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# 1NC SHELL

1. **UNIQUENESS**

Obama has proven to be a STRONG commander-in-chief, electing NOT to withdraw troops from the Middle East

**GUARDIANO Writer and analyst on political, military and public-policy issues 2k10**

[John R-](file:///C%3A%5CDocuments%20and%20Settings%5CDB%5CMy%20Documents%5CJohn%20R-); “[Obama's Defense Budget](http://spectator.org/archives/2010/02/04/obamas-defense-budget),” The American Spectator, 2.4.10 @ 6:07AM,

pg. http://spectator.org/archives/2010/02/04/obamas-defense-budget]

Historical perspective and contextual understanding also are required. Obama, remember, inherited two wars, an omnipresent terror threat, and the greatest military in the history of the world. So it is not surprising that as president, and as commander-in-chief, he hasn't simply and recklessly dismantled and disarmed the U.S. military.

Yet, that seems to be the ridiculous and ahistorical standard against which the media judge the president. And, of course, given this standard (or grading curve), the president looks like a stellar performer and a **strong commander-in-chief**.

Give Obama credit for not being reckless; he is not. If he were reckless, then he would have foolishly and precipitously withdrawn troops from Iraq and Afghanistan. Obama, however, has not done that; in fact, quite the opposite: He has sent tens upon thousands of more troops to Afghanistan and is adhering, essentially, to the Bush administration's deliberative, conditions-based plan for troop withdrawals from Iraq.

The president recognizes that a sudden and precipitous withdrawal from Iraq and Afghanistan would be an unmitigated national security disaster for the United States.

1. **LINK**

The plan will signal a WEAKNESS of the president as commander-in-chief. Appeasement is VIRTUAL SURRENDER sending a message to America’s enemies that the U.S. does not believe in using POWER.

**MORRIS former political adviser to Sen. Lott & President Clinton 2k9**

Dick-, “Obama's Weakness Issue,” RealClearPolitics, June 24, 2009, pg. http://www.realclearpolitics.com/articles/2009/06/24/obamas\_weakness\_issue\_97145.html]

**If** foreign **policy issues** ***actually******involve*** war and the commitment of ***troops, they can be politically potent***. But otherwise, the impact of international affairs on presidential image is largely metaphoric. Since **foreign policy is the only area** in which the president can govern virtually alone, it provides a window on his personality and use of power that domestic policy cannot.

When President Clinton, for example, dithered as Bosnia burned, he acquired a **reputation for weakness** that dragged down his ratings. It was only after he moved decisively to bomb and then disarm the Serbs that he shed his image of weakness. It took **President H.W.** Bush's invasion of Iraq to set to rest concerns that he was a "wimp." Jimmy Carter never recovered from the lasting damage to his reputation that his inability to stand up to Iran during the hostage crisis precipitated.

So now, as North Korea defies international sanctions and sends arms to Myanmar and Iran slaughters its citizens in the streets, President Obama looks helpless and hapless. He comes across as not having a clue how to handle the crises.

And, as North Korea prepares to launch a missile on a Hail Mary pass aimed at Hawaii, the Democrats slash 19 missile interceptors from the Defense Department budget.

The transparent **appeasement** of Iran's government -- and its obvious lack of reciprocation -- **make Obama look ridiculous**. Long after the mullahs have suppressed what limited democracy they once allowed, Obama's image problems will persist.

While Americans generally applaud Obama's outreach to the Muslims of the world and think highly of his Cairo speech, they are very dissatisfied with his inadequate efforts to stop Iran from developing -- and North Korea from using -- nuclear weapons. Clearly, his policies toward these two nations are a weak spot in his reputation.

His failure to stand up to either aggressor is of a piece with his virtual surrender in the war on terror. Documented in our new book, "Catastrophe," we show how he has disarmed the United States and simply elected to stop battling against terrorists, freeing them from Guantanamo as he empowers them with every manner of constitutional protection.

Obviously, the Iranian democracy demonstrators will not fare any better than their Chinese brethren did in Tiananmen Square. But the damage their brutal suppression will do to the Iranian government is going to be huge. The ayatollahs of Tehran have always sold themselves to the world's Islamic faithful as the ultimate theocracy, marrying traditional Muslim values with the needs of modern governance. But now, in the wake of the bloodshed, they are revealed as nothing more than military dictators. All the romance is gone, just as it faded in the wake of the tanks in Budapest and Prague. All that remains is power.

China, of course, fared better after Tiananmen because of its economic miracle. But Iran has no such future on its horizon. The loss of prestige in the Arab world and the end of the pretense of government with popular support will cost Iran dearly.

In the meantime, Obama's pathetic performance vis-a-vis Iran and North Korea cannot but send a message to all of America's enemies that the president of the United States does not believe in using power. That he is a wimp and they can get away with whatever they want. A dangerous reputation, indeed.

