

US–Israeli Relations in a New Era

Issues and challenges after 9/11

Edited by

Eytan Gilboa and Efraim Inbar



BESA Studies in International Security

This volume presents a variety of views from American, Israeli (and other) policy makers and academics and is indispensable in understanding American–Israeli relations. It is fair minded, tough, and wide ranging. No one who wishes to understand American policy in the Middle East can afford to ignore it.

Steven David, Johns Hopkins University, author of *Catastrophic Consequences: Civil Wars and American Interests* (2008)

In contrast to recent treatments of the US–Israeli relationship which provide sweeping critiques based on superficial and impressionistic judgments, this book provides a welcome corrective in its exemplary and knowledgeable treatment of this important subject.

Robert J. Lieber, Georgetown University, author of *The American Era: Power and Strategy for the 21st Century* (2005)

This is the most comprehensive and up-to-date collection of works on US–Israel relations in the post-9/11 age. Gilboa and Inbar have furnished an essential resource for scholars, students, journalists, and decision-makers.

Michael Oren, The Shalem Center, author of *Power, Faith, and Fantasy: America in the Middle East, 1776 to the Present* (2007)

Everyone talks about US–Israel relations but few people research them thoroughly and analyze them carefully. This book provides a careful and useful view of this relationship in the post-Cold War, post-September 11 world, sinking many myths and focusing on the key questions. It is essential reading for anyone wishing to understand the reality of this important, complex alliance.

Barry Rubin, GLORIA Center, author of *The Truth About Syria* (2008) and co-author with Walter Laqueur of *The Israel–Arab Reader* (2008)

US–Israeli Relations in a New Era

This book examines in depth the fundamental problems, factors and issues in current US–Israeli relations, which will have implications both for the Middle East and for world peace and prosperity.

The US and Israel have established an exceptional relationship, which has significant effects on events and processes in the entire Middle East. Israel depends on the US for military hardware, for support against hostile international organizations, and for economic and financial aid. In turn, it is viewed by the US as a strong and reliable ally, and the US has adopted strategic concepts that for decades have governed Israel's national security, such as pre-emptive strikes and counter-terrorist strategies. However, politicians and scholars have accused Israel and pro-Israeli organizations of exerting too much influence on US policy in the Middle East. Here, a collection of international experts present original research and findings on a wide variety of critical bilateral and regional issues in American–Israeli relations, approaching the topics from both theoretical and practical angles.

This book will be of interest to students of US Foreign Policy, Middle Eastern Politics, and International Relations in general.

Eytan Gilboa is Professor of Political Science and International Communication at Bar-Ilan University. He is also a Senior Research Associate at the Begin-Sadat (BESA) Center for Strategic Studies and a Visiting Professor of Public Diplomacy at the University of Southern California. **Efraim Inbar** is Professor of Political Studies at Bar-Ilan University and the Director of its Begin-Sadat (BESA) Center for Strategic Studies.

