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A2 Afghanistan Corruption CP

**Non-Unique**

**Their cards are powertagged – Karzai admitted no solvency for 5 years, and he’s already implementing reform**

**Daily Mail 9** (David Williams, Nov 21 2009, http://www.dailymail.co.uk/news/worldnews/article-1229183/Miliband-Clinton-watch-Karzai-vow-fight-corruption-inauguration--minister-accused-30m-bribe.html)IM

Afghanistan will not be able to control its own security for another five years, Hamid Karzai admitted yesterday as he was sworn in for a second term as the country's leader. His forecast comes under increasing pressure to bring British troops home and Barack Obama set to announce whether the U.S. will send a further 40,000 soldiers to Afghanistan. Mr Karzai used his inauguration speech to spell out his timetable for when Afghan forces would be ready to take over security. He said that beyond the five years foreign troops would need to remain to provide support and training. The inauguration was attended by dignitaries from 40 countries, including Foreign Secretary David Miliband and U.S. Secretary of State Hillary Clinton. As he was sworn in for his second five-year term, Mr Karzai took the opportunity to portray himself as a unifying force in Afghanistan, insisting he will address the corruption that tainted his first term and re-election. Karzai has come under intense international pressure to clean up his government, and has often bristled at the criticism of corruption levelled at him from Western powers. At his inauguration yesterday, Karzai swore he would prosecute corrupt government officials and end a culture of impunity. After being sworn in to the second five-year term, Karzai said his government was doing whatever it could to implement reforms. Mired in controversy: President Karzai told an audience at the Presidential Palace that Afghanistan will control its own security within five years And he claimed he believed the 'problem of international terrorism' in his country would be overcome. 'We are trying our best to implement social, judicial and administrative reforms in our country,' Karzai said. 'Being a president is a heavy task and we will try our best to honestly fulfil this task in the future.'

Karzai is already addressing corruption in his government

**CNN 9** (Nov. 19 2009, http://www.cnn.com/2009/WORLD/asiapcf/11/19/afghanistan.karzai/index.html)IM

Kabul, Afghanistan (CNN) -- Amid intense international pressure for reform, Afghan President Hamid Karzai vowed to tackle corruption and drug-trafficking in a speech delivered at his inaugural ceremony Thursday. Karzai was sworn in for a second term following a fraud-marred election that questioned his legitimacy. His inauguration also came a day after a report of grave government graft had surfaced. "Corruption is a very dangerous enemy of the state," Karzai told about 800 guests assembled in the fortified presidential palace in the Afghan capital, Kabul. Security was tight throughout the city, fraught with the potential for Taliban attacks on inauguration day. With U.S. Secretary of State Hillary Clinton sitting in the front row, Karzai said he was sorry if he had let his allies down. "I am sorry if I have not fulfilled anything I have promised," he said. "It's not easy to govern this state." The Obama administration, considering sending up to 40,000 more U.S. troops to Afghanistan, has expressed concerns about Karzai's viability and has ratcheted up pressure to end corruption in order to combat an intensifying Taliban insurgency. Clinton reiterated those concerns in a dinner meeting with Karzai on the eve of his inauguration and encouraged him to seize the "clear window of opportunity" before him at a "critical moment" in Afghanistan's history. Clinton's remarks came after The Washington Post reported that a Chinese firm apparently had secured a contract for a big copper extraction project after a government minister accepted a $30 million bribe. The Afghan ministry denied the allegation. "Good governance -- that's what I want," Karzai said. "I want competent ministers who can lead this country." He said government officials who overstep should be prosecuted. He linked graft to Afghanistan's heroin trade. "It is our duty to tackle drug traffickers and punish those people who are cultivating poppies," Karzai said.

**Non-Unique**

Karzai’s current efforts towards creating a more tribe-centric government in Afghanistan are the best option for democracy in that region – reform would only hurt the region

**Ungaro 6/14** (Carlos, former Italian diplomat to Afghanistan, http://www.opendemocracy.net/carlo-ungaro/is-afghan-jirgah-way-forward) GAT

The military intervention in Afghanistan has become one of the longest-lasting war efforts in US history. It does not  look like a coincidence that particularly deadly attacks are being carried out by the Taleban, while the repeated threats of an “all out attack” on Kandahar underlines the Sisyphean nature of NATO’s efforts. These circumstances do not bode well for the success of the recently convened “[Peace Jirgah](http://www.president.gov.af/Contents/88/Documents/1834/resolution_English.htm)”, and yet the idea  deserves close scrutiny and should not be dismissed, out of hand, as yet another failed attempt  by The Afghan Government - with the support of its allies – to embark upon a political path instead of relying mainly on a military venture which shows no signs of  imminent success. My first memory of an Afghan Jirgah dates back to the years of World War II, when, as a child, I was living in Kabul with my parents: the British had issued strong demands that Afghanistan deport all Axis citizens, and close their Diplomatic Missions. A “Loya Jirgah” was convened and, after many days of debate, declared – to our great relief – that this would contravene Afghanistan’s laws of hospitality. A fundamentally important decision had been taken which would guarantee Afghanistan’s neutrality until the Soviet invasion of 1979. The Jirgah has traditionally been an institute of primary importance in the Pathan tribal areas of Pakistan and the Pashtun areas of Afghanistan. Although, traditionally, it gathered only Pashtun tribal elders, in modern times it has been extended also to include representatives of all the other areas. It can be argued, as, indeed it has been argued, that this form of representation is much more suited to the Afghan political reality than a western-style Parliament, no matter how correct the electoral process. Afghanistan, as Pakistan’s North-West, is basically a tribal society, and peaceful coexistence among the tribes cannot be guaranteed by political processes which do not take this reality into account. With the passage of time, the term “democracy” has acquired a rather dogmatic aspect, and is associated with certain particular rituals which have evolved, in the course of centuries, in some western societies, and which have then been applied, with success, also outside Europe and North America. An analysis, even a superficial one, of local interpretations of democracy would be completely out of context in an attempt to examine the Afghan situation, which is of grave and understandable concern, but serious thought ought to be given on how it would be possible to reconcile the need for stability in such a volatile and strategically important area with social and political realities which long predate the current insurgency, and all this without further eroding basic liberties. It is, of course, probable that the Jirgah called by president Karzai will not have immediate, appreciable repercussions in the desired direction, mainly because, rightly or wrongly, the President no longer has the massive backing of the Afghan people, not even in his own tribal area. At the same time, his support among the leading international actors in Afghanistan has also sensibly declined. These circumstances, unfortunately, lend credibility to the accusations that this Jirgah is rigged and that it has been packed with Karzai supporters, thereby depriving it of the dignity essential to its success. A future scenario could, however, be envisaged in which enhanced local autonomy would allow the application of “our” democratic rules in Towns and Provinces ready freely to choose such a solution (Herat comes to mind), while others could choose more traditional methods of local rule. The central Government, instead, with a role more of guidance and coordination rather than dominance or rule, would be more in tune with the traditions of the land. This arrangement has worked in the past, and could be an indication – with the necessary variations – of a way  forward. The calling of Jirgahs, and their composition and competencies should not be left to the arbitrary will of the Head of State, but rather be regulated in a new, bold and imaginative attempt to reconcile respected and valid Afghan traditions to the country’s aspirations to be part of the modern family of nations. Of course, the principal obstacle to any durable, credible negotiated settlement remains the massive and bellicose foreign military presence, whose support of the government is distasteful to many strata of Afghan opinion. The possibility of solutions along the lines suggested by the Jirgah would be greatly enhanced if agreements in that sense would coincide with a publicized, credible and accepted timetable for the withdrawal of the bulk of foreign troops. As things stand, there are few alternative suitable solutions, and recourse to the Jirgah as a convincing instrument of negotiation should not be discarded.

Non-Unique

Karzai is already implementing tough reforms

**King 9** (Laura, LA Times, Nov. 17 2009, http://articles.latimes.com/2009/nov/17/world/fg-afghanistan-corrupt17)IM

KABUL, AFGHANISTAN — Seeking to smooth over a key point of contention in advance of President Hamid Karzai's inauguration this week, senior Afghan officials Monday unveiled what they described as tough new anti-corruption measures. With the Afghan leader poised to be sworn in Thursday for a second five-year term, the West has been putting pressure on Karzai to institute swift reforms or face a loss of international support. Recent days have seen criticism from Secretary of State Hillary Rodham Clinton and British Prime Minister Gordon Brown, both of whom suggested that future aid to Karzai's government could be tied to his efforts against corruption. In apparent response to the growing international pressure, Afghanistan's chief justice, interior minister, justice minister, security chief and attorney general appeared at an unusual joint news conference to announce the launch of a major-crime task force and a new anti-corruption unit. The ambassadors to Britain and the United States also attended the briefing, in what appeared to be a gesture aimed at demonstrating solidarity in the anti-corruption fight but also providing an implicit warning to the Karzai camp of the consequences of a failure to act. Karzai's inauguration coincides with debate in the Obama administration over war strategy in Afghanistan, including whether to send in tens of thousands more U.S. troops. Rather than providing a hoped-for mandate for the next Afghan government, the election exacerbated long-simmering anger over the pervasive reach of corruption in public life, extending from the village to the national level. Bribes are routinely extorted for everything, from fixing traffic tickets to awarding lucrative contracts.

Karzai is implementing reforms, the best he can

**AP 10** (Nov. 19 2010, http://www.nydailynews.com/news/world/2009/11/19/2009-11-19\_hamid\_karzai\_sworn\_in\_as\_afghan\_president\_vows\_to\_end\_corruption\_that\_marked\_fir.html)IM

KABUL - Afghanistan will control its own security within five years and prosecute corrupt officials, President Hamid Karzai pledged Thursday in an inauguration speech made under intense pressure to shed the cronyism and graft that marked his government's first term. Karzai also said he wanted private Afghan and foreign security companies to stop operating in the country within two years. "We are determined that by the next five years, the Afghan forces are capable of taking the lead in ensuring security and stability across the country," with foreign troops only responsible for support and training, he said. Karzai won this year's fraud-marred presidential election after his main rival, Abdullah Abdullah, pulled out of a runoff, saying it was impossible for the vote to be fair. But in his speech, Karzai sought to portray himself as a unifying force and invited those who ran in the election to work together for the benefit of the country. "I would like to invite all the presidential candidates, including my brother Dr. Abdullah Abdullah, to come together to achieve the important task of national unity, and make our common home, Afghanistan, proud and prosperous," he said. He stopped short, however, of inviting any political rivals into his government. He said a loya jirga, or traditional council of elders, would be called to address the insurgency, but did not set a timeframe. "We will utilize all national and international resources to put an end to war and fratricide," he said. Karzai, who has often bristled at the criticism leveled at him from Western powers, said his government was doing whatever it could to implement reforms. "We are trying our best to implement social, judicial and administrative reforms in our country," he said. "Being a president is a heavy task and we will try our best to honestly fulfill this task in the future."

Karzai committed now

**CBC News 9** (Nov. 3 2009, http://www.cbc.ca/world/story/2009/11/03/karzai-afghan-president-election108.html)IM

Afghan President Hamid Karzai has promised to establish an inclusive government that will banish the corruption that undermined his previous administration. Afghanistan "has a bad name from corruption," the president said. "We will do our best through all possible means to eliminate this dark stain from our clothes." Karzai delivered a speech in Kabul on Tuesday after he was declared victor of his country's presidential election by the Independent Election Commission. Karzai effectively secured a second term when his only contender, Abdullah Abdullah, dropped out of the run-off election on Sunday, alleging the Nov. 7 vote wouldn't have been transparent or fair. The election commission cancelled the run-off on Monday. Karzai has been told by several Western leaders and the UN that he must do more to tackle corruption in the government. But the president has contended that cannot be accomplished by just shuffling officials from his cabinet. The problem of corruption was not certain officials, but inadequate laws and enforcement, Karzai said. "We need to review the law where we have problems, and draft what is needed," he said, adding that an anti-corruption commission created a year ago should also be strengthened.

A2 – Corruption

Corruption in Afghanistan is mostly Western media hype

**Reuters 10** (Peter Graff, Jan 8 2010, http://www.reuters.com/article/idUSTRE60717B20100108)IM

(Reuters) - A defiant Afghan President Hamid Karzai defended his record on corruption in an interview broadcast on Friday, saying the issue that has damaged his reputation had been "blown out of proportion" by Western media. In the interview, with Qatar-based Al Jazeera television, the Afghan leader said he did not depend on the good opinion of Western leaders, who had sent their troops out of self interest. Repeatedly emphasizing Afghanistan's sovereignty, he said he would not ask for more cash from donors at a conference later this month, but would demand foreign troops stop arresting Afghans, halt night raids and work harder to end civilian deaths. "With the international community, I don't need to have their favor. They are here for a purpose: the fight on terror. And we are working with our purpose, which is the stability and safety of Afghanistan," he said. "The international community, especially the West, they must respect Afghanistan and its government, and understand that we are a people, we are a country, we have a history, we have interests, we have pride, we have dignity," he said. "Our poverty must not become a means of ridicule and insult to us." The issue of corruption has driven a wedge between Karzai and many of the Western leaders who have nearly 110,000 troops in the country fighting a growing Taliban insurgency. Karzai's standing abroad has slid especially since his re-election in August, when a U.N.-backed probe threw out nearly a third of his votes as fake. That forced a second round, which was canceled when Karzai's opponent withdrew. Karzai acknowledged that Afghanistan "like all countries" has problems with graft, but said: "The Western media has blown corruption totally out of all proportion in Afghanistan."

Afghanistan instability has leveled off

**Washington Post 10** (Craig Whitlock, Apr. 29 2010, http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/content/article/2010/04/28/AR2010042805747.html)IM

The Afghan government can count on popular support only in a quarter of the main urban areas and other districts that are considered key to winning the war with the Taliban and other insurgents, the Pentagon said in a report delivered to Congress on Wednesday. In the status report on the war in Afghanistan, the Defense Department said that years of rising instability had "leveled off" since January and that the number of Afghans who see their government heading in the right direction has increased. The report stops short of declaring that the tide has turned in a nine-year war in which the Taliban has made a strong comeback since it was toppled from power after the Sept. 11, 2001, terrorist attacks. "Afghanistan has achieved some progress on anti-corruption, particular with regard to legal and institutional reforms” the report stated.

A2 – Corruption

Karzai’s reputation is fine – the international community thinks it is worse than it is

Coburn 9 (Noah, Socio-Cultural Anthropologist at The United States Institute of Peace, Afghanistan Research and Evaluation Unit Post-Election Brief 2, p. 5)JFS

Karzai’s reputation in the communities studied seems to have been much less damaged by the flawed election process than much of the current debate in the international community suggests. With the exception of some Tajiks who originally voted for Karzai but later moved to Abdullah, in general there seemed to be little real movement in opinions about Karzai or his government as a direct result of the election process. Most people originally supporting Karzai maintained their positive opinion of him and those initially opposed to him used the electoral fraud only as further evidence of the problems of his administration.

Much of the criticism was instead directed at Karzai’s political allies. As one voter in Qarabagh stated, “His brother is the leader of all smugglers and his first assistant is the leader of the mafia in Afghanistan.” Another added, “A group of traitors, smugglers, mafia and robbers are leading Afghanistan and now the destiny of the country is in their hands.” Karzai was also criticised for his relationship with the international community, particularly for not responding more strongly to issues such as civilian casualties and for some of his criticisms of conservative religious leaders, which many believe is done at the behest of the international community: “If Karzai follows his previous strategy of not bringing foreign soldiers to justice for killing innocent Afghans and calling legitimate religious scholars Al Qaeda, his government will weaken.”

Others, particularly in Dasht-i Barchi, maintained a positive opinion of Karzai and his government. He was particularly praised for bringing some degree of stability and economic growth to the country, and for preventing ethnic conflict. As one man stated, “Most people voted for Karzai because he is the symbol of unification among the ethnicities of Afghanistan...he is the only person who can bring peace and security in Afghanistan because he is in touch with all the ethnicities.”

A2 – Terrorism

Pressuring Karzai to reform gives strength to the Taliban and increases terrorism

Munir 10 (Manzer, Agora Vox, Pakistanis For Peace, http://www.agoravox.com/news/international/article/hamid-karzai-is-losing-all-his-11440)JFS

Kabul, Afghanistan- President Hamid Karzai’s troubling remarks this past Saturday that he would join the Taliban if he continues to come under pressure to reform by the United States and other “outsiders” has caused a stir in Washington DC. Karzai’s comments came a week after President Obama’s surprise visit to Afghanistan at the end of March to pressure Karzai’s government to reform the political system, end corruption, and do a better job of fighting the Taliban. Instead, what Karza delivered was a threat of the worse kind and quite possibly the most offensive and troubling thing one can say to a country that is risking countless soldiers lives daily to secure the country from the Taliban and other militant warlords in Afghanistan. In 8 short years, Hamid Karzai has gone from being the special guest of honor at George Bush’s State of the Union address to a leader who threatened to join our worst enemy. All because he feels that the US needs to stop badgering him to be a more responsible, fair, and an equitable leader as well as an effective partner in fighting the Taliban. Karzai apparently made these unusual comments at a closed door meeting of lawmakers on Saturday, just days after accusing “foreigners” presumably the Unites States of being behind the fraud of the disputed elections of 2009. “He said that if I come under foreign pressure, I might join the Taliban”, said Farooq Marenai, a lawmaker from the eastern province of Nangarhar. Mareni also stated that Karzai appeared nervous and demanded to know why parliament last week rejected legal reforms that would have strengthened Karzai’s authority over the country’s electoral institutions. Several other lawmakers confirmed that Karzai twice threatened to join the insurgency and the Taliban. Karzai’s comments are troubling on many levels. First and foremost, he gives legitimacy and strength to the Taliban as his comments present the Taliban as an alternative option to American support or view on the situation. Karzai’s statement will no doubt have traveled the length and breadth of Afghanistan as word will spread that there is a weakness in the American-Afghan coalition that has been fighting and hunting the Taliban since October of 2001, post 9-11. The remarks by Karzai also puts every American, NATO, and Pakistani soldiers as instead of liberators, the foreign armies would be thought of as invaders, literally overnight. Lastly, Karzai’s remarks prove to the fact that Karzai is no longer an ally nor a credible partner for the US , NATO, and Pakistani army fighting with the Taliban with all their might.

