### \*\*1NCs\*\*

### 1NC - Russia

#### US military aid to Israel is necessary to curb Russian threat

**Ettinger 9/20** Yoram Ettinger, 9-20-2018, "Aid To Israel Isn’t Foreign Aid; It’s An Investment," Breaking Defense, <https://breakingdefense.com/2018/09/aid-to-israel-isnt-foreign-aid-its-an-investment/> OHS-AT

The US-Israel strategic compatibility is underlined by their national security orientation, allocating 3.6 percent and 4.7 percent of their budgets, respectively, to defense, much more than any European country: Britain 2.1 percent, France 1.8 percent, Germany 1.1 percent and Italy 1.1 percent, etc.

The scope of US-Israel strategic cooperation has surged since the 1991 demise of the USSR, which transformed the bi-polar globe into a multi-polar arena of conflicts, replete with highly unpredictable, less controllable and more dangerous local and regional threats. Israel’s experience and capabilities in facing such threats has provided the US a unique reinforcement in the face of three critical challenges, which impact the national and homeland security of the US: the megalomaniacal vision of Iran’s Ayatollahs; the clear and present threat of Islamic terrorism; and the need to bolster the pro-US Arab regimes, which are lethally threatened by the Shi’ite Ayatollahs and Sunni terrorist regimes.

In addition, the convergence of US-Israel strategic interests has been enhanced in response to the anti-US Arab tsunami (conventionally defined as the Arab Spring); the declining European posture of deterrence; the drastic cuts in the US defense budget; an increasingly unpredictable, dangerous globe; Israel’s surge of military and commercial capabilities; and the 400-year-old US-Israel shared Judeo-Christian values.

In July, 1950, in the aftermath of Israel’s War of Independence, Gen. Omar Bradley, first chairman of the US Joint Chiefs of Staff, said: “The Israeli army would be the most effective force south of Turkey, which could be utilized for delaying action [extending the strategic hand of the USA]….” General Bradley’s assessment was rejected by the State Department and the Pentagon, which opposed the 1948 establishment of the Jewish State, contending that it would be decimated by the Arabs, a burden upon the US and probably an ally of the USSR.

In 2018, General Bradley’s assessments are vindicated, as the pro-US Saudi Arabia, Bahrain, the United Arab Emirates, Kuwait and Oman, as well as Jordan and Egypt, seek further strategic ties with Israel. They view Israel as a most effective ally in the face of lethal threats posed by the anti-US ayatollahs, ISIS (Daesh) and Muslim Brotherhood terrorists, irrespective of the unresolved Palestinian issue – which they never considered a crown jewel – and their fundamental reservations about the existence of an “infidel” Jewish State in “the abode of Islam.”

In 2018, Russia lends credence to General Bradley recognizing Israel’s enhanced strategic posture, accepting Israel’s military operations against the rogue ayatollahs and Hezbollah terrorists in Syria, which has been a Moscow satellite since the late 1960s.

Moscow recognizes the impact of the Israel’s posture of deterrence on the Washington-Moscow balance of power: the 1967 Six Day War stopped the lethal offensive by pro-USSR Egypt against Saudi Arabia and other pro-US oil-rich Arab countries; a 1970 Israeli military mobilization forced the rollback of the pro-Soviet Syrian invasion of pro-US Jordan; the 1967 and 1973 Israeli military victories over Soviet-armed Egypt and Syria provided the US military with a rare study of Soviet military systems and Soviet battle tactics; the June 1982 (first ever!) destruction of 29 of the most advanced Soviet surface-to-air missile batteries and the downing of 83 Soviet MIGs employed by Syria, and subsequent sharing of innovative battle tactics and technology with the US; the 1981 and 2007 Israeli destruction of the nuclear reactors in pro-Soviet Iraq and Syria, which spared the US a nuclear confrontation in 1991 and a much more traumatic Middle East. And there’s more.

#### Russia war is the *only* existential risk

Cotton-Barratt 17 (Owen, PhD in Pure Mathematics, Oxford, Lecturer in Mathematics at Oxford, Research Associate at the Future of Humanity Institute, “Existential Risk: Diplomacy and Governance,” 2/3/17, <https://www.fhi.ox.ac.uk/wp-content/uploads/Existential-Risks-2017-01-23.pdf>)