BESA studies in international security

Series Editor: Efraim Inbar

Middle Eastern Security

Prospects for an arms control regime

Edited by Efraim Inbar and Shmuel Sandler

Religious Radicalism in the Greater Middle East

Edited by Bruce Maddy-Weitzman and Efraim Inbar

The National Security of Small States in a Changing World

Edited by Efraim Inbar and Gabriel Sheffer

Israeli Strategy after Desert Storm

Lessons of the Second Gulf War

Maj. Gen. (res.) Aharon Levran

The Politics and Economics of Defense Industries

Edited by Efraim Inbar and Benzion Zilberfarb

Democratic Societies and Their Armed Forces

Israel in comparative context

Edited by Stuart A. Cohen

US Allies in a Changing World

Edited by Barry Rubin and Thomas Keaney

Armed Forces in the Middle East

Politics and strategy

Edited by Barry Rubin and Thomas Keaney

The Gulf War of 1991 Reconsidered

Edited by Andrew J. Bacevich and Efraim Inbar

Democracies and Small Wars

Edited by Efraim Inbar

Religion in World Conflict

Edited by Jonathan Fox and Shmuel Sandler

Radical Islam and International Security

Challenges and responses

Edited by Hillel Frisch and Efraim Inbar

US–Israeli Relations in a New Era

Issues and challenges after 9/11

Edited by Eytan Gilboa and Efraim Inbar

US–Israeli Relations in a New Era

Issues and challenges after 9/11

Edited by Eytan Gilboa and Efraim Inbar

First published 2009

by Routledge

2 Park Square, Milton Park, Abingdon, Oxon OX14 4RN

Simultaneously published in the USA and Canada

by Routledge

270 Madison Ave, New York, NY 10016

Routledge is an imprint of the Taylor & Francis Group, an informa business

This edition published in the Taylor & Francis e-Library, 2008.

“To purchase your own copy of this or any of Taylor & Francis or Routledge’s collection of thousands of eBooks please go to www.eBookstore.tandf.co.uk.”

© 2009 Selection and editorial matter, Eytan Gilboa and Efraim Inbar;
individual chapters, the contributors

All rights reserved. No part of this book may be reprinted or reproduced or utilized in any form or by any electronic, mechanical, or other means, now known or hereafter invented, including photocopying and recording, or in any information storage or retrieval system, without permission in writing from the publishers.

British Library Cataloguing in Publication Data

A catalogue record for this book is available from the British Library

Library of Congress Cataloging in Publication Data

US-Israeli relations in a new era : issues and challenges after 9/11 / edited by Eytan Gilboa and Efraim Inbar.

p. cm. — (Besa studies in international security)

1. United States—Foreign relations—Israel. 2. Israel—Foreign relations—United States. I. Gilboa, Eytan. II. Inbar, Efraim, 1947–

JZ1480.A571 758 2009

327.7305694—dc22

2008022089

ISBN 0-203-88712-3 Master e-book ISBN

ISBN10: 0-415-47701-8 (hbk)

ISBN10: 0-203-88712-3 (ebk)

ISBN13: 978-0-415-47701-7 (hbk)

ISBN13: 978-0-203-88712-7 (ebk)

Contents

<i>Biographies</i>	xi
Introduction	1
EYTAN GILBOA AND EFRAIM INBAR	
PART I	
The strategic landscape	7
1 US management of Middle East war and peace: between defensive realism and offensive liberalism	9
BENJAMIN MILLER	
2 US–Israel relations in the post-Cold War era: the view from Jerusalem	33
EFRAIM INBAR	
PART II	
Domestic sources	51
3 The public dimension of US–Israel relations: a comparative analysis	53
EYTAN GILBOA	
4 AIPAC and US Middle East policy	76
MITCHELL G. BARD	
5 American Jewish demography: implications for US–Israel relations	91
IRA M. SHESKIN	
6 American Christian support for Israel	108
PAUL CHARLES MERKLEY	

PART III

Foreign policy issues 123

7 A war for Israel? Israel and the war in Iraq 125

DOV WAXMAN

8 The US and the Arab–Israeli peace process: conflict management versus conflict resolution 140

JONATHAN RYNHOLD

9 The Jerusalem issue: between President, Congress, and the courts 158

SHLOMO SLONIM

PART IV

Multi-lateral dimensions 171

10 Transatlantic relations and the Middle East: beyond policy disagreements? 173

EMANUELE OTTOLENGHI

11 India, Israel, and the US factor 196

CHERIAN SAMUEL

12 Turkey, Israel, and American hegemony 216

AMIKAM NACHMANI

PART V

Looking ahead 233

13 The future of US–Israel relations 235

P. EDWARD HALEY

Index 250

Biographies

Editors

Eytan Gilboa is Professor of Political Studies and Chair of the Communications Program at Bar-Ilan University. He is also a Senior Researcher at the Begin-Sadat (BESA) Center for Strategic Studies and a Visiting Professor of Public Diplomacy at the University of Southern California. His numerous publications include two books (1987, 1993) and many articles and book chapters on American attitudes toward Israel and the Middle East.