**A2 – Reform Solvency**

Electoral reform can’t solve legitimacy – it’s about outcomes of Karzai’s government, not the process

Coburn 9 (Noah, Socio-Cultural Anthropologist at The United States Institute of Peace, Afghanistan Research and Evaluation Unit Post-Election Brief 2, p. 3)JFS

“Legitimacy” has often been discussed in the Afghan and international press in the context of these elections, but these discussions often include blanket-statements about Afghan voter opinion that miss some of the nuance found in respondents’ descriptions of their perceptions of government. As many interviewees pointed out, legitimacy for most voters is about having trust in the government and the satisfaction of certain expectations. The legitimacy of the elections were not as damaged by accusations of fraud as some have concluded because legitimacy for many Afghans is more about outcomes than processes, and the legitimacy of Karzai’s new government is based more on what he will now deliver than how he came into office. It was uncommon for interviewees to use the formal Dari word for legitimacy, *mashroyat*, in their criticisms of the government or the elections. Instead, a much more used phrase was *baa atebaar*, “with trust.” Those critical of the election process often said they had “lost trust” in Karzai and his government. … Across interviews, legitimacy was perceived to derive mostly from the meeting of voter expectations. Those with higher expectations and those who thought Abdullah and his supporters should ultimately have been given a firmer place in the government tended to state that they had lost trust in the government and elections more generally over the past several months. For most voters, however, the greatest concern was security, and they tended to voice support for any government that could provide it, regardless of the flaws in the democratic process. As a teacher at Kabul University said, “Ordinary people do not consider matters of legitimacy and whether the election process is transparent; the things that are most important for them are peace, security and jobs.” Another man believed, “Democracy is second to the needs of the people. First there should be security and an improvement of people’s economic situation, then democracy can be practiced.”

Hopes of a free election in Afghanistan are idealist – the status quo is fine

Coburn 9 (Noah, Socio-Cultural Anthropologist at The United States Institute of Peace, Afghanistan Research and Evaluation Unit Post-Election Brief 2, p. 3)JFS

Other respondents said that international expectations for a free and transparent election in an unstable country with a population that has limited experience of elections were unrealistic. From the start of the process, Afghan observers generally had much lower expectations than the international community. As one community leader said, “I accept that there has been fraud and people’s votes were not respected and candidates were disgraced, but still this situation and the government is much better than the past governments we have experienced in this country.” Another man added, “Thirty years of destruction cannot be reconstructed in eight years,” a sentiment typical of Karzai supporters.

A2 – Reform Solvency

Your impacts are not the result of corruption – it’s a question of cultural difference between America and Afghanistan

Eland 9 (Ivan, December, LA Progressive, http://www.laprogressive.com/the-middle-east/more-corruption-is-needed-in-afghanistan/)JFS

One of the reasons why most counterinsurgency campaigns fail is that they’re run by foreign occupiers who don’t know the culture of the invaded country. This usual cultural ignorance, latent for eight years of the U.S. war effort in Afghanistan, came into sharp focus during the recent election campaign. The American foreign policy elite blanched at the massive fraud allowing President Hamid Karzai to win a second term handily. The election fraud then led to a thorough examination by the American media of Afghanistan’s corrupt government and questions about whether such a venal government could ever win the hearts and minds of the Afghan people. Of course, the implication was that it couldn’t and that the U.S. war effort, attached to this sinking anchor, would ultimately fail. Odds are that the U.S. war effort will ultimately fail, not primarily because of a tainted election or a corrupt government—but because the U.S. elite and ordinary Afghans have such different worldviews that they might as well live on different planets. Two things that Afghans have gotten used to in the last 200 years are wars caused by foreign occupiers and corruption from their own rulers. The impact of the fraudulent election, as an example of the latter, probably has not disillusioned Afghans as much as it has Westerners. That is because in Afghan culture, elections and majority rule don’t have that much legitimacy anyway. People in Afghanistan usually solve their political issues by inviting tribal leaders and warlords to a grand assembly called a loya jirga. Rather than majority rule governing, a consensus is hammered out. Furthermore, what is considered corrupt in Western countries is just good clean fun in Afghanistan. In the West, to soothe our consciences, our leaders disguise fighting for loot, territory, influence, or national interest in terms of high national principle (peacekeeping, nation-building, spreading democracy, etc.), and then people actually start believing the malarkey. In Afghanistan, fighters who switch sides for money may seem corrupt to the Western eye, but may be more honest with themselves than are Westerners. Because of this vast cultural divide, the United States should realize that a foreign occupier can never really win hearts and minds in Afghanistan. Afghan factions loyal to the U.S. will only be so until the cash or in-kind payments run out. Thus, the Obama administration needs to realize that it probably can never bring about long-term stability in Afghanistan—which should have been obvious since the Russians, Soviets, and British all failed to do so. The Afghans will somehow have to do that themselves.

A2 – Terrorism

The only way to solve for the motives that create Middle Eastern terrorism is to pull out and not push reform upon them – allowing them to create their own democracy is the best option

Miles 10 (Jim, contributor to Middle East Online, http://www.middle-east-online.com/english/?id=39246) GAT

Jihadism returns with more discussion of its ideological/theological development as well as the development of the suicide bomber as a holy warrior. At first concerned with the near enemy - apostate governments and citizens of their own countries and regions - the idea was transformed by bin Laden and Zawahiri against the far enemy, in this case, the US and its allies. He concludes that confronting “the social movement that Osama bin Laden and Ayman Zawhiri inspired a decade ago will require more than military might.” He does not quite reiterate his initial comment about refusing to fight the war, but indirectly says it is a “battle that can be won not with bullets and bombs but with words and ideas.” Unfortunately the latter idea is well pronounced in US publicity about its intentions, about winning the hearts and minds of the indigenous population, but that cannot be done with the ongoing occupation and military surges that fully contradict the ill-considered verbiage. The focus shifts to Europe with its small yet significant Muslim population, a section of society that is one result of Europe’s colonial past. As immigrants from oppression and as immigrants being employed as cheap labour the Muslim people of Europe are generally well integrated into their respective societies. Aslan is a bit starry eyed about the both globalization and the European Union. He never does fully define what his idea of globalization is and what affects it has on society, and he arrives at a rather surprising statement that “For the enthusiasts of globalization, the European Union offers a thrilling glimpse into a future of transnational interdependency.” Thrilling for sure as the debt crisis surges through the ‘have not’ countries of Europe, threatening to shake once again the global financial markets; and the transnational interdependency relies much more on transnational corporations and their non-democratic rule over the rights of nations. That weakness of analysis aside, the observations and analysis of jihadism as represented in Europe are accurate. He examines it as a social movement as much as a religious movement (in Islam as with Christian fundamentalists, there is little difference). The terrorist does not arise from poverty but from the educated population that has put considerable thought into the injustices - real and perceived - of society, sacrificing themselves not so much from hatred but “to sacrifice oneself for a positive reason such as love, reputation, or glory.” The final chapter points out some significant ideas. First is that “this was never conceived of as a war against terror per se” otherwise it would have included a much broader range of ideological targets other than just Islamic people, and a broader range of physical targets other than the oil rich Middle East. Next, if this war is about the “hearts and minds of Muslims, there should no longer be any question that the battle has been lost.” Included in Aslan’s list of uncommon perceptions is the brief bout of democracy in 2006 in Lebanon, Palestine, Egypt, and Morocco, described as the US “telling the world that the promise of peaceful political reform through democratic participation was a lie.” Democracy is the “one issue President Bush was right: only through genuine democratic reform can the appeal of extremist groups be undermined and the tide of Muslim militancy stemmed.” That includes the idea that “radical groups such as Hamas and Hezbollah must be brought into the political fold,” (and concurrently, the Taliban in Afghanistan). Aslan correctly identifies that it was not the promise of democracy, but the “retraction of the promise that led to fracturing of the Palestinians, the blockade of Gaza, the war between Hamas and Israel, and, ultimately the devastation of 1.5 Palestinian lives.” But there it stops. Aslan does not reiterate his call to “refuse to fight” the war. Nor does he provide the practical physical steps required to do so, so simple at one level - leave - and yet more complicated at another to try and provide the infrastructure and support for true democracy and to accept its results in a region where the entrenched privileges of the transnational corporations tie into the privileges of the current political elites on both sides of the Atlantic. Much could be managed by reversing the manipulation of US money, as has been done in supporting Israel over the years, buying the loyalty of many Arab regimes and many insurgent groups over the years. The ongoing problem of US support for Israeli occupation of Palestinian territory and its brazen double standards when it comes to nuclear weapons and the intent of the Nuclear Non-proliferation Treaty in relation to Israel, Iran, India, and Pakistan (among others) is the symbolic and most significant hot spot that requires a solution before any overall attempts at democracy are able to come into play. True democracy needs to given its due, not at the barrel of a US military gunship, but from the votes of the people and the participation of all political elements in the area - and then to have it supported even if the democratic outcome is quite different in style and look from what the developed countries envision. It has been seen in Ireland and South Africa - and more recently Lebanon - that significant changes can be made in drawing together disparate groups who can at least suppress their ideological differences from a warring status to a negotiating status if outside interference and ideologically contrived interventions are avoided. Aslan’s views in Beyond Fundamentalism have some back-ground weaknesses (globalization, the US role in jihad), but the specific ideas he presents about terrorism, global jihad, fundamentalism and democratic rights are sound and accurate. It is a short work with some powerful statements, a bit sensational at times, but mostly well grounded.

A2 – Terrorism

Attempting to push democratic reform upon the Afghan people fails – their own local thoughts must be integrated into politics to avoid assisting the Taliban

Adiparvar 9 (Naysan, UN diplomat to Afghanistan, http://archive.arabnews.com/?page=7&section=0&article=128406&d=13&m=11&y=2009) GAT

The foundations of democracy are alive and well in Afghanistan. However the recent elections did nothing to build upon them. They were meant to present a facade to the "folks at home" demonstrating that all is well, allowing the state-building machinery to roll on. But they failed to contribute to a sustainable democracy. Why? The answer lies behind the elections. The recent fraudulent elections in Afghanistan cost over $250 million, and added to a growing dissatisfaction among the Afghan people. This money was spent on staging an elaborate political exercise - an exercise aimed at demonstrating that the "West" had brought democracy to Afghanistan. The exercise failed. What it did demonstrate, however, was first, patronage on a grand scale, second, the importance of ethnic allegiance, and third, the inappropriateness of the "Western" model of democracy for Afghanistan. Following the reinstatement of Hamid Karzai as president we must not take our eye of the ball: Is democracy for Afghanistan? Was this multimillion-dollar fortune wasted? To respond to these questions we must look at the focus and approach of democracy building in Afghanistan. It is after spending the majority of the last three and a half years working in Afghanistan with nongovernmental organizations and the United Nations that I realize that we - the US-dominated international community in Afghanistan - have been naive in our pursuit of democracy. We have aimed to demonstrate democracy superficially with "free and fair" elections, a "vibrant" civil society and a "representative" Parliament. Yet they are far from free, fair, vibrant or representative. In other words, we have focused our efforts on the visible outcomes of democracy at the expense of the quality of the processes that produce them. Democracy is about people and their interactions. Acknowledging that Afghanistan is a country marked by strongly established hierarchies and age-old systems of patronage, is it any surprise that the elections proceeded as they did - with 1 in 3 ballots potentially fraudulent and with many of the votes cast under coercive circumstances? No, and this wouldn't have changed had an election runoff gone ahead. In fact what the second round would have done would have been to further polarize people along ethnic lines, present opportunity for further violence and most likely reinstated Karzai through fraudulent means. It is only by broadening our focus beyond democratic outcomes - beyond elections - to include democratic process that we have any chance at democratizing Afghanistan. We must strive to promote social and economic equality in a land rife with corruption, where money is power and the majority is poor; where ethnicity, tribe, and gender determine one's lot. We must work at local levels - in villages - with ordinary people to do this. The democratic ideal will never be achieved solely through national-level initiatives. But what is the democratic ideal in Afghanistan? If we are to engage on the uneven ground of inequality, hierarchy and patronage we must do so carefully. It is only by beginning a process of democratization that is amenable to the Afghan people and realistic in its expectations that we have any chance of success. We must always be working at the boundary of what is culturally and religiously acceptable, rather than rushing toward benchmarks founded on Western values and concepts. If we demand too great a change from Afghan culture it is likely to be rejected and provide ideological ground for the Taleban's advance. To identify the Afghan "democratic ideal" then we must separate democracy-as-a-mode-of-governing from democracy-as-a-value: We must separate the concept of the democratic political system from its associations with Western liberal values, which will not be accepted in present-day Afghanistan. We must Afghanize democracy. Research recently conducted by Afghanistan Research and Evaluation Unit (www.areu.org.af) indicates that a different notion of democracy exists in Afghanistan. It is a democracy shrouded in culture and founded on Islam. It is a democracy that is founded on the Islamic concept of "Shoura". In Afghanistan a Shoura is a group of selected people, who through consultations, resolve problems and make decisions. However, years of conflict, political interference and opportunism have distorted its functioning. Thus, another cornerstone of Islam must be promoted: Social justice. This has already been demonstrated in Afghanistan and with mixed results. Across the country village-level Shouras have been elected as part of the National Solidarity Program. This process has met with mixed results, but what cannot be denied is that first seeds of an Afghan Islamic democracy have been sown. We must nurture these seeds to help them grow. It is only by pursuing democratization, at local levels with Afghan people, that we have any chance of success. Our focus must be on the quality of democracy rather than solely on its outcomes: We must strive to ensure social justice for the people of Afghanistan. We must strategically work toward producing an environment in which freedom to vote is realized, in which civil society is able to support the Afghan people to challenge nondemocratic behavior, and we must ensure that political representatives meet with and lobby on behalf of their constituents, primarily to receive the services they so desperately need. We must adopt an approach that is culturally and religiously amenable to the Afghan people - they must respect our intentions and we theirs. We must begin with a feasible start point: We must recognize and facilitate the establishment of a progressive Islamic Democracy.

A2 – Pakistan (Impact turn)

The US-Karzai alliance is at a brink – if we push for reform too hard, his administration will collapse – this leads to insurgency in Pakistan and Afghanistan, turning the net benefit

Khan 10 (Wasif, contributor to Dawn Media Group, http://www.dawn.com/wps/wcm/connect/dawn-content-library/dawn/news/world/03-the-karzai-conundrum-ss-08) GAT

While both sides have softened their stance and made attempts at reconciliation following the week-long spat, it is clear that the long term prospects for the US-Karzai alliance are bleak. For the moment though, necessity and pragmatism have compelled the American’s to mend fences with Hamid Karzai. The absence of (viable) alternative leadership and an expanding military offensive in the Taliban stronghold of Kandahar have left the west with limited options for the time being.   The rocky American-Karzai relationship has serious implications for neighboring Pakistan as well. On one hand, the Karzai regime has hardly masked its mistrust and hostility toward Pakistan. The Afghan President has publicly accused Pakistan of meddling in domestic affairs and even supporting the Taliban on numerous occasions during his stint in power. Karzai has also actively encouraged Indian support and involvement in Afghanistan, which has been of great concern for the Pakistani establishment. Yet, if Karzai’s government were to crumble following a US withdrawal, the consequences for Pakistan could be disastrous. A Taliban resurgence in Kabul would undoubtedly bolster the insurgency in Pakistan, where the military and security forces are already spread thin battling homegrown militants, and the population is reeling from frequent suicide attacks. Like all other stakeholders, for Pakistan, there are no easy solutions in Afghanistan. Perhaps one reason for optimism is that in contrast to the 1980’s, the US has indicated a firm and balanced resolve to support and engage Pakistan in the long run, at least under the Obama administration.

A2 – Reform Solvency

More US involvement will not provide what is needed – the only way to prevent the animosity against the US is to fulfill Obama’s Cairo rhetoric by allowing the people to decide, not the politicians

LeVine 10 (Mark, Prof. of Hist. at UC Irvine, http://english.aljazeera.net/focus/2010/05/2010518111649460720.html) GAT

The "war on terror" might have been retired as the official term for describing US military activities across the Muslim world, but the focus on a military surge in Afghanistan while intensifying covert military operations in Pakistan's Northwest Frontier Province have in fact doomed the prospects for peaceful reconciliation precisely because they exacerbate the incredibly corrupt and violent political and economic system the US helped create in Afghanistan and the border regions of Pakistan. Indeed, Obama's "middle of the road" policy of greater violence - touted as a compromise between withdrawal or all out occupation - has helped radicalise increasing numbers of Pakistanis and Afghans. What was needed was a radical shift in the other direction; ending support for corrupt and autocratic leaders, supporting freedom and democracy unequivocally, demanding more equitable distribution of national resources in client states, and a laser-like focus on what is the only legitimate reason the US has to maintain troops in Afghanistan - to capture or kill the men directly responsible for the 9/11 terrorist attacks, and nothing more. Of course, such a shift vis-à-vis AfPak policy could not occur in a vacuum. It would have to part of a larger and even more radical shift in the orientation of US policy throughout the Middle East. Instead, however, the incoming Obama administration publicly touted as a refreshing dose of "realpolitik" and "pragmatism" its laying aside of the Bush administration's pro-democracy rhetoric in favour of no - or at best, few - questions asked diplomatic support for, and tens of billions of dollars in military aid or weapons sales to, Egypt, Israel, Saudi Arabia, Nigeria and other client states with miserable human rights records. This policy was doomed to fail. Such pragmatism is precisely what has increased animosity towards the US, who for decades refused to walk the talk when it comes to advocating democracy, freedom and human rights in the Muslim world. What Obama desperately needed to do was radical, but it was and remains achievable: to build credibility through offering tangible support for the peoples rather than the leaders of the region. He hinted at significant change in his famous Cairo speech of one year ago with his call for a "new beginning" based on "tolerance and dignity," but his rhetoric has turned out to be just more smoke and mirrors. Not only does his administration continue to "tolerate" dictators and systematic human rights violations, he has sought to continue and in some cases even extend policies that violate constitutional norms and/or US law. This is evidenced most recently by the administration's support for loosening Miranda rights for terrorism suspects and the extension of assassinations to people who merely share certain "lifestyle characteristics" of supposed anti-US rebels. As we saw with the Bush administration, and during the Johnson administration in Vietnam, even with the best intentions once a government crosses over to the "dark side" it is almost impossible to come back to the light. In fact, it becomes a "force multiplier" for militancy among the peoples the US is occupying - expanding the anger and hatred across a region that is already filled to the brim with both (as one friend remarked to me, you can't kick people in the stomach and not expect them to go for your groin in return). Simply put, as long as the US is not serious about supporting real freedom, accountability and democracy in the Middle East, animosity to and violence against the US - both there and when possible in the US - will continue. Moreover, when the president needs to make bold moves, such as in trying to reinvigorate the Israeli-Palestinian peace process, he will not have the credibility to demand major compromises from either side.

