

## **CHAPTER IV**

### **THE REASON BEHIND THE U.S. FOREIGN POLICY TOWARD ISRAEL ON THE NUCLEAR WEAPONS PROLIFERATION**

The United States has become the long promotor in creating the global non-proliferation regime since 1953. By establishing IAEA, U.S. planned to control the application of nuclear energy and fissile materials universally. IAEA and other nuclear treaties have been designed to prevent the spread of nuclear weapons. However, in the implementation, the international regime faced a lot of challenges. They must deal with the increasing number of states pursuing the nuclear energy for military purposes. Israel and Iran are the examples. They are believed that they have been pursuing nuclear weapons capability.

Not only their nuclear program that becomes the source of international debate, but also the different attitudes of United States in responding toward the two countries nuclear programs. In 2006, United States put high pressure on Iran by accommodating states to put sanctions on them. Meanwhile, the United States did not give the same attitudes to Israel who is universally believed that it had acquired nuclear weapons even since the 1960s. In fact, United States get along with Israel's policy of nuclear ambiguity. They never urge Israel to be the part of the non-proliferation regime or urge Israel to submit its nuclear program to international inspections.

This chapter analyzes the reason of the U.S. acceptance toward the possession of the nuclear weapon by Israel but rejecting the possession of the nuclear weapon by Iran. In order to understand the U.S. different attitudes, it is very important to analyze the U.S. foreign policy and how the foreign policy is formulated. As a democratic country, there will be many parties involved in the decision-making process. United States will examine every single input from those parties. As a theoretical framework, the writer put theory from the William D. Coplin namely *Decision Making Process* in analyzing how U.S. formulate the foreign policy especially in responding Israel's and Iran's nuclear program.

William D. Coplin explains that the foreign policy of a state is the result of the three considerations. They are international context, domestic politics, and economic and military capability. The reason why United States support Israel nuclear weapon program instead of Iran's is due to these considerations as well.

- 1) International Context: U.S interests in Middle East is being threatened by Iran pursuing nuclear weapons capability.
- 2) Domestic Politics: Strong influence from Israel lobby work in U.S executive and legislative branches to maintain close and supportive relations with Israel.
- 3) Economics and Military Capability: U.S has sufficient sources of funds and military power to support Israel.

## **A. International Context**

The circumstances in international arena often determine a state to take the strategic policy in the relations with other states. The circumstances include the conditions of geographic, economic, and politic in certain states with past, present, and future possibility. In formulating the foreign policy, U.S come into this considerations as well. There are several international aspects that influence the U.S decision makers in responding the possession of the nuclear weapon by Iran and Israel.

### **1. The U.S. Strategic Partner in Middle East**

Before the 1970s, both Iran and Israel were the close partners of the U.S. in the Middle East. However, since the Iranian Islamic Revolution in 1979, U.S no longer considered Iran as its strategic partner. The revolution caused the most degraded U.S.-Iran relationship (Cook & Roshandel, 2009). Until today, Israel remains as the U.S. strategic partner in the Middle East. Thus, the biggest U.S. support had been given to Israel politically, economically, and militarily.

The close relation between the United States with Israel has been established even since the creation of the state of Israel in 1948. Israel is the key ally of U.S in the Middle East. Both states share the common democratic values, religious kinship, and political-security interests. They have been conducting bilateral cooperation in many aspects. Every President of U.S always consider Israel as a very important partner both in the Middle East and in the international arena (Addis, 2011).

U.S. could not neglect the contribution of Israel during the Cold War Era. In the struggle to influence Soviet, Israel became the U.S. barrier against the Soviet influence in the Middle East and to counter the radical Arab nationalism. Israel gave a very useful intelligence information about the Soviet military capability leading into the total defeats of Soviet allies like Egypt and Syria. The U.S-Israel partnership also remains solid until today (Mearsheimer & M. Walt, 2006).

Today, the U.S. support for Israel is warranted by a common situation that both countries faced. They have been threatened by some terrorist groups that originally come from the Muslim world. U.S. and Israel are really aware of some states in the Middle East such as Islamic Republic of Iran, Iraq under Saddam Hussein and Syria under Bashar al-Assad. Thus, Israel is a crucial ally for U.S in the war on terror because the Israel enemies are the U.S. enemies as well (Mearsheimer & M. Walt, 2006).

Beside their close relationship, there had been a secret agreement between the United States and Israel in the past. Regarding the Israel nuclear weapons, United States agreed to accept nuclear facts on the ground and did not acknowledge it in public. It means that U.S. will remain silent about Israel nuclear weapons as long as Israel kept the bomb in the basement. Israel must keep being low profile and must not be the first countries in the Middle East to introduce nuclear weapons or conducting nuclear tests. The agreement was concluded between the U.S. President Richard Nixon and the Israel Prime Minister Golda Meir in 1969 (Ami, 2009).