Efraim Inbar is Professor of Political Studies at Bar-Ilan University and Director of the Begin-Sadat (BESA) Center for Strategic Studies. His area of specialization is Middle Eastern strategic issues with a special interest in the politics and strategy of Israeli national security. His latest book is *Israel's National Security: Issues and Challenges since the Yom Kippur War* (London: Routledge, 2008).

Contributors

Mitchell Bard is Executive Director of the non-profit American-Israeli Cooperative Enterprise (AICE) and one of the leading authorities on US Policy in the Middle East. He is also the director of the Jewish Virtual Library, the world's most comprehensive online encyclopedia of Jewish history and culture. His latest book is *Will Israel Survive?* (New York: Palgrave, 2007).

P. Edward Haley is W.M. Keck Foundation Professor of International Strategic Studies and Chairman of the International Relations Program, Claremont McKenna College; and Professor, Claremont Graduate University. He writes about US foreign policy with a special focus on the Eastern Mediterranean, the Gulf, and great power relations. He is the author of *Strategies of Dominance: The Misdirection of US Foreign Policy* (Washington, DC: Woodrow Wilson Center Press, 2006), and co-author of *Strategic Foreign Assistance: Civil Society in International Security* (Stanford: Hoover Institution Press, 2006).

Paul Charles Merkley is Professor Emeritus of History at Carleton University, Ottawa, Canada. He serves regularly as an advisor on international politics to the current Canadian Minister of Public Safety. He has written extensively on the Christian interest in Zionism and Christian attitudes toward Israel. His most recent book is *American Presidents, Religion, and Israel* (Westport, CT: Praeger, 2004).

Benjamin Miller is Associate Professor of International Relations at the School of Political Sciences at the University of Haifa. He has served as a visiting professor at various schools including the University of Colorado, Boulder, and Duke University. His areas of research include conflict and cooperation, regional war and peace, and nationalism and conflict. His latest book is *States, Nations and Great Powers: The Sources of Regional War and Peace* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2007).

Amikam Nachmani is Associate Professor of Political Studies at Bar-Ilan University and a Senior Researcher at the Begin-Sadat (BESA) Center for Strategic Studies. He specializes in strategic affairs of Turkey, Greece and Cyprus, and is an authority on the politics of water in the Middle East. His most recent book is *Turkey: Facing a New Millennium* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2003).

Emanuele Ottolenghi is Executive Director of the Brussels-based Transatlantic Institute. He taught Israel studies at Oxford University (1999–2006). He is a regular commentator on Middle Eastern affairs for the Italian press. His latest book is *Autodafé: Europe, the Jews and Anti-Semitism* (Torino, Italy: Lindau, 2007 [Italian]).

Jonathan Rynhold is Senior Lecturer in Political Studies at Bar-Ilan University and a Senior Researcher at the Begin-Sadat (BESA) Center for Strategic Studies. His recent publications have analyzed American policy toward the Israeli–Palestinian conflict, the rise and fall of the Oslo process, the separation barrier, the Gaza disengagement and the role of foreign policy in Israeli elections.

Cherian Samuel is Associate Fellow at the Institute for Defense Studies and Analyzes, New Delhi. He served as a Research Fellow at the Observer Research Foundation, New Delhi where he edited the weekly *ORF US Monitor*. He specializes in Indo-US relations, US domestic policy and the Indian Diaspora in the US. He is co-editor of *The Second Bush Presidency: Global Perspectives* (New Delhi: Dorling Kindersley, 2006).

Ira M. Sheskin is Professor of Geography and Regional Studies at the University of Miami and the Director of the Jewish Demography Project at the Sue and Leonard Miller Center for Contemporary Judaic Studies. His area of research is Jewish demography. His most recent book is *How Jewish Communities Differ: Variations in the Findings of Local Jewish*

Demographic Studies (New York: City University of New York, North American Jewish Data Bank, 2001).

Shlomo Slonim is James G. McDonald Professor Emeritus of American History at the Hebrew University of Jerusalem. He has written extensively on legal and political aspects of the Arab–Israeli conflict including American–Israeli relations. He is the author of *Jerusalem in America's Foreign Policy, 1947–1997* (The Hague: Kluwer Law International, 1998).

