5.pdf>

But even in the absence of a crisis, sustained deficits have deleterious effects, as they translate into lower national savings, higher interest rates, and increased indebtedness to foreign investors, all of which serve to reduce future national income. Gale and Orszag (2004a) estimate that a 1 percent of GDP increase in the deficit will raise interest rates by 25 to 35 basis points and reduce national saving by 0.5 to 0.8 percentage points of GDP.

HARM 2. Human rights violations. Military aid is used to commit human rights abuses and damages America’s reputation

Josh Ruebner 2013 .(Jewish political activist; graduate degree in International Affairs from Johns Hopkins University School of Advanced International Studies; former  Analyst in Middle East Affairs at Congressional Research Service ) <http://thehill.com/blogs/congress-blog/foreign-policy/285991-israel-lobby-to-push-for-aid-despite-sequestration-cuts#ixzz34if3Sjzv>

Beyond the fiscal absurdity of this policy, what makes it even more galling is that U.S. taxpayers are thereby made complicit in Israel’s systematic violation of Palestinian human rights, its military occupation and illegal colonization of Palestinian land, and its apartheid policies toward Palestinians which deny them freedom and self-determination. This military aid continues to flow despite the fact that U.S. laws such as the Arms Export Control Act and Foreign Assistance Act are designed to prevent foreign countries from misusing U.S. aid to commit human rights abuses.  This tangible support for Israel’s oppression of the Palestinians guts the credibility of U.S. claims to promote human rights and makes it exponentially more difficult for the United States to gain the trust of people around the world whose support is needed to confront the scourge of terrorism.

HARM 3. Fuels terrorism. US military aid for Israel motivates jihadi terrorism

Benjamin Friedman 2011. (research fellow in defense and homeland security studies at Cato Institute; Ph.D. candidate in Political Science ; affiliate of the Security Studies Program at the Mass. Institute of Technology) 8 Feb 2011 “ Rand Paul Is Right about Israel” <http://www.cato.org/publications/commentary/rand-paul-is-right-about-israel>

In recent years, U.S. military aid to Israel has become even less tethered to a strategic rationale. The Israelis know that our domestic politics prevents us from trading aid for concessions to Palestinians. So they take our money but not our advice. What our spending does buy is ill will among Palestine's supporters, including jihadist terrorists. If we did not fund Israel, terrorists would not suddenly love Americans, but it might make some of them less inclined to kill us.

HARM 4. Weakens Israel.

While you might think that giving them cash ear-marked for military hardware would make Israel stronger, in fact it actually does the reverse. Giving money is not always the same as helping. We see this in 2 sub-points:

Sub-point A: The Link. US assistance creates weakness and dependency.

Yarden Gazit 2011. (senior researcher at Jerusalem Institute for Market Studies ) “Economic and Strategic Ramifications of American Assistance to Israel” <http://jimsisrael.org/pdf/PPusaidEnglish.pdf>

The very act of accepting American assistance impairs Israeli democracy and sovereignty. When a country receives a sizable portion of its revenues from sources other than taxpayer money (whether from its natural resources or from foreign aid), policy makers have no incentives to act in accordance with citizens’ interests or to advance the economy. This is known as the “curse of resources,” a situation in which the higher the state’s income from natural resources, the less the country is free. The political survival of leaders in countries like Venezuela, Iran, Saudi Arabia and Russia, for example, depends more on the price of oil than on the achievements of its educational system or the freedom of its citizens. When it comes to foreign aid, the result is a compounded distortion. Countries receiving humanitarian aid are continuously required to demonstrate their weakness and inability to care for their citizens in order to qualify for ongoing aid. Thus, instead of Israel’s leaders seeing their job as building Israel’s capacity to defend itself, the defense system and military industry are guided by interests to preserve Israel’s vulnerability as the prerequisite for more American aid.

Sub-point B: The Impact. Big damage to Israeli society.

Yarden Gazit 2011. (senior researcher at Jerusalem Institute for Market Studies ) “Economic and Strategic Ramifications of American Assistance to Israel” <http://jimsisrael.org/pdf/PPusaidEnglish.pdf>

The Government of Israel’s reliance on the American taxpayer sets a negative example which acts to encourage a culture of dependence. The Government invests many resources in encouraging citizens to join the workforce and in extolling initiative and entrepreneurship. Yet when a country like Israel, with its highly developed cutting-edge market, can live off someone else’s tab, these state-backed initiatives lack moral standing. In cultivating a culture of dependence, the Government of Israel causes incalculable damage to Israeli society.

OBSERVATION 4. We have a PLAN, to be implemented by Congress and the President.

1. Foreign military financing aid to Israel is phased out over 10 years.
2. Aid resumes only if Israel comes under military invasion.
3. No changes in funding for Iron Dome or Missile Defense.
4. Enforcement through normal means.
5. Net savings of funding by reducing the federal budget.
6. Plan takes effect Oct 1, 2015
7. Affirmative speeches may clarify as needed.

OBSERVATION 5. The Plan produces ADVANTAGES

ADVANTAGE 1. Reduces the federal deficit

ADVANTAGE 2. Strengthens Israel. Both of these come from…

Doug Bandow 2012. (J.D. from Stanford; senior fellow at the Cato Institute, specializing in foreign policy and civil liberties; worked as special assistant to President Reagan) The Case for Ending Aid to Israel 5 June 2012 <http://www.cato.org/publications/commentary/case-ending-aid-israel>

The financial trials facing America will worsen in coming years. Instead of continuing to borrow to subsidize other countries, Uncle Sam needs to admit that he’s broke and stop giving away money he doesn’t have. Heavily indebted Spain just announced that it was ending development assistance for Latin America. Washington should do the same, including to Israel. Far from hurting Israel, ending “aid” would be doing America’s ally a favor. Israel is likely to achieve its full potential only after it ends its unnatural dependence on Washington.