# 1NC SHELL

1. **IMPACT**

**Weak Obama makes global wars inevitable. One test of resolve will open the floodgates**

**Hanson 09** – Senior Fellow in Residence in Classics and Military History @ Hoover Institution, Stanford University [Dr. Victor Davis Hanson, “Change, Weakness, Disaster, Obama: Answers from Victor Davis Hanson,” Interview with the [Oregon Patriots](http://www.resistnet.com/group/oregon), Resistnet.com, December 7, 2009 at 3:52pm, pg. <http://www.resistnet.com/group/oregon/forum/topics/change-weakness-disaster-obama/showLastReply>.]

BC: Are we currently sending ***a message of weakness to our foes and allies***? Can anything good result from President Obama’s marked submissiveness before the world?
Dr. Hanson: Obama is one bow and one apology away from a circus. The world can understand a kowtow gaffe to some Saudi royals, but not as part of a deliberate pattern. Ditto the mea culpas. Much of diplomacy rests on public perceptions, however trivial. We are now in a great waiting game, as regional hegemons, wishing to redraw the existing landscape — whether **China,** **Venezuela, Iran, North Korea, Pakistan, Syria**, etc. — are just **wait**ing to see who’s going to be the first to try Obama — and whether Obama really will be as tenuous as they expect. ***If he slips once, it will be*** 19***79*** ***redux***, when we saw the rise of radical Islam, the Iranian hostage mess, the communist inroads in Central America, the Soviet invasion of Afghanistan, etc.
BC: With what country then — **Venezuela, Russia, Iran**, etc. — do you believe his global repositioning will cause the most damage?
Dr. Hanson: I think all three. I would expect, in the next three years, Iran to get the bomb and begin to threaten ever so insidiously its Gulf neighborhood; Venezuela will probably cook up some scheme to do a punitive border raid into Colombia to apprise South America that U.S. friendship and values are liabilities; and Russia will continue its energy bullying of Eastern Europe, while insidiously pressuring autonomous former republics to get back in line with some sort of new Russian autocratic commonwealth. There’s an outside shot that **North Korea** might do something really stupid near the 38th parallel and China will ratchet up the pressure on Taiwan. **India**’s borders with both Pakistan and China will heat up. I think we got off the back of the tiger and now no one quite knows whom it will bite or when.

# 2NC/1NR OVERVIEW CARDS

**Now is a key time. Obama’s retreat will reshape the international order.**

**Kissinger 09** - Former National Security Adviser (69-75) and Former US Secretary of State (73-77). [Henry Kissinger, “The world must forge a new order or retreat to chaos,” The Independent, Tuesday, 20 January 2009 pg. http://www.independent.co.uk/opinion/commentators/henry-kissinger-the-world-must-forge-a-new-order-or-retreat-to-chaos-1451416.html]

Not since the inauguration of president John F Kennedy half a century ago has a new administration come into office with such a reservoir of expectations. It is unprecedented that all the principal actors on the world stage are **avowing their desire to undertake** the transformations imposed on them by the world crisis in **collaboration with the U**nited **S**tates.

The extraordinary impact of the President-elect on the imagination of humanity is an important element in shaping a new world order. But it defines an opportunity, not a policy. The ultimate challenge is to shape the common concern of most countries and all major ones regarding the economic crisis, together with a common fear of jihadist terrorism, into a strategy reinforced by the realisation that the new issues like proliferation, energy and climate change permit no national or regional solution.

The new administration could make no worse mistake than to rest on its initial popularity. The role of China in a new world order is crucial. A relationship that started on both sides as essentially a strategic design to constrain a common adversary has evolved over the decades into a pillar of the international system. China made possible the American consumption splurge by buying American debt; America helped the modernisation of the Chinese economy by opening its markets to Chinese goods.

Each side of the Pacific needs the cooperation of the other in addressing the consequences of the financial crisis. Now that the global financial collapse has devastated Chinese export markets, China is emphasising [infrastructure development](http://www.independent.co.uk/opinion/commentators/henry-kissinger-the-world-must-forge-a-new-order-or-retreat-to-chaos-1451416.html) and domestic consumption. It will not be easy to shift gears rapidly, and the Chinese growth rate may fall temporarily below the 7.5 per cent that Chinese experts define as the line that challenges political stability.

What kind of global economic order arises will depend importantly on how China and America deal with each other over the next few years. A frustrated China may take another look at an exclusive regional Asian structure, for which the nucleus already exists in the ASEAN-plus-three concept. At the same time, if protectionism grows in America or if China comes to be seen as a long-term adversary, a self-fulfilling prophecy may blight the prospects of global order. Such a return to mercantilism and 19th-century diplomacy would divide the world into competing regional units with dangerous long-term consequences.