Dov Waxman is Assistant Professor of Political Science at Baruch College, the City University of New York. He serves on the Board of Directors of the Association for Israel Studies and is the Associate Editor of the journal *Israel Studies Forum*. His latest book is *The Pursuit of Peace and the Crisis of Israeli Identity: Defending/Defining the Nation* (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2006).

Introduction

Eytan Gilboa and Efraim Inbar

The Middle East stands today at the center of world concern and international activity. The US, the hegemonial power following the end of the Cold War, is greatly involved in this region. One of its closest allies is Israel. The US and Israel have established an exceptional relationship, which has significant effects on events and processes in the entire Middle East. Israel depends on the US for military hardware, for support against hostile international organizations, and for economic and financial aid. In turn, it is viewed by the US as a strong and reliable ally which shares highly valuable intelligence, offers access, and cooperates in many strategic and diplomatic areas. US–Israel relations have become closer after the September 11, 2001 terrorist attacks due to Washington’s view that the two countries are fighting the same battle against Arab and Islamic terrorism. Yet, a few American politicians and scholars have accused Israel and pro-Israeli organizations of exerting too much influence on US policy in the Middle East.

This book examines the fundamental issues in American–Israeli relations which have significant implications for the future of the Middle East and world peace and prosperity. A group of distinguished experts from several countries was convened in Israel, at the Begin-Sadat (BESA) Center for Strategic Studies at Bar-Ilan University in May 2007, to discuss a wide variety of critical bilateral and regional issues. This volume is the product of this international conference that benefited from the generous support of the Anti-Defamation League (ADL) and the Argov Center at Bar-Ilan University. This conference was the first in a series of similar intellectual gatherings the BESA Center and the ADL plan to hold in order to deal with the complexities of the special US–Israel relationship over the coming years. This conference also was the stage for publicizing the results of a BESA/ADL multi-year project to survey and study Israeli attitudes toward America. The results are also presented and discussed in Eytan Gilboa’s chapter. The following chapters are original pieces containing the most up-to-date, previously unpublished information, analysis and provocative thoughts. These studies include both theoretical and policy-oriented contributions.

The book is divided into five sections: The Strategic Landscape, Domestic Sources, Foreign Policy Issues, Multilateral Dimensions, and Looking Ahead. The first section, the Strategic Landscape, provides a comprehensive and broad review of key strategic elements in US policy toward the Middle East and

Israel's relations with the US. The first chapter examines patterns in US management of war and peace, while the second explores and compares common strategic interests and approaches to global and regional politics. The second part, *Domestic Sources*, examines factors and issues which affect foreign policy making in the US including public opinion, the pro-Israel lobby in Washington, the American Israel Public Affairs Committee (AIPAC), American Jews and American Christians. The third part explores three major controversial issues in US policy and American-Israeli relations: the 2003 War in Iraq, American mediation in the Arab-Israeli conflict and Jerusalem. The fourth part presents multilateral dimensions and linkages between the US, Israel and other states, such as Europe, India and Turkey. The last part suggests scenarios for future developments in US-Israel relations.

The first section, *The Strategic Landscape*, begins with Benny Miller's theoretical framework of analysis designed to study US management of Middle East war and peace via two approaches to international relations: realism and liberalism. Miller argues that there are great variations in US management of war and peace in the region in the last decades and thus focuses on a conceptual and empirical description of these variations in conflict management. He provides an explanation of the variations based on the logic of the combined effects of the systemic and regional balances of threat. Four types of management are applied to US strategies in four Middle East wars and subsequent diplomacy: The 1973 Yom Kippur War, the 1990-91 Gulf War, the 2003 Iraq War and the 2006 Second Lebanon War.