ADVANTAGE 3. Promote human rights. Suspending military aid applies pressure on Israel to better uphold human rights

Amnesty International 2014. (internationally known human rights advocacy non-profit group) ‘Trigger-happy’ Israeli army and police use reckless force in the West Bank 27 Feb 2014 <http://www.amnesty.org/en/news/trigger-happy-israeli-army-and-police-use-reckless-force-west-bank-2014-02-27> (brackets added)

Amnesty International is calling on the Israeli authorities to instruct their forces to refrain from lethal force, including the use of live fire and rubber-coated bullets, except when strictly necessary to protect lives. They must also respect the right of Palestinians to peaceful assembly. It urges the USA, the European Union and the rest of the international community to suspend all transfers of munitions, weapons and other equipment to Israel. “Without pressure from the international community the situation is unlikely to change any time soon,” said Philip Luther [Middle East and North Africa Director at Amnesty International].

ADVANTAGE 4. Israel’s foreign policy. Freeing Israel of dependence on the US would be good for Israel’s foreign policy

Prof. Brent Sasley 2013. (Assistant Professor of Political Science at Univ of Texas-Arlington) 21 Jan 2013 Should U.S. Military Aid To Israel Be Cut? <http://www.thedailybeast.com/articles/2013/01/21/should-u-s-military-aid-to-israel-be-cut.html>

In practical terms, reducing U.S. aid would remove a clear form of Israeli dependence on the United States, which hampers Israeli freedom to maneuver—a primary strategic objective from the time of David Ben-Gurion. While the focus is often on Israel’s shrugging off of U.S. pressure, standing on its own might make Israel act more responsibly when it comes to regional affairs. With less U.S. aid, Israel will be required to work harder for American support in international forums since U.S. largesse couldn’t be taken for granted anymore.

2A Evidence: Israel Military Aid

OPENING QUOTE

George Washington

George Washington, Farewell Address. <http://natsummit.org/transcripts/james_david.htm> (ellipses in original)

“… a passionate attachment of one nation for another produces a variety of evils."

INHERENCY

US has 10-year $30 billion program of military aid to Israel

Jeremy M. Sharp 2014. (Specialist in Middle Eastern Affairs, with Congressional Research Service) 11 Apr 2014 “U.S. Foreign Aid to Israel” <http://www.fas.org/sgp/crs/mideast/RL33222.pdf> (brackets added)

Israel is the largest cumulative recipient of U.S. foreign assistance since World War II. To date, the United States has provided Israel $121 billion (current, or non-inflation-adjusted, dollars) in bilateral assistance. Almost all U.S. bilateral aid to Israel is in the form of military assistance, although in the past Israel also received significant economic assistance. Strong congressional support for Israel has resulted in Israel receiving benefits not available to any other countries; for example, Israel can use some U.S. military assistance both for research and development in the United States and for military purchases from Israeli manufacturers. In addition, U.S. assistance earmarked for Israel is generally delivered in the first 30 days of the fiscal year, while most other recipients normally receive aid in installments, and Israel (as is also the case with Egypt) is permitted to use cash flow financing for its U.S. arms purchases. In addition to receiving U.S. State Department-administered foreign assistance, Israel also receives funds from annual defense appropriations bills for rocket and missile defense programs. Israel pursues some of those programs jointly with the United States. In 2007, the Bush Administration and the Israeli government agreed to a 10-year, $30 billion military aid package for the period from FY2009 to FY2018.

Obama budgeted $3.1 billion military aid to Israel for fiscal year 2015  
That number doesn’t include Iron Dome, Missile Defense, or Migration & Refugee Assistance

Jeremy M. Sharp 2014. (Specialist in Middle Eastern Affairs, with Congressional Research Service) 11 Apr 2014 “U.S. Foreign Aid to Israel” <http://www.fas.org/sgp/crs/mideast/RL33222.pdf> (brackets added)

For FY2015, the Administration is requesting $3.1 billion in FMF [foreign military financing] to Israel and $10 million in Migration and Refugee Assistance. The Missile Defense Agency’s FY2015 request for joint U.S.- Israeli programs is $96.8 million. The Administration also is requesting $175.9 million for Iron Dome.

Israel does not receive, and does not need, US economic aid

Jeremy M. Sharp 2014. (Specialist in Middle Eastern Affairs, with Congressional Research Service) 11 Apr 2014 “U.S. Foreign Aid to Israel” <http://www.fas.org/sgp/crs/mideast/RL33222.pdf> (brackets added)

For many years, U.S. economic aid helped subsidize a lackluster Israeli economy, but since the rapid expansion of Israel’s high-tech sector and overall economy in the 1990s (sparked partially by U.S.-Israeli scientific cooperation), Israel has been considered a fully industrialized nation. Consequently, Israel and the United States agreed to gradually phase out economic grant aid to Israel. In FY2008, Israel stopped receiving bilateral Economic Support Fund (ESF) grants.

Missile Defense and Iron Dome are in a separate budget – not part of military aid

Prof. Brent Sasley 2013. (Assistant Professor of Political Science at Univ of Texas-Arlington) 21 Jan 2013 Should U.S. Military Aid To Israel Be Cut? http://www.thedailybeast.com/articles/2013/01/21/should-u-s-military-aid-to-israel-be-cut.html

Regular installments of about $1.8 billion in military assistance began in 1987, and the American defense budget itself provides separate funding for specific programs like Israel’s missile defense systems (the Arrow, Iron Dome), which in fiscal year 2013 stood at $99.8 million.

HARMS / SIGNIFICANCE

US TAXPAYER COST / FEDERAL DEFICITS

Advocacy: Former Israeli Defense Minister says Israel doesn’t need aid and the US can’t afford it

WORLD TRIBUNE 2014. “Arens argues U.S. military aid no longer serves Israel’s interests“ 9 Jan 2014 <http://www.worldtribune.com/2014/01/09/arens-argues-u-s-military-aid-no-longer-serves-israels-interests/>

“We love to get it, and our finance minister would probably kill me if he heard me say this, but we could get along without it,” former Israeli Defense Minister Moshe Arens said. Arens, who was defense minister three times in the 1980s and 1990s, has long advocated Israel’s military independence. He told a parliament caucus on U.S.-Israel relations that Jerusalem could no longer rely on the current $3.2 billion in annual aid as the United States underwent the worst financial crisis since 1929. “The United States is going through a financial crisis with debts in the trillions of dollars,” Arens said. “We would be unhappy to find that aid is being cut, but we could survive without it.”

