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OBJECTIVES, METHODOLOGY AND PARAMETERS

OBJECTIVES

This report aims at mapping and analyzing the current US-Israel relationship and their projection by the end of 2012. It is based on the Globe Expert tools. Globe Expert is an information technology, which manages and analyzes the flows of information. By crossing entropy, fuzzy logic and different models such as neural or genetic algorithms, it provides cartographies and forecasting analyzes.

METHODOLOGY

1. Preparing a semantic analytical framework structured by axes, segments and associated keywords.
2. Starting from this frame of reference, a first search is executed on the whole database (3 million documents) in order to retrieve the most relevant documents matching with each reference. Thus, a documentary repository is carried out. It includes about 500 documents by segments.
3. Provided with this “base of learning”, the system executes new queries and searches for the most relevant and complex documents with respect to the references. In this way a mini database (20.000 documents) is carried out.
4. Keywords expressing the core question of the study are associated with the frame of reference and the mini database before the full process starts.
5. The process takes into account concepts and not only words. It is not binary - yes or no, white or black - but fuzzy: i.e. rendering a wide scope of colours. It is comparative.

PARAMETERS

1. In order to look at the issues from an American standpoint and an Israeli one, we executed two queries: a’) “USA AND Israel AND Negotiations”; b’) “Israel AND Negotiations”.
2. We limited the projection by 2012: that is the end of President Obama’s term of office.
3. Regarding the “behavioural simulations” (genetic algorithms) we opted for the “Prey and Predator Model” based on the Lotka-Volterra equation and associated with the Malthus model, i.e. an unlimited growth of the “predators”, which can prey upon each other.
4. We did not balance the weight of the different predators, just as we did not modify the selection of the preys and predators that the system had carried out.

NOTA BENE

This report constitutes a first approach. On its base, new hypotheses for research can be established, notably by taking into account a specific selection of predators with individual weights. New queries can be also executed in order to deepen the analysis of some issues.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Axes</th>
<th>Segments</th>
<th>Keywords</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Domestic AND politics</td>
<td>Evangelic AND Right</td>
<td>Bible AND belt; Red AND state; Roman AND Catholicism AND rise; Evangelic; Episcopalian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pro-Israel</td>
<td>PAC; Pressure AND group; AIPAC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Arab AND Muslim</td>
<td>Pressure AND group; demography</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Military AND aid</td>
<td>BMENA</td>
<td>Reform AND Arab AND world; Society AND open; Moderate AND government; Media; Property AND private</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organization</td>
<td>NATO</td>
<td>ICI; MD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>UN</td>
<td>Sanctions; Security AND council; Regional AND group; veto</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peace AND process</td>
<td>Territories</td>
<td>Implantation AND Jewish; Gaza AND tunnel; withdrawal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Attack</td>
<td>Rocket; Bomb; Arm AND smuggling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Palestine AND government</td>
<td>Abbas; Hamasómo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missile</td>
<td>Lebanon</td>
<td>Hezbollah; Katyusha; Fajr-3; Fajr-5; Zelzal-2; cyberspace</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Syria</td>
<td>Hezbollah; Proliferation; Finance; Training; Peace</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Iran</td>
<td>Shahab; Zelzal; No And Dong; Teapo AND dong; Nuclear AND threshold</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Missile AND defense</td>
<td>Arrow; Aegis; Boeing AND laser; Theater AND Missile AND defense</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oil</td>
<td>Reserve</td>
<td>Saudi AND Arabia; Aramco; OPEC; Non-OPEC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Oil AND pressure AND group</td>
<td>Sanctions AND Iran; Big AND oil; Oil AND terrorism; Oil AND freedom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Environment</td>
<td>Oil AND peak; Pollution AND oil; Energy AND alternative</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
EVOLUTION OF THE US-ISRAEL RELATIONSHIP

1. OBSERVATIONS

From the generated graphs, it appears immediately that there is an imbalance of interests between the two countries.

The United States, when looking at Israel, sees four major axes of issues: instability within the peace process, regional defense issues with Lebanon or more broadly, with missile-defense, and a domestic politics segment.

Map 1: relations of interaction centered on USA when looking at Israel
This kind of cartography renders a graphic visualization of the way the different segments interact with each other. It is based on the analysis of the concepts contained in the information regarding each segment.
Map 2: relations of interaction centered on the segment “Domestic Politics Pro-Israel”
This kind of cartography renders a graphic visualization of the way the different segments interact with each other. It is based on the analysis of the concepts contained in the information regarding each segment.

The domestic politics segment reveals issues regarding military aid, the evangelic right, the BMENA and another domestic politics issue, that of Arab Muslims.
Map 3: relations of interaction centered on the segment “Domestic Politics Arab Muslim”

This kind of cartography renders a graphic visualization of the way the different segments interact with each other. It is based on the analysis of the concepts contained in the information regarding each segment.