The bombings of Hiroshima and Nagasaki demonstrated the unprecedented destructive power of nuclear weapons. However, even in an all-out nuclear war between the United States and Russia, despite horrific casualties, neither country’s population is likely to be completely destroyed by the direct effects of the blast, fire, and radiation.8The aftermath could be much worse: the burning of flammable materials could send massive amounts of smoke into the atmosphere, which would absorb sunlight and cause sustained global cooling, severe ozone loss, and agricultural disruption – a nuclear winter. According to one model 9 , an all-out exchange of 4,000 weapons10 could lead to a drop in global temperatures of around 8°C, making it impossible to grow food for 4 to 5 years. This could leave some survivors in parts of Australia and New Zealand, but they would be in a very precarious situation and the threat of extinction from other sources would be great. An exchange on this scale is only possible between the US and Russia who have more than 90% of the world’s nuclear weapons, with stockpiles of around 4,500 warheads each, although many are not operationally deployed.11 Some models suggest that even a small regional nuclear war involving 100 nuclear weapons would produce a nuclear winter serious enough to put two billion people at risk of starvation,12 though thisestimate might be pessimistic.13 Wars on this scale are unlikely to lead to outright human extinction, but this does suggest that conflicts which are around an order of magnitude larger may be likely to threaten civilisation. It should be emphasised that there is very large uncertainty about the effects of a large nuclear war on global climate. This remains an area where increased academic research work, including more detailed climate modelling and a better understanding of how survivors might be able to cope and adapt, would have high returns. It is very difficult to precisely estimate the probability of existential risk from nuclear war over the next century, and existing attempts leave very large confidence intervals. According to many experts, the most likely nuclear war at present is between India and Pakistan.14 However, given the relatively modest size of their arsenals, the risk of human extinction is plausibly greaterfrom a conflict between the United States and Russia. Tensions between these countries have increased in recent years and it seems unreasonable to rule out the possibility of them rising further in the future.

### 1NC – Intelligence Gathering

#### Military cooperation allows for key intelligence sharing – only gateway into the Middle East

**Ettinger 9/20** Yoram Ettinger, 9-20-2018, "Aid To Israel Isn’t Foreign Aid; It’s An Investment," Breaking Defense, <https://breakingdefense.com/2018/09/aid-to-israel-isnt-foreign-aid-its-an-investment/> OHS-AT

In 2018, in response to growing sophisticated online and offline threats posed by Arab/Islamic countries and beyond, Israel has become a leading developer/producer in the area of cyber-technology, second only to – and in close collaboration with – the US. Israel is the site of 15 percent to 20 percent of the global venture capital raised by cybersecurity companies, aiming to defend critical infrastructures, while preempting rogue regimes. On January 30, 2018, General David Petraeus, former CIA Director, stated: “the [US-Israel] collaboration reaches new heights, far beyond what is being published in the media…. Our cooperation has harmed significantly Iran’s nuclear program….”

In 2018, Israel is the chief source of intelligence for the US on the volatile, tectonic Middle East, which has been a highly-complex platform of global terrorism, inherent instability, unpredictability, tyranny, domestic and regional intra-Arab/Islamic violence and intolerance, tenuous and shifty regimes, and consequently tenuous and shifty policies and agreements.

In fact, the nature of the Middle East highlights Israel’s unique qualities as a systematic, democratic, effective, strategic ally of the US, whether we are led by right or left of center coalition governments. The nature of the Middle East was demonstrated by the violent toppling of a series of pro-US Arab/Islamic regimes by anti-US elements. For example, the 1952 toppling of Egypt’s King Farouk; the 1958 toppling of Iraq’s King Faisal; the 1969 toppling of Libya’s King Idris (Wheelus Air Base, in Libya, was the largest US military facility outside the US); the 1979 toppling of Iran’s Shah; the 2011 toppling of Egypt’s Mubarak; the 2014-15 toppling of Yemen’s Hadi; and it is not over yet….

#### Solves multiple scenarios for extinction

Rossi 14 (Amanda, MA – Security Studies @ Johns Hopkins, "SHARING SECRETS OPTIMIZING INTERNATIONAL INTELLIGENCE COOPERATION TO COUNTER TERRORISM and RISING THREATS" May 2014, Thesis Dissertation @ JHU)

The past two decades have brought a shift to the international security environment. Globalization has provided opportunities for non-state actors and transformed criminal operations into dangerous transnational organized crime. The United States faces threats from global terrorism, cyber-attacks, rising military powers, nuclear weapons, economic espionage, and drug trafficking. The rise of non-state actors has provided a unique concern for states. Non-state actors use underground means and spread out across borders, making it difficult for states to detect and thwart their operations. They have also been able to take advantage of globalization while global governance has remained weak.136 The operations of these individuals depend on secrecy and elusiveness, which is why, in response, governments have turned to intelligence agencies. 137 The terrorist attacks on September 11th, combined with the effects of globalization, have resulted in an increase in international intelligence cooperation.138 The study of intelligence systems can be difficult and complex, as evidenced by the fact that scholars often struggle to come to consensus on the definition of intelligence. Broadly speaking, state intelligence services work to provide leadership with useful, often secret, information to support state security.139 Experts also argue that as intelligence organizations have been tasked to go beyond collection and into actions, including covert actions, the secret operations should be incorporated into an understanding of the definition of intelligence. Much of the literature on this subject concentrates on intelligence failures. There is also budding scholarship on intelligence oversight and accountability. However, due to the secret nature of intelligence, there is only a small amount of literature that focuses on international intelligence cooperation, and most of it concentrates on historical examples, specifically the UKUSA agreement, United Kingdom – United States of America Agreement, human rights concerns or counterterrorism collaboration. How can the United States build effective intelligence cooperation with foreign agencies to combat 21st century security threats? Increased international intelligence cooperation has been noted over the past ten years.140 The CIA has recognized the “long overdue” need to adapt the intelligence model from state-centric, which was institutionalized during the Cold War, to one that focuses on “anticipating and warning about major threats to our nation’s security.”141 International terrorist attacks have been planned and carried out across several countries, making it unlikely that one government could detect, deter or prevent attacks on its own. 142 In an effort to counter transnational terrorist networks, the United States has had to increase cooperation with traditional international intelligence partners and cultivate intelligence relationships with new ones.