The Sino-American relationship needs to be taken to a new level. This generation of leaders has the **opportunity to shape relations into a design for a common destiny**, much as was done with trans-Atlantic relations in the postwar period – except that the challenges now are more political and economic than [military](http://www.independent.co.uk/opinion/commentators/henry-kissinger-the-world-must-forge-a-new-order-or-retreat-to-chaos-1451416.html).

The complexity of the emerging world requires from America a more historical approach than the insistence that every problem has a final solution expressible in programmes with specific time limits not infrequently geared to our political process. We must learn to operate within the attainable and be prepared to pursue ultimate ends by the accumulation of nuance. An international order can be permanent only if its participants have a share not only in building but also in securing it. In this manner, America and its potential partners have a **unique opportunity** to transform a moment of crisis into a vision of hope.

**Lack of credibility will make him a helpless giant**

**Posner & Vermeule 07** - Professor of Law @ University of Chicago & Professor of Law @ Harvard Law School [Eric A. Posner & Adrian Vermeule “ARTICLE: The Credible Executive,” University of Chicago Law Review, Summer, 2007, 74 U. Chi. L. Rev. 865

For presidents, **credibility is power.** With credibility, the formal rules of the separation of powers system can be bargained around or even defied, as Lincoln and FDR demonstrated. **Without credibility, a** nominally all-powerful **president is a helpless giant.** Even if legal and institutional constraints are loose and give the president broad powers, those powers cannot effectively be exercised if the public believes that the president lies or has nefarious motives.

But presidential credibility can benefit all relevant actors, not just presidents. The decline of congressional and judicial oversight has not merely increased the power of ill-motivated executives, the typical worry of civil libertarians. It also threatens to diminish the power of well-motivated presidents, with indirect harms to the public. Such presidents would, if credibly identified, receive even broader legal delegations and greater informal trust -- from legislators, judges, and the public -- than presidents as a class actually have. Absent other credibility-generating mechanisms, such as effective congressional oversight, presidents must bootstrap themselves into credibility through the use of signaling mechanisms. In this Article, we suggest a range of such mechanisms, and suggest that under the conditions we have tried to identify, those mechanisms can make all concerned better off.

# 2NC/1NR OVERVIEW CARDS

**Forward presence is key to prevent crisis escalation. Conflicts are much worse without it. Our DA turns the case**

**Johnson & Krulak 09** - Chief of Naval Operations & Commandant of the Marine Corps [Admiral Jay L. Johnson, & General Charles C. Krulak, “Forward presence essential to American interests,” United States Navy, Reviewed: 17 August 2009, pg. http://www.navy.mil/navydata/navy\_legacy\_hr.asp?id=274]

Also this morning, United States Navy amphibious assault ships carrying 4,400 combat-ready American Marines are forward deployed in the waters of the Mediterranean Sea and the Persian Gulf. And at sea in the Mediterranean and in the Persian Gulf are aircraft carrier battle groups with 16,000 Sailors and two air wings of combat ready aircraft. And finally, in the Far East, the United States has permanently deployed a third aircraft carrier battle group and a third amphibious ready group. The vigilant "forward presence" of these forces is vital, but not always as visible to Americans as it is to the rest of the world. Their routine daily efforts don't always make the headlines, but they are vitally important to world peace and stability.

Some argue that the forward presence these forces represent is no longer necessary. They argue that forces reacting from the United States are enough to maintain international stability. They further maintain that "brushfires," or outbreaks of regional instability, are insignificant, or incidental at best. And they argue that America can no longer afford the forward presence of these forces on what amounts to a near continuous basis.

We would argue just the opposite. Forward deployed U.S. forces, primarily naval expeditionary forces — the Navy-Marine Corps team — are vital to regional stability and to keeping these crises from **escalating into full-scale wars**. To those who argue that the United States can't afford to have this degree of vigilance anymore, we say: The United States can't afford not to.

These brushfires, whether the result of long-standing ethnic tensions or resurgent nationalism in the wake of the Cold War will only continue. The Cold War was an anomaly.

Never again will we live in a bipolar world whose nuclear shadow suppressed nationalism and ethnic tensions. We have, in some respects, reverted back to the world our ancestors knew: A world in disorder. Somalia, Bosnia, Liberia, Haiti, Rwanda, Iraq and the Taiwan Straits are merely examples of the types of continuing crises we now face. Some might call this period an age of chaos.

The United States and the world cannot afford to allow any crisis to escalate into threats to the United States', and the world's, vital interests. And while the skies are not dark with smoke from these brushfires, today's world demands a new approach. The concepts of choice must be selective and committed engagement, unencumbered global operations and prompt crisis resolution. There is no better way to maintain and enforce these concepts than with the forward presence of the U.S. Navy-Marine Corps team.

There are four basic tenets to international security in today's world; prevention, deterrence, crisis resolution and war termination. The underlying assumption of these tenets is that the U.S. and its allies should not be forced into winning a war in an overwhelming (and expensive) fashion. Instead, it is much better — and cheaper — to resolve a crisis before it burns out of control.