Impact – Taliban

The Taliban currently has the technology to create undetectable IEDs – this is crucial to the amount of casualties in the Middle East

DMG 10 (Dawn Media Group, 2/9/10, http://www.dawn.com/wps/wcm/connect/dawn-content-library/dawn/news/world/07-taliban-develop-new-bomb-called-omar-ha-06) GAT

The biggest killer of Western troops in Afghanistan are home-made bombs, known as improvised explosive devices or IEDs, which the Taliban deploy to wide effect in their eight-year insurgency and detonate by remote control. Western military intelligence officials have said most foreign troop deaths, which hit a record 520 last year, are caused by IEDs. But the Taliban claimed – ahead of a major assault by foreign troops on the southern Taliban stronghold of Helmand province – to have created a new IED using materials that make them undetectable. The network’s spokesman, who identified himself as Yousuf Ahmadi, said the new bomb had been named after Taliban leader Mullah Mohammad Omar Mujahed, believed to be based in Pakistan. “Omar is our latest weapon in the war against the invaders,” he told AFP by telephone from an undisclosed location. “It’s a very effective bomb, it can’t be detected by mine-sweeping vehicles and it causes more deaths,” he said. He refused to provide more details, saying “it’s our military secret” but added that each Omar cost around 100 dollars to make. “With a 100-dollar mine we are able to destroy the enemy’s multi-million-dollar anti-mine vehicles,” he claimed, referring to heavily armoured vehicles used in Afghanistan by US and other NATO troops. Ahamdi charged the “Omar bomb” had already been used in attacks on Western forces, but his claim could not be verified immediately. Around 113,000 foreign troops are deployed to Afghanistan under US and NATO command fighting a Taliban insurgency that increasingly relies on IEDs and suicide bomb attacks as its tactics have morphed into guerrilla warfare. So far this year 62 foreign soldiers have died in the Afghan theatre, according to an AFP tally based on the independent icasualties.org website.

A2 Consult JCS CP

Say No

**The military would say no – their goals are incompatible with pulling out**

**QDR 2010** (Quadrennial Defense Review, <http://www.defense.gov/qdr/images/QDR_as_of_12Feb10_1000.pdf>) GAT

**The mission of the** **D**epartment **o**f **D**efense **is to protect the American people** and advance our nation’s interests. In executing these responsibilities, **we must recognize that** first and foremost, **the United States is a nation at war**. In Afghanistan, our forces fight alongside allies and partners in renewed efforts to deny Al Qaeda safe haven, reverse the Taliban's momentum, and strengthen the capacity of Afghanistan's security forces. In Iraq, U.S. military personnel advise, train, and support Iraqi forces as part of a responsible transition and drawdown. Above all, the United States and its allies and partners remain engaged in a broader war—a multifaceted political, military and moral struggle—against Al Qaeda and its allies around the world. Furthermore, as a global power, **the strength and influence of the United States are deeply intertwined with the fate of the broader international system**—a system of alliances, partnerships, and multinational institutions that our country has helped build and sustain for more than sixty years. **The U.S. military must therefore be prepared to support broad national goals of promoting stability in key regions**, providing assistance to nations in need, and promoting the common good. With these realities in mind, the **2010 Quadrennial Defense Review advances two** clear **objectives**. First, **to** further **rebalance the capabilities of America’s Armed Forces to prevail in today’s wars**, while building the capabilities needed to deal with future threats. Second, **to** further reform **the Department’s institutions and processes to better support the urgent needs of the warfighter**; buy weapons that are usable, affordable, and truly needed; and ensure that taxpayer dollars are spent wisely and responsibly. The strategy and initiatives described in the QDR will continue to evolve in response to the security environment. Using the QDR as its foundation, the Department will continually examine its approach—from objectives to capabilities and activities to resources—to ensure its best alignment for the nation, its allies and partners, and our men and women in uniform.

Say No

**The JCS would say no to withdrawal of troops stationed for non-combat presence in every topic region**

**Schwalbe 5** (Stephen R., Director of the Air War College’s Regional Studies Program, prof. of Global Security at Air War College, http://www.airpower.maxwell.af.mil/airchronicles/cc/schwalbe2.html) GAT

Congress legislated a defense review every four years, called **the Quadrennial Defense Review** (QDR), which **includes an assessment of the US overseas military posture**. Shortly after President George W. Bush took office, another QDR was required (the final report was due to Congress by September 2001). Dr. Michele **Flourney was tasked by the** Chairman of the **Joint Chiefs of Staff to organize** a small working group at the National Defense University (NDU) to provide the intellectual underpinnings of **the 2001 QDR.** Flourney’s subsequent book, QDR 2001: Strategy-Driven Choices for America’s Security, covered the military posture in chapter five (cowritten with Col Sam Tangredi), “Defense Strategy alternatives: Choosing Where to Place Emphasis and Where to Accept Risk.”9 Professor Flourney broke the book up into sections covering the three major regions of the world: Europe, Middle East, and Asia-Pacific. **In Europe, the NDU working group determined that Russia was still a potential threat to the security of the U.S**., even though it had a democratically-elected president and was aligned with the West. **As such, they recommended no major force changes in Europe** in order to maintain peace and stability (more of the Cold War mantra: keep America in, Germany down, and Russia out). **This included keeping the combat-heavy forces in place**. They admitted their recommendation left the Cold War force posture pretty much intact, meaning it was positioned to fight in place; not to be deployed outside the region. To counter such criticisms, they recommended DOD develop new weapon systems that were more easily deployable**. In the Middle East, the NDU working group recommended an increase in naval presence**, primarily because the Arab governments of these countries wanted the American security, but being sensitive to their Islamic citizens, wanted to keep US forces out of sight. As such, the US presence in the Middle East remained small, but supported by a significant amount of pre-positioned weapon systems and supplies (enough to field 11 Army brigades). **In the Asia-Pacific region, the group considered China to be the next peer competitor to America. So**, once again, **no change in the US military posture in this region was recommended**. In fact, they recommended that the facilities in Guam and Diego Garcia be upgraded just in case. (Note: of all the recommendations the NDU working group proposed, this may have been the only one actually implemented.)

Say No 🡪 Link to Politics

**If the military says no in a binding consultation, there will be huge political backlash**

**Feaver et al 5** (Peter, professor of Poli. Sci., Asian Perspective, Vol. 29, No. 1, pp. 233-271) GAT

**The** post-cold war **election of** President Bill **Clinton**, however, markedly **shifted** the values of **the factors that determined civil-military relations**. At least along some crucial dimensions, **the civil-military gap widened** with a liberal-leaning Democratic president facing a conservative-leaning, Republican-oriented military. Of even greater consequence, Clinton [brought to the office unique civil-military baggage; he famously avoided any kind of military service during the Vietnam War, dissembled about those efforts in the campaign, and then was obliged to confront an extremely popular military leader, General Colin Powell, whom many considered to be a likely future electoral rival. **When Clinton challenged the military** on lifting the ban on gays serving openly in the ranks, he **was met with vigorous objections; he backed down, paid an enormous political cost for doing so**, and subsequently signaled repeatedly that he was reluctant ever to challenge the military again. Observers warned of a "crisis" in American civil-military relations.4

Costs capital

Feaver 9 (Peter, Oct 21, Foreign Policy, http://shadow.foreignpolicy.com/posts/2009/10/21/obamas\_military\_problem\_is\_getting\_worse)JFS

If Obama regains a deft touch, the crash can be averted. To avert it he needs to do more than simply endorse the McChrystal request, though that would surely help. He needs to show that he respects the civil-military process, and he needs to rein in his advisors who have been stumbling about. If he is going to over-rule McChrystal, which is his right as a Commander-in-Chief, he will have a much steeper climb out of his civil-military hole. At a minimum, he will need to forthrightly take ownership of the war and all of its consequences and spend the political capital he has hitherto avoided spending on national security issues to explain his decision to the American people and the American military.

Perm Solvency

**The best form of CMR involves non-binding consultation**

**Feaver 9** (Peter, prof. of Poli. Sci. at Duke Univ., http://shadow.foreignpolicy.com/posts/2009/05/15/is\_obama\_really\_getting\_rolled\_by\_the\_us\_military) GAT

It is not shirking, however, when the military is given an opportunity to present its case to the president, and the president changes his mind. **Healthy civil-military relations involve civilians** giving the military an opportunity to provide candid advice -- check that, **requiring the military to provide candid advice -- and** then civilians making a decision. Sometimes that decision is different from what the civilians would have made in the absence of that advice. But **that is not necessarily "getting rolled." It could just be "getting informed."**

**Consultation is fine, but only when it’s the civilians who ultimately make the decision**

**Noonan 8** (Michael P., managing director of the Program on National Security at the Foreign Policy Research Institute, http://www.fpri.org/enotes/200801.noonan.mindthegap.html) GAT

Lt. Col. Frank G. Hoffman, USMCR (ret.), a non-resident senior fellow of the FPRI and a research fellow at the Center for Emerging Threats and Opportunities (CETO) in Quantico, Virginia, stated that the protracted war in Iraq “has uncovered profound cracks in some of the dysfunctional elements that are inherent to American civil-military relations.” The precarious nature of the nation’s civil-military relations contributed to poor policymaking and ineffective execution. **Civilian control of the military is firmly grounded constitutionally, structurally, and historically, but civil-military relations**—the interface between policy leaders and military officers—**are more complex and less structured**. “Ultimately, **it’s about the interchange of viewpoints, and the production of effective strategies** and decisions about the use of the military instrument.” **A narrow focus on control leads to overlooking the overall purpose of the use of force and can denigrate the quality of the decision-making process**, the outputs of which are what are really at issue. **During recent conflicts** the climate and context of the civil-military relationship has not been open to rigorous discourse. **Needed inputs for military officers** and others were **“either ignored, muzzled, intimidated, or cut out of the process.”** Hoffman noted that problems in civil-military relations are embedded in several myths. One myth is that there has been a clear, inherent division of labor between the military and civilians since Vietnam: civilians set political objectives and then get out of the way. This overlooks what Eliot Cohen has called the “unequal dialogue,” where civilian leaders probe the military and the military asks the same about the ends and means of policy.[4] “Separating policy from strategy and operations is simply an extremely poor alternative to the intense and admittedly uncomfortable interaction of policy desires and military realities that needs to occur inside the White House and inside the Pentagon.”

**Non-binding consultation is key to civilian authority – this is a net benefit to the perm**

**Cook & Ulrich 6** (Martin L., U.S. Air Force Academy; Marybeth P., Department of National Security and Strategy at U.S. Army War College, November 2006, Journal of Military Ethics, Vol. 5, No. 3, p. 161-182) GAT

Professional guidelines for military professionals include the limits of dissent, restraint from leveraging bureaucratic advantage to achieve institutional self-interest, and the acceptance of the principle of non-partisanship. It is essential to the professional development of military officers that they learn to recognize when the bounds of the limits of dissent are breached. **Policy advocacy has its place in a collaborative policymaking process, but actions resulting in outcomes counter to the civilian leadership’s policies subvert civilian authority.** The military leadership should apply its expertise without ‘shirking’.7 Officers should represent their profession and offer their best military advice. Their core responsibility is to execute policy, avoiding excessive advocacy and insistence of their views. **Healthy civilmilitary relationships engender a climate of collaboration within which civilian and military expertise can come together** to craft national security policy. **The civilian** political **leadership sets political objectives that the military supports through** continued **interaction with the political leadership**.

Binding Consultation 🡪 Less Effective

**Ceding power to the military leads doesn’t lead to an effective policy – nothing changes**

**Partridge 5/24** (Teddy, reporter for the Seminal, http://seminal.firedoglake.com/diary/50577) GAT

**The Lieberman** sham **compromise on** **D**on’t **A**sk **D**on’t **T**ell **cedes control of the military from the law-making** and law-executing **branches of government to the U**nited **S**tates **military**. In effect, this law says open service is legal, but only when the military pleases. Joe Lieberman, Monday’s progressive hero, has not introduced a repeal of Don’t-Ask-Don’t-Tell. The legislative language in the much-heralded compromise leaves everything up to our formerly civilian-controlled military and formerly subordinate-to-the-President Secretary of Defense. Sure, **there’s a structure for repeal, but there are lots of hoops the military can elect to jump through**. Or not. **This isn’t repeal. This is repeal with a trigger. And the trigger is in the hand of** the President, along with his **Secretary of Defense and the** Chairman of the **Joint Chiefs of Staff**. Who do you think holds the whip hand on military matters there? **Everything remains exactly the same:** Section 654 of title 10, United States Code, shall remain in effect until such time that all of the requirements and certifications required by subsection (b) are met. If these requirements and certifications are not met, section 654 of title 10, United States Code, shall remain in effect. In fact, that clause is entitled "No Immediate Effect on Current Policy." Until the President, the Secretary, and the Chairman complete, certify and accept the idea that the time for open service has arrived. All of these must occur before the policy will change: (b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by subsection (f) shall take effect only on the date on which the last of the following occurs: ARM10802 S.L.C. (1) The Secretary of Defense has received the report required by the memorandum of the Secretary referred to in subsection (a). (2) The President transmits to the congressional defense committees a written certification, signed by the President, the Secretary of Defense, and the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, stating each of the following: (A) That the President, the Secretary of Defense, and the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff have considered the recommendations contained in the report and the report’s proposed plan of action. (B) That the Department of Defense has prepared the necessary policies and regulations to exercise the discretion provided by the amendments made by subsection (f). (C) That the implementation of necessary policies and regulations pursuant to the discretion provided by the amendments made by sub-section (f) is consistent with the standards of military readiness, military effectiveness, unit cohesion, and recruiting and retention of the Armed Forces. Note that all the excuses-language previously justifying this homophobic policy are included in the final paragraph: military readiness, military effectiveness, unit cohesion, and recruiting and retention. Not one of which has been a problem for any of our many allies that have implemented open service. In other words, the legislative branch has ceded its law-making power to the formerly subordinate-to-the-Executive military. Until the military is ready to implement open service, it won’t happen. (And just in case you weren’t completely satisfied with your purchase, there’s a bonus section to ensure that no benefits are provided to anyone possibly affected by any eventual DADT repeal in violation of the Defense of Marriage Act.) **This is a sham — a sop to the Democrats’ left-of-the-left**, as you might expect from anything organized by Joe Lieberman.

Binding Consultation 🡪 Less Effective

Deferring all military decisions to binding consultation with the military is simply not realistic – it is inevitable that the civilian sphere must make some military decisions

Cook & Ulrich 6 (Martin L., U.S. Air Force Academy; Marybeth P., Department of National Security and Strategy at U.S. Army War College, November 2006, Journal of Military Ethics, Vol. 5, No. 3, p. 161-182) GAT

This analysis points to a more subtle and nuanced characterization of the ideal civil military relationship than is typical in civil military relations literature. There the tendency is to take for granted the professional expertise of the military and frame the question solely in terms of the degree to which that advice is or is not heeded by civilian leaders. Indeed, the imagined ideal tends toward a pole which suggests that civilian leaders make the core determination that the political ends being sought warrant use of military force for their achievement (and, in consultation with the highest levels of military leadership, that those goals are indeed achievable by military means). But after that determination is in place, military officers (and at times political leaders, such as Bush’s deferment to his commanders on troop levels) often imagine the ideal case to be one in which civilians defer all subsequent operational decisions to military expertise. One unfortunate consequence of that way of looking at things is that it views every intervention of civilian leadership into operational decisions as an inappropriate encroachment of civilians into the sphere of proper military expertise. But since all uses of military force are inevitably ‘politics by other means’, civilian leaders will necessarily be monitoring closely the political consequences of the details of the conduct of military operations. Eliot Cohen’s outstanding set of case studies chosen for Supreme Command illustrates multiple instances of near-certain defeat of national interests had not civilian leaders remained engaged in the process of strategy adaptation and oversight of military operations in wartime (Cohen 2002).

A2 Consult Nato CP

Lie Perm Card

(**\_\_) NO LEAKS.**

LOVEN, NOVEMBER 5TH 2008

Jennifer, Great expectations: Obama will have to deliver, Associated Press, <http://www.cleveland.com/nation/index.ssf/2008/11/great_expectations_obama_will.html>

He also showed himself to be a highly disciplined, CEO-style manager. **The leak-proof, tightly managed and orderly Obama operation mimics the Bush White House, and flows from "No Drama Obama" himself** -- a man so focused that he didn't give himself a day off from working out, even the morning after winning the presidency.