Israel can easily afford to pay for its own weapons

Josh Ruebner 2013 .(Jewish political activist; graduate degree in International Affairs from Johns Hopkins University School of Advanced International Studies; former  Analyst in Middle East Affairs at Congressional Research Service ) <http://thehill.com/blogs/congress-blog/foreign-policy/285991-israel-lobby-to-push-for-aid-despite-sequestration-cuts#ixzz34if3Sjzv>

After all, Israel is a wealthy country. According to the International Monetary Fund, Israel ranked 27th in per capita gross domestic product in 2011, with its residents enjoying a higher average income than people in Spain, South Korea, and Saudi Arabia. It could certainly afford to pay for those U.S. weapons it wanted without relying on the largesse of the American taxpayer. But instead, AIPAC demands that the United States underwrite approximately 20 percent of the Israeli military budget.

US deficits justify cutting military aid to Israel

Yarden Gazit 2011. (senior researcher at Jerusalem Institute for Market Studies ) “Economic and Strategic Ramifications of American Assistance to Israel” <http://jimsisrael.org/pdf/PPusaidEnglish.pdf>

Projections for the coming decades predict that the economic and strategic damage to Israel as an outcome of American aid will only increase. The global economic crisis, added to the policies of the Bush and Obama administrations, have placed America heavily in debt, with forecasts of slow growth and continued high unemployment. Most economic indicators show Israel's position as better than America's, with unemployment in America at 9.8%, versus 6.6% in Israel. US debt-to-GDP ratio stands at 94% compared to 79% in Israel and the US Government deficit exceeds productivity by 10%, more than double the Israeli rate. All this will oblige the American taxpayer to change its spendthrift ways and tighten its belt. Indeed, the main issue of the November 2010 Congressional elections was government waste of taxpayer dollars. The main, perhaps sole, plank of the "Tea Party" platform, which gained much power in those elections, was a call to reduce government spending. At a certain point, US taxpayers may ask themselves why they should be subsidizing a developed country like Israel.

Israel no longer needs our charity   
Being “pro-Israel” doesn’t mean we have to arm them with our tax dollars

Benjamin Friedman 2011. (research fellow in defense and homeland security studies at Cato Institute; graduate of Dartmouth College and a Ph.D. candidate in Political Science and an affiliate of the Security Studies Program at the Massachusetts Institute of Technology) 8 Feb 2011 “ Rand Paul Is Right about Israel” <http://www.cato.org/publications/commentary/rand-paul-is-right-about-israel>

The problem with aiding Israel is not that we are being ideological. We can afford that. The problem is that Israel no longer needs our charity. Israel's backers in Washington talk like it is 1948, when Israel was poor and surrounded by aggressive neighbors. Even in 1970 Israel had almost ten times more GDP per capita than either Egypt or Syria, according to UN statistics. Today Israel has calmer borders, and its vibrant technology sector increases its military superiority over its rivals (Paul says our aid is fueling an Egyptian-Israeli arms race, but Egypt quit racing).

END QUOTE. And Friedman concludes elsewhere in the same article by saying QUOTE:

"Being pro-Israel does not require arming it with our tax dollars forever. Israel can now defend itself and then some."

END QUOTE.​

AID HARMS ISRAEL

Economic harm to Israel.

Yarden Gazit 2011. (senior researcher at Jerusalem Institute for Market Studies ) “Economic and Strategic Ramifications of American Assistance to Israel” <http://jimsisrael.org/pdf/PPusaidEnglish.pdf>

As noted, American assistance is not linked to the Israeli market and is granted to the public sector. Without this aid, it stands to reason that the government would be forced to reduce the public sector in size, through defense budget cuts, restructuring and increased efficiency in other frameworks. This would direct many more resources toward the private sector, which would be motivated to seek creative and growth-oriented solutions, involving personnel, financing, as well as land and other resources currently held by the government. These challenges and opportunities would pass to private sector hands were it not for American assistance. Instead of helping advance the Israeli market, it acts to obstruct economic growth and promotes its stagnation.

US aid rules lead to wasteful purchase of more expensive, lower quality equipment

Yarden Gazit 2011. (senior researcher at Jerusalem Institute for Market Studies ) “Economic and Strategic Ramifications of American Assistance to Israel” <http://jimsisrael.org/pdf/PPusaidEnglish.pdf>

Less expensive equipment of perhaps even higher quality might be available in Israel or in other countries. But with the US-purchase budget so ample, and the shekel budget so limited, there is little leeway but to buy in the USA. In this sense, the cost of this equipment does not reflect its real value, since many of the same items could have been purchased at a lower price. In an interview several years ago, Shomron Dasht, Deputy CEO of Israel’s Military Industries, told researcher Erez Raphaeli that “The cost of the (American) raw materials is double that of the options available in Israel or Europe, upping the final cost by 20%.” Raphaeli also cited former IDF Chief of Staff Dan Halutz, who claimed:   
The shift to US products on the basis of currency rather than economic considerations is wasteful and works to Israel's disadvantage. We’re buying equipment of lower quality than we could get in Israel and at a higher price. One example is the American “attack pod.” Despite the fact that Rafael [Rafael Advanced Defense Systems Ltd.] offers a pod which is more suited to our needs and is cheaper (by half), without the shekel-currency budget, there was no option but to buy the US product.