Both United States and Israel also see nuclear weapon proliferation in a common attitude. A nuclear weapon is essential for their own security but it will be a critical danger if it is acquired by their enemies like Iran as the prominent example. Since then, both U.S and Israel have been developing their nuclear arsenals while preventing other states in the Middle East from acquiring nuclear weapons by using persuasive way or military coercion (Lawrence & Miller, 2003).

## **2. The Extreme Ideology of Iran**

After Shah regime was overthrown, Iran rose under a radical fundamentalist of the Islamic regime. The regime has pursued the extreme ideological objectives that willingly commit suicide for religious purposes under the name of Jihad. Iran also gave hostile stance towards Israel. The leader of Iran's Islamic Revolution, Ayatollah Khomeini, declared that the elimination of Israel is a religious duty. The Iran's next leader also inherited the spirit calling for Israel that should be wiped out from the world's map. Iranian leader believed that Holocaust is merely a myth used as a pretext for creating the Jewish state and begging for the U.S. assistance (Addis, 2011).

Iran has supported armed hostilities toward Israel and sabotages the peace process between Arab states and Israel. From the closest partner, Iran has turned into the biggest enemy of Israel in Middle east. Iran will become an existential threat toward Israel if they successfully achieved nuclear weapons capability. It will increase the possibility that Iranian leader attempt to use its nuclear weapons to destroy the state of Israel (Evron, 2008).

The revolution caused the most degradation of the relationship between Iran and United States. Iran under the Shah regime enjoyed the nuclear cooperation with the United States. However, in the Islamic revolution, Shah was overthrown and Iran was under Ayatollah Khomeini as the Supreme Leader. The U.S. diplomatic agents were seized and held as hostages by Iranian students for more than a year. The revolution was not only derived to total political change in Iran but also from the U.S. distrust to Iran. Until today, both countries relationship has never recovered and there is no formal diplomatic relations between Iran and United States (Hossain, 2012).

Iran became one of the main focus of U.S. in the Global War on Terror. U.S believed that Iran had been sponsoring some terrorist groups such as Hezbollah, Hamas, and al-Qaeda. These groups had been working to destabilize governments in various countries in the region. They also had committed many human right abuses, oppressed the liberty of the people, and spread the resentment of anti-American. Iran was also designated as a list of the state supporter of terrorism and the most active one. Being labeled as a state sponsor of terrorism, Iranian government argued that they did not support terrorist groups. Instead, these groups were the one fighting against foreign occupation and intervention (Cook & Roshandel, 2009).

The United States also accused Iran that played important role in insurgency activities in Iraq, especially after the fall of Saddam Hussein. These insurgencies have been undermined the U.S. policy and actions in Iraq. Iran is believed supporting the insurgency activities by providing weapons and explosive devices, giving military

training, and financing them (Cook & Roshandel, 2009). Thus, it is very important to prevent Iran from acquiring nuclear weapons to protect the security of Israel and prevent the fall of the nuclear weapon in the hands of the terrorist groups.

### **3. The Possibility of Nuclear Arms Race in The Middle East**

Iran in pursuing nuclear weapons gives many potential negative results that U.S. can not just ignore it. It does not only threaten the Israel or counter the U.S. interests but also destabilize the region. Iran may attack another U.S. ally and U.S. troops in the region. Moreover, the nuclear weapon might be passed on some of the terrorist organizations to achieve their political motives. Iran's acquisition of nuclear weapons might be resulted in Middle East nuclear arms race by confronting other states to build nuclear weapons as well. In addition, Egypt, Turkey, Saudi Arabia, and other countries may consider nuclear weapons for their protection and for countering Iranian nuclear threats (Cook & Roshandel, 2009).

Another possibility might be resulted in a bigger military conflict among states in the Middle East. If U.S. does not take decisive actions to eliminate the Iran's nuclear weapons program, Israel will take action on their own. Some of the U.S. government are afraid that Israel will launch an attack first on Iran's nuclear facilities as what they did to Iraq. No matter what, U.S. will stand on the Israel's side. In the case of Iran retaliates with a military attack, U.S. will come to help Israel. It could force U.S. into military conflicts with Iran or other Iran allies which potentially become a regional war. Thus, the U.S. government must put strong pressure toward Iran to stop their nuclear

program and keep Iran from acquiring the nuclear weapon (Watson Institute for International Studies, 2008).