Consult Bad Theory

**A) Conditional solvency – the plan becomes contingent on a yes. Its not reciprocal, allowing them to spike out of arguments**

**B) Artificially competitive Textual competition is best – it’s the least arbitrary, guarantees good counterplan competition and causes careful plan writing. Artificial competition makes permutations impossible and justifies intrinsic permutations like plan plus consult on another china policy. We can go for it.**

**C) There’s an infinite number - can consult countries, alliances, groups of countries, infinitely regresses to consulting individuals and NGO’s. Makes it impossible to predict**

NATO Weak Now

NATO is becoming increasing weak and ineffective in the 21st century

Sieff 9 (Martin, UPI Sr News Analyst, April 17, http://www.upi.com/Business\_News/Security-Industry/2009/04/17/21st-century-NATO-a-weak-hollow-giant/UPI-99071239994461/) LL

[WASHINGTON](http://www.upi.com/Business_News/Security-Industry/2009/04/17/21st-century-NATO-a-weak-hollow-giant/UPI-99071239994461/##), April 17 (UPI) -- The NATO alliance that confronted the collapse of the Soviet Union from 1989-91 really had teeth. Today, a far larger but also far weaker NATO resembles a 1930s airship -- huge, slow, unwieldy, vulnerable and filled with nothing more than hot gas. Many military analysts believed that as late as the early 1980s, the Soviet Union and its satellite allies in the Warsaw Pact still had an overwhelming superiority in conventional forces, particularly in artillery and main battle tanks, over the assembled forces of NATO, especially on the expected main battlefield area between them of the North European plain. However, the decision of NATO leaders to push ahead with the deployment of their small, highly mobile, nuclear-armed U.S.-built Pershing II intermediate-range ballistic missiles changed the strategic equation. The Pershings gave deployed NATO forces in Western Europe a far more lethal and credible deterrent than anything they had previously fielded. Even at its time of greatest relative weakness in the face of the Red Army and its Soviet allies, there was no question during the Cold War that NATO was first and foremost a defensive military alliance. Its member states agreed that the military forces they put under the command of NATO at alliance headquarters outside Brussels were meant to defend their territories, not to project power outside them, however worthy the cause was. Therefore, the U.S. commitment in the 1950-53 Korean War, with allies such as Britain and Turkey sending military contingents to fight alongside U.S. forces, was never a NATO operation. Neither was the long U.S. military commitment in Vietnam. Nor was the 1991 Gulf War to liberate Kuwait from Iraq, although NATO allies, primarily Britain and France, sent significant forces to fight alongside U.S. troops. However, in the years following the collapse of communism and the disintegration of the Soviet Union, the nature of the alliance gradually changed. It eventually grew to its present size of 28 member states -- one more in number than the 27-nation European Union. All the former member states of the Warsaw Pact eventually joined NATO. So did even three former Soviet republics, the small Baltic nations of Latvia, Lithuania and Estonia that had been swallowed by the Soviet Union against their will in 1940. Successive U.S. presidents, both Republican and Democratic, enthusiastically backed by [British governments](http://www.upi.com/Business_News/Security-Industry/2009/04/17/21st-century-NATO-a-weak-hollow-giant/UPI-99071239994461/##), welcomed the new NATO member states one and all. There was a happy, almost universally shared agreement across the political spectrum in Washington that expanding the alliance was a good thing that would spread peace and security, as well as democracy and free markets, throughout Central and [Eastern Europe](http://www.upi.com/Business_News/Security-Industry/2009/04/17/21st-century-NATO-a-weak-hollow-giant/UPI-99071239994461/##). However, all the new member states were net consumers of NATO and U.S. security; they could not add to it themselves. This was dramatically demonstrated after the al-Qaida terrorist attacks on the United States of Sept. 11, 2001, that killed 3,000 Americans. To the astonishment of U.S. and European leaders alike, the first time the Article 5 clause for mutual defense in the alliance's founding 1949 North Atlantic Treaty, also known as the Treaty of Washington, was ever activated, it was for the Europeans to help America rather than the other way around. But this support, while emotionally important and welcome, was symbolic rather than practical. In the 21st century, the United States remained the single military giant on whom the defense of an ever-increasing number of much smaller and weaker NATO member states rested.

NATO Weak Now

**Structural weaknesses prevent NATO from acting effectively**

Afghan Voice Agency 10 (February 24, http://www.avapress.com/vdcfxmdy.w6dvja7riw.txt?PHPSESSID=5092ea07059843556defb256f9b88html&PHPSESSID=8abbe5a888a8ab4a9e42bb4c3a3ddhtml&PHPSESSID=457ca2dbdd0cbc9f55b7aab2310292b0) LL

With the war in Afghanistan as his guide, Defense Secretary Robert Gates on Tuesday called for sweeping changes in the way NATO prepares for and fights nontraditional conflicts. (AP)\_ Citing a "crisis" in the alliance, Gates said Afghanistan has exposed fundamental NATO weaknesses — shortcomings that he said can undermine the viability of NATO as it faces future security threats. He cited a money shortage within NATO — a perennial problem that successive American administrations have tried and failed to fix. That, in turn, is a "symptom of deeper problems with the way NATO perceives threats," assesses its defense needs and sets spending priorities, Gates said. Gates tempered his stern message with words of praise for NATO allies, saying they had demonstrated in just the last three months an "unparalleled level of commitment" to the war effort by increasing their troop contributions from 30,000 last summer to 50,000 this year. "By any measure that is an extraordinary feat," he said. He did not mention, however, that even NATO members who have shared the combat burden in Afghanistan are finding it hard to sustain. In the Netherlands, for example, the coalition government collapsed this month over the issue of troop contributions; the 2,000-strong Dutch troop contingent is to begin withdrawing in August. Another stalwart, Canada, plans to remove 2,800 troops by next year, even as some other nations send more. NATO's budget squeeze reflects a larger cultural and political trend within an alliance, Gates said. After decades of success in preventing a catastrophic eruption of conflict on the European continent, NATO member countries have failed to modernize their militaries — instead relying on superior U.S. firepower. Afghanistan, however, has shown that a superpower cannot succeed alone in a conflict that requires not just traditional military strength but also civilian expertise and the clout of international support. "The demilitarization of Europe — where large swaths of the general public and political class are averse to military force and the risks that go with it — has gone from a blessing in the 20th century to an impediment to achieving real security and lasting peace in the 21st," he told a National Defense University audience filled with uniformed military officers from many of NATO's 28 member countries. The danger, he added, is that potential future adversaries may view NATO as a paper tiger. "Not only can real or perceived weakness be a temptation to miscalculation and aggression, but, on a more basic level, the resulting funding and capability shortfalls make it difficult to operate and fight together to confront shared threats," Gates told a forum on rewriting the basic mission plan of the NATO alliance. "All of this should be a wake-up call that NATO needs serious, far-reaching and immediate reforms to address a crisis that has been years in the making," Gates said. If NATO simply rewrites its basic agenda — officially known as its "strategic concept" — without changing the practices and the mindset of alliance members, the result "will not be worth the paper it is printed on," he added.

NATO Weak Now

**The US doesn’t need NATO**

Bandow 9 (Doug, The American Spectator, February 6, http://spectator.org/archives/2009/02/06/completely-useless) LL

Three of Great Britain's retired top military officers have [declared](http://news.yahoo.com/s/afp/20090116/wl_uk_afp/britainpoliticsnucleardefence_20090116005401) their country's nuclear deterrent to be "completely useless." They suggest dropping the British submarine-based missiles, relying instead on the U.S. Such a step would effectively complete Europe's status as America's biggest military dependent.

NATO was created during the midst of the Cold War to prevent Soviet domination of Eurasia. Europe was a notorious freeloader on the U.S. even then, but the conventional wisdom was that Washington had to defend the Europeans even if they weren't terribly interested in defending themselves. Both Great Britain and France created independent nuclear forces, but these arsenals were viewed as adjuncts to America's nuclear umbrella.

Europe's dependence on the U.S. makes no sense today. The Cold War is over, and with it Moscow's potential for dominating the continent. Even before the economic crisis Russia's global pretensions exceeded its capabilities. The victory over tiny Georgia demonstrated that Moscow could defeat a small neighbor, not conquer any of the populous and prosperous countries in Old Europe, the traditional center of America's defense efforts. The Russian economy has since taken a huge hit and political protests are increasing. Georgia might turn out to be Moscow's high water mark before its own social problems force Russians to turn inward.

Even if the Europeans face a serious security threat, they do not need America's help. The European Union has a larger population and GDP than does America; the EU also has begun forging a continental perspective on foreign policy issues. Yet the Europeans have proved to be the worst sort of military deadbeats, with neither the will nor the ability to project much force anywhere. This isn't just an American judgment. British Defense Secretary John Hutton declared in mid-January: "Free-loading on the back of U.S. military security is not an option if we wish to be equal partners in this trans-Atlantic alliance."

He pointed to Afghanistan as emblematic of Europe's defense failure, demonstrating "a legacy of underinvestment by some European member states in their armed forces, significant variance in political commitment to the campaign, and underneath it all a continued overreliance on the U.S. to do the heavy lifting." If a more centralized European Union does anything on defense, it should be to develop a continent-wide force capable of combat and backed by sufficient lift to get it where needed.

As part of that process, Europe needs to consider the question of nuclear weapons. For 60 years the Europeans have relied on the U.S., yet why should Washington risk nuclear war to protect them from a sharply diminished threat? A week before the statement by the three British military officers, a Pentagon panel recommended keeping U.S. nuclear weapons in Europe and possibly modernizing the arsenal.

NATO Weak Now

**Doesn’t matter if relations with NATO are strained; NATO’s only a burden**

Bacevich 9 (Andrew, professor of history and international relations at Boston University, April 2, http://articles.latimes.com/2009/apr/02/opinion/oe-bacevich2/2) LL

The alliance has lost its sense of purpose. The way to get it back is for the U.S. to withdraw and let Europe be responsible for its own defense. When he visits Strasbourg, France, this week to participate in festivities marking NATO's 60th anniversary, President Obama should deliver a valedictory address, announcing his intention to withdraw the United States from the alliance. The U.S. has done its job. It's time for Europe to assume full responsibility for its own security, freeing the U.S. to attend to more urgent priorities. The creation of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization in 1949 remains a singular example of enlightened statecraft. With Europe's democracies still suffering from the ravages of World War II, and fearing the threat posed by Stalinist Russia, the U.S. abandoned its aversion to "entangling alliances" and committed itself to Europe's defense. Gen. Dwight D. Eisenhower came out of retirement to serve as NATO's first military chief. As U.S. forces arrived to take up their stations, the alliance soon found its footing. In its heyday, NATO possessed formidable capabilities and real (if never fully tested) cohesion. Its safety ensured, Western Europe prospered and remained at peace. Over time, the Soviet threat diminished and eventually disappeared. Since then, however, an alliance once regarded as the most successful in all of history has lost its way. When the end of the Cold War left Russia temporarily weakened, the United States and its allies wasted no time in exploiting that weakness. NATO pressed eastward, incorporating into its ranks nations that had previously formed part of the Soviet empire and of the Soviet Union itself. American policymakers urged the alliance to expand its reach, abandoning its defensive posture to become an instrument of intervention. According to the conventional wisdom of the 1990s, NATO needed to go "out of area" or it would surely go "out of business." This program of enlarging both NATO's territorial expanse and its ambitions has now reached an impasse. Through its military punishment of Georgia last year, Russia has signaled it will not tolerate further encroachments into what the Kremlin sees as its legitimate sphere of influence. Meanwhile, through its ineffective performance in Afghanistan -- NATO's most ambitious "out of area" contingency -- the alliance has revealed the extent to which its capabilities and its cohesion have eroded. Present-day NATO is a shadow of what it once was. Calling it a successful alliance today is the equivalent of calling General Motors a successful car company -- it privileges nostalgia over self-awareness. As with GM, so too with NATO: Fixing past mistakes will require painful changes. Continuing along the existing trajectory is not an option. If the alliance pursues any further eastward expansion (incorporating Ukraine into its ranks, as some in Washington have advocated), it will implode. If it persists in attempting to pacify Afghanistan (vainly trying to prod the Germans and other reluctant allies into deploying more troops with fewer strings attached), it will only further expose its internal weakness. NATO won't survive by compounding its own recent errors. Salvation requires taking a different course. However counterintuitive, the best prospect for restoring NATO's sense of purpose and direction lies in having the U.S. announce its intention to exit the alliance. Salvaging NATO requires reorienting the alliance back to its founding purpose: the defense of Europe. This remains a worthy mission. Although Vladimir Putin's Russia hardly compares with Josef Stalin's Soviet Union, and although current Russian military capabilities pale in comparison with those of the old Red Army, the fact is that Europe today does face a security threat to its east. Having been subjected (in its own eyes at least) to two decades of Western humiliation, authoritarian Russia is by no means committed to the status quo. Given the opportunity, the Kremlin could well give in to the temptation to do mischief. NATO's priority must be to ensure that no such opportunity presents itself, which means demonstrating an unquestioned capacity for self-defense. The difference between 1949 and 2009 is that present-day Europe is more than capable of addressing today's threat, without American assistance or supervision. Collectively, the Europeans don't need U.S. troops or dollars, both of which are in short supply anyway and needed elsewhere. Yet as long as the United States sustains the pretense that Europe cannot manage its own affairs, the Europeans will endorse that proposition, letting Americans foot most of the bill. Only if Washington makes it clear that the era of free-riding has ended will Europe grow up. NATO's anniversary bash promises to be an historic event. As part of his promise to promote change, Obama should make it a farewell party.

Say No – Afghanistan

**McChrystal’s plans for an offensive in Kandahar means that NATO will be reluctant to allow US troop withdrawal from Afghanistan.**

Rozoff 10 (Rick, researcher for Centre for Research on Globalization, Stop NATO, June 9, http://rickrozoff.wordpress.com/2010/06/09/military-watershed-longest-war-in-u-s-and-afghan-history/) LL

Ahead of what has been planned as the largest military offensive of the nearly nine-year war, the assault against the southern province of Kandahar and in particular the city of the same name which is its capital, the initiative does not appear to be with the U.S. and NATO. The campaign was scheduled to begin this month and culminate in August when combined U.S. and NATO troop strength in Afghanistan will reach 150,000. On the morning of June 9 fifty NATO tankers transporting oil and other supplies were attacked only fifty kilometers south of the Pakistani capital of Islamabad. According to earlier reports, top U.S. and NATO commander Stanley McChrystal is amassing over 25,000 troops – American, NATO and Afghan government – for the offensive in the city of Kandahar. The Daily Telegraph recently reported that “British military intelligence estimates there are between 500 and 1,000 insurgents who operate regularly in the area,” [2] which would mean as high as a 50-1 ratio of U.S.-led troops to Afghan insurgents, comparable to February’s attack on the town of Marjah in neighboring Helmand Province where 15,000 U.S.- and NATO-led forces faced as few as 400 armed fighters. [3] The Kandahar operation is still scheduled to commence this month and “will focus on Kandahar city and the farmland around it, and could take from four to six months. While Nato commanders are promising a low-key, Afghan-led approach to Kandahar city itself, international troops are preparing for combat operations in some of the areas around the city.” [4]

Withdrawal is unpopular with NATO; NATO commander General MacCrystal believes it will bring instability

The Voice of Russia 10 (May 31, http://english.ruvr.ru/2010/05/31/8797239.html) LL

The Commander of the US and NATO forces in Afghanistan, General Stanley MacCrystal has said that it will be  wrong to believe  that stability will  return to that  country after the pull out of American troops. US President, Barack Obama has promised to begin withdrawing American soldiers from Afghanistan in July of 2011, but  all those who believe that the presence of foreign troops in Afghanistan is the cause of the country’s instability will be  disappointed, declared Mac Crystal.

Afghan nationals do not trust the local authorities that are unable to provide security for the nation unaided at the present time. It is a no win situation: withdrawing  U.S troops is bad and leaving them in Afghanistan will bring neither peace nor stability; 9 years of the  so-called anti-terrorism operation have not produced the desired results, but the  task of bringing peace and stability to Afghanistan should  not be left  to the  US  alone, said  Professor Sergei Druzhilovsky of the Moscow Institute of International Affairs.

Say No – Afghanistan

NATO will say no; NATO is already expecting increased American troops in Afghanistan

CNN 9 (December 2, http://edition.cnn.com/2009/POLITICS/12/01/obama.world.reax/index.html) LL

(CNN) -- The non-U.S. members of NATO intend to commit at least 5,000 more troops to Afghanistan along with the American buildup just announced, the alliance's top civilian leader said Wednesday. NATO Secretary-General Anders Fogh Rasmussen said the 5,000 figure is "based on what we know now," adding, "I would expect a few thousand on top of that." "Based on my talks with a big number of political leaders, I feel confident that we will see significant increases in the troop contributions," Rasmussen said on CNN's "Amanpour" program. The additional units would bring NATO's contribution to the Afghan war to about 47,000 troops. That figure comes on top of the nearly 100,000 Americans expected to be in the fight once the additional deployments U.S. President Barack Obama announced Tuesday night are in place. "The important thing here is that allies and partners have responded very positively to the speech made by President [Obama](http://topics.edition.cnn.com/topics/Barack_Obama)," Rasmussen said. He said the first pledges could be announced at a conference of NATO foreign ministers Thursday and Friday in Brussels, Belgium, the seat of the alliance. "There is a broad consensus in the alliance that we must stand together," Rasmussen said. "We are in this together. We will support the United States. It is an alliance mission." Obama announced Tuesday night that he will send an additional 30,000 U.S. troops to Afghanistan while setting a goal of starting to bring forces home by the summer of 2011. The new strategy is designed to eliminate al Qaeda in Afghanistan and help the Afghan government defeat the Taliban insurgency, while bolstering neighboring Pakistan's anti-terrorism efforts. n addition to the 28 NATO allies, 15 non-NATO members have contributed troops to the U.S.-led coalition. The largest contribution from those countries is from Australia, with 1,200 troops. Rasmussen said the allies will stay in Afghanistan "as long as it takes to finish our job -- but, obviously, it's not forever." "The way forward is to hand over responsibility to the Afghans, province by province, as their own capacity develops," he said. The additional troops being dispatched "will build the bridge to the transition," he added. In his speech, Obama emphasized that the U.S. troop commitment in Afghanistan was not open-ended, saying, "the nation that I am most interested in building is our own."