Israel doesn’t need US military aid – their military is by far the strongest in the region

Prof. Stephen Zunes 2011. (professor of politics and Chair of Mid-Eastern Studies at Univ. of San Francisco) 29 Dec 2011 Obama Ad Condemns Israel Aid Opponents <http://www.huffingtonpost.com/stephen-zunes/obama-ad-condemns-israel-_b_1148678.html>

What is so bizarre about the Obama campaign's hostility toward those who oppose aid to Israel is that Israel doesn't need U.S. assistance to begin with. Israel, the region's only nuclear power, has by far the strongest military capability in the greater Middle East, and it possesses the only significant domestic arms industry in the region. Israel also has, by far, the region's highest standard of living, comparable to that of most European countries. Even putting human rights concerns aside, questioning why American taxpayers should be spending over $3 billion annually in aid to Israel at a time of massive cutbacks at home doesn't seem unreasonable.

Aid makes Israeli military less efficient: no incentive to improve

Doug Bandow 2012. (J.D. from Stanford; senior fellow at the Cato Institute, specializing in foreign policy and civil liberties; worked as special assistant to President Reagan ) The Case for Ending Aid to Israel 5 June 2012 http://www.cato.org/publications/commentary/case-ending-aid-israel

Another impact of foreign aid on Israel is the same as elsewhere—a disincentive to be efficient. The guaranteed payment irrespective of Israel’s defense needs “leaves the system with no incentive to become more efficient,” warns Gazit. Former prime minister Ehud Olmert argued that Israel could cut its military outlays with no harm to its security but that American money reduces the pressure to do so.

US FOREIGN POLICY HARM

Israeli officials admit: Aid reduces US national security - it undermines broader US interests in the region

Josh Ruebner 2013. (Jewish political activist; graduate degree in International Affairs from Johns Hopkins University School of Advanced International Studies; former  Analyst in Middle East Affairs at Congressional Research Service ) <http://thehill.com/blogs/congress-blog/foreign-policy/285991-israel-lobby-to-push-for-aid-despite-sequestration-cuts#ixzz34if3Sjzv> (brackets in original)

Even Israeli military officials admit that U.S. military aid to Israel undermines broader U.S. interests. In a revealing cable from the U.S. embassy in Tel Aviv, made public by WikiLeaks, Amos Gilad, head of the Political-Military Bureau of the Israeli Ministry of Defense, “acknowledged the sometimes difficult position the U.S. finds itself in given its global interests, and conceded that Israel's security focus is so narrow that its QME [Qualitative Military Edge, a provision written into U.S. law mandating weapons deliveries to Israel to maintain its dominance over any combination of potential enemies] concerns often clash with broader American security interests in the region.”

US aid doesn’t motivate Israel to support US foreign policy goals – it backfires and gives disincentives

Josh Reubner 2012. (National Advocacy Director of the US Campaign to End the Israeli Occupation. He is a former Analyst in Middle East Affairs at Congressional Research Service ) U.S. Military Aid to Israel Policy Implications & Options, March 2012 <http://aidtoisrael.org/downloads/Policy_Paper_print.pdf> (brackets added)

The Obama Administration’s approach to U.S.-Israel relations—including record-breaking requests to Congress for military aid to Israel that are not tied to major advances in the “peace process” and unprecedented levels of Pentagon partnership and funding for joint research and development projects and joint military exercises—has backfired by providing Israel with disincentives to support stated U.S. policy goals. Rather than continuing to feed Israel’s insatiable appetite for more U.S. taxpayer-funded weapons and closer U.S.-Israeli military ties in the mistaken hope that doing so will somehow, despite all evidence to the contrary, support U.S. policy goals, the Obama Administration should look to the examples cited above from the Eisenhower, Ford, Carter, Reagan, and George H.W. Bush Administrations to see how the threat of or actual imposition of sanctions against Israel has compelled positive changes in Israel’s behaviors to bolster U.S. policy objectives.

HUMAN RIGHTS ABUSES

US weapons are misused by Israeli forces

Prof. Stephen Zunes 2009. (professor of politics and Chair of Mid-Eastern Studies at Univ. of San Francisco) 4 Mar 2009 Obama and Israel’s Military: Still Arm-in-Arm <http://fpif.org/obama_and_israels_military_still_arm-in-arm/> (brackets in original)

During the fighting in January, Amnesty documented Israeli forces engaging in “direct attacks on civilians and civilian objects in Gaza, and attacks which were disproportionate or indiscriminate.” The leader of Amnesty International’s fact-finding mission to the Gaza Strip and southern Israel [noted](http://www.amnesty.org/en/news-and-updates/foreign-supplied-weapons-used-against-civilians-israel-and-hamas-20090220" \t "_blank" \o "noted) how “Israeli forces used white phosphorus and other weapons supplied by the USA to carry out serious violations of international humanitarian law, including war crimes.” Amnesty also reported finding fragments of U.S.-made munitions “littering school playgrounds, in hospitals and in people’s homes.” Malcolm Smart, who serves as Amnesty International’s director for the Middle East, [observed](http://www.amnesty.org/en/for-media/press-releases/israeloccupied-palestinian-territories-evidence-misuse-us-weapons-reinfo" \t "_blank" \o "observed) in a press release that “to a large extent, Israel’s military offensive in Gaza was carried out with weapons, munitions and military equipment supplied by the USA and paid for with U.S. taxpayers’ money.” The release also noted how before the conflict, which raged for three weeks from late December into January, the United States had “been aware of the pattern of repeated misuse of [its] weapons.”

Israeli forces kill Palestinian children

Amnesty International 2014. ( internationally known human rights advocacy non-profit gropu) “Trigger Happy: Israel’s Excessive Use of Force in the West Bank” Feb 2014 <http://www.amnesty.org/en/library/asset/MDE15/002/2014/en/349188ef-e14a-418f-ac20-6c9e5c8d9f88/mde150022014en.pdf>

Recent years have seen a mounting toll of deaths and injuries of Palestinians as a result of shooting or other violence by Israeli soldiers outside the context of armed conflict. According to the UN Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs (OCHA), 27 Palestinians were killed in 2013 by Israeli forces (25 by live ammunition and two by rubber-coated metal bullets). This was 1.5 times the number of those killed in 2011 and 2012 combined; 10 were killed in 2011 (eight by live ammunition, one by a tear gas canister and one following tear gas inhalation) and another eight in 2012 (all by live ammunition) , a total of 18.

