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**Responsibility Begins At Conception**

*By Brian Moore*

DNA was not invented inside a test tube.

Many of the rationales that support the United States’ intrusion in that part of the world are flawed. America’s national interest, directly and indirectly, is the protection of Western citizens from an acute threat that cannot be countered militarily. While we should acknowledge and support a long-term policy of nonmilitary engagement, we should not confuse the end with the means. The US presence in the region has a purpose that extends beyond counterterrorism.

Dr. John Mearsheimer and Dr. Stephen Kohnl, in a recent article in *The National Interest*, stated that for the US to withdraw from the Middle East is “to take the responsibility for the creation of a new state with a powerful and aggressive government that is well known for its ideology, political power, and military capabilities.”

Mearsheimer and Kohnl argue that the US has no choice but to make a decision in the Middle East. They believe that “a choice between a US-led coalition and a nuclear-armed Iran” is a false dichotomy. They argue that “in the absence of a strong US presence in the region, Iran would move closer to nuclear weapons.”

The authors further argue that “the US has an interest in preventing Iran from acquiring nuclear weapons.” They believe that “the US should not withdraw from the Middle East.”

In conclusion, Mearsheimer and Kohnl argue that the US must remain in the Middle East to prevent Iran from acquiring nuclear weapons. They believe that “the US has an interest in preventing Iran from acquiring nuclear weapons.” They argue that “the US should not withdraw from the Middle East.”
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