Say no – NATO is rededicated to the war

Reuters 9 (Dec. 22, NATO says no deadline for Afghan troop withdrawal http://www.reuters.com/article/idUSTRE5BL2H220091222 TBC 6/21/10)

NATO Secretary-General Anders Fogh Rasmussen was visiting Afghanistan for the first time since U.S. President Barack Obama announced plans this month to send 30,000 extra troops to Afghanistan to try and tame mounting violence. NATO allies have also promised to send around 7,000 more. But Washington's plan also calls for U.S. troop levels to be scaled down from 2011 as Afghan security forces gradually take over responsibility, sparking concerns among Afghan civilians. Unrest has reached its worst levels in the eight-year war, and many fear that bombings and attacks may rise if their police and troops have not been well-enough prepared for their new responsibilities. There are currently around 110,000 international troops in Afghanistan, including 68,000 Americans. "My first message is to the Afghan people: I know that some are wondering how long international forces will stay, more specifically, they are worried we will leave too soon," Rasmussen told reporters alongside the Afghan president in Kabul. "Let there be no doubt, the international community will stand with you, will protect you, and help rebuild your country until you are ready to stand on your own," he said. Rasmussen said there would be a "new momentum" in 2010 as NATO ramped up its mission in Afghanistan but that its main focus would be to protect the population and train more Afghan forces.

Say No – Kuwait

Say No – NATO has been increasing cooperation with Kuwait and sees it as its future in the middle east

Rozoff 9 (ROZOFF February, 2009 Eurasia Critic NATO In The Persian Gulf Rick http://www.eurasiacritic.com/articles/nato-persian-gulf TBC 6/21/10)

With this unprecedented move, both countries being part of the Istanbul Cooperation Initiative, one observer opined that "we can assume that a military base in Abu Dhabi would contribute to a better NATO-GCC understanding. " (Gulf News [Saudi Arabia], January 27, 2008) "For France, the military base certainly improves its status within NATO as well as with the US as it would become the only NATO member other than the US that is stationed in the Gulf." (Ibid) A couple of days before NATO's Secretary General Scheffer signaled his approval of the initiative in advance by visiting the UAE, when it was noted "that his first ever official visit to this region showcases the strengthening pace of cooperation between NATO and the countries of this region." On that occasion Scheffer emoted that "Even before the launch of the ICI, the UAE displayed strong cooperation with NATO in the Balkans during the 1990s" and threatened that "The issue of nuclear proliferation has again taken center stage owing to the ambitions of Iran and North Korea...." (Dubai City Guide, January 24, 2008) And it was added, not that it needed to be, "The United Arab Emirates and Nato mull the establishment of cooperation in line with the Istanbul Cooperation Initiative (ICI), said the secretary-general of the North Atlantic Treaty Organisation (Nato), Jaap de Hoop Scheffer." (Khaleej Times [United Arab Emirates], January 27, 2008] On January 29 NATO Assistant Secretary Jean-Francois was in Qatar where he told the local press corps: "Our practical cooperation has intensified as well, especially at the military-to- military level. There has been a growing number of participants from Qatar in NATO courses and seminars. Besides, Qatar was the first ICI country to appoint a Liaison Officer to NATO in Brussels, in order to facilitate our cooperation, " after which the press reported that "A NATO team recently visited Doha to discuss...the possibility of elaborating an Individual Cooperation Programme with the Alliance.... " (The Peninsula [Qatar], January 29, 2008) Not to be left out, the Pentagon announced the following month that it was establishing a permanent Army command in Kuwait. Its commander described it as "a permanent platform for 'full spectrum operations in 27 countries around southwest Asia and the Middle East" and added, ""That's full spectrum operations. We're able to adapt better ... and go from high-intensity to regular warfare...." (Stars and Stripes, February 19, 2008)

Link Turn – Rising Expectations

Genuine consultation with Europe causes rising expectations which hurt the alliance -

Mead 4 (Walter Russell, MEAD, Senior Fellow @ The CFR, 2004 Power, Terror, Peace, and War, pg. 130-134)

Partly because it needed European cooperation in the Balkans, partly because ideologically many Clinton era officials agreed with European positions on issues like Kyoto and the ICC, and partly out of habits of consultation and deference that grew up during the cold war, the Clinton administration never quite made clear to Europeans just how unreasonable their hopes were. At the same time, most American diplomats and the broader "interlocutor class" of experts who specialize in transatlantic relations are generally more sympathetic to the ; European approach than they are to the red state, red meat approach of the American Jacksonians and the Revival Wilsonians who, since September 11th, have figured so prominently in the politics of American foreign policy. The Bush administration made the strategic decision that it no longer made sense to encourage Europe in illusions about the direction of American policy. Whether Europe liked that policy or disliked it was less important than that Europe understood it. Moreover, stroking Europe only seemed to increase Europe's already inflated sense of its importance in the world of American foreign policy. This transition was a necessary and normal one, I and it ultimately does offer the prospect of a more realistic but still very close relationship among the Cold War allies. If the Clinton administration and the broader American foreign policy establishment had done a better job of communicating the changing American approach in earlier years, the transition might not have been so painful—but it is also true that the Bush administration could and should have done more to cushion the shock for what, after all, are some of our closest and most important allies in a dangerous world. The bitterness of the controversy was regrettable, and hasty remarks by Bush officials exacerbated it, but it was probably on balance a good thing to remind Europeans in general and Germans in particular that transatlantic crises have a way of turning into European crises. With Germany, France, and Russia locked in an anti-American alliance, Poland understandably becomes nervous, and rightly so. When Russia and Germany get close, Poland has a way of getting smaller. A good German relationship with the United States remains the best basis for continuing progress toward European integration.

Link Defense – No Spillover

NATO consultation fails – one single issue will not spillover.

Kissinger 4 (Henry, former secretary of state, NEWSWEEK, November 08, page lexis)

Across the Atlantic, leaders have been concentrating on transferring national sovereignty to new European institutions. This involves a host of technicalities and legal issues which are both arcane and elusive for most Americans. More fundamentally, the United States conducts its policies as the sovereign states of Europe did in the 19th and first half of the 20th centuries. The European nations having invented the concept of the nation-state are now in the process of seeking to abandon their sovereignty to a European Union not yet possessing the traditional attributes of the state. They find themselves in a halfway house between their history and a future still in the process of evolving.  
All this has generated a witches' brew of mutual misunderstandings. In America, critics describe European attitudes as fainthearted, querulous and, on occasion, duplicitous. In Europe the media (and too many political figures) revel in descriptions of America's racial tension, the death penalty, differences over the environment and mistreatment of prisoners as if aberrations reflected the ultimate meaning of the United States. Shifting their priority from the Atlantic alliance to the U.N. Security Council, Europeans feel no special obligation to support U.S. policy, on occasion actively opposing it.  
These conditions cannot be removed by consultation on any one individual issue, and require a fundamental change of attitude on both sides of the Atlantic. The nations bordering the North Atlantic need to ask themselves the fundamental question that has always underpinned the alliance--that is, what will the allies do for the relationship beyond the international consensus reflected at the United Nations? Much of European debate today implies that the answer is "very little." To subject common military action to prior approval of the Security Council is incompatible with the very concept of alliance, which implies a special set of obligations. It spells the ultimate disintegration of a world order with the Atlantic partnership as its centerpiece. The Atlantic relationship, to be meaningful, needs to have a special character. The United States and Europe should be prepared to do things for each other in the sphere beyond the immediate dictates of national interest and without insisting on universal consensus.

Solvency Deficit – Delay

CP delays solvency –huge beauracracy, large numbers of new nations, and consensus based decision making mean that consultation takes forever

REUTERS 4 ( 3/31, Taipei Times, <http://www.taipeitimes.com/News/world/archives/2004/03/31/2003108563>

**Forty percent of NATO will now be former communist states**, and Washington has welcomed them as a counterweight to the "old Europe" of France and Germany, who opposed the Iraq war.

A Russian parliamentary deputy dismissed the Washington ceremony as a "show."

Konstantin Kosachev, representative of a Russian parliamentary committee on international affairs, said a NATO plan to patrol Baltic airspace was an "unfriendly" move. Estonia and Latvia border Russia, while Lithuania has a frontier with Moscow's Kaliningrad enclave.

"It can not be ruled out that Russia ought to look at the possibility of taking corresponding measures," he sai Russian Foreign Ministry spokesman Alexander Yakovenko said, **"**The main thing that could improve the state of European security is a fundamental change in the very nature of NATO ... including a joint fight against new and real threats and challenges." Monday's expansion has brought NATO nearer to the Balkans, the south Caucasus, the Middle East and Central Asia, all potential breeding grounds for the West's post-Sept. 11 enemies: terrorism and the spread of weapons of mass destruction. But the expansion could hinder NATO's ability to respond quickly to such threats because of its consensus decision-making.

Consultation Non-Unique

Lack of consultation has been a problem since NATO formation

Slocombe 10 (WALTER B. SLOCOMBE June 2010 PERSPECTIVE Towards A New NATO Strategic Concept A View from the United States http://library.fes.de/pdf-files/id/ipa/07299.pdf)

NATO remained at the center of American foreign and security policy throughout the Cold War. The transat-lantic relationship was not – despite a good deal of recent misplaced nostalgia – always an easy one. US and European views diverged on relations with the Soviet Union, on Ostpolitik and arms control, on the relative role of nuclear and conventional weapons in alliance strategy, and on »burden sharing«. The allies resisted American proposals to extend NATO’s scope beyond geographically defined defense of alliance territory, and complained of American domination of NATO decision-making and lack of consultation on matters, such as arms control, where essentially unilat-eral US actions affected their interests. For all these differences – which still persist in new guises – the Alliance retained broad support in the US. That continues to be the case, with opinion polls consis-tently showing more support for US security relation-ships with NATO and its members than with other partners.

**NATO Weak on Terrorism**

**Empirically, NATO is useless in efforts to combat terrorism**

Gordon 2(Philip H., Senior Fellow for U.S. Foreign Policy Foreign,

The Brookings Institution, Summer of 2002, http://www.brookings.edu/articles/2002/summer\_globalgovernance\_gordon.aspx) LL

SUMMER 2002 — Less than 24 hours after the September 11 terrorist attacks on the United States, America's allies in the North Atlantic Treaty Organization came together to invoke the alliance's Article 5 defense guarantee—this "attack on one" was to be considered an "attack on all." When it came time to implement that guarantee, however, in the form of the American-led military campaign in Afghanistan, NATO remained on the sidelines—by U.S. choice. The Americans decided not to ask for a NATO operation for both military and political reasons—only the United States had the right sort of equipment to project military forces halfway around the world, and Washington did not want political interference from 18 allies in the campaign. In light of these decisions, some observers have begun to wonder whether NATO has any enduring role at all. And there are, in fact, serious reasons for concern about the future of the alliance if leaders on both sides of the Atlantic do not take the steps necessary to adapt it to changing circumstances. The Afghanistan campaign revealed large gaps between the war-fighting capabilities of the United States and its allies and reinforced the perception in some quarters in Washington that it is easier to conduct operations alone than with allies who have little to offer militarily and who might hamper efficient decisionmaking. Moreover, the U.S. decision to increase its defense budget by some $48 billion for 2003—an increase larger than any single European country's entire defense budget—will only make this capabilities gap worse. To the extent that the war on terrorism leads the United States to undertake military operations in other distant theaters, and to the extent that the Europeans are unwilling or unable to come along, NATO's centrality will be further diminished.

**NATO lacks the infrastructure to effectively participate in the war on terror**

De Nevers 7 (Renee, President and Fellows of Harvard College and MIT, *International Security*, 2007, http://muse.jhu.edu/journals/international\_security/v031/31.4denevers.html) LL

Moreover, several of NATO's current activities, such as its missions in Afghanistan and the Mediterranean, are closely linked to the war on terror, with other NATO missions also contributing to this fight. These activities have led NATO's secretary-general, Jaap de Hoop Scheffer, to declare that "more than ever, NATO is in demand, and NATO is delivering."1 This apparent vibrancy, however, may not accurately reflect NATO's true condition. Although its missions have expanded dramatically since the end of the Cold War and alliance members agree on the threat posed by terrorism, NATO's actual role in the multifaceted struggle against terrorists is minor. This could have long-term implications for alliance unity. This article investigates how the United States has worked with NATO in prosecuting the war on terror. The U.S. government conceives of this struggle broadly, with counterinsurgency and efforts to constrain the spread of weapons of mass destruction (WMD) as essential elements. NATO is the United States' premier alliance, and most of Washington's closest allies are members. But how does NATO contribute to this war on terror? To be sure, NATO is not simply a "tool" of U.S. policy. The war on terror is a U.S. creation, however, and NATO has been forced to adjust to this fact. The United States perceives [End Page 34] terrorism as the key national security threat it will face in the coming years. Just as the United States is working to transform its strategies in response to this threat, we would expect it to evaluate key alliances and security relationships with this measure. I argue that NATO is playing a largely supportive role in U.S. efforts to combat terrorism. The focus of both the European "fight against terrorism" and the U.S. "war on terror" lies elsewhere, leaving NATO's contribution to efforts to quell terrorism somewhat tangential. NATO is conducting a defensive mission in the Mediterranean in response to the terrorist threat, and it has adopted strategies ranging from new technology development to consequence management to prevent or mitigate terrorist attacks. In Afghanistan the alliance has assumed a frontline role in seeking to deny terrorist groups a foothold there, making this NATO's first de facto combat operation ever. But many of the essential elements of the fight against terrorism, such as intelligence sharing, occur outside NATO. Afghanistan aside, NATO members participate in offensive efforts to respond to terrorism outside NATO through bilateral activities or loose coalitions of the willing. There are three main reasons for NATO's limited role: shifts in alignments and threat perceptions caused by systemic changes, NATO's limited military capabilities, and the nature of the fight against terror.

**NATO Weak on Terrorism**

**US does not need NATO support in the war on terror**

De Nevers 7 (Renee, President and Fellows of Harvard College and MIT, *International Security*, 2007, http://muse.jhu.edu/journals/international\_security/v031/31.4denevers.html) LL

NATO's military guidelines are more defensive and reactive than those of the United States. NATO places greater emphasis on reducing vulnerabilities and enhancing capabilities to respond quickly to potential attacks. In contrast, the United States seeks to keep terrorists from striking the homeland or U.S. interests abroad. And, whereas NATO's military guidelines suggest that its forces could play either lead or supportive roles in offensive operations against terrorists, more planning is recommended before NATO-led offensive operations are undertaken, while the recommendations for support missions are more practical. This indicates the alliance's greater comfort and experience with its support role.

The goals of NATO and the United States as outlined in these strategies do overlap in important ways. For example, each recognizes the usefulness of multilateral actions and seeks to prevent attacks before they occur. In addition, NATO's counterterrorism strategy shares with U.S. policy the recognition that [End Page 38] preventing attacks may require offensive action against terrorists or states that support them. As NATO's Military Concept for Defense against Terrorism states, "Allied nations agree that terrorists should not be allowed to base, train, plan, stage, and execute terrorist actions, and the threat may be severe enough to justify acting against these terrorists and those who harbor them."14

The overlap notwithstanding, U.S. strategy documents suggest that NATO's deeply institutionalized, consensus-based model is not the United States' preferred approach for multilateral cooperation in the war on terror. Moreover, NATO appears to be less central to U.S. policy and planning. Both the 2002 and 2006 NSS documents promote the formation of coalitions, both within and outside NATO, to address a range of threats.15 More critically, the 2006 NSS makes explicit the U.S. preference for a looser form of cooperation, citing as a model the Proliferation Security Initiative (PSI), an activity designed by the George W. Bush administration to constrain the spread of WMD-related technology. The 2006 NSS states as a goal "[the] establish[ment of] results-oriented partnerships on the model of the PSI to meet new challenges and opportunities. These partnerships emphasize international cooperation, not international bureaucracy. They rely on voluntary adherence rather than binding treaties. They are oriented towards action and results rather than legislation or rule- making."16 The 2006 NSS also states that "existing international institutions have a role to play, but in many cases coalitions of the willing may be able to respond more quickly and creatively, at least in the short term."17 Similarly, the 2006 Quadrennial Defense Review (QDR) highlights the distinction between "static alliances versus dynamic partnerships" and the Pentagon's preference for the latter.18 Some Pentagon officials insist that the apparent disdain for existing alliances is aimed not at NATO, but at bodies such as the Organization for American States, which, for example, has resisted U.S. efforts to revise its charter in an attempt to isolate Venezuela's president, Hugo Chavez, to punish his anti-U.S. stance. Although NATO's European members are less concerned now that the United States would use NATO as a "toolbox" than they were immediately after the U.S. invasion of Iraq in 2003,19 they may not be reassured that the United States strongly supports the alliance. [End Page 39]

**NATO Weak on Terrorism**

**The US could check terrorism more efficiently without NATO**

De Nevers 7 (Renee, President and Fellows of Harvard College and MIT, *International Security*, 2007, http://muse.jhu.edu/journals/international\_security/v031/31.4denevers.html) LL

Second, the United States and its European allies have diverging views about the role of military intelligence. From the U.S. perspective, military intelligence [End Page 42] is an increasingly important component on the battlefield. The Department of Defense emphasizes that military intelligence is no longer just a staff function, but rather a war-fighting function that soldiers on the battlefield will be actively engaged in at all times. In addition, as part of its broader interest in network-centric warfare, the Defense Department is pushing to establish a fully "networked battlespace," with the goal of "information dominance" in any conflict.30 NATO's European members do not place the same degree of emphasis on real-time military intelligence.