In the next chapter, Efraim Inbar sketches the strategic view from Jerusalem as it has evolved since the end of the Cold War. This chapter evaluates Israel's strong pro-American disposition and its preference for an American-dominated world. Inbar also analyzes the strategic glue that has developed between the two states since the end of the Cold War and points out the similarities in their strategic agendas. The gap between the national security doctrines of the US and Israel was narrowed and the cooperation in the strategic sphere intensified. Indeed, the strategic partnership between the US and Israel has survived the changing circumstances in the international system and the occasional bilateral tensions. As Israel remained America's most reliable partner in the region, the US continued its Cold War policies by providing Israel with much-needed diplomatic and economic support, as well as access to modern weaponry.

The second section, *Domestic Sources*, begins with the pioneering comparative analysis of trends in American and Israeli attitudes toward each other. Eytan Gilboa presents and integrates new data based on several recent polls taken in Israel and in the US including a poll commissioned especially for this work. Gilboa places the polling results within long-term trends and political and strategic contexts of major events occurring in the relations between the two countries, primarily since the September 11, 2001 terrorist attacks in the US. Gilboa examines American and Israeli mutual opinions on various bilateral issues such as favorability, reliability, leadership, foreign aid and strategic interests, and on regional issues including Iran's quest for nuclear weapons, the war in Iraq, the

Palestinian-Israeli conflict, and the Second Lebanon War. His study reveals mostly positive mutual attitudes and considerable agreement between the two peoples on most bilateral and regional issues.

Moving to Washington, Mitchell Bard looks at the influence of the pro-Israeli lobby in Washington, the American Israel Public Affairs Committee (AIPAC), on US foreign policy. AIPAC has relied on the strong standing of Israel in American public opinion. According to its detractors, however, AIPAC is an all-powerful lobby that is concerned only with advancing the interests of Israel and uses its influence to persuade US decision-makers to adopt policies that undermine the national security of the US. AIPAC denies that it has such power, or that it acts nefariously. AIPAC does though tell prospective donors and its members that it is the second most powerful lobby in Washington – the most powerful foreign policy lobby – and that its actions strengthen the relationship between Israel and the US, an alliance that also bolsters America's national interests. Bard investigates questions such as: How an organization that ostensibly represents a miniscule minority of Americans, the 2 percent of the population that is Jewish, can attract so much positive and negative attention and be perceived as playing such a significant role in US foreign policy? And how much of AIPAC's power is perceived and how much is real?

AIPAC also relies on the perceived political power of American Jews. Israel has developed an extensive and long standing relationship with American Jewry which aside from Israel is the largest Jewish community in the world. Since 1990, the organized American Jewish community has completed two National Jewish Population Studies (NJPS 1990 and NJPS 2000) and more than 50 local Jewish community studies. The major purpose of these studies is to provide guidance nationally and locally to Jewish federations, synagogues, and other Jewish organizations about the size and geographic distribution of the Jewish population, its demography and religiosity, membership patterns, levels of Jewish education, social service needs, media usage, levels of philanthropic donations, and other topics. Ira Sheskin presents some of the more important findings and discusses the impact on US–Israel relations. The first part of the chapter examines the political implications of the data collected on the number of Jews in the US, recent and projected changes in the number of Jews in the US, and the changing geographic distribution of American Jews. The second part examines issues related to political parties and the political ideology of American Jews. The third part looks at the relationship of American Jews to Israel. The overall question addressed in this chapter is the extent to which changing American Jewish demographics are likely to affect the ability and willingness of the American Jewish community to influence the US–Israel relationship.

Paul Merkley examines a different perspective altogether – the support of American Christians for Israel. Christian Zionists have always been the most consistent supporters of Israel's cause – more consistently pro-Israel, in fact, than the general constituency of those who identify themselves by the US Bureau of Census as Jews. Merkley destroys myths and misconceptions about the American Christian support for Israel. Christian Zionism reflects a basically

pro-Israel disposition deeply embedded in American culture, rooted in America's Puritan beginnings, standing even today upon the general public's belief that the State of Israel came into the world in fulfillment of biblical prophecy and that the well-being of America requires her leaders to display a preference for Israel's cause in all the challenges that she faces.