In turn, this segment reveals proximity with the US’ vision for Israel, pro-Israeli groups, the BMENA and regional security issues, such as Syria’s proliferation.
Map 4: relations of interaction centered on Israel, from the standpoint of negotiations with the Palestinians.

This kind of cartography renders a graphic visualization of the way the different segments interact with each other. It is based on the analysis of the concepts contained in the information regarding each segment.

For Israel, from the standpoint of negotiations with the Palestinians, there appears only the instability within the peace process.
Map 5: relations of interaction centered on the UN, from the standpoint of Israel looking at negotiations with the Palestinians.

This kind of cartography renders a graphic visualization of the way the different segments interact with each other. It is based on the analysis of the concepts contained in the information regarding each segment.

Shifting the focus to the UN reveals a proximity to the issues of instability within the peace process, NATO and oil; which, in turn, brings the issue of oil reserves and the UN.
Map 6: relations of interaction centered on the segment “Oil Environment”, from the standpoint of Israel looking at negotiations with the Palestinians. This kind of cartography renders a graphic visualization of the way the different segments interact with each other. It is based on the analysis of the concepts contained in the information regarding each segment.

Thus, where Israel appears to be mainly concerned with security, institutional management of security (UN, NATO) or the effects of oil, the United States has a much broader scope of interests, ranging from domestic issues (pro-Israeli, Evangelic right, Arab Muslims, bilateral military aid) to regional security issues (missile defense, Lebanon, Syria’s proliferation) and security architecture (BMENA).

Interestingly, the Israeli viewpoint includes international organizations and energy, whereas the United States sets them aside with respect to its vision of Israel.
Map 7 (left): heat map of the relations of proximity from the standpoint of the USA looking at Israel, in 2010. Map 8 (right): 2012 projection, all things being equal.

This kind of cartography renders a graphic visualization of the proximities between segments. It allows to see the segments whose the information is close, not intrinsically -i.e. same words - but in terms of manipulated concepts.

Yet, despite proximity of the issues, it appears, that the issues remain largely disconnected from one another. Heat maps show little overlap unless the issues are close-bound, meaning that for the time being, the issues operate more or less as independent clusters:

- Regional security issues (esp. with respect to “missiles”);
- Peace process (settlement, negotiations, attacks);
- Institutional arrangement (UN, NATO);
- Oil (reserves, environment);
- Domestic politics (pro-Israeli, Evangelic right, Arab Muslims);

This is further illustrated by the resilience of the issues when placed in a predator-prey projection, as all issues remain regardless of the projection.
Map 11 (left): potential power and influence balances from the standpoint of the US, in 2010.
Map 12 (right): predators and preys in 2012, all things being equal.
These charts render a graphic visualization of the genetic algorithm known as the “Prey and Predator Model” (Malthus model), based on the Lotka-Volterra equation.

Map 13 (left): potential power and influence balances from the standpoint of Israel, in 2010.
Map 14 (right): predators and preys in 2012, all things being equal.

However, the most revealing aspect is that predators to this geopolitical environment are domestic constituencies (military aid, the “iron triangle”¹, Evangelic right, Arab Muslims, pro-Israeli), thriving on the various issues to make their case heard. Although, there is a striking resemblance between the US and Israeli predator-prey projections, it is important to note that the issue of Syrian missiles behaves as a predator in the Israeli viewpoint, but as a prey in the American viewpoint. Given the history of the Israeli-Syrian relationship, this confirms the “domestic” aspect of the issue for the Israelis. Therefore, it comes as no surprise, that the central issue will be more tangled if projected in a relative short term (2012). The projected heat map - all things being equal - shows a tendency to overlap as clusters expand and “spill” onto one another. Interestingly, the segments oil-pressure groups and missile-Iran will heat up yet remain largely disconnected to the central topic, but generally, proliferation issues will seep into the topic (missile defense, missile-Lebanon, missile-Syria, etc.)

¹- The relationship among the congressional committees, the executive and the interest groups.
2. COMMENTS

From the graphs, it appears unlikely that the US-Israeli will experience a shift before the term of the current administration (2012). Despite the internal dynamic of the peace process, it seems that the US and Israel are both constituency-driven rather than issue-driven.

Therefore, the centers of gravity seem to be the national capitals rather than the negotiating tables. In consequence, the factors of evolution are likely to be found in the gaining or dwindling influence of pressure groups. One may expect that as the issues will be greatly interwoven in the coming future, local constituencies will become stronger. The 2012 projections show that all pressure groups will become increasingly influential, but for the time being, the pro-Israel and Evangelic right pressure groups remain dominant along with the Iron Triangle, thus ensuring that the US is unlikely to shift.

For the outside observer, it seems that there's an increasingly small window of opportunity to reach an agreement in the negotiations. Indeed, as issue-linkage will grow more importantly, the negotiators’ benefit of independent clusters will fade, resulting in more complex trade-offs.

IF you wish to know more about Globe Expert, its different functionalities and applications, its analysts, please send an email to contact@globe-expert.com.