## **B. Domestic Politics**

The foreign policy of the state also depends on the dynamics of internal politics. In formulating the foreign policy, the decision makers are influenced by other political actors called as the policy influencer. The U.S. acceptance of the possession of the nuclear weapon by Israel is also being influenced by some policy influencer which there are four types of them.

### **1. The Bureaucratic Influencer**

Bureaucracy refers to individual and organization in the executive departments that helps the government in the decision-making process and later contributes in implementing the policies (Coplin, 2003). Bureaucratic agents in the United States that are usually involved in foreign policy decision-making are Department of State, Department of Defense, Joint Chiefs of Staff, Central Intelligence Agency, National Security Council, The U.S. Trade Representatives and Department of Homeland Security (Cipto, 2003).

The U.S. Presidents and many Congressional members have maintained close and supportive relation with Israel. They demonstrated a commitment to Israel security and preserved both countries cooperation in politics, economics, and military. The U.S. policy makers are often carefully calculate what kinds of impact that could be received



by Israel when they make policy choices in the Middle East. The Congress and the President have provided strict oversight toward bureaucratic agents dealing with Israel and broadening the U.S-Middle East affairs (Zanotti, 2012).

There are many U.S. bureaucracies that had been conducting bilateral cooperation with Israel including the arms sales, joint exercises, intelligence sharing, military aid, and industrial cooperation (Zanotti, 2012). U.S has granted Israel major non-NATO ally status, provided substantial military and economic aid, and committed to preserving Israel qualitative military edge over its neighbors. They also conducted joint development of the Arrow Anti-Ballistic Missile Program, cooperated in homeland security, and joint effort to detect the smuggling of nuclear and other radioactive materials (Eisenstadt & Pollock, 2012). Thus, due to many strategic cooperations that both countries have been conducted, strengthening the relation with Israel will be more beneficial for the United States.

Regarding nuclear weapon proliferation of Israel, the U.S. governments refuse to comment or discuss it. This no-comment policy began since the secret deal between President Nixon and Prime Minister Golda Meir was reached. The U.S. government officials have been ordered not to discuss, write or acknowledge in public about Israel nuclear weapons possession. As the consequences of their disobedience, they will get sanctions or prosecution (Smith, 2014).

There are several cases show that the U.S. government get along with the no-comment policy. In the White House press conference in 2009, President Obama was

asked by a journalist if he knew which nations in the Middle East with nuclear weapons. Obama answered "With respect to nuclear weapons, you know, I don't want to speculate. Israel's established status as a nuclear-weapons state was only a matter of rumor and conjecture" (Birch & Smith, 2014). The Congress also did the same. When the Senate Foreign Relations Committee published the 2008 report entitled *Chain Reaction: Avoiding a Nuclear Arms Race in the Middle East*, they inserted the chapter which analyzed about Saudi Arabia, Egypt, and Turkey, but they excluded the state of Israel. In the footnote in page 61, the book argued that Israel nuclear arm was a perception (Birch & Smith, 2014).

## **2. The Partisan Influencer**

The Partisan influencer refers to the political parties passing through the aspirations and demands of society to government. They tried to give influence in the decision-making process through some members of party that they put in the government (Coplin, 2003). There are two big parties in the United States, Democratic Party, and Republican Party. These two political parties are the most influential one among other U.S political parties. In response toward Iran's nuclear programs, both Democratic and Republican parties totally support the existence of Israel condemning Iran's capability in pursuing nuclear weapons.

Their supports toward Israel and critics toward Iran have been continuing until today. One of the examples is both parties stance in the 2012 U.S Presidential election season. In creating the parties platform, one of the important political issues that they

proposed is about determining a policy on nuclear weapons. Each party platform addressed the issue of nuclear weapon proliferation both domestic and abroad. Thus, Iran's nuclear weapons program becomes one of the topic focuses.

a. Democratic Stance

Democratic stance on Iran nuclear weapons program and U.S.-Israel relationship have stated in the 2012 Democratic Platform. At the time, the U.S. current administration under President Barack Obama who comes from Democratic Party. The platform stated that:

President Obama and the Democratic Party maintain an unshakable commitment to Israel's security. A strong and secure Israel is vital to the United States not simply because we share strategic interests, but also because we share common values. The President's consistent support for Israel's right to defend itself and his steadfast opposition to any attempt to delegitimize Israel on the world stage are further evidence of our enduring commitment to Israel's security. President Obama, working closely with our international partners and Congress, has put in place unprecedented sanctions against Iran. Iran has yet to build a nuclear weapon, but has continually failed to meet its obligations under the NPT and several United Nations Security Council resolutions, and it cannot demonstrate with any credibility that its program is peaceful. The President is committed to using all instruments of national power to prevent Iran from acquiring nuclear weapons. President Obama believes that a diplomatic outcome remains the best and most enduring solution. But we have an obligation to use the time and space that exists now to put increasing pressure on the Iranian regime to live up to its obligations and rejoin the community of nations, or face the consequences (Democrats, 2012, pp. 23-26).