The third section looks at key long-standing foreign policy issues in US-Israel relations. One of the major issues of American foreign policy post-September 11, 2001 has been the war in Iraq. Although Israel has not taken part in this war, it has been deeply associated – some would say implicated – in it. Indeed, aside from the US and the United Kingdom, in the public imagination (both in Western countries and Middle Eastern ones) Israel is perhaps more tied to the Iraq War than any other country. While the US led the 'coalition of the willing' into war against Saddam Hussein's Iraq in March 2003, it is widely believed that Israel was, in some way, behind this decision to go to war. Dov Waxman refutes this popular belief, and offers a more accurate analysis of pre-war Israeli views concerning the desirability of a US-led war with Iraq. It also considers the consequences of the Iraq War for Israel and its possible implications for future US-Israeli relations.

Another major issue in American-Israeli relations has been the US approach to Arab-Israeli negotiations. Jonathan Rynhold examines debates in the US on the most effective way to resolve the conflict. Since the collapse of the process in year 2000, and events such as September 11, 2001 and the 2003 Iraq War, this debate has become particularly acute as policymakers and academics grapple with numerous threats and challenges to the US emanating from the Middle East. A key question has been whether the US should focus on managing or resolving the Arab-Israeli conflict. Some argue that the Clinton Administration focused too much on conflict resolution, contributing to the collapse of the peace process and a region-wide deterioration, while others argue that the George W. Bush Administration has focused too little on conflict resolution, with highly negative consequences for US interests in the Middle East. Rynhold examines such claims and considers the implications for US policy in the region.

The issue of Jerusalem has been a matter for much debate and polemics in American-Israeli relations. Since the establishment of Israel, the US refused to recognize Jerusalem as the capital of Israel. Presidents, even those considered very friendly to Israel, have been reluctant to implement Congressional resolutions instructing them to move the US embassy to Jerusalem. Shlomo Slonim describes the battle for Jerusalem in Washington, focusing on legal and political aspects of the problem.

The volume then turns to the fourth section, the Multilateral Dimensions, which looks at the trilateral relationships existing between the US and Israel with Europe, India, and Turkey. Emanuele Ottolenghi analyzes the European view of the Middle East and Israel. The centrality of the Middle East to the vital strategic interests of both Europe and the US poses a constant strain to transatlantic relations. European views of the Middle East and of the US are not uniform. Regardless, this chapter focuses on mainstream views, especially

within Western European countries such as France, Germany, Italy and the United Kingdom, which play a leading role in shaping European foreign policy in the region – while remaining mindful of important exceptions and differences from country to country. Ottolenghi argues that Europe and the US increasingly differ on their interpretation of the Middle East, and looks at how these differences affect transatlantic cooperation.

Cherian Samuel's chapter examines the existing bilateral relations between India and Israel, and the nature and scope for trilateral adjustments with the US in various areas and contexts of geo-politics and economics. The end of the Cold War offered many countries an opportunity to re-evaluate and reassess their respective foreign policies. The reassessment on the Indian side resulted in the establishment of formal diplomatic relations with Israel in 1992. One of the main factors of the decision was the hope that this step would have a favorable impact on Indo-US relations. The US is a common denominator for both countries for similar reasons; in addition to being the sole remaining superpower with influence and interests worldwide, it is also the world leader in high technology and consequently the chief source of financing for the global innovation economy.

The next chapter deals with the trilateral US–Turkey–Israel relationship in the post-Cold War era. Only in that period did the two best allies of the US in the region, Turkey and Israel, develop close relations. Amikam Nachmani reviews the issues that bring the three countries together. Subsequently, he analyzes the issues of discord among the three.

The final chapter takes a look at the future of American–Israeli relations. Ed Haley suggests that the Middle East has changed dramatically since September 11, 2001 in ways that both improve and damage Israeli and American security. Ironically, the biggest improvement – the downfall of Saddam Hussein – also hurts: the elimination of a united Iraq and its replacement by a weak Shiite-dominated state alters the balance of power in the Gulf in favor of Iran. Other changes also make the future uncertain, including the Iranian nuclear program, the rise of Islamist movements and their terrorist off-shoots, the problems facing Israel in Lebanon and among the Palestinians, the setbacks suffered by the US in Iraq and Afghanistan, and the resulting spread of Iranian influence throughout the region. The central strategic question facing Israel remains unchanged: is peace and security possible in this troubled region, and will changes in the US global and regional status affect that challenge?