Third, the capabilities gap that has presented a chronic problem for NATO is increasing in the intelligence area, which suggests growing problems for interoperability. Already in the 1990s, the U.S. military had to maintain "legacy" communications systems to enable it to operate with other NATO members, and allied forces depended heavily on U.S. communications and intelligence during the 1999 Kosovo bombing campaign.31 One reason the United States rejected some European offers of military assistance in its intervention in Afghanistan in 2001 was the difficulties presented by different levels of technological sophistication. The United States spends far more on research and development than its allies; the Defense Department's budget request for research and development for FY 2007 is $57.9 billion. In contrast, the entire defense budget for the United Kingdom, NATO's next largest spender, was $50.2 billion in FY 2006.32 The United States also has a more robust domestic high-technology industry than does any of its European allies.

To be sure, alliance members agree on the need for improvements in intelligence capabilities and interoperability. NATO adopted an initiative on developing new capabilities, particularly in areas such as intelligence and surveillance, in November 2002. In addition, some alliance members are working to improve their information warfare capabilities.33 That better intelligence [End Page 43] capabilities continue to be problematic is evident in repeated references to the need for improved intelligence sharing both among national agencies and internationally.34

The problem, however, is deeper than merely the need for better intelligence capabilities; NATO's members have developed diverging operational concepts because their military capabilities differ. Differences in their views on the role of information in war fighting are one example of this divergence. The United States approaches the use of force differently than do most European militaries, which means that cooperation on the battlefield could be increasingly difficult.35 Although joint exercises may highlight these differences, they do not necessarily resolve them.

**NATO Weak on Terrorism**

NATO is not effective in counter terrorism; internal disagreements and ability gaps prove

De Nevers 7 (Renee, President and Fellows of Harvard College and MIT, *International Security*, 2007, http://muse.jhu.edu/journals/international\_security/v031/31.4denevers.html) LL

Three factors explain Washington's circumvention of the alliance in prosecuting the war on terror. First, two critical changes in the international system, U.S. hegemony and the emergence of a security community, particularly among European states, have led NATO's members both to differ among themselves on a broad range of global issues and to perceive security threats differently. They also differ on the appropriate means for responding to perceived threats, as was most evident in the dispute over the U.S. invasion of Iraq. These shifting alignments and attitudes have reduced U.S. willingness to accept alliance constraints.

Second, U.S. military capabilities are greater and more sophisticated than those of its allies, which makes it difficult for even close U.S. allies to coordinate with U.S. forces in frontline military activities. Some U.S. officers point out that one goal of NATO training exercises is to illuminate these differences, as a way to spur allies to improve their capabilities.104 But NATO's expansion has eroded its military capabilities further. Combined with the increasing use of national caveats, which constrain what individual military forces can do in NATO operations, the alliance's ability to work with the United States in confronting immediate military threats appears limited, at best. [End Page 64]

Third, the nature of the war on terror itself constrains NATO's contribution to U.S. strategy. Iraq and Afghanistan notwithstanding, terrorism is fought primarily by nonmilitary means, such as law enforcement and intelligence gathering. Moreover, NATO's members face different threats.

**NATO Weak in Afghanistan**

**NATO suffers from insufficient troops, national caveats, and weak political will**

De Nevers 7 (Renee, President and Fellows of Harvard College and MIT, *International Security*, 2007, http://muse.jhu.edu/journals/international\_security/v031/31.4denevers.html) LL

ISAF was initially established with UN Security Council authorization under British command in October 2001, after the United States overthrew Afghanistan's Taliban government. NATO assumed control of ISAF in August 2003.53 Initially ISAF's mission was limited to patrolling Kabul, but since 2004, ISAF has undertaken a four-stage expansion of its mission into the northern and western provinces of Afghanistan, and later to the south and east. It has also deployed several provincial reconstruction teams, which are based on a [End Page 49] model developed by the U.S. military that combines security and reconstruction functions in an effort to help stabilize the countryside.54 ISAF assumed responsibility for security throughout Afghanistan in October 2006. At that point, it was NATO's largest operation, involving about 31,000 troops, including roughly 12,000 U.S. troops under ISAF command.

ISAF represents a valuable contribution to the U.S. goal of denying terrorists sanctuary or allies, given al-Qaida's close ties with the previous Taliban regime and ongoing efforts to pursue al-Qaida members in the border region between Afghanistan and Pakistan. All twenty-six NATO members participate in ISAF, as do ten non-NATO partner countries.

At the same time, ISAF has suffered from three significant problems. First, since 2003 the alliance has been unable to secure sufficient troop commitments to meet the target force size. When NATO took control of the southern and eastern regions of Afghanistan in August 2006, its 31,000-strong force represented about 85 percent of the troops and equipment that NATO commanders had requested for the mission. Since July 2006, NATO troops have confronted far more intense fighting than expected.55 The alliance appealed for more troops in September 2006, but only one member country, Poland, offered to send additional troops.56 At the November 2006 summit meeting in Riga, Latvia, new pledges from member states raised the troop and equipment totals to 90 percent of requirements.57 ISAF's commander at that time, Lt. Gen. David Richards, said that it can manage with the current troop strength, but additional troops would allow it to conduct major operations more rapidly and with less risk to NATO soldiers.58 [End Page 50]

Second, many troops in Afghanistan operate under "national caveats," whereby governments place limits on what military activities their troops are allowed to do or where they are allowed to go in carrying out their missions. These caveats are problematic for two reasons: they hurt operational effectiveness; and alliance members do not share risks equally, which can cause friction.59 Germany's troops can be deployed only near Kabul, for example, and in 2006 Poland resisted sending additional troops to southern Afghanistan, where they are needed the most. Only six NATO members operate without caveats. The problem is not unique to ISAF; national caveats caused headaches during NATO's peacekeeping mission in Bosnia as well, and they have long been a problem in UN peacekeeping missions.60 Recognition of the operational problems such caveats pose has led to a marked decline in their use, but they have made both multinational cooperation and operations in general more difficult in Afghanistan.61 Caveats tend to creep back in, moreover, as is evident in repeated efforts to eliminate them. NATO leaders agreed to reduce caveats at the 2006 Riga summit, for example, with the result that 26,000 troops of the increased force of 32,000 had broader freedom to act.62

Third, the Afghan leadership fears that the United States will abandon it, and it is unsure what NATO's authority over both the security and counterterrorism mission will mean in the long run. Concern has also been raised about whether NATO has the political will and capabilities to fight a sustained counterinsurgency campaign.63 Since NATO forces assumed responsibility for security in southern Afghanistan, the frequency and intensity of Taliban attacks have increased.64 This renewed fighting forced the United States to reverse plans to reduce [End Page 51] its military commitment in Afghanistan and led the British to expand their troop contribution to ISAF.65 The United States decided in January 2007 to extend the tours of 3,200 troops in Afghanistan, and further troop increases were under consideration.66 Notably, U.S. forces, ISAF's largest contingent, will continue to conduct the bulk of counterterrorism activities aimed at al-Qaida. The U.S. military also retains 11,000 troops outside ISAF's command to sustain a separate counterinsurgency function in addition to peacekeeping.67

**NATO Weak in Iraq**

National caveats, lack of funding, and lack of consensus have prevented effective NATO handling of Iraq

De Nevers 7 (Renee, President and Fellows of Harvard College and MIT, *International Security*, 2007, http://muse.jhu.edu/journals/international\_security/v031/31.4denevers.html) LL

In 2004, at U.S. urging, NATO agreed to play a central role in training Iraqi security forces. NATO's training effort has several elements: mentoring of Iraqi military officers by NATO personnel; creation of an officer training facility in Iraq; and training of Iraqi officers in NATO facilities. NATO's target is to train 1,000 officers inside Iraq annually, and 500 outside the state; by September [End Page 52] 2006, NATO had trained 650 Iraqi officers in European facilities and roughly 2,000 officers overall.71 NATO has also donated military equipment to Iraq's security forces. This equipment comes primarily from former Warsaw Pact countries that have become NATO members, and it is compatible with Iraq's Soviet-supplied military hardware.

NATO's training mission has faced significant difficulties, however. First, the need to gain consensus on all decisions hamstrung efforts to get the mission up and running and greatly slowed the process; residual bitterness over the U.S. decision to invade Iraq contributed to this problem. Some members objected to the precedent set by taking on the training mission, which also slowed decisionmaking.72 Second, as in Afghanistan, some troop contributions have operated under national caveats, which has hindered commanders' efforts to coordinate NATO's activities. Third, funding for the mission has been a serious problem. Countries contributing troops are expected to cover their own costs. NATO set up a "trust fund" to pay for the establishment of a defense university in Iraq, but contributions to the fund have thus far been insufficient. As a result, although the Iraqi government has stressed its preference for in-country training to help gain popular trust and support for the new security forces, more officers have been trained outside Iraq.73

NATO Peacekeeping in the West Bank fails – Caveats

Diker et. al 10 (Dan Senior Foreign Policy Analyst, Jerusalem Center for Public Affairs; Adjunct

Fellow, Hudson Institute *Jerusalem Center for Public Affairs* ISRAEL’S CRITICAL SECURITY NEEDS FOR A VIABLE PEACE http://www.jcpa.org/text/security/fullstudy.pdf

Even in a robust NATO deployment in Afghanistan, which is not a peacekeeping mission, European states have insisted on “caveats” for the employment of their forces, restricting their use for only the safest missions. There were national caveats banning nighttime operations and restricting the geographic deployment of forces to specific areas which were known to be more secure. Some caveats required consultations between commanders in the field and national capitals in Europe before tactical decisions could be taken. Most importantly, there were national caveats that excluded the use of certain forces that were part of the NATO alliance in counterterrorism operations.1 General John Craddock, the former Supreme Allied Commander of NATO, admitted in 2009 that NATO forces were burdened with 83 national caveats, which were reduced to about 70.2 NATO remains a cumbersome organization. Given its track record in Afghanistan, it is difficult to imagine the efficacy of similar forces in the West Bank. NATO remains a cumbersome organization, especially when it comes to decisionmaking and processing urgent operational requirements from commanders. In counterterrorism operations, it is precisely the ability to act quickly and decisively that keeps the peace and prevents attacks. Given the track record of NATO in Afghanistan, it is difficult to imagine the efficacy of similar forces in the West Bank

NATO Fails – Generic

NATO lacks cohesion and organization

Rupp 4 (Richard, International Studies Association, Mar 17, fromhttp://www.allacademic.com/meta/p73714\_index.html) LL

Despite substantial internal reform, collaborative missions, membership enlargement, and consistent public pronouncements of allied unity, NATO’s days as a coherent, effectively functioning, military alliance are drawing to a close. The states that established the Alliance in 1949 confronted a common threat to their survival. Though NATO’s member-states have made considerable efforts to identify new threats and missions since 1991, no unifying set of priorities has surfaced. Though many dangers to Western security have emerged in the post-Cold War period--the rise of the Al-Qaeda arguably the most significant--these issues have not unified the NATO members in significant common purpose. In the absence of a menace to their vital interests, and with fundamental political, economic, and environmental differences dividing the United States from Canada and Europe since the early 1990s, NATO will prove less and less valuable to its members with each passing year. This assertion is certainly provocative in light of the reforms and military operations that NATO has undertaken since the collapse of the Soviet Union. From the adoption of the Alliance’s 1991 Strategic Concept, to the design of the North Atlantic Cooperation Council (NACC), the Combined Joint Task Forces (CJTF), Partnership for Peace (PFP), membership enlargement, and military operations in Bosnia, Kosovo, and Afghanistan, NATO has consistently endeavored to adapt to the changing security and political terrain of the post-Cold War era. Scholars and policy makers who endorse NATO’s value and utility, acknowledge the array of challenges continuing to confront the Alliance. However, NATO advocates argue that those challenges are manageable and with the right set of reforms and policy initiatives, the Alliance will function effectively well into the future.

NATO Fails at Peacekeeping

NATO fails at peacekeeping

Davis 9 (Dr. Ian Davis is the founding director of NATO Watch and an independent human security and arms control consultant, writer and activist 31 March - 1 April 2009The Shadow NATO Summit: Options for NATO - pressing the reset button on the strategic concept 31 March - 1 April 2009, Brussels http://www.basicint.org/pubs/natoshadow.pdf)

In summary, NATO is not ideally suited to peacekeeping operations. If this is to become a core goal of the Alliance, it would need to adapt its doctrines to clearly separate peacekeeping from war-fighting. It also needs to adjust its approach to planning. Rather than seeking to make NATO operations ‘comprehensive’ by bringing a greater range of actors into its planning process, it needs to orient its planning towards implementation of core military peacekeeping tasks, as defined in a peace agreement or a commonly agreed peacebuilding/recovery strategy. While it must evidently strive to be networked with other civilian actors – and well informed of its operational context –it must relinquish its ambition to direct the entire international reconstruction effort. This is not only politically unrealistic, but is arguably unhelpful in so far as it limits the diversity and innovation in support of complex political stabilization or peacebuilding processes, and reduces the space for local leadership in the peacebuilding effort.

NATO Bad – Hegemony

NATO Requires overstretch that collapses hegemony

Merry 3 ( E. Wayne, Therapy’s End: Thinking Beyond NATO, The National Interest, http://findarticles.com/p/articles/mi\_m2751/is\_74/ai\_112411717/pg\_8/?tag=content;col1

For better or worse, the United States has global responsibilities and unique global capabilities. At the same time, **Washington's** diplomatic and political **capacities are already overburdened**. While U.S. operational and logistical capabilities are today supreme, America's overall force structure is little more than half the size it was a generation ago, and its reserves are seriously overcommitted. The best forces can cover only limited tasks, especially for a democratic nation that employs only volunteers. Stated plainly, **NATO is a luxury the United States can no longer justify. This vast subsidy for Europe is in direct conflict with the procurement and development budgets required to maintain the American technological lead in an ever-competitive world. Today's precision weapons will be commonplace tomorrow, and even the Pentagon's immense budget cannot always keep up**.

NATO Bad – China

The CP causes NATO overreach which causes conflict with China – other issues stabilize the alliance.

Heisbourg 6 ( Special adviser at the Fondation pour la Recherche Strategique, 2006

Francois, Paris, “Why Nato needs to be less ambitious,” Financial Times, 11/22/06, lexis

Yet it is as clear that Nato is no longer a pivot of US strategy, as demonstrated by its marginal treatment in America's latest quadriennal defence review. Indeed, the word "Nato" is all too often, in American political and media parlance, a euphemism for the phrase "the European allies" - which is not saying quite the same thing. Nato's expansion may be reaching the limits beyond which it would become a force of regional instability rather than one of stabilisation: Ukraine is literally split down the middle over the issue of entry to the Nato alliance. Going "out of area", as in Afghanistan, has helped keep Nato in business but in the process the alliance has become an a la carte multilateral institution. The Atlantic alliance has also ceased to be the principal point of US-European consultation on the key strategic issues of our times: the rise of China, the nuclear ambitions of Iran and North Korea and the fate of the crisis-ridden Middle East are dealt with mainly outside the Nato framework. In itself, this reduction of Nato's place in the overall scheme of strategic affairs should not be a big concern for those who live and work beyond the confines of the Nato bureaucracy. After all, Nato is immensely and uniquely useful in fostering interoperability between the military forces of its members, which is key to forming effective coalitions of forces. In a world in which the mission determines the coalition, this ability is more important than ever. Similarly, Nato remains key in ensuring that the partner states of eastern Europe press on with reform of their security sectors. Unfortunately, Nato is not sticking to its core competencies. In a quest to carve a greater role for itself and demonstrate global relevance, the alliance is running the risk of overreaching itself in strategic and political terms, with potentially dangerous consequences. In the run-up to Riga, there has been much talk of a "Nato-bis", or second version, of a privileged partnership between Nato and hopefully like-minded states in the Asia-Pacific region such as Japan and Australia. The wisdom of this is questionable, to put it mildly, given its potential for needless friction with a rising China. The push for a Nato-bis is probably not intended to foster a "west against the rest" alignment in east Asia; but that could be its inadvertent effect. Nato should not be acting like a solution in search of a problem.

The impact is nuclear war

Johnson 1 (Charles Former Professor of Poly Sci @ Berkeley, Former Chairman of the Department and Chair of the Center for Chinese Studies, 5-14-01,

Chalmers, *The Nation*, n19v272 p. 20, L/N)

China is another matter. No sane figure in the Pentagon wants a war with China, and all serious US militarists know that China's minuscule nuclear capacity is not offensive but a deterrent against the overwhelming US power arrayed against it (twenty archaic Chinese warheads versus more than 7,000 US warheads). Taiwan, whose status constitutes the still incomplete last act of the Chinese civil war, remains the most dangerous place on earth. Much as the 1914 assassination of the Austrian crown prince in Sarajevo led to a war that no one wanted, a misstep in Taiwan by any side could bring the United States and China into a conflict that neither wants. Such a war would bankrupt the United States, deeply divide Japan and probably end in a Chinese victory, given that China is the world's most populous country and would be defending itself against a foreign aggressor. More seriously, it could easily escalate into a nuclear holocaust. However, given the nationalistic challenge to China's sovereignty of any Taiwanese attempt to declare its independence formally, forward-deployed US forces on China's borders have virtually no deterrent effect.