b. The Republican Stance

The Republican stance on Iran nuclear weapons program and the U.S.-Israel relationship was also stated in the 2012 Republican Platform:

Israel and the United States are part of the great fellowship of democracies who speak the same language of freedom and justice, and the right of every person to live in peace. The security of Israel is in the vital national security interest of the United States. We affirm our unequivocal commitment to Israel's security and will ensure that it maintains a qualitative edge in military technology over any potential adversaries. We support Israel's right to exist as a Jewish state with secure, and defensible borders. Iran's pursuit of nuclear weapons capability threatens America, Israel, and the world. That threat has only become worse during the current Administration. A continuation of its failed engagement policy with Iran will lead to nuclear cascade. In solidarity with the international community, America must lead the effort to prevent Iran from building and possessing nuclear weapons capability. With unstable regimes in Iran, and the possibility that a terrorist group could gain control of a nuclear weapon. We must retain all options in dealing with a situation that gravely threatens our security, our interests, and the safety of our friends (Republicans, 2012, pp. 39-50).

Both Republican and Democratic parties advocated the U.S. government to take action in order to stop Iran's nuclear programs and prevent them from acquiring nuclear weapons. The difference is the Democratic Party stressed more on diplomatic efforts first and then military as the last resort, but Republican advocated the government to choose military option instead. The Republican showed more eagerness to use military attack rather than the Democratic.

When both countries were dealing with the nuclear weapon issue. They only focus on the nuclear possession of the U.S. potential enemies such as Iran and North Korea. It concerned on how these countries nuclear weapon may threat U.S interests and what should be done to deal with their nuclear program. On another side, they do not mention about the possession of the nuclear weapons in the hand of Israel. Instead, they support

the right of Israel to defend itself from existending threats and take on the Israel's side no matter what will happened.

### **3. The Interests Influencer**

The interest influencer refers to the state's interest group. Though they are not as wide as the political party, they are very important as a source of support for the decision makers. There are several U.S interest groups who often influenced the government in formulating foreign policy such as Human Rights Watch, Amnesty International, The Brooking Institution, Jewish Lobby, China Lobby, and many others. The most powerful and the most influential among them is The Jewish Lobby (Cipto, 2003).

The Jewish Lobby is defined as the coalitions of individuals and organizations who work to shape the U.S. foreign policy in pro-Israel direction. The lobby consists of American-Jews who make effort to influence the foreign policy decision makers to create policy which advances the Israel's interests. They contribute in lobbying executive and legislative branches through letter-writing, shaping public opinion, and supporting other pro-Israel organizations. In return, they will give the financial assistance and vote for pro-Israel candidates (Mearsheimer & M. Walt, 2006).

The Jewish Lobby has influenced almost the entire aspects of the U.S. domestic politics such as in bureaucracy level, partisan, and mass media. The lobby has succeeded to shape the core elements of the U.S Middle East policy. No other interest

group has managed to change the U.S. foreign policy directions as far as what the Jewish Lobby did. The lobby continually convinced the U.S. government that their interests were identical with Israel's interests. If any government official was dare to criticize Israel, he or she will get the big wrath from the Lobby and its supporters in the Congress (Mearsheimer & M. Walt, 2006).

**Table 4.1 List of the Pro-Israel Groups in United States**

<b>The Interest Groups</b>	<b>Website Address</b>
American Israel Public Affairs Committee (AIPAC)	<a href="http://www.aipac.org/">http://www.aipac.org/</a>
Americans for Peace Now	<a href="http://www.peacenow.org/">http://www.peacenow.org/</a>
American Jewish Committee	<a href="http://www.ajc.org/">http://www.ajc.org/</a>
American Jewish Congress	<a href="http://www.ajcongress.org/">http://www.ajcongress.org/</a>
Jewish Alliance for Justice and Peace	<a href="http://www.btvshalom.org/">http://www.btvshalom.org/</a>
Conference of Presidents of Major Jewish Organizations	<a href="http://www.conferenceofpresidents.org/">http://www.conferenceofpresidents.org/</a>
The Israel Project	<a href="http://www.theisraelproject.org/">http://www.theisraelproject.org/</a>
Israel Policy Forum	<a href="http://www.israelpolicyforum.org/">http://www.israelpolicyforum.org/</a>
New Israel Fund	<a href="http://www.nif.org/">http://www.nif.org/</a>
Zionist Organization of America	<a href="http://www.zoa.org/">http://www.zoa.org/</a>