Prevent: The key to prevention is **continuous presence** in a region. This **lets our friends know we have an interest and lets potential foes know that we're there to check any move**. Both effects occur without any direct action taken. Although hard to measure, **the psychological impact** of naval expeditionary forces **is undeniable**. This regional presence underwrites political and economic stability.

This is forward presence.

Deter: Presence does not prevent every crisis. Some rogues are going to be tempted to strike no matter what the odds, and will require active measures to be deterred. When crises reach this threshold, there is no substitute for sustained actual presence. Naval expeditionary forces can quickly take on the role of the very visible fist. **Friends and potential enemies recognize** naval expeditionary **forces as capable of defending or destroying**. **This visible fist**, free from diplomatic and territorial constraints, **forms the bedrock of** regional **deterrence**. For example, the mere presence of naval expeditionary forces deterred Chinese attempts to derail the democratic process in Taiwan and countered Iraqi saber-rattling toward Jordan. It's hard to quantify the cost savings of deterring a crisis before it requires our intervention. But the savings are real — in dollars, and often in blood and human misery.

This is forward presence.

Resolve: If a crisis can be neither prevented nor deterred, then prompt and decisive crisis resolution is imperative before the crisis threatens vital interests. U.S. Naval expeditionary forces are a transoceanic key that finds and opens — forcibly if necessary — any gateway into a fiery world. This ability is equally expandable and retractable according to the situation. Perhaps most importantly, naval expeditionary forces don't need permission from foreign governments to be on scene and take unilateral action in a crisis. This both unencumbers the force and takes the pressure off allies to host any outside forces.

Over the past two years, for example, U.S. naval expeditionary forces simultaneously and unilaterally deployed to Liberia and to the Central African Republic (1,500 miles inland) to protect U.S. and international citizens. They also launched measured retaliatory Tomahawk strikes to constrain unacceptable Iraqi behavior, and conducted naval air and Tomahawk strikes which brought the warring parties in Bosnia to the negotiating table.

This is forward presence.

Terminate: Each of the above tenets is worthy of the United States paying an annual peace insurance premium. Otherwise we, and our allies, risk paying the emotional, physical and financial costs of a full-blown conflagration that began as just another brushfire. If there is a war, naval expeditionary forces will be first to fight. They are inherently capable of enabling the follow-on forces from the United States for as long as it takes. And they will remain on-scene to enforce the settlement that ends the conflict.

This is forward presence.

The Iraqis, Central Africas, Somalias and Bosnias inevitably destabilize and erode world order and respect for the rule of law. Indeed, **a failure to respond** to them **encourages future — more serious — crises**.

The United States must foster stability around the world, today and tomorrow. **The peace insurance premium is a small price** and is the cost of leadership. Who else is capable of this type of forward presence on a global basis? For the United States, maintaining a steady commitment to stability will be a challenge. But maintain it we must, or the price, literally and figuratively, will be much greater down the road. The example of fighting forest fires is precisely applicable. The philosophy is simple: Prevention through living in the environment; deterrence through vigilance; and resolution through quick and selective engagement. Ninety-five percent of all forest fires are contained — the direct result of the watchful presence of the local initial attack crews who attack flashpoints. As for the other five percent, once the window of opportunity for decisive early action is missed, firefighters must be brought in from outside the region, and it is exponentially more expensive. Sometimes there are casualties — casualties that would not have been incurred had the fire been contained before it had the opportunity to flare.

America's Navy-Marine Corps team is underway, ready and on-scene at trouble spots around the world. Forward presence makes it — and will keep it — the right force, tailor-made for these uncertain and sometimes fiery times.

# UNIQUENESS EXTENSION

**Congress will prevent base drawdowns in the squo. The are off-limits**

**Dayen 10** [[David Dayen](http://news.firedoglake.com/author/dday/), “[Defense Spending Cuts Face Likely Congressional Override](http://news.firedoglake.com/2010/05/17/defense-spending-cuts-face-likely-congressional-override/),” Monday May 17, 2010 9:18 am, http://news.firedoglake.com/2010/05/17/defense-spending-cuts-face-likely-congressional-override/]

The lesson of Congress in the modern age is that it’s much harder to eliminate a program than it is to enact one. Every program has a champion somewhere on Capitol Hill, and it probably only needs one to be saved – but 218 and 60 to be put into motion.

A case in point: our bloated military budget. The Obama Administration has generally tried to cancel out unnecessary defense programs, with meager success in the last budget year. **Congress will probably** [**assert themselves**](http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/content/article/2010/05/16/AR2010051602937.html?hpid=moreheadlines) **in an election year**, however.

Defense Secretary Robert M. Gates has vowed to impose fiscal austerity at the Pentagon, but his biggest challenge may be persuading Congress to go along.