US military aid is used to kill Palestinian civilians

Josh Reubner 2012. (National Advocacy Director of the US Campaign to End the Israeli Occupation. He is a former Analyst in Middle East Affairs at Congressional Research Service ) U.S. Military Aid to Israel Policy Implications & Options, March 2012 <http://aidtoisrael.org/downloads/Policy_Paper_print.pdf> (brackets added)

Between FY [fiscal year] 2000 and 2009, the United States gave Israel $24.1 billion of military aid. With this taxpayer money, the United States licensed, paid for and delivered more than 670 million weapons and related equipment to Israel, including almost 500 categories of weapons. During roughly the same period (September 29, 2000, to December 31, 2009), Israel killed at least 2,969 unarmed Palestinians in the West Bank, East Jerusalem and Gaza Strip. Often Israel killed these Palestinians with many of the types of weapons provided with U.S. military aid.

Aid makes the US responsible for abuses committed by Israeli military

Josh Reubner 2012. (National Advocacy Director of the US Campaign to End the Israeli Occupation. He is a former Analyst in Middle East Affairs at Congressional Research Service ) U.S. Military Aid to Israel Policy Implications & Options, March 2012 <http://aidtoisrael.org/downloads/Policy_Paper_print.pdf>

Due to the quantity and scope of U.S. weapons deliveries to the Israeli military, it is highly unlikely that even the most routine Israeli military patrol could be accomplished without utilizing U.S. ammunition and guns, communications equipment and vehicles, making the United States complicit in and partly responsible for all of Israel’s military actions and the human rights abuses it routinely commits against Palestinians in its 44-year military occupation of the West Bank, including East Jerusalem and the Gaza Strip.

Israeli soldiers commit war crimes against Palestinian civilians

Amnesty International 2014. (internationally known human rights advocacy non-profit group) “Trigger Happy: Israel’s Excessive Use of Force in the West Bank” Feb 2014 <http://www.amnesty.org/en/library/asset/MDE15/002/2014/en/349188ef-e14a-418f-ac20-6c9e5c8d9f88/mde150022014en.pdf>

This report shows how Israeli forces have repeatedly violated their obligations under international human rights law by using excessive force to stifle dissent and freedom of expression, resulting in a pattern of unlawful killings and injuries to civilians, including children, and have been permitted to do so with virtual impunity due, in no small part, to the authorities’ failure to conduct thorough, impartial and independent investigations. Such arbitrary and abusive use of force contravenes policing standards that protect the right to life and other human rights and they also violate international humanitarian law applicable in territories under foreign military occupation, including the West Bank. In some cases that Amnesty International has examined and documents below, it appears that Palestinians killed by Israeli soldiers were victims of wilful killings; if so, such killings would amount to war crimes

Israeli weapons are used to injure US citizens

Josh Reubner 2012. (National Advocacy Director of the US Campaign to End the Israeli Occupation. He is a former Analyst in Middle East Affairs at Congressional Research Service ) U.S. Military Aid to Israel Policy Implications & Options, March 2012 <http://aidtoisrael.org/downloads/Policy_Paper_print.pdf>

On March 13, 2009, 37-year-old U.S. citizen Tristan Anderson was critically injured after an Israeli soldier shot him in the head with a high-velocity tear gas canister in the West Bank village of Ni’lin while he was observing a nonviolent Palestinian protest. The tear gas canister made a large hole in his forehead, causing brain damage and leaving him largely paralyzed. On May 31, 2010, 21-year-old U.S. citizen Emily Henochowicz was also struck in the face by a high-velocity tear gas canister fired by an Israeli soldier during a demonstration against Israel’s attack on the Gaza Freedom Flotilla at the Qalandia checkpoint outside of Jerusalem. She lost her left eye as a result.

SOLVENCY / ADVOCACY

Advocacy: Multiple reasons to stop US military aid to Israel

Josh Reubner 2012. (National Advocacy Director of the US Campaign to End the Israeli Occupation. He is a former Analyst in Middle East Affairs at Congressional Research Service ) U.S. Military Aid to Israel Policy Implications & Options, March 2012 <http://aidtoisrael.org/downloads/Policy_Paper_print.pdf>

If credible evidence exists that Israel misuses U.S. weapons to commit grave and systematic human rights abuses in violation of U.S. laws; if the $30 billion in U.S. military aid pledged to Israel from 2009 to 2018 could be put to better use to reduce the debt or fund unmet domestic needs; if U.S. military aid to Israel creates disincentives for Israel to support U.S. foreign policy objectives; if even Israelis cast doubts on the benefits of U.S. military aid for their country’s strategic, political, and economic options; and if Israel should not be held to a different standard, but be held accountable to the rule of law like other countries, then the United States must stop giving Israel carte blanche with its military aid.

Israel can afford it: It’s only 1% of their income per year; would improve Israel’s national defense and foreign policy

Dr. Steven Strauss 2013. (PhD; adjunct lecturer in public policy at Harvard's Kennedy School of Government ) Israel Has Reached Childhood's End -- It's Time to End U.S. Aid to Israel, 10 Nov 2013 HUFFINGTON POST <http://www.huffingtonpost.com/steven-strauss/us-aid-israel_b_4251742.html>

**Israel has become an affluent and developed country that can afford to pay for its own defense**. Israeli GDP is about [$250 billion dollars/year](https://www.cia.gov/library/publications/the-world-factbook/geos/is.html" \t "_hplink), and its per capita income is about [$33,000/year](https://www.cia.gov/library/publications/the-world-factbook/geos/is.html" \t "_hplink). In other words, replacing all American aid would cost Israelis about 1 percent of their income per year, hardly an outrageous sum. Aside from the financial metrics, Israel has a well developed economy in other ways. For example, on the UN Human Development Index, Israel ranks [16th](http://hdrstats.undp.org/en/countries/profiles/ISR.html" \t "_hplink) (between Denmark and Belgium). Israeli life expectancy at birth is [81 years](https://www.cia.gov/library/publications/the-world-factbook/rankorder/2102rank.html" \t "_hplink), compared with only [79 years](https://www.cia.gov/library/publications/the-world-factbook/rankorder/2102rank.html" \t "_hplink) in the United States. Also, as a general principle, people and institutions make better choices when they have to internalize costs. If the U.S. ends aid to Israel, Israelis may make better choices about their national defense and foreign policy.