*Source:* (Addis, 2011, p. 42)

Those pro-Israel organizations consist of the moderates and hardliners. The hardliners such as AIPAC and the Conference of Presidents of Major Jewish Organizations (CPMJO) generally support every policy of Israel. The moderates

include The bulk of U.S. Jewry and Jewish Voice for Peace, a bit different in some specific Israel issues. One of the differences can be seen from how the moderates and hardliners responses toward Israel expansionist movements in Gaza, Palestine. The hardliners support the continuation to build Jewish settlement, but the moderates are more favorably to make concessions to the Palestinians. However, despite their differences, both moderates and hardliners are one voice if it is related to the U.S. support and aid toward Israel (Mearsheimer & M. Walt, 2006).

One of the Jewish Lobby, AIPAC (American, Israel Public Affairs Committee), is the most powerful interest group in the United States. AIPAC is quite successful in influencing the U.S. legislatives branch to give Israel more diplomatic cover, military, and economic aid. AIPAC is able to keep Israel as a leading recipient of the U.S. foreign aid. Moreover, the pro-Arab interest groups as their competitor are weak and almost non-exist. Thus, the AIPAC's influence remains unchallenged (Smith, 2014).

The Israel government and pro-Israel lobbies in the U.S government have been working together to shape the U.S. foreign policy in the Middle East, especially toward Israel enemies such as Iraq, Syria, and Iran. In the case of Iran's nuclear weapons program, they unceasingly urge the U.S. government to eradicate their nuclear program, weaken the Iranian power and run the foreign policy which is beneficial for Israel. The Iranian nuclear program is seen as a potential threat to Israel and the U.S. interest in the Middle East. Due to the lobbies from AIPAC, the Congress agreed to

pass the policy about bringing Iran's nuclear program into the UN Security Council and giving economic sanctions to Iran (Schulberg, 2015).

Israel defined Iran as the most dangerous enemy, since the changed of the regime into an Islamic fundamentalist regime. Moreover, when the issue about Iran pursuing nuclear weapons arises. Israel has tendency to describe every Islamic country in the Middle East with the nuclear weapon as an existential threat. Thus, the lobby pushed the Congress to extend sanctions on Iran through the approval of the Iran Freedom Support Act. On another side, the pro-Israel lobby in the Congress also has sufficient power to prevent any party from raising the discussion about the Israel's nuclear weapons program.

The Congress as one of the main branches of the U.S. government is firmly committed to support AIPAC and Israel. The Congress almost never turned away from the Israel interests. AIPAC's success in lobbying the U.S. government is due to their ability to reward legislator member and congressional candidates supporting its agenda. When it comes to electoral seasons, money and connection are critical to the success of the candidate. AIPAC with lots of connections can endorse the pro-Israel candidates by letter-writing campaign or endorsing it in the U.S. influential newspapers. No candidate that challenge Israel will be able to sit in the top branches of the U.S. political system (Mearsheimer & M. Walt, 2006).

There are many top Jewish senators and congressmen who work in formulating the U.S. foreign policy. By the sense of their Jewishness, they help in advancing Israel's



interests. It becomes the main sources of the power for Jewish Lobby. As one of a former head of AIPAC, Morris Amitay, once makes a statement:

There are a lot of guys at the working level up here (on Capitol Hill) who happen to be Jewish, who are willing to look at certain issues in terms of their Jewishness. These are all guys who are in a position to make the decision in these areas for those senators. You can get an awful lot done just at the staff level (Mearsheimer & M. Walt, 2006).

AIPAC also derives its power in the Executive branch through Jewish voters that they have on presidential elections. They also make campaign donations for candidates from both parties. The Washington Post ever reported that the Jewish supporters have helped 60% of funding for the candidate's campaign. When the pro-Israel people occupy the important position in the executive branch, they will become tools to serve the Israel's interests (Mearsheimer & M. Walt, 2006).

Israel is virtually immune from criticism. AIPAC is able to punish the government officials who are dare to challenge them. No open debate about the U.S. foreign policy toward Israel occurs there, though the policy may give an impact for the entire world. This condition is confirmed by the former Senator Ernest Hollings that noted: "You can't have an Israeli policy other than what AIPAC gives you around here". Israel's Prime Minister Ariel Sharon also ever told to American audiences "When people ask me how they can help Israel, I tell them - Help AIPAC". (Mearsheimer & M. Walt, 2006, p. 18).