Lawmakers from both parties are poised to override Gates and fund the C-17 cargo plane and an alternative engine for the F-35 Joint Strike Fighter — two weapons systems the defense secretary has been trying to cut from next year’s budget. They have also made clear they will ignore Gates’s pleas to hold the line on military pay raises and health-care costs, arguing that now is no time to skimp on pay and benefits for troops who have been fighting two drawn-out wars.

The competing agendas could lead to a major clash between Congress and the Obama administration this summer. Gates has repeatedly said he will urge President Obama to veto any defense spending bills that include money for the F-35’s extra engine or the C-17, both of which he tried unsuccessfully to eliminate last year.

Last year, after a similarly protracted struggle, Gates succeeded in getting Congress to end funding for the F-22, a plane which tended to malfunction in the rain. [Seriously](http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/content/article/2009/07/09/AR2009070903020.html). But Congress did not move on the F-35 engine or the C-17, and they seem similarly positioned this year. Ike Skelton and Carl Levin support the F-35 engine, for example, and included it in their appropriation requests out of the House and Senate Armed Services Committees, which they separately chair.

I fully recognize that the **off-limits discussion about military spending concerns the bases in over 100 countries** and continued adventures abroad in places where “victory” means almost nothing. But it is a symptom of the same problem – the persistent inertia that aids the military-industrial complex to keep the war machine moving. And so we get new engines to planes that don’t need new engines.

# LINK [FORWARD DEPLOYMENT KEY]

**Forward deployment is key to signal US readiness to act**

**Thomason 02** - Senior Analyst in the Strategy, Forces and Resources Division @ Institute for Defense Analyses [James S. Thomason (Ph.D. in International Relations @ Northwestern University (78)), “Transforming US Overseas Military Presence:

Evidence and Options for DoD Volume I: Main Report,” Institute for Defense Analyses, IDA Paper P-3707, July 2002]

Richard Haass - Also writing in the mid-1990s, Richard Haass, then of the Brookings Institution, alluded explicitly to what he viewed as the use of US forces deployed and stationed forward in a deterrent role and, implicitly at least, to their value in that role [Haass, 1999]. Force is used every day [by the US] for deterrence; examples include maintaining strategic nuclear forces on some kind of alert, stationing large numbers of forces in Europe and Korea, and the US Navy sailing the high seas to **signal US interests and a readiness to act** on their behalf. [p. 20] Haass, like Dismukes, alluded to the importance of appropriate signaling behavior in successful deterrence:

The movement and use of military forces is obviously a critical component of a deterrent strategy. Forces can be positioned, deployed, and/or exercised to **signal the existence of interests and the readiness to respond militarily** if those interests are either threatened or attacked….Deterrence can be the purpose behind long-term deployments, such as the US military presence on the Korean Peninsula or in Europe since the end of World War II. Such deployments are structural, to remain until the political map or international situation fundamentally changes….Deterrence can also take the form of a response to a specific or tactical situation that emerges suddenly—say the perceived threat to shipping in the Persian Gulf in the late 1980’s when the United States decided to reflag Kuwaiti vessels, or the stationing of US and coalition forces in Saudi Arabia under Desert Shield to deter Iraqi aggression against Saudi Arabia following the invasion of Kuwait. [pp. 50–51]. Pg. II-5

**Allies and adversaries measure US commitment by its forward deployment strategy**

**Thomason 02** - Senior Analyst in the Strategy, Forces and Resources Division @ Institute for Defense Analyses [James S. Thomason (Ph.D. in International Relations @ Northwestern University (78)), “Transforming US Overseas Military Presence:

Evidence and Options for DoD Volume I: Main Report,” Institute for Defense Analyses, IDA Paper P-3707, July 2002]

There is a widespread habit of equating the degree of US commitment to the security of any overseas region to the number of military personnel the US maintains in that theater in peacetime. The US has worked in recent years to convince the parties concerned that a better measure is the United States’ demonstrated willingness and capabilities to conduct the type of military operations important to success in each theater, while keeping enough force and support in theater to demonstrate such willingness and to facilitate the capability. Pg. ix9

**Force deployment is the key determinant of international perceptions of Obama**

**SSQ 09** [Editorial, “Obama’s “Eisenhower Moment” American Strategic Choices and the Transatlantic Defense Relationship,” Strategic Studies Quarterly, Winter 2009]

Instilling confidence among Americans in his party’s foreign policy competence and credibility **requires that Obama articulate and implement** diplomatic, **military**, and economic **strategies, the ends of which attract broad-based support** both at home and **abroad**, and the ways and means of which reflect the realities of a global economic crisis more profound than any since the 19 0s. But 20 years after the end of the Cold War, defining a framework for Euro-Atlantic cooperation and implementing tasks to accomplish common purposes will be even more difficult than for leaders of the Atlantic alliance in the 1950s. The greatest difficulties, both conceptually and practically, will arise over strategies projecting, and possibly using, military force. Despite the departure of the Bush administration, it remains unclear whether there is a consensus within Europe on the desirability of cooperating with the United States on such strategies. Pg. 3