Netanyahu says Israel wants economic independence from the US: We should help by phasing out military aid

Dr. Steven Strauss 2013. (PhD; adjunct lecturer in public policy at Harvard's Kennedy School of Government ) Israel Has Reached Childhood's End -- It's Time to End U.S. Aid to Israel, 10 Nov 2013 HUFFINGTON POST <http://www.huffingtonpost.com/steven-strauss/us-aid-israel_b_4251742.html> (second brackets added; other brackets and parentheses in original)

"I believe that we can now say that Israel has reached childhood's end, that it has matured enough to begin approaching a state of self-reliance ... We are going to achieve economic independence [from the United States]." Israeli Prime Minister Benjamin Netanyahu to a Joint Session of the United States Congress - Washington D.C., July 10, 1996 (Source: [Israeli Ministry of Foreign Affairs](http://www.mfa.gov.il/mfa/mfa-archive/1996/pages/pm%20netanyahu-%20speech%20to%20us%20congress-%20july%2010-%201996.aspx" \t "_hplink) ) It's been over 15 years since PM [prime minister] Netanyahu's speech to a joint session of Congress stating Israel's goal of economic independence. In 1997, Israel received [$3.1 billion](http://www.fas.org/sgp/crs/mideast/RL33222.pdf" \t "_hplink) in aid from the U.S. In 2012, Israel was still receiving [$3.1 billion](http://www.fas.org/sgp/crs/mideast/RL33222.pdf" \t "_hplink) annually in U.S. aid. We haven't made much progress towards PM Netanyahu's goal. For Israel's sake, as well as for America's, it's time to reduce U.S. annual aid to Israel -- to 0 -- over some reasonable adjustment period (perhaps 5 to 10 years), leaving open the possibility, of course, for emergency aid.

DISADVANTAGE RESPONSES

Meaningless Slogan: Throwing around phrases like “commitment to Israel’s security” increases Israeli anxiety, due to its vagueness

Haim Malka 2011. (senior fellow and deputy director of the Middle East Program at Center for Strategic & International Studies; was a research analyst at the Saban Center for Middle East Policy at the Brookings Institution; spent six years living in Jerusalem, where he worked as a television news producer; bachelor’s degree from the University of Washington in Seattle and a master’s degree from Columbia University’s School of International and Public Affairs) “Crossroads : the future of the U.S.-Israel strategic partnership” July 2011 <http://csis.org/files/publication/110908_Malka_CrossroadsUSIsrael_Web.pdf>

Today the depth of U.S.-Israeli military-to-military cooperation is unprecedented. Yet in the current political  
and strategic climate, vague verbal declarations about America’s “commitment to Israel’s security” have become slogans rather than a formula for practical security arrangements. U.S. politicians and government officials will continue using such mottoes for political gain, but overusing them may exacerbate Israeli anxiety because their vagueness is subject to such wide interpretation.

“You Must Be Anti-Semitic” – Response: We can oppose Israel’s mistakes without being anti-Semitic

Prof. Marjorie Cohn 2014. (Thomas Jefferson School of Law) 24 M1y 2014 BDS: Non-Violent Resistance to Israeli Occupation <http://www.huffingtonpost.com/marjorie-cohn/bds-nonviolent-resistance_b_5018866.html>

Nobel Peace Prize winner South African Archbishop Desmond Tutu concurs. "My voice will always be raised in support of Christian-Jewish ties and against the anti-Semitism that all sensible people fear and detest," Tutu wrote in the *Tampa Bay Times*. "But this cannot be an excuse for doing nothing and for standing aside as successive Israeli governments colonize the West Bank and advance racist laws," he added, noting "Israel's theft of Palestinian land" and "Jewish-only colonies built on Palestinian land in violation of international law."

The US should help Israel see its need for reform: Supporting Israel when they’re wrong hurts Israelis

Jonathan Ben-Artzi 2010 (PhD candidate at Brown University ; nephew of Israeli Prime Minister Benjamin Netanyahu ; Israeli citizen and 9th generation native of Palestine/Israel) 1 Apr 2010 Peace for Israelis and Palestinians? Not without America's tough love. <http://www.csmonitor.com/Commentary/Opinion/2010/0401/Peace-for-Israelis-and-Palestinians-Not-without-America-s-tough-love>

Because of the US’s relationship with Israel, it is important for all Americans to educate themselves about the realities of the conflict. When they do, they will realize that just as much as support for South Africa decades ago was mostly damaging for South Africa itself, contemporary blind support for Israel hurts us Israelis. We must lift the ruthless siege of Gaza, which only breeds more anger and frustration among Gazans, who respond by hurling primitive, homemade rockets at Israeli towns. We must remove travel restrictions from West Bank Palestinians. How can we live in peace with a population where most children cannot visit their grandparents living in the neighboring village, without being stopped and harassed at military checkpoints for hours? Finally, we must give equal rights to all. Regardless of what the final resolution will be – the so-called [“one state solution,](http://www.csmonitor.com/Commentary/Opinion/2008/0530/p09s02-coop.html" \t "_blank)” the “two state solution,” or any other form of governance.