Besides lobbying, AIPAC also performs as the important sources of information in Capitol Hill. They are often called to draft speeches, give advise on tactics, perform research, and collect co-sponsors. Thus, it is common for members of the Congress or legislature staffs to choose to ask AIPAC first when they need information instead of the Congressional Research Service, Library of Congress, or the Administration experts (Mearsheimer & M. Walt, 2006).

#### **4. The Mass Influencer**

Mass influencers come from the public opinions. The decision makers often consider public opinion as their supports and inputs toward the political agendas. Media is one of the effective ways of political communication. The government may socialize their program to society or get public support for political agenda through media. By using media, government is also able to shape society's perception and opinion to pro-government directions.

Beside influencing the government, the Israel Lobby also seeks to construct public perception about Israel in the Middle East. Pro-Israel organizations have worked hard to influence the mass media agencies because they are critical in shaping public opinion. The Lobby's influence can be reflected in the mainstream of the U.S. media which the most American news editors and commentators are pro-Israel. The journalists and columnists who criticized Israel are rarely widely published. The Lobby seeks to ensure the public discourse about Israel in positive direction and prevents

critical public comments or opinions about the U.S. foreign policy toward Israel (Mearsheimer & M. Walt, 2006).

In order to prevent unfavorable reports on Israel, the Lobby organized a letter writing campaigns, demonstration, and even boycotts against news agency in which the content is Anti-Israel. One CNN executive has said that he ever received 6000 e-mails in one day complaining certain news reports that they published having contained hostility statements to Israel. That is why U.S medias rarely make a news that contains criticism of Israel. Another Lobby's strategy to limit public's criticism is by charging anyone who criticizes Israel with anti-Semitism. This is quite effective because anti-Semite status is loathsome and no one wants to get such a label. Anti-Semite person has been accused of putting unfair standard toward Israel or questioning Israel's right to exist (Mearsheimer & M. Walt, 2006).

Another thing that helps the pro-Israel lobby in shaping public perceptions is the fact that several Jewish-Americans run the majority of the U.S. televisions, printed medias, and movie industries. Today, only small number of the U.S. newspaper owned by local non-Jewish people. Most local newspapers are owned by large company and controlled by some executives by using multi-newspaper chains system (Socio-Economics & History, 2013). Here is the list of the U.S. medias which are controlled by the Jewish-Americans people:

**Table 4.2 List of the Medias Controlled by  
Jewish-Americans**

<b>Media's Company</b>	<b>Owner</b>
Time Warner	Gerald Levin
The Walt Disney Company	Michael Eisner
Seagram Company Ltd	Edgar Bronfman
Universal Studios	Edgar Bronfman
Viacom	Sumner Redstone
General Electric	Dennis Dammerman
News Corporation Limited	Peter Chernin

*Source:* (Whitley, 2011)

Those Jewish media owners also collectively control news portals such as ABC, NBC, CBS, The Turner Broadcasting System, CNN, MTV, etc.

The three most prestigious newspapers in the United States such as the New York Time, the Wall Street Journal, and the Washington Post are also controlled by Jewish. These newspapers have been dominating the U.S. media in reporting economics and political issues. Both New York Times and the Washington Post were originally owned by non-Jewish, but due to the Great Depression, many newspaper companies went bankruptcy. Later, these companies were purchased by wealthy Jewish publisher (Socio-Economics & History, 2013).

The fact that Jewish people are able to control news and media means that it gives them a decisive influence on the U.S. political system and controls the government agendas. They also control the public opinions, in which the attitudes and ideas are shaped by the Jewish newspaper, televisions, and other medias. According to the survey, the majority of Americans believed that Iran has already possessed nuclear weapons. When they are being asked, "Do you believed Iran has nuclear weapons?" 58,5% correspondence choose yes, and 41,5% no. One of the reasons that most Americans wrongly believed Iran possession of nuclear weapons is due to the intensive propaganda campaign in mass media. The active party behind it is the pro-Israel lobby. They have conducted long campaign to create international focus on Iran's nuclear program (Smith, 2014).