**Withdrawal undermines our military and emboldens adversaries**

**Mauro 07 –** geopolitical analyst, specializes in tracking and assessing terrorist threats. [Ryan Mauro “The Consequences of Withdrawal from Iraq,” Global Politician, 5/7/2007, pg. http://www.globalpolitician.com/22760-foreign-iraq]

Military Consequences
Senator John McCain, a former POW in Vietnam, said it best this week when he stated that “the only thing worse than a stressed military, is a broken and defeated military.” Withdrawal would mean the **complete collapse** of morale in the military and a **reluctance to support a responsible military budget**. Failing to support and fund our military leaves our troops without the armor they need and our political leaders without the option of force in dealing with foreign enemies.

# LINK [FORWARD DEPLOYMENT KEY]

**Forward presence is superior and key to all other strategies**

**Thomason 02** - Senior Analyst in the Strategy, Forces and Resources Division @ Institute for Defense Analyses [James S. Thomason (Ph.D. in International Relations @ Northwestern University (78)), “Transforming US Overseas Military Presence:

Evidence and Options for DoD Volume I: Main Report,” Institute for Defense Analyses, IDA Paper P-3707, July 2002]

Bradford Dismukes

In several studies conducted midway through the 1990s, Bradford Dismukes of the Center for Naval Analyses argued on behalf of a forward military presence posture over one centered in the United States and deployed only as needed [Dismukes, 1994]. “The posture of overseas presence is superior to one centered on forces in CONUS in capacity to support the objectives of the national strategy.” [p. 49] “CONUS forces are indeed influential, including in the deterrence of adversaries who know that forces overseas can be augmented by forces from CONUS…. But…that is not to say that CONUS-based forces would be as effective in either deterrence or military action as forces overseas.” [p. 38] “Military power is but one of many instruments available to US policy makers. The fact that what follows focuses on the manifestation of military power in the form of forces forward does not indicate that it is the leading instrument. It is not. In today’s world, primacy rests with the economic and political. But military power in the form of overseas presence is an essential component of US policy without which political and economic means of influence will not remain effective.” [p. 14] pg. II-4

**Forward deployment is key. All other strategies will fail without it**

**Thomason 02** - Senior Analyst in the Strategy, Forces and Resources Division @ Institute for Defense Analyses [James S. Thomason (Ph.D. in International Relations @ Northwestern University (78)), “Transforming US Overseas Military Presence:

Evidence and Options for DoD Volume I: Main Report,” Institute for Defense Analyses, IDA Paper P-3707, July 2002]

Colin Powell - Writing in 1991 in Foreign Affairs, General Colin Powell, then Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, offered an eloquent statement of the importance of a continuing overseas military presence. Our forward presence is a given—to signal our commitment to our allies and to give second thoughts to any disturber of the peace…. Economic power is essential; political and diplomatic skills are needed; the power of our beliefs and values is fundamental to any success we might achieve; but **the presence of our arms to buttress these other elements is as critical to us as the freedom we so adore**. [p. 36] pg. II-2

## APPEASEMENT = NET BENEFIT TO CONSULTATION

**THE APPEASEMENT DISADVANTAGE IS A NET BENEFIT TO CONSULTATION**

The process MORE than the magnitude is Key. Reductions must include CONSULTATION with allies as the reduction decision is being made and implemented. ONLY the Counterplan solves the case and avoids the D.A.

**Thomason 02** - Senior Analyst in the Strategy, Forces and Resources Division @ Institute for Defense Analyses [James S. Thomason (Ph.D. in International Relations @ Northwestern University (78)), “Transforming US Overseas Military Presence:

Evidence and Options for DoD Volume I: Main Report,” Institute for Defense Analyses, IDA Paper P-3707, July 2002]

Indeed, the weight of the evidence suggests that the process—more than the magnitude—of change will evoke the most objections. Accordingly, if reductions in these regions are desired, we recommend giving considerable attention to the process of change as it relates to our friends and allies. Fundamental is to consult with an ally as the reduction decision is being made and as it is being implemented, in order to educate foreign experts and allow them to take ownership of the change. The painful memory that remains in Korea (whether or not it is accurate) of the Carter administration’s unilateral reduction is an example of why this is important. At the same time, consultations may provide the US valuable insights as to how to achieve policy goals. For example, one Korean advised, if the US wants to reduce US Forces Korea, the US and RoK should at least try to figure out how to obtain a reciprocal gesture from Kim Jong-Il. Pg. v17-v18

# LINK [WEAKNESS INTERNAL]

**Weakness leads belligerence from our adversaries**

**Bolton 09** - Senior fellow at the American Enterprise Institute [John R. Bolton (Former U.S. ambassador to the United Nations) “The danger of Obama's dithering,” Los Angeles Times, October 18, 2009, pg. http://articles.latimes.com/2009/oct/18/opinion/oe-bolton18]

**Weakness** in American foreign policy in one region often **invites challenges** elsewhere, because our adversaries carefully follow diminished American resolve. Similarly, presidential indecisiveness, whether because **of uncertainty or internal political struggles**, signals that the United States may not respond to international challenges in clear and coherent ways.