Camp David treaty: No worries. US aid to Israel is not key to maintaining peace with Egypt

Benjamin Friedman 2011. (research fellow in defense and homeland security studies at Cato Institute; graduate of Dartmouth College and a Ph.D. candidate in Political Science and an affiliate of the Security Studies Program at the Massachusetts Institute of Technology) 8 Feb 2011 “ Rand Paul Is Right about Israel” <http://www.cato.org/publications/commentary/rand-paul-is-right-about-israel>

After the 1979 Camp David accords, codifying peace between Egypt and Israel, U.S. aid to Israel was supposed to reward peace. But the notion that American largesse, rather than Israeli security concerns, kept Israel from going to war with Egypt was always dubious. And relations between those states have minimal impact on American security. Peace there serves our moral sensibilities, not our safety.

“Moral imperative to help Israel” – Response: Even God refused to help Israel’s military when they were doing wrong

Moses 1500BC. (well-known prophet and law-giver with close ties to the Egyptian ruling family; author of 5 world renowned books on world history and Jewish history) Leviticus, King James Version

Leviticus 26:27 [And if ye will not for all this hearken unto me, but walk contrary unto me;](http://www.kingjamesbibleonline.org/Leviticus-26-27/)28 [Then I will walk contrary unto you also in fury; and I, even I, will chastise you seven times for your sins.](http://www.kingjamesbibleonline.org/Leviticus-26-28/) 29 [And ye shall eat the flesh of your sons, and the flesh of your daughters shall ye eat.](http://www.kingjamesbibleonline.org/Leviticus-26-29/) 30 [And I will destroy your high places, and cut down your images, and cast your carcases upon the carcases of your idols, and my soul shall abhor you.](http://www.kingjamesbibleonline.org/Leviticus-26-30/) 31 [And I will make your cities waste, and bring your sanctuaries unto desolation, and I will not smell the savour of your sweet odours.](http://www.kingjamesbibleonline.org/Leviticus-26-31/) 32 [And I will bring the land into desolation: and your enemies which dwell therein shall be astonished at it.](http://www.kingjamesbibleonline.org/Leviticus-26-32/) 33 [And I will scatter you among the heathen, and will draw out a sword after you: and your land shall be desolate, and your cities waste.](http://www.kingjamesbibleonline.org/Leviticus-26-33/) 34 [Then shall the land enjoy her sabbaths, as long as it lieth desolate, and ye be in your enemies' land; even then shall the land rest, and enjoy her sabbaths.](http://www.kingjamesbibleonline.org/Leviticus-26-34/) 35 [As long as it lieth desolate it shall rest; because it did not rest in your sabbaths, when ye dwelt upon it.](http://www.kingjamesbibleonline.org/Leviticus-26-35/) 36 [And upon them that are left alive of you I will send a faintness into their hearts in the lands of their enemies; and the sound of a shaken leaf shall chase them; and they shall flee, as fleeing from a sword; and they shall fall when none pursueth.](http://www.kingjamesbibleonline.org/Leviticus-26-36/) 37 [And they shall fall one upon another, as it were before a sword, when none pursueth: and ye shall have no power to stand before your enemies.](http://www.kingjamesbibleonline.org/Leviticus-26-37/)

“Israel is threatened” – Response: Israel doesn’t need our aid – they can defend themselves

Benjamin Friedman 2011. (research fellow in defense and homeland security studies at Cato Institute; graduate of Dartmouth College and a Ph.D. candidate in Political Science and an affiliate of the Security Studies Program at the Massachusetts Institute of Technology) 8 Feb 2011 “ Rand Paul Is Right about Israel” <http://www.cato.org/publications/commentary/rand-paul-is-right-about-israel>

Even in 1970 Israel had almost ten times more GDP per capita than either Egypt or Syria, according to UN statistics. Today Israel has calmer borders, and its vibrant technology sector increases its military superiority over its rivals (Paul says our aid is fueling an Egyptian-Israeli arms race, but Egypt quit racing). Without our three billion dollars in aid, Israel’s military budget would still be more than three times that of Lebanon and Syria combined and more than Iran’s. And that ignores Israel’s qualitative military superiority and its nuclear weapons, which deter attack. Senator Paul is right that it is time to stop treating Israel like a perpetual ward, issuing it subsidies and instructions it ignores. If Israel faced conquest, we would be right to defend it. But we should do our friends the favor of acknowledging that they have the ability to prevent that without our help.

“Israel is threatened” – Response: All the major military threats are gone

Prof. Stephen Zunes 2009. (professor of politics and Chair of Mid-Eastern Studies at Univ. of San Francisco) 4 Mar 2009 Obama and Israel’s Military: Still Arm-in-Arm <http://fpif.org/obama_and_israels_military_still_arm-in-arm/>

Under Obama, U.S. military aid to Israel will likely continue be higher than it was back in the 1970s, when Egypt’s massive and well-equipped armed forces threatened war, Syria’s military rapidly expanded with advanced Soviet weaponry, armed factions of the PLO launched terrorist attacks into Israel, Jordan still claimed the West Bank and stationed large numbers of troops along its border and demarcation line with Israel, and Iraq embarked on a vast program of militarization. Why does the Obama administration believe that Israel needs more military aid today than it did back then? Since that time, Israel has maintained a longstanding peace treaty with Egypt and a large demilitarized and internationally monitored buffer zone. Syria’s armed forces were weakened by the collapse of their former Soviet patron and its government has been calling for a resumption of peace talks. The PLO is cooperating closely with Israeli security. Jordan signed a peace treaty with Israel with full normalized relations. And two major wars and a decade of strict international sanctions have devastated Iraq’s armed forces, which is in any case now under close U.S. supervision.

“Israel is threatened” – Turn: US arms transfers to Israel fuel additional arms to Israel’s enemies

Prof. Stephen Zunes 2009. (professor of politics and Chair of Mid-Eastern Studies at Univ. of San Francisco) 4 Mar 2009 Obama and Israel’s Military: Still Arm-in-Arm <http://fpif.org/obama_and_israels_military_still_arm-in-arm/>

In addition, every major arms transfer to Israel creates a new demand by Arab states — most of which can pay hard currency through petrodollars — for additional U.S. weapons to challenge Israel. Indeed, Israel announced its acceptance of a proposed Middle Eastern arms freeze in 1991, but the U.S. government, eager to defend the profits of U.S. arms merchants, effectively blocked it.