The editors and the contributors to this volume thank the ADL and particularly the National Director Abraham H. Foxman for their support of this project. They also thank Rebecca Goldberg for her excellent editorial assistance in preparing this volume for publication. The editors thank the contributors for their patience with repeated demands for revisions. The BESA Center provided a wonderful intellectual home and a source for unwavering logistical support for this book.

We hope that readers and reviewers of this volume will find it a useful and interesting contribution to a better understanding of the complex American–Israeli relationship and its effects on the Middle East.

Part I

The strategic landscape

1 US management of Middle East war and peace

Between defensive realism and offensive liberalism

Benjamin Miller

How does the US manage regional conflicts and their escalation to wars? In responding to this question, four management types can be derived. The *objectives* can focus on either the regional balance of power (BOP)¹ or the domestic character of the regional states. The *means* can be either a unilateral approach or a multilateral one. These management types can approximate theoretical International Relations (IR) approaches. In general, *realists* focus on the regional balance of power,² while *liberals* focus on the domestic character of the state.³ Furthermore, the *defensive* approach, either realist or liberal, uses multilateral means, while the *offensive* approach uses unilateral means. Thus, four management types emerge – offensive realism, defensive realism, offensive liberalism, and defensive liberalism (see Table 1.1).

It should be noted that this theoretical framework refers to either a senior superpower in a bipolar or a multipolar world, or a hegemon in a unipolar world. Both terms are used alternately.

Logic of the management pattern: variations in the balance of threat

What is the best explanation for the variations in systemic management? The distribution of capabilities in the international system is a key factor. Yet, to the extent there is a variation in management under the same power distribution, it somewhat weakens the explanatory strength of this factor. Thus, I choose to focus on the balance of threat as the leading cause, in two senses:

Table 1.1 How (liberal) great powers manage regional conflict and war: four approaches

<i>Objectives/means</i>	<i>Unilateral (offensive)</i>	<i>Multilateral (defensive)</i>
Inter-state BOP (realism)	Offensive realism	Defensive realism
Domestic regime (liberalism)	Offensive liberalism	Defensive liberalism

- 1 *Regional Perspective*: What is the nature of the regional threat posed to the international system? Here I will make a key distinction between threats derived from the regional balance of power and threats coming from domestic/transborder sources. Such sources can be derived from rogue regimes, or from a certain ideological orientation or movement that leads to revolutions or instability.
- 2 *International Perspective*: To what extent do the great powers see each other as the major threat or see a third party, i.e. the regional threat (elaborated above), as a common threat that surpasses the threat they pose to each other? The answer to this inquiry will substantially depend on whether the great power threat perception is shared or divergent.

The nature of the regional threat and the objectives of its management

A threat originating in the regional balance of power will create a *realist* objective, focused on the regional balance of power, whereas a domestic/trans-border threat will result in a *liberal* objective, which is, managing the domestic regime. Threat perception related to the balance of power is more likely when states in the region are strong states, institutionally speaking, and at least some of them are revisionist, but they are rational actors in the sense that they calculate cost-benefit considerations. Under these conditions, realist approaches to management are especially appealing. In contrast, liberal approaches will tend to be selected by liberal great powers when radical ideologies are promoted by non-state actors in weak or failed states.

The greatest threat at present will determine the means used in managing the regional threat. When the greatest threat is posed to the senior power by another great power, such as in a bipolar system, an offensive, unilateral approach is more likely, especially in case of a threat to the balance of power. The unilateral approach prevails as long as the system is bipolar and the threat concerns balance of power, regardless of international-level policies intended to ease the tension between the two poles. A policy such as *détente* might influence the international level, yet it does not have a decisive effect on the great power regional policy. In the case of a unipolar system, a shared threat perception (between the great powers) will lead to a defensive, multilateral approach, while a divergent threat perception will lead to an offensive, unilateral approach of the senior power. Though the four possible management patterns are comprehensive and distinct, and the elements of each one of them are cohesively interrelated, for the purpose of clarity and parsimony, the relations between the variables can be simplified in Figure 1.1.