The Iranian nuclear weapon's issue has been the top foreign policy issue throughout Washington for the past two months. Because media naturally remains within the agendas that is set by their owners, the public has been constructed about the danger of the Iran's nuclear programs. Thus, mostly public opinion were support for sanction given to Iran. The U.S. mass media is bias in reporting the fact about Iranian nuclear program. It is because the influence from the owner of medias in U.S. which the majority owned by the Jewish-American people. They are also able to silence the mainstream of the U.S. media regarding the Israel nuclear stockpiles and Israel refusal in signing the NPT (Smith, 2014). One of the Israeli women ever made statements which stressed on the Jewish influence in the United States:

You know very well, and the Americans know equally well, that we control their government, irrespective of who sits in the White House. You see, I know it and you know it that no American president can be in a position to challenge us even if we do the unthinkable. What can they (Americans) do to us? We control congress, we control the media, we control show biz, and we control everything in America. In America you can criticize God, but you can't criticize Israe - Israeli spokeswoman, Tzipora Menache (Socio-Economics & History, 2013)

### **C. The Economic and Military Capability**

In order to advance the state's national interest, it is very important to consider the state's economic and military capability. The success of the foreign policy of the states is somehow determined by how strong their military power and how much budget they could afford. In the case of United States supporting Israel, it is because they have sufficient military power and economic budget to run their policy in the Middle East. The United States has strong military power for defensive and offensive power. Economically, they are also rich. U.S. has allocated the huge number of foreign budget for giving foreign aid to all of the U.S. allies in the world.

Israel got the largest amount of the U.S. assistance compared with other countries. The United States has provided 3 billion dollars each year to Israel. The majority of the U.S. bilateral aid to Israel is in form of military assistance. In the past, the U.S. foreign aid to Israel divided into military and economic assistance, but all of the economic assistance was ended in 2007 due to the strong of the Israel's economic growth (Addis, 2011). The strong economic and military support from U.S. to Israel is not without reasons. U.S. has sufficient sources of funds and military power to support Israel. This

is due to the fact that Jews run majority of the U.S. economic sector. U.S and Israel had been conducting long cooperation in military industry. U.S. also rely on the Israel military technology.

The majority of the U.S. financial services are essentially Jewish franchise. From the Federal Reserve, Americans banks, and other financing industries are owned by Jewish-American people. They own and run the Federal Reserve Bank which is the most important banks in the United States. The U.S. government continually borrows from it and U.S. is in debt to. According to Forbes, 25-30% U.S. billionaires are Jewish people. Napoleon ever said “ When a government is depend on the money from the bankers means not the government leaders who control the nation. This is because the hand that gives is above the hand that takes. Financiers are without patriotism and without decency” (Rense, 2009).

The strong support from the U.S. Congress made Israel as the greatest benefactor than any other countries. While Israel got all of the U.S. foreign assistance plus interests in the beginning of the fiscal year, other countries got the U.S. foreign assistance in regular installments. Israel is the only country which is allowed to spend the parts of military aid for its domestic arms industry while other countries are required to use the aid for purchasing the U.S. manufactured weapons (Addis, 2011). Not like other recipients, Israel does not have to account and report the details about how the aid is spent. This kind of immunity makes the United States hard to prevent the money for

illegal purposes such as buying nuclear materials in black market or build settlement in the West Bank (Mearsheimer & M. Walt, 2006).

Such a big amount of military assistance is intentionally given by the United States to maintain Israel qualitative military edge in the regions, prevent from potential threats, and ensure the security of Israel. The U.S. military aid to Israel has made Israel become the strongest military power in the Middle East. Israel is able to transform their armed forces into the most sophisticated military technology in the world (Zanotti, 2012). The other military supports is also include Israel's access to the U.S. top intelligence informations and the most advanced U.S. weaponry system (Mearsheimer & M. Walt, 2006).

The reason behind U.S. in giving big military support to Israel is due to both countries cooperation in military industry. For decades, American and Israeli scientists have worked together to develop sophisticated military platforms like the Jointly Funded Arrow Antimissile System and David's Sling. U.S. weaponry systems which was deployed in Iraq and Afghanistan is rely on Israeli technology. Both states have ongoing joint research that benefited both sides. The United States and Israel committed to continue close military cooperation that emphasizing the interoperability, missile defense, deterrence, and joint funding (Malka, 2011).

U.S. weapon's deal with Israel worth \$38 billion. Until now U.S. continues to supply weapons to Israel. The newest stealth fighter F-35, is now being introduced in the U.S. military. It has been sent to Israel. The differences between what Israel can get



and what other countries can get from U.S. are that Israel able to choose the most advanced type of U.S. arms but other countries can't. Pieter Wezeman, a senior researcher at the Stockholm International Peace Research Institute ever said "So whereas Israel can buy the latest combat aircraft, the F-35, a country like Saudi Arabia, Qatar and Kuwait are not allowed to buy that." (Snyder, 2016)

Israel is a major supplier of defense articles to the U.S. military. Israeli ideas and concepts are sometimes copied and marketed by U.S. military firms. Israel's defense industries remain become the U.S. suppliers of innovative high tech items. Israel is United States' most sophisticated and experienced partner in rocket and missile defense. Israel has made a number of important contributions to the U.S. way of war. Israel has become a leading innovator in a number of U.S critical military issues. U.S. has often looked to Israeli military counterparts for lessons learned, innovative technologies and tactics (Eisenstadt & Pollock, 2012).