NATO Bad – Arms Sales

**NATO arms sales contribute to regional instability**

Rozoff 9 (Rick, Global Research, Sep 22, <http://www.globalresearch.ca/index.php?context=va&aid=15339>) LL

The vast preponderance of American and other NATO states' arms are sold to nations neither in North America and Europe nor on their peripheries. They are sold to nations like Saudi Arabia, India, Israel, the United Arab Emirates, Australia, Egypt, Taiwan, South Korea, Georgia, Azerbaijan, Colombia, Kuwait, the Philippines, Morocco and other Western client states and military outposts far removed from the much-vaunted Euro-Atlantic space. The weapons along with the military technicians, trainers and advisers that inevitably accompany them are spread throughout nations in geostrategically vital areas of the world, near large oil and natural gas reserves and astride key shipping lanes and choke points. In many instances Western-fueled arms buildups are accelerating in nations bordering Russia, China, Iran and Venezuela. Geopolitics in its most transparent, cynical and brutal manifestation. The growing sales of Western arms in the Persian Gulf, the South Caucasus, South America (Chile and Colombia most pronouncedly), Africa, Far East Asia and the South Pacific (Australia in the first instance) are an integral element of American and general Western plans to gain access to and domination over world energy resources. The campaign is not limited to efforts to muscle into nations and regions rich in oil and natural gas (and uranium), nor to employing fair means or foul, peaceful or otherwise, to seize the commanding heights of the international energy market. The overarching objective is to control the ownership, transport and consumption of energy worldwide. To determine who receives oil and natural gas, through which routes and at which prices. And to dictate what the political and military quid pro quo will be for being invited to join a U.S.-dominated international energy transportation and accessibility network. Those who are allowed to exploit, sell and transit hydrocarbons to the Western and ultimately world market are levied for a handsome share of their energy-derived revenues for unprecedented acquisition of arms and for the stationing of U.S. and other NATO states' military forces on their soil. Saudi Arabia, Kuwait, the United Arab Emirates, Azerbaijan and Georgia are salient examples. The last two-named nations have increased their military budgets by well over 1,000 percent in the first case and by over 3,000 percent in the second in the span of a few years. A United Press International report of August 25, 2009 estimated that Middle Eastern nations would purchase $100 billion worth of arms over the next five years, with the lion's share going to the oil-rich Western client states of Saudi Arabia, the United Arab Emirates and Iraq. There are six major areas in the world that the United States and its allies have targeted in history's largest scramble for hydrocarbons and, it's important to remember, against a recent backdrop of diminishing energy consumption, plunging prices and both the discovery and presumption of oil and natural gas reserves hitherto unexploited.

A2 Courts CP

Courts don’t solve – lower courts

Lower Courts Don’t Follow Supreme Court

**Borochoff 2008,** J.D. Candidate, 2010, Harvard Law School; M.A. Political Science, 2007, Emory University; B.A. Political Science, 2007, Emory University, 2008

(Elise, *Copyright (c) 2008 Touro College Jacob D. Fuchsberg Law Center Touro Law Review/LexisNexis*, “Lower Court Compliance With Supreme Court Remands,” 2008, ]

The traditional model of the United States legal system envisions the relationship between federal district courts, appeals courts, and the Supreme Court as strictly hierarchical. n13 The district courts constitute the base of the judicial pyramid, the appeals court the middle, and the Supreme Court its peak. n14 This model implies the Supreme Court issues the final edict in any area of law, and the lower levels of the judicial hierarchy simply implement Supreme Court policy. Consequently, early legal scholars focused their research solely on Supreme Court decision making, and assumed that both federal and state lower courts strictly obeyed the Supreme Court's rulings. n15 Supreme Court decisions were viewed as the reigning law of the land  [\*856]  and compliance was a foregone conclusion.

Under the hierarchal view of the federal judiciary, Supreme Court remands would not be an issue. Lower courts are faithful implementers of Supreme Court decisions and their decisions are an extension of the Supreme Court's legal views. Thus, all lower court decisions would comply with the Supreme Court, whether heard on remand or for the first time. B. Recognition of Noncompliance with the Supreme Court

Beginning in the 1950s, legal scholars began to doubt the hierarchical model's validity. n16 First, some articles noted that state courts would often rely on state law, effectively ignoring the Supreme Court's reasoning. n17 Others soon noted that even federal courts, while relying on federal law, also ignored Supreme Court decisions. n18 While authors did not openly criticize the hierarchical model, the increasing profile of noncompliance shed doubt on its accuracy. Implicit critiques of the hierarchical model became more explicit after the Warren Court's decisions in Brown v. Board of Education n19 and other controversial civil rights cases. n20 Noncompliance  [\*857]  with the Supreme Court's decisions undermined the model of the Supreme Court as an apolitical institution ruling over the entirety of the judicial branch.

Courts don’t solve foreign policy

Judicial decisions in foreign policy issues are not enforced – executive branch will ignore the plan

Jide Nzelibe 2004 [Bigelow Fellow and Lecturer in Law, University of Chicago Law School, March 2004 89 Iowa L. Rev. 941, “The Uniqueness of Foreign Affairs”]

Unlike in domestic constitutional controversies, it is also doubtful that the judiciary can draw on the popular underpinnings of its legitimacy should the political branches ignore its foreign affairs determinations. As one commentator has explained, the public appetite for judicial involvement in international issues is not particularly strong. 217 The judiciary's lack of popular legitimacy in foreign affairs is particularly understandable when the relevant controversy touches on matters of national security. As demonstrated above, in matters involving the domestic operations of the government, the court plays an important role in legitimizing the activities of the other branches, as well as providing a reliable mechanism for the resolution of disputes between private individuals. When matters touch on the very existence of the state, however, such as when the state faces an external threat, the justifications for judicial involvement correspondingly diminish. 218 Thus, far from getting popular support in the event of a confrontation with the political branches, it is more likely that the courts will face public criticism for intervening improperly in foreign affairs or jeopardizing national security.

Courts link to politics

Congress perceives and reacts to Supreme Court decisions-the counterplan links to politics

Brickman in 2k7 (Danette. "Congressional Reaction to U.S. Supreme Court Decisions: Understanding the Introduction of Legislation to Override" Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Southern Political Science Association, Hotel InterContinental, New Orleans, LA, Jan 03, 2007 <Not Available>. 2009-05-24 <http://www.allacademic.com/meta/p143265\_index.html>

The United States Constitution sets forth a government that prescribes specific roles for each of its branches. While, constitutionally, Congress is the policy-making branch, the U.S. Supreme Court enters the policy-making arena through statutory interpretation and judicial review decisions. The preferred policies of these two branches of government do not always coincide, causing conflict between the Court and Congress. At such times this conflict can lead to a battle over control of national policy. This paper explains congressional reaction to Supreme Court decisions by relaxing two of the assumptions of the separation of powers game and incorporating changing congressional preferences and context. U.S. Supreme Court decisions tend to be viewed “not as a mere interpretation of law, but a determinative statement of national policy that is, for all practical purposes, irrevocable” (Paschel 1991:144). While the majority of Supreme Court decisions remain untouched by Congress, a number of statutory interpretation and judicial review decisions have been successfully overridden by the legislative branch, making it apparent that Supreme Court decisions are not necessarily final. In certain circumstances Congress is willing to do battle with the Court to achieve their preferred policy. Although successful congressional overrides of Supreme Court decisions are infrequent, their occurrence has generated a body of research that has contributed to our understanding of the interaction between these two branches of government. What is missing from the discourse is an examination that focuses on the introduction of legislation to override Supreme Court decisions 1 . This paper fills that gap, examining the circumstances under which Congress introduces legislation attempting to override a Supreme Court decision. Using an approach which incorporates changing congressional preferences and context this research contributes to our understanding of Court-Congress interaction.

Court’s decisions affect politics – relationship with the executive branch

Smith 7 (Joseph L. , Assistant Professor, The University of Alabama , Department of Political Science, Journal of Law, Economics, and Organization May 9, http://jleo.oxfordjournals.org/cgi/content/full/23/2/346) ELJ

The consequences of the institutional choice are more complex and potentially far-reaching. A decision endorsing the disputed agency action not only allows the agency decision to stand (with whatever policy consequences that entails) but also signals to the lower courts that agencies should be given latitude to take the disputed action. Every decision upholding a disputed agency action expands, ever so slightly perhaps, the ability of agencies to implement their agendas. Because lower courts are supposed to implement the legal doctrines articulated by the Supreme Court, the effects of this institutional choice, whether or not to defer to the agency decision, will ripple throughout the lower courts and should affect the decisions in many disputes. This article continues a line of research begun by Linda Cohen and Matt Spitzer in the 1990s. Cohen and Spitzer began with the insight that Supreme Court decisions evaluating agency actions do more than merely uphold or overturn the action being litigated. These decisions also communicate legal doctrine to the lower courts, sending signals regarding the level of deference they should show to agency decisions. Given the small number of administrative law cases the Supreme Court hears each term, they assert that the signal-sending or doctrinal element of these decisions will have a larger impact on policy than the direct effects on the litigants. Cohen and Spitzer argue that Supreme Court Justices can best achieve their policy-related goals if they consider their ideological relationship with the executive branch and then factor this relationship into their decisions evaluating administrative actions. Their model generally suggests that as the median member of the Court gets ideologically closer to the president, the Court should become more deferential to the administrative action.

Only Congress/Prez Solve Foreign Policy

**Congress and the President are essential for determining foreign policy.**

Murphy 7 (Bill, BA in political science, Associated Content, November 23rd, 2007, <http://www.associatedcontent.com/article/449188/the_president_and_congress_role_in.html>) NK

Congress and the president play important roles in the foreign policy of the United States. The Constitution grants both branches of the government specific powers and also has areas where they need to work together. Both the legislative and executive branches have informal powers that each can use and exploit for political gain. Congress and president share the foreign policy role by the Principle of Codetermination.

**The President and Congress have vital roles in determining the country’s foreign policy.**

Grimmett 99 (Richard, Specialist in National Defense for the US Department of State, US Department of State, June 1st, 1999, <http://fpc.state.gov/6172.htm>) NK

The United States Constitution divides foreign policy powers between the President and the Congress so that both share in the making of foreign policy. The executive and legislative branches each play important roles that are different but that often overlap. Both branches have continuing opportunities to initiate and change foreign policy, and the interaction between them continues indefinitely throughout the life of a policy. This report reviews and illustrates 12 basic ways that the United States can make foreign policy. The practices illustrated in this report indicate that making foreign policy is a complex process, and that the support of both branches is required for a strong and effective U.S. foreign policy. For a detailed discussion of how war-making powers are shared, see War Powers Resolution: Presidential Compliance.

The President and Congress are the integral creators of US foreign policy.

ThisNation.com No Date Given (ThisNation.com, repository of basic information, resources and historical documents related to American Government and Politics, ThisNation.com, No Date Given, <http://www.thisnation.com/foreign.html>) NK

The Constitution of the United States gives the President the clear upper-hand in the conduct of foreign policy. The President is the Commander-in-Chief of the nation's armed forces. As the single officer of the United States charged with receiving the leaders of other nations and with negotiating treaties, the President is also the nation's Chief Diplomat. The President, however, does not have the authority to make foreign policy independently. The Constitution gives the Congress the power to check the President's foreign policy powers in important ways. While the President can order the United States military into action to respond to emergencies and threats to the security of the nation, only the Congress has the authority to officially "declare war." Ultimately, it is the Congress' power of the purse that allows it to cut off funding to presidentially ordered military ventures of which it does not approve.

Only Congress/Prez Solve Foreign Policy

**The executive and legislative branches are necessary to determine the country’s foreign policy.**

Grimmett 99 (Richard, Specialist in National Defense for the US Department of State, US Department of State, June 1st, 1999, <http://fpc.state.gov/6172.htm>) NK

The United States Constitution divides the foreign policy powers between the President and Congress so that both share in the making of foreign policy. The executive and legislative branches each play important roles that are different but that often overlap. Both branches have continuing opportunities to initiate and change foreign policy, and the interaction between them continues indefinitely throughout the life of a policy. This report identifies and illustrates 12 basic ways to make U.S. foreign policy. The President or the executive branch can make foreign policy through: 1) -- responses to foreign events 2) -- proposals for legislation 3) -- negotiation of international agreements 4) -- policy statements 5) -- policy implementation 6) -- independent action. In nearly all of these circumstances, Congress can either support the President's approach or seek to change it. In the case of independent Presidential action, it may be very difficult to change policy in the short term; in the case of a legislative proposal by the executive branch or treaties and international agreements submitted to the Senate or Congress for approval, Congress has a decisive voice. In most cases Congress supports the President, but it often makes significant modifications in his initiatives in the process of approving them. Congress can make foreign policy through: 1) -- resolutions and policy statements 2) -- legislative directives 3) -- legislative pressure 4) -- legislative restrictions/funding denials 5) -- informal advice 6) -- congressional oversight. In these circumstances, the executive branch can either support or seek to change congressional policies as it interprets and carries out legislative directives and restrictions, and decides when and whether to adopt proposals and advice. The practices illustrated in this report indicate that making U.S. foreign policy is a complex process, and the support of both branches is required for a strong and effective U.S. foreign policy.

Prez Solves Foreign Policy

The executive is most effective at making foreign policy

Powell 99 (H. Jefferson, Law professor at Duke, George Washington Law Review, March 1999, <http://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract_id=821384>) NK

The executive branch's perspective on the constitutional law of foreign affairs is one approach for working out the implications of the text, structure, and history of the Constitution as it bears on foreign affairs. This perspective accords the President primary responsibility for the conduct of foreign policy and the preservation of national security, without denying the Congress very broad powers relating to foreign affairs and national security. The coherence of the executive primacy interpretation of Constitutional authority over foreign affairs, and the respect it embodies for the presidency, for Congress, and for the constitutional system of separated but interlocking powers, support the argument that the best reading of the Constitution regarding foreign affairs is the "executive primacy" position.

**The president has many indispensable roles in determining foreign policy.**

Murphy 7 (Bill, BA in political science, Associated Content, November 23rd, 2007, <http://www.associatedcontent.com/article/449188/the_president_and_congress_role_in.html>) NK

The Constitution grants the president three powers as to foreign policy. First of all, the President is the Commander in Chief of all the armed forces. He is also the head of the national security establishment. This power gives him the right to direct the military as well as the intelligence community and to appoint all high level officials. The President can also issue executive orders that affect both. The President is the head of State and the Government so when he goes on trips overseas he speaks for the country. The President has the power to make treaties with other nations and bring it to the Senate for ratification. They may choose to or not to pass the treaty just as the President has the authority to veto any bill the Congress passes.

As president, the President has extra power due to his position.

Murphy 7 (Bill, BA in political science, Associated Content, November 23rd, 2007, <http://www.associatedcontent.com/article/449188/the_president_and_congress_role_in.html>) NK

Along with the Constitutional powers the President has are the informal powers that automatically come with the position but varies between men. One source of power is the simple fact that he is the President of the United States, the greatest and most powerful nation on Earth. This alone comes with much prestige that he can speak to the world and be listened to. Being a domestically popular figure also helps enhance this. A President can tout his past experience when making policy that will also help further his power. During his tenure the political allies through the years will come into play and help raise support for particular policies. Being the President and having many allies gives you a larger bully-pulpit in which to speak your views. One of the most vital sources of power for the President is being able to speak your views as well as have other prominent officials echo your beliefs.

Prez Solves Foreign Policy

The Constitution gives the president power over foreign policy.

Morris 1787 (Gouverneur Morris, Writer of the US Constitution, US Constitution, September 17th, 1787, <http://www.senate.gov/civics/constitution_item/constitution.htm>) NK

The President shall be Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy of the United States, and of the Militia of the several States, when called into the actual Service of the United States; he may require the Opinion, in writing, of the principal Officer in each of the executive Departments, upon any Subject relating to the Duties of their respective Offices, and he shall have Power to Grant Reprieves and Pardons for Offences against the United States, except in Cases of Impeachment. As Commander in Chief, the president controls the military forces. Presidents have also cited this power as extending to their control of national and foreign policy in war and peacetime. Congress may not restrain the president's power to pardon, except in impeachment cases. He shall have Power, by and with the Advice and Consent of the Senate, to make Treaties, provided two thirds of the Senators present concur; and he shall nominate, and by and with the Advice and Consent of the Senate, shall appoint Ambassadors, other public Ministers and Consuls, Judges of the supreme Court, and all other Officers of the United States, whose Appointments are not herein otherwise provided for, and which shall be established by Law: but the Congress may by Law vest the Appointment of such inferior Officers, as they think proper, in the President alone, in the Courts of Law, or in the Heads of Departments. The Constitution gives the Senate a share in foreign policy by requiring Senate consent, by a two-thirds vote, to any treaty before it may go into effect. The president may enter into "executive agreements" with other nations without the Senate's consent, but if these involve more than minor matters they may prove controversial. The president must also submit judicial and major executive branch nominations to the Senate for its advice and consent. The Constitution makes no provision for the removal of executive officers, which has remained largely at the discretion of the president.

The constitution grants the president the majority of the power in determining foreign policy.

Porter No Date Given (Keith, About.com guide, About.com, No Date Given, <http://usforeignpolicy.about.com/od/backgroundhistory/a/whomakesforpol.htm>) NK

Article II of the Constitution says the president has the power to: •make treaties with other countries (with consent of the Senate), •appoint ambassadors to other countries (with consent of the Senate) •and receive ambassadors from other countries Article II also establishes the president as commander-in-chief of the military, which gives him or her a lot of control over how the United States interacts with the world. As Carl von Clausewitz said, "War is the continuation of diplomacy by other means." The president's authority in all things is exercised through various parts of his or her administration. Therefore, understanding the executive branch's international relations bureaucracy is one key to understanding how foreign policy is made.

Prez Solves Foreign Policy

The framers of the Constitution intended for the President to have complete power over foreign affairs.