The combined effect of variations in the two independent variables can explain which school would be the best in describing the key patterns of the systemic management of regional wars by the hegemon/senior power, as articulated in the propositions of Table 1.2.

1 The Regional Perspective		
Independent variable: nature of regional threat	→	Dependent variable: objectives of management
2 The International Perspective		
Independent variable: the greatest threat/level of great power conflict	→	Dependent variable: means of management

Figure 1.1 Management pattern rational.

Both causality and the characteristics of the various management patterns are elaborated below, where I suggest under what conditions each of the approaches will be dominant and what will be its key manifestations.

*Offensive realism*⁴

The great powers pose a threat to each other and state military power is the major regional threat. The expectations of offensive realism will be approximated under these conditions. As the great powers see each other as the biggest threat to themselves, it is a competitive system in which they will tend to pursue a unilateral avenue rather than collaboration. They will do it both because of mistrust and a desire for unilateral achievements at the expense of the other great power(s), aiming to reach dominance and to exclude the other powers from the regional management. They will try to maximize these achievements by affecting the regional balance of power, each power enhancing the power of its client.

Table 1.2 The balance of systemic and regional threat

<i>Nature of regional threat</i>	<i>Level of great-power conflict/division of opinion</i>	
	<i>High (GPs pose threat to each other) Leading to a unilateral approach</i>	<i>Low (higher common threat to the GPs) Leading to a multilateral approach</i>
State military power		
Leading to a regional BOP objective	<i>Offensive realism</i> Regional BOP/unilateral (change in the BOP in favor of one GP at the expense of the other)	<i>Defensive realism</i> Regional BOP/multilateral
Ideological/non-state		
Leading to a domestic regime objective	<i>Offensive liberalism</i> Regime/unilateral (regime change – democratization)	<i>Defensive liberalism</i> Regime/multilateral (state-building)

Defensive realism

A common threat to all the great powers is present in the region. This threat poses a greater threat than the threat they pose to each other. This regional threat is related to state military power, especially a revisionist regional power which seeks regional hegemony. Under a common threat related to the balance of power, we should expect the patterns associated with defensive realism to prevail. The great powers will cooperate against the shared threat and will focus on suppressing and defeating the hegemonic ambitions of the revisionist regional state by military means.⁵

Offensive liberalism

The regional threat is related to ideology and domestic regime more than to the balance of military power. However, this threat is seen as a serious one which justifies military action only by some of the great powers, while others see the unilateral action of those powers as posing a greater threat to them than the regional threat itself. Under these conditions, offensive liberalism is likely to be pursued by the hegemon, if the hegemonic power is liberal and if it seems that the regional threat is posed by ideology and the nature of the regimes involved. This offensive liberal approach will be directed toward regime change in the region and is likely to be opposed by other powers, who do not share this threat perception. They will try to balance the hegemon, at least by 'soft balancing'; if the hegemon is too powerful by 'hard balancing.'⁶ This approach can be employed since both the hegemon and the regional threat do not present a substantially direct threat to the other great powers' key security interests such as their independence and territorial integrity.

Defensive liberalism

The great powers pose a low threat to each other while there is a common threat posed to all of them from the region. This threat is related to domestic or trans-border instability and ideology rather than to state military power in the regional balance of power. Under the conditions of a common domestic threat perception, shared by the powers, especially when it has trans-border implications in the region, we should expect the systemic powers to follow the logic of defensive liberalism. Facing a common regional threat imposed by weak state structures or trans-border instability, they will prefer the multilateral road to a unilateral one, focusing on state building. Thus, preferred strategies would include reinforcement of government and military institutions, economic aid and political reforms, strengthening of democratic institutions, peacekeeping and conflict resolution – regionally and domestically.⁷ The underlying logic is that domestic stability brings about regional and international stability. Stable states deter not only civil wars but also foreign intervention, while unstable states attract regional intervention. Foreign intervention can be either out of fear that