### 1NC – Iran War

#### Cutting aid prolongs the Iran-Israeli conflict and drastically increases the risk of escalation

**Pearl 15** Mike Pearl, 3-6-2015, "We Asked a Military Expert What Would Happen if the US Stopped Giving Money to Israel," Vice, [https://www.vice.com/en\_us/article/dpwnkm/what-would-happen-if-the-us-stopped-giving-money-to-israel-305 //](https://www.vice.com/en_us/article/dpwnkm/what-would-happen-if-the-us-stopped-giving-money-to-israel-305%20//) ash \*\*brackets in original text\*\*

And what would the outcome be?

Israel wouldn't lose the conflict, that's for sure. They get a lot of money from the States in terms of support in terms of the Iron Dome anti-missile program, but at the end of the day they have enough hardware already in the sheds to be able to thoroughly defeat any belligerents—for example, non-state-level actors like Hamas or Hezbollah, but also state-level actors like Iran.

I don't think it would be a question of turning the tide of battle it would just be a question of how long the war would go on, how bloody it would be, and who would get dragged in.

Who would get dragged in?

I think the US, even if they really fell out with and really strongly dislike[d] Israel, would probably still work toward a cessation of hostility as a superpower. I think that no matter what happens, we would go back to some sort of paradigm representing what we have at the moment. But the fighting would probably be longer and bloodier, and the US would have less of an ability to stop it straight away.

Would Israel make moves on Iran?

I think the Saudis would be ready to turn a blind eye to an Israeli attack [on Iran], which has been suggested before. So I think again the probability of mass-casualty warfare and violence would be much higher if the US, tomorrow, said, "Screw you, guys. I'm going home. This is too much effort."

What kind of warfare would we see?

In terms of Iranian retaliation, Iran has a lot of medium- to long-range missiles. They're not very accurate, but they stopped firing them at the end of the Iran-Iraq war, so they do have a very hefty stockpile that they could then fire at Israel. Israel would inevitably retaliate with their stock. So it'd be quite hard for them to launch a bombing campaign against Iran because they'd have to go through unfriendly territory on the way.

What might the targets of Israel's military action be?

I think you'd see one Israeli strike, one very pinpointed, strategic attack on Iranian nuclear assets. Then afterwards Israel would basically try to hold its own, because Iran would unleash its proxies on the region, which are primarily Hamas in the Gaza Strip and Hezbollah in Lebanon.

I think we'd see fighting very close to Israel's doorstep and I think you'd see a lot of devastation of both Gaza and Lebanon. But on the flip side you'd also see a lot more damage to Israel's home front than you've seen in a very long time.

#### Extinction---draws in major nuclear powers

Avery 13 – PhD @ MIT, Associate Professor, University of Copenhagen (11/6/2013, John Scales Avery, “An Attack On Iran Could Escalate Into Global Nuclear War,” *Counter Currents*, <http://www.countercurrents.org/avery061113.htm>)

Despite the willingness of Iran's new President, Hassan Rouhani to make all reasonable concessions to US demands, Israeli pressure groups in Washington continue to demand an attack on Iran. But such an attack might escalate into a global nuclear war, with catastrophic consequences. As we approach the 100th anniversary World War I, we should remember that this colossal disaster escalated uncontrollably from what was intended to be a minor conflict. There is a danger that an attack on Iran would escalate into a large-scale war in the Middle East, entirely destabilizing a region that is already deep in problems. The unstable government of Pakistan might be overthrown, and the revolutionary Pakistani government might enter the war on the side of Iran, thus introducing nuclear weapons into the conflict. Russia and China, firm allies of Iran, might also be drawn into a general war in the Middle East. Since much of the world's oil comes from the region, such a war would certainly cause the price of oil to reach unheard-of heights, with catastrophic effects on the global economy. In the dangerous situation that could potentially result from an attack on Iran, there is a risk that nuclear weapons would be used, either intentionally, or by accident or miscalculation. Recent research has shown that besides making large areas of the world uninhabitable through long-lasting radioactive contamination, a nuclear war would damage global agriculture to such a extent that a global famine of previously unknown proportions would result. Thus, nuclear war is the ultimate ecological catastrophe. It could destroy human civilization and much of the biosphere. To risk such a war would be an unforgivable offense against the lives and future of all the peoples of the world, US citizens included.