“Israel needs Qualitative Military Edge” – Response: QME cannot be the only consideration in US foreign policy

William Wunderle & Andre Briere 2008. (Wunderle (Army) and Briere (Air Force) are both Lieutenant Colonels in the US military and are Middle East political military planners in the Joint Strategic Plans & Policy Directorate of the Joint Staff ) Augmenting Israel's Qualitative Military Edge, MIDDLE EAST QUARTERLY Winter 2008 Volume XV <http://www.meforum.org/1824/augmenting-israels-qualitative-military-edge>

Israel's QME cannot be the only consideration in U.S. decision-making. The U.S. government must, first and foremost, defend the vital interests of the United States and its citizens. Any U.S. decision on weapons sales to the region must look at the broader military balance, Arab capabilities, the current political-military environment, and U.S. foreign policy interests. Such issues highlight the lack of analytical framework or methodology to assess QME. According to the Israeli definition, QME can equate to Israel versus most of the Arab Middle East and Iran, but if U.S. policymakers took the traditional Israeli definition at face value, Washington could not arm Persian Gulf allies that support U.S. policy vis-à-vis Iran. This is significant given the fact that both the Persian Gulf states and Israel rightly view the Iranian regime as their greatest military concern.

“Ends US/Israel Relationship” – Response: Nothing in the US/Israel relationship requires military aid. The friendly relationship started with an arms embargo

Josh Reubner 2012. (National Advocacy Director of the US Campaign to End the Israeli Occupation. He is a former Analyst in Middle East Affairs at Congressional Research Service ) U.S. Military Aid to Israel Policy Implications & Options, March 2012 <http://aidtoisrael.org/downloads/Policy_Paper_print.pdf>

When the United States began providing Israel with foreign assistance, nothing about the relationship pre-ordained Israel to become the largest cumulative recipient of U.S. taxpayer-funded weapons. In fact, the opposite is true. In 1948, President Harry Truman placed an arms embargo on Israel and its Arab neighbors and in 1950, the United States joined Great Britain and France in the Tripartite Declaration opposing an Israeli-Arab arms race. As a result, from 1949 to 1965, more than 95 percent of U.S. foreign aid to Israel consisted of economic development assistance and food aid.

“Israel benefits the US” – Response: Our aid is all out of proportion to the Israel’s strategic importance

*Paul Miller 2014. (political scientist at RAND Corporation and a former National Security Staff member in the Bush and Obama administrations) 16 Mar 2014 “*[The Foreign Policy Essay: Evangelicals, Israel, and U.S. Foreign Policy](http://www.lawfareblog.com/2014/03/the-foreign-policy-essay-evangelicals-israel-and-u-s-foreign-policy/)” <http://www.lawfareblog.com/2014/03/the-foreign-policy-essay-evangelicals-israel-and-u-s-foreign-policy/>

The level of U.S. aid to Israel is out of all proportion to Israel’s importance to U.S. strategic interests. According to the Green Book, most American aid to Israel—an average of 70 percent since Camp David, but rising to 98 percent in 2011—is military aid, specifically the waiving of payments for foreign military financing contracts. The United States should simply stop issuing waivers and seek payment, thereby converting aid into trade. As the third-largest buyer of U.S. weapons, Israel has demonstrated that it can afford to pay.

“Need to promote Israel/Palestinian peace process” – Response: Quit wasting time – no impact on US national security

*Paul Miller 2014. (political scientist at RAND Corporation and a former National Security Staff member in the Bush and Obama administrations) 16 Mar 2014 “*[The Foreign Policy Essay: Evangelicals, Israel, and U.S. Foreign Policy](http://www.lawfareblog.com/2014/03/the-foreign-policy-essay-evangelicals-israel-and-u-s-foreign-policy/)” <http://www.lawfareblog.com/2014/03/the-foreign-policy-essay-evangelicals-israel-and-u-s-foreign-policy/>

Finally, American policymakers’ time and attention seems disproportionately taken up worrying about a region of the world that is, in truth, secondary to worldwide American interests. Some critics argue that U.S. policy towards Israel is wrong because it is unfair to the Palestinians. Whether or not that is true is beside the point: lots of political relationships are characterized by unfairness, but not all of them are relevant to U.S. national security. Americans tend to read something unique, portentous, and epic into the Israeli-Palestinian conflict. It is time for U.S. policymakers to see the conflict for what it is: a fairly typical real estate spat between a micro-sovereignty and a failed state that is peripheral to U.S. national security interests.

“We lose leverage/influence over Israel” – Response: Military aid isn’t giving us any leverage. Withholding aid is the only thing that has ever given us leverage

Josh Reubner 2012. (National Advocacy Director of the US Campaign to End the Israeli Occupation. He is a former Analyst in Middle East Affairs at Congressional Research Service ) U.S. Military Aid to Israel Policy Implications & Options, March 2012 <http://aidtoisrael.org/downloads/Policy_Paper_print.pdf>

These provisions can successfully leverage U.S. influence over Israel through its FMF appropriation. Blank checks to Israel have not succeeded in modifying its behavior to accomplish U.S. policy goals of promoting human rights and establishing peace. In fact, just the opposite is true. When the United States has leveraged its influence over Israel by either threatening to withhold aid or sanctioning it, Israel has changed its policies and behaviors to comport with U.S. policy objectives. The continuation of the current policy of “all-carrots-no-sticks” will bring only the same failed results and policy frustrations. The time for change is overdue.

1. Jonathan Ben-Artzi 2010 (PhD candidate at Brown University ; nephew of Israeli Prime Minister Benjamin Netanyahu ; Israeli citizen and 9th generation native of Palestine/Israel) 1 Apr 2010 Peace for Israelis and Palestinians? Not without America's tough love. <http://www.csmonitor.com/Commentary/Opinion/2010/0401/Peace-for-Israelis-and-Palestinians-Not-without-America-s-tough-love> [↑](#footnote-ref-1)