Taken together, weakness and indecisiveness have proved historically to be a **toxic combination** for America's global interests. That is exactly the combination we now see under President Obama. If anything, his receiving the Nobel Peace Prize only underlines the problem. All of Obama's campaign and inaugural talk about "extending an open hand" and "engagement," especially the multilateral variety, isn't exactly unfolding according to plan. Entirely predictably, we see more clearly every day that diplomacy is not a policy but only a technique. **Absent presidential leadership, which** at a minimum **means** clear policy direction and **persistence in the face of criticism** and adversity, **engagement** simply **embodies weakness and indecision**.

Obama is no Harry Truman. At best, he is reprising Jimmy Carter. At worst, the real precedent may be Ethelred the Unready, the turn-of the-first-millennium Anglo-Saxon king whose reputation for indecisiveness and his unsuccessful paying of Danegeld -- literally, "Danish tax" -- to buy off Viking raiders made him history's paradigmatic weak leader.

Beyond the disquiet (or outrage for some) prompted by the president's propensity to apologize for his country's pre-Obama history, Americans increasingly sense that his administration is drifting from one foreign policy mistake to another. Worse, the current is growing swifter, and the threats more pronounced, even **as the admin**istration **tries to** turn its **face** away from the world and toward its **domestic priorities. Foreign observers, *friend and foe alike*, sense the same aimlessness and drift**. French President Nicolas Sarkozy had to remind Obama at a Sept. 24 U.N. Security Council meeting that "we live in the real world, not a virtual

one."

**Doubts about US commitment will force a nuclear arms race throughout Asia**

**Mauro 07 –** geopolitical analyst, specializes in tracking and assessing terrorist threats. [Ryan Mauro “The Consequences of Withdrawal from Iraq,” Global Politician, 5/7/2007, pg. http://www.globalpolitician.com/22760-foreign-iraq]

China’s rise in power would become inevitable and accelerated, as our Asian allies **doubted our commitments**, and would decide on appeasement and entering China’s sphere of influence, rather than relying upon America.
The new dynamics in Asia, with allies of America questioning our strength, would result in a nuclear arms race. Japan would have no option but to develop nuclear weapons (although she may do so regardless). Two scenarios would arise: China would dominate the Pacific and America’s status as a superpower would quickly recede, or there would be a region wide nuclear stalemate involving Burma, China, India, Pakistan, North Korea, South Korea, Japan, and possibly Taiwan and Australia.

**Perceived weakness will trigger challenges to US dominance around the globe**

**Eaglen 09** - Research fellow for National Security Studies @ The Heritage Foundation. [Mackenzie Eaglen, “How to Dismantle a Military Superpower,” Defense News, Published: 13 September 2009, pg. http://www.defensenews.com/story.php?i=4275078]

As militaries expand and modernize, the probability of miscalculation grows. **Military weakness, real or perceived**, **encourages enemies to act**. Threats to the global system of trade (which rests on the foundation of the U.S.-led security structure) would increase. This **delicate** system would become more vulnerable to attempts to disrupt access to vital resources. Weakness opens the opportunity for hostile powers to more likely dominate East Asia, Europe or the Persian Gulf.

The U.S. defense budget will continue to favor people over platforms and immediate needs over long-term readiness. The procurement holiday of the 1990s instituted by the Clinton administration and agreed to by a Republican-led Congress put the United States on course to relinquish its superpower military status. The Bush administration, after Sept. 11, was able to slow the advancement down that path, but couldn't reverse course.

Another procurement holiday championed by President Obama would see the United States move further away from where it needs to be, and perhaps, ultimately, relinquish its position as the world's sole military superpower. ■

# LINK [WEAKNESS INTERNAL]

**Whining military undermines US international influence**

**Walt 05** – Academic dean at Harvard's John F. Kennedy School of Government. [[Stephen M. Walt](http://belfercenter.ksg.harvard.edu/experts/213/stephen_m_walt.html?back_url=%2Fpublication%2F1472%2Fworld_watches_as_america_attempts_its_restoration.html%3Fbreadcrumb%3D%252Fpublication%252F17677%252Foffshore_balancing_or_international_institutions_the_way_forward_for_us_foreign_policy&back_text=Back%20to%20publication), “"The World Watches as America Attempts its Restoration", Financial Times, October 19, 2005, pg. http://tiny.cc/kvyja]

The US's ability to shape world events rests on three pillars. The first is our economic and military power. The second is others' belief that we are using that power properly. And the third is confidence in US competence. When other countries recognise our strength, support our aims and believe that we know what we are doing, they are more likely to follow our lead. If they doubt our power, our wisdom or our ability to act effectively, US global influence shrinks. Even before the storms, the Iraq war was corroding all three elements of US power. Our armed forces have been weakened and our economy burdened by the costs of occupation, and the abuses at Abu Ghraib jail are a stain on the US's reputation.