**Table 4.3 Recent U.S. Bilateral Aid to Israel**  
(millions of dollars)

<b>Year</b>	<b>Total</b>	<b>Military Grant</b>	<b>Economic Grant</b>	<b>Immig. Grant</b>	<b>ASHA</b>	<b>All other</b>
1949-1996	68,030.9	29,014.9	23,122.4	868.9	121.4	14,903.3
1997	3,132.1	1,800.0	1,200.0	80.0	2.1	50.0
1998	3,080.0	1,800.0	1,200.0	80.0	—	—
1999	3,010.0	1,860.0	1,080.0	70.0	—	—
2000	4,131.85	3,120.0	949.1	60.0	2.75	—
2001	2,876.05	1,975.6	838.2	60.0	2.25	—
2002	2,850.65	2,040.0	720.0	60.0	2.65	28.0
2003	3,745.15	3,086.4	596.1	59.6	3.05	—
2004	2,687.25	2,147.3	477.2	49.7	3.15	9.9
2005	2,612.15	2,202.2	357.0	50.0	2.95	—
2006	2,534.5	2,257.0	237.0	40.0	—	0.5
2007	2,503.15	2,340.0	120.0	40.0	2.95	0.2
2008	2,423.9	2,380.0	0	40.0	3.90	0
2009	2,583.9	2,550.0	0	30.0	3.90	0
2010	2,803.8	2,775.0	0	25.0	3.80	0
2011	3,029.22	3,000.0	0	25.0	4.225	0
2012	3,098.0	3,075.0	0	20.0	3.00	0
2013	2,943.234 (After Sequestration)	3,100.0	0	15.0	—	0
2014	3,115.0	3,100.0	0	15.0	—	0
2015	3,110.0	3,100.0	0	10.0	—	0

2016	3,110.0	3,100.0	0	10.0	—	0
<b>Total</b>	<b>124,300.804</b>	<b>70,523.4</b>	<b>30,897.0</b>	<b>1,673.2</b>	<b>162.075</b>	<b>14,991.9</b>

Source: (Sharp, 2015, p. 29)

**Table 4.4 The U.S. Loan Guarantees to Israel: FY2003-FY2015**  
(current \$ in millions)

<b>Fiscal Year</b>	<b>Deductions for Settlement Activity</b>	<b>Amount Borrowed by Israel</b>	<b>Amount Available for Israel to Borrow</b>
FY2003	289.5	1,600.0	1,110.5
FY2004	—	2,500.0	1,610.5
FY2005	795.8	—	1,814.7
FY2006	—	—	2,148.0
FY2007	—	—	2,481.4
FY2008	—	—	2,814.7
FY2009	—	—	3,148.0
FY2010	—	—	3,481.0
FY2011	—	—	3,814.0
FY2012	—	—	3,814.0
FY2013	—	—	3,814.0
FY2014	—	—	3,814.0
FY2015	—	—	3,814.0

Source: (Sharp, 2015, pp. 21-22)

**Table 4.5 Defense Budget Appropriations for U.S.-Israeli Missile  
Defense. FY2006-FY2016 Request (Current \$ in millions)**

<b>Fiscal Year</b>	<b>Arrow II</b>	<b>Arrow III (High Altitude)</b>	<b>David's Sling (Short-Range)</b>	<b>Iron Dome</b>	<b>Total</b>
FY2006	122.866	—	10.0	—	<b>132.866</b>
FY2007	117.494	—	20.4	—	137.894
FY2008	98.572	20.0 37.0	37.0	—	<b>155.572</b>
FY2009	74.342	30.0	72.895	—	<b>177.237</b>
FY2010	72.306	50.036	80.092	—	<b>202.434</b>
FY2011	66.427	58.966	84.722	205.0	<b>415.115</b>
FY2012	58.955	66.220	110.525	70.0	<b>305.700</b>
FY2013	40.800	74.700	137.500	194.0	<b>447.000</b>
FY2014	44.363	74.707	149.712	460.309	<b>729.091</b>
FY2015	56.201	74.707	137.934	350.972	<b>619.814</b>
FY2016 (Request)	11.000	55.100	36.700	55.000	<b>157.800</b>

*Source:* (Sharp, 2015, pp. 13-14)