Prakash and Ramsey 1 (Saikrishna and Michael, professor of law at UCSD, Yale Law Journal vol 30, no 1, 2001, <http://www.law.harvard.edu/students/orgs/jlpp/Vol30_No1_Ramseyonline.pdf>) NK

What I want to present here is, if not an alternative to Justice Robert Jackson’s famous Youngstown framework,1 at least a complement to that framework for approaching the President’s foreign affairs power. My central proposition is that the eighteenth‐ century meaning of “executive” power included foreign affairs powers as well as the more familiar power to execute the law. Thus, Article II, Section 1 of the U.S. Constitution— which states that “the executive Power shall be vested in a President”—grants, in eighteenth‐century terms, the power to execute the law plus foreign affairs powers. This is sometimes called Hamilton’s vision of executive power, but its first reasoned exposition after the Constitution’s ratification was actually made by Thomas Jefferson, and that is why I have called it the “Jeffersonian” executive power in prior articles. There are four basic steps in this argument. First, the key writers of the eighteenth century on whom the Framers relied, particularly Montesquieu and Blackstone, defined “executive” power to include foreign affairs powers. For example, Montesquieu wrote: “In every government, there are three sorts of power: the legislative; the executive in respect to things dependent on the law of nations; and the executive in regard to matters that depend on the civil law.”4 In listing the “executive” powers “dependent on the law of nations,” he included things like war and peace, ambassadors, defense, and national security.5 Modern experts on Montesquieu’s philosophy conclude that Montesquieu “use[s] the term ‘executive power’ . . . to cover the function of the magistrates to make peace or war, send or receive embassies, establish the public security, and provide against invasions,” and that “Montesquieu, like most writers of his time, was inclined to think of the executive branch of government as being concerned nearly entirely with foreign affairs.”6 According to constitutional historian Francis Wormuth, “[t]he famous sixth chapter of Book XI of [Montesquieu’s] Spirit of the Laws . . . recognizes . . . the executive power in foreign relations . . . .”7 Similarly, Blackstone described the “executive” powers of the English monarch as encompassing the principal foreign af‐ fairs authorities, including ambassadors, treaties, war, and letters of marque and reprisal. These “foreign concerns,” Blackstone explained, are included within the powers “the exertion whereof consists the executive part of government.”8 This in itself does not prove how the Framers chose to organize their new government. It does suggest, though, that the vocabulary that they started with defined “executive” power to include foreign affairs powers. Montesquieu and Blackstone were by far the most widely read and influential political writers in America during the founding era, enjoying wide circulation and citation.9 Madison described Blackstone’s Commentaries as “a book which is in every man’s hand” and Montesquieu as “the oracle who is always consulted and cited” on separation of powers.10 Their use of words, especially words as central to the idea of separation of powers as “executive power,” was surely well‐known to educated Americans.

History proves that the president should have control over foreign affairs, beginning with Washington.

Prakash and Ramsey 1 (Saikrishna and Michael, professor of law at UCSD, Yale Law Journal, 2001, <http://www.law.harvard.edu/students/orgs/jlpp/Vol30_No1_Ramseyonline.pdf>) NK

The third step of the argument is that when George Washington became President after the ratification of the Constitution, he immediately took over control of foreign affairs. Without statutory authority, he exercised the foreign affairs functions of the nation that were not specifically mentioned in the Constitution—things like control and removal of diplomats, foreign communications, and formation of foreign policy. These powers had all been exercised by the Continental Congress under the Articles, but both Washington and the new Congress acted as if something in the Constitution had shifted them to the new office of the President.

Prez Solves Foreign Policy

All of the evidence points to the president as the head of foreign affairs.

Prakash and Ramsey 1 (Saikrishna and Michael, professor of law at UCSD, Yale Law Journal, 2001, <http://www.law.harvard.edu/students/orgs/jlpp/Vol30_No1_Ramseyonline.pdf>) NK

It is not the case that all the Framers made this association. In particular, although Madison initially seemed to acknowledge the relationship between executive power and foreign affairs power, he later famously denied it in disputing Hamilton’s Pacificus.22 But the weight of the evidence, both before and after ratification, seems clearly to favor including foreign affairs powers within the definition of “executive” powers. This seems particularly true when this reading is compared to alternative readings. Neither Madison, in his response to Hamilton, nor modern scholars have been able to offer a satisfactory alternative account of the text’s foreign affairs powers. The power to control and recall U.S. diplomats, to communicate with foreign nations, and to establish foreign policy is not included within any other grant of power in the Constitution.23 Yet surely the Framers—who were anxious to correct the Articles in the field of foreign affairs—did not simply forget to provide for such important foreign affairs powers in their new government. Once the Constitution was ratified, no one acted as if these powers were missing, or were allocated other than to the President. These mysteries are explained only if we give the Constitution its eighteenth century meaning, recognizing that “executive” power had two components: law execution and foreign affairs.

Prez Solves - Middle East

The executive branch is the driving branch in Middle East foreign policy.

Bzostek and Robinson 8 (Rachel and Samuel, Ph. D and M.A., Physorg.com, November 6th, 2008, <http://www.physorg.com/news145197719.html>) NK

A new study in the journal International Studies Perspectives examines U.S. foreign policy towards three Middle Eastern states and finds that the executive branch is often the driving force in foreign policy. Also, U.S. foreign policies tend to be reciprocal in nature. Rachel Bzostek, Ph.D., and Samuel B. Robison, M.A. conducted a quantitative and qualitative analysis of the influences on U.S. foreign policy toward Israel, Iraq, and Saudi Arabia from 1981 to 2004. Results show that the executive branch is the primary force driving policy towards those Middle Eastern states. Congress may seek to influence or mold policy and oftentimes does in significant ways. However, its ability to truly direct policy is limited. Also, the policies engaged in by the U.S. tend to be reciprocal in nature. More often than not, the United States tends to "reward" states that adopt policies the U.S. likes and "punish" states that engage in behaviors disapproved of by the U.S.

Prez Solves – Military

The president has broad constitutional power to take military action

Yoo 1 (John, Supreme Court Deputy Assistant Attorney General, MEMORANDUM OPINION FOR THE DEPUTY COUNSEL TO THE PRESIDENT [Supreme Court Memorandum following September 11th], <http://www.justice.gov/olc/warpowers925.htm>) NK

The President has broad constitutional power to take military action in response to the terrorist attacks on the United States on September 11, 2001. Congress has acknowledged this inherent executive power in both the War Powers Resolution and the Joint Resolution passed by Congress on September 14, 2001. The President has constitutional power not only to retaliate against any person, organization, or State suspected of involvement in terrorist attacks on the United States, but also against foreign States suspected of harboring or supporting such organizations. The President may deploy military force preemptively against terrorist organizations or the States that harbor or support them, whether or not they can be linked to the specific terrorist incidents of September 11.

Prez Solves – Arms Sales

The executive branch has the authority to determine our military policy.

Grimmett 99 (Richard, Specialist in National Defense for the US Department of State, US Department of State, June 1st, 1999, <http://fpc.state.gov/6172.htm>) NK

Even when Congress establishes foreign policy through legislation, the Administration continues to shape policy as it interprets and applies the various provisions of law. This is illustrated in arms sales policy. Congress has established the objectives and criteria for arms sales to foreign countries in the Arms Export Control Act, and it has required advance notification of major arms sales and provided procedures for halting a sale it disapproves. But the executive branch makes the daily decisions on whether or not to sell arms to specific countries and what weapons systems to provide. As an example, on September 14, 1992, President Bush notified Congress of his intention to sell 72 F-15 fighter aircraft to Saudi Arabia, and after the 30-day congressional review period expired, the sale proceeded

Deference Good – Threat Response

**Deference is key to rapid response in our military**

Carter 3 (Phillip, writer, CNN, July 15, <http://www.cnn.com/2003/LAW/07/15/findlaw.analysis.carter.security/>) ELJ

As the ratification debates reveal, the Framers assigned these powers to the President because they feared that judicial or congressional interference in these areas might render the new nation weak, or incapable of rapid response to threats from abroad. The Framers also felt that because, at the time, the majority of national security knowledge and expertise lay in the Executive Branch, decision making on such issues properly belonged to that branch. Accordingly, while Article II gives expansive military and foreign policy powers to the President, Article I gives Congress only limited military powers. It may "define and punish piracies and felonies committed on the high seas, and offenses against the law of nations"; "declare war, grant letters of marque and reprisal, and make rules concerning captures on land and water"; "raise and support armies, but no appropriation of money to that use shall be for a longer term than two years"; "provide and maintain a navy"; "make rules for the government and regulation of the land and naval forces"; and provide for calling forth the militia to execute the laws of the union, suppress insurrections and repel invasions . . ." But that is all. Finally, Article III gives the judicial branch no power at all over the military. As a result, the courts, unlike the other two branches, have no constitutional mandate to make military policy. The tradition of judicial deference to the military grew out of this constitutional structure and history. As commander-in-chief, the argument goes, the President should have the utmost latitude in making decisions that affect the readiness of America's military. Similarly, Congress deserves free rein in exercising its Constitutional responsibilities to fund the military and make laws for its governance. In contrast, the courts have no such Constitutional mandate to make military policy; thus, they should yield to decisions by the President and Congress.

Deference Good – Readiness

A judicial branch rejection of Deference kills military readiness

Hudson 99 (Walter, Major, US Army, Military Law Review 159, March <http://www.loc.gov/rr/frd/Military_Law/Military_Law_Review/pdf-files/277C75~1.pdf>) ELJ

By granting the elected branches plenary and command power over the military, the Constitution links military control to the democratic will and the democratic process. Because the people will feel the burden of war, the elected branches can best respond to that will.223 Furthermore, in granting power to the elected branches to control the military, the Constitution acknowledges that the elected branches grant a degree of legitimacy to military policy that courts cannot. These elected branches can best reflect and respond to the societal consensus, a particularly relevant and important concern when dealing with national security.224 Of the three branches, the judiciary has the least competence to evaluate the military’s formation, training, or command. It has, as one court stated, “no Armed Services Committee, Foreign Relations Committee, Department of Defense, or Department of State” nor does it have the same access to intelligence and testimony on military readiness as does Congress or the President.225 The Supreme Court has thus repeatedly cited its own lack of competence to evaluate military affairs.226

Judicial rejection of deference creates friction in the military that jeopardizes national security

Hudson 99 (Walter, Major, US Army, Military Law Review 159, March <http://www.loc.gov/rr/frd/Military_Law/Military_Law_Review/pdf-files/277C75~1.pdf>) ELJ

It is not thus simply the lack of judicial competence in military affairs, but the effects that the lack of competence may have that is an additional "friction" in the military environment. The problem in applying a standard of review similar to the kind used for civilian society is not just that the court may err, but the ramifications of such an error given the uncertainty of conflict. n240 An error in military policy making could impede military effectiveness and thereby jeopardize national security. n241 These judicial decisions put the courts squarely into the political arena. Judges unwittingly become "strategists" -- unelected and ill-equipped officials deciding matters of potentially ultimate importance.

The Courts are too technical for effective military control

Hudson 99 (Walter, Major, US Army, Military Law Review 159, March <http://www.loc.gov/rr/frd/Military_Law/Military_Law_Review/pdf-files/277C75~1.pdf>) ELJ

There are several problems with adjudication as a means of rule making. Adjudication is more costly and more time consuming. Years and millions of dollars can be spent in litigating one issue that involves one individual. n228 Adjudication concerns itself with an individual remedy based upon "a small set of controverted facts" that are highly contextual and may or may not be applicable to a larger class of individuals. n229 Furthermore, adjudication sets up elaborate procedures according to its ultimate goal -- to determine whether a particular individual should prevail in a particular case. n230 [\*48] Dissenters, in particular Justice Brennan, have asserted that the Court decides issues that are far more technically complicated than adjudicating rather straightforward rules on discipline. n231 Yet that argument does not address rules formation in an administrative, as opposed to an adjudicative, system. Military policy-making is, by its nature, meant to do precisely what administrative policy-making does: allocate rights, benefits, and sanctions, among large groups using consistent standards. n232 What makes military policy making along administrative rule-making lines even more advantageous is that the military's primary concern is ensuring military discipline and combat effectiveness of units, rather than focusing primarily on individuals themselves. Applying consistent and predetermined norms among large groups is what administrative rule making is best equipped to do. n233

Deference Good – Readiness

Deference is key to maintain the power of our military

Yoo 3 (John C., Visiting Professor of Law, University of Chicago Law School, The George Washington Law Review 72 Geo. Wash. L. Rev. 427, December, Lexis) ELJ

The role of the courts in reviewing the detention of enemy combatants demonstrates the tension between judicial review and the usual judicial deference to political wartime decisions. In the first category, that of alien enemy combatants captured and held abroad, the courts historically have refused to exercise judicial review. n91 In Johnson v. Eisentrager, the Supreme Court refused to entertain a habeas petition brought by German World War II prisoners who challenged their trial and conviction by the military commission for war crimes. n92 Finding that Article III courts had no jurisdiction over their petition, the Court observed that "these prisoners at no relevant time were within any territory over which the United States is sovereign, and the scenes of their offense, their capture, their trial and their punishment were all beyond the territorial jurisdiction of any court of the United States." n93 Further, judicial deference to the decisions of the political branches was warranted because "trials would hamper the war effort and bring aid and [\*446] comfort to the enemy." n94 Judicial proceedings would engender a "conflict between judicial and military opinion," interfere with military operations by recalling personnel to testify, and "would diminish the prestige of" a field commander called "to account in his own civil courts" and would "divert his efforts and attention from the military offensive abroad to the legal defensive at home." n95 In such cases, just as with the initiation of hostilities, judicial review has no role, as such decisions have been vested in the political branches and any exercise of jurisdiction would interfere with the conduct of military operations.

Deference ensures our military can function correctly

Carr 98 (B.S., United States Air Force Academy, J.D., Harvard Law School, The Air Force Law review, 45 A.F. L. Rev. 303Lexis) ELJ

Both courts and commentators have justified the judicial deference to the military on the grounds that the Constitution vests the primary responsibility for respecting the rights of servicemembers with the Legislative and Executive branches. The Constitution gives Congress the power to "raise and support Armies," n23 "provide and maintain a Navy," n24 and "make Rules for the Government and Regulation of the land and naval Forces." n25 The President is designated as the "Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy of the United States." n26 Given this division of responsibility, it has been argued that the two branches have safeguarded the rights of service personnel while protecting the readiness of the military. Senator Nunn explains that: [A] system of military and criminal and administrative law that carefully balances the rights of individual service members and the changing needs of the armed forces . . . has demonstrated considerable flexibility to meet the needs of the armed forces without undermining the fundamental needs of morale, good order, and discipline. The principles of judicial review developed by the Supreme Court recognizes the fact that over the years Congress has acted responsibly in addressing the constitutional rights of military personnel. n27

Deference is key to military order

Carr 98 (B.S., United States Air Force Academy, J.D., Harvard Law School, The Air Force Law review, 45 A.F. L. Rev. 303Lexis) ELJ

The regulations serve two related purposes. The first is to avert clear and present dangers to military order and discipline as described in the preceding court opinions. The second purpose is to maintain a politically disinterested military that remains safely under the control of civilian superiors. The balance between the free speech rights of military personnel and the military's interest in good order and discipline and mission effectiveness can be a particularly challenging task.

Deference Good – Readiness

The courts are too incompetent to be involved in military affairs

Carr 98 (B.S., United States Air Force Academy, J.D., Harvard Law School, The Air Force Law review, 45 A.F. L. Rev. 303 Lexis) ELJ

Underlying the judiciary's cautious excursions into the realm of military command are fears that courts lack the competence to contradict the judgment of military experts. Chief Justice Earl Warren has explained that the Supreme Court's deference to military determinations is based upon the "strong historical" tradition supporting "the military establishment's broad power to deal with its own personnel." n30 According to Warren, the "most obvious reason" for this deference is that "courts are ill-equipped to determine the impact upon discipline that any particular intrusion upon military authority might have." n31 The Supreme Court has alluded to the judiciary's lack of expertise to review prosecutions based upon military custom. In Parker v. Levy, it cited lower court opinions which held that the applications of military custom are best determined by military officers who are "more competent judges than the courts of common law." n32 Additionally, in the oft-quoted opinion of Orloff v. Willoughby, the Court expressly adopted a hands-off approach to the military, stating: But judges are not given the task of running the Army . . . . The military constitutes a specialized community governed by a separate discipline from that of the civilian. Orderly government requires that the judiciary be as scrupulous not to interfere with legitimate Army matters as the Army must be scrupulous not to intervene in judicial matters. n33

Judicial interference in the military kills military readiness

Carr 98 (B.S., United States Air Force Academy, J.D., Harvard Law School, The Air Force Law review, 45 A.F. L. Rev. 303Lexis) ELJ

When deciding constitutional or statutory issues in the military context, the Supreme Court has emphasized the special characteristics of the military community as a separate society. For example, the Court reviewed the nature of and justifications for these characteristics in Parker v. Levy. n34 The Court stressed that it "has long recognized that the military is, by necessity, a specialized society separate from civilian society." n35 This specialization is necessitated by the fact that "it is the primary business of armies and navies to fight or be ready to fight wars should the occasion arise." n36 The Court noted that "the military has, again by necessity, developed laws and traditions of its own during its long history." n37 Quoting from previous opinions, it also reiterated that the army "is not a deliberate body" n38 and that "the rights of men in the armed forces must perforce be conditioned to meet certain overriding demands of discipline and duty." n39 Furthermore, in order to "maintain the discipline essential to perform its mission effectively, the military has developed what 'may not unfitly be called the customary military law' or 'general usage of the military service.'" n40

Deference Good – Readiness

The Court is ill-equipped to control the military

O’Connor 0 (John F., Former USMC officer, Georgia Law Review, Fall, 35 Ga. L. Rev. 161, Lexis) ELJ

This "hands off" attitude has strong historical support, of course. While I cannot here explore the matter completely, there is also no necessity to do so, since it is indisputable that the tradition of our country, from the time of the Revolution until now, has supported the military establishment's broad power to deal with its own personnel. The most obvious reason is that courts are ill-equipped to determine the impact upon discipline that any particular intrusion upon military authority might have. Many of the problems of the military society are, in a sense, alien to the problems with which the judiciary is trained to deal. n254

Congressional control of the military is key to national security

Aden 4 (Steven H., J.D. (cum laude) 1989, Georgetown Univ. Law Center, Western State University Law Review, 31 W. St. U. L. Rev. 185, Lexis) ELJ