# IMPAX – MULTIPLE WARS

**There are multiple scenarios**

**Peters 08** – Former [Foreign Area Officer](http://en.wikipedia.org/w/index.php?title=Foreign_Area_Officer&action=edit&redlink=1), in the Office of the [Deputy Chief of Staff for Intelligence](http://en.wikipedia.org/w/index.php?title=Deputy_Chief_of_Staff_for_Intelligence&action=edit&redlink=1). [Ralph Peters (Retired [United States Army](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/United_States_Army) [Lieutenant Colonel](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Lieutenant_colonel_%28United_States%29). Currently is a reporter who fouses on politics in troubled countries), “AMERICA THE WEAK: US RISKS TURMOIL UNDER PREZ O,” Last Updated: 4:51 AM, New York Post, October 20, 2008, pg. <http://www.nypost.com/p/news/opinion/opedcolumnists/item_GS5vnNwCO6UjfBPf3uobyM>.]

IF Sen. [Barack Obama](http://www.nypost.com/p/news/opinion/opedcolumnists/item_GS5vnNwCO6UjfBPf3uobyM) is elected president, our republic will survive, but our international strategy and some of our allies may not. His first year in office would conjure globe-spanning challenges **as our enemies pile**d **on to** **exploit his weakness**.

Add in Sen. Joe Biden - with his track record of calling every major foreign-policy crisis wrong for 35 years - as vice president and de facto secretary of State, and we'd face a formula for strategic disaster.

Where would the avalanche of confrontations come from?

\* **Al Qaeda**. Pandering to his extreme base, Obama has projected an image of being soft on terror. Toss in his promise to abandon Iraq, and you can be sure that al Qaeda will pull out all the stops to kill as many Americans as possible - in Iraq, Afghanistan and, if they can, here at home - hoping that America will throw away the victories our troops bought with their blood.

\* **Pakistan**. As this nuclear-armed country of 170 million anti-American Muslims grows more fragile by the day, the save-the-Taliban elements in the Pakistani intelligence services and body politic will avoid taking serious action against "their" terrorists (while theatrically annoying Taliban elements they can't control). The Pakistanis think Obama would lose Afghanistan - and they believe they can reap the subsequent whirlwind.

\* Iran. Got nukes? If the Iranians are as far along with their nuclear program as some reports insist, expect a mushroom cloud above an **Iran**ian test range next year. Even without nukes, President Mahmoud Ahmadinejad would try the new administration's temper in Iraq, Afghanistan and the Persian Gulf.

\* Israel. In the Middle East, Obama's election would be read as the end of staunch US support for Israel. Backed by Syria and Iran, Hezbollah would **provoke a**nother, far-bloodier **war with Israel**. Lebanon would disintegrate.

\* Saudi Arabia. Post-9/11 attention to poisonous Saudi proselytizing forced the kingdom to be more discreet in fomenting terrorism and religious hatred abroad. Convinced that Obama will be more "tolerant" toward militant Islam, the Saudis would redouble their funding of bigotry and butchery-for-Allah - in the US, too.

\* Russia. Got Ukraine? Not for long, slabiye Amerikantsi. Russia's new czar, Vladimir Putin, intends to gobble **Ukraine** next year, assured that NATO will be divided and the US can be derided. Aided by the treasonous Kiev politico Yulia Timoshenko - a patriot when it suited her ambition, but now a Russian collaborator - the Kremlin is set to reclaim the most important state it still regards as its property. Overall, 2009 may see the starkest repression of freedom since Stalin seized Eastern Europe.

\* Georgia. Our **Georgian** allies should dust off their Russian dictionaries.

\* **Venezuela.** Hugo **Chavez** will intensify the rape of his country's hemorrhaging democracy and, despite any drop in oil revenue, he'll do all he can to export his megalomaniacal version of gun-barrel socialism. He'll seek a hug-for-the-cameras meet with President Obama as early as possible.

**\* Bolivia.** Chavez client President Evo Morales could order his military to seize control of his country's dissident eastern provinces, whose citizens resist his repression, extortion and semi-literate Leninism. President Obama would do nothing as yet another democracy toppled and bled.

\* North Korea. **North Korea** will expect a much more generous deal from the West for annulling its pursuit of nuclear weapons. And it will regard an Obama administration as a green light to cheat.

\* NATO. The brave young democracies of **Central and Eastern Europe** will be gravely discouraged, while the appeasers in Western Europe will again have the upper hand. Putin will be allowed to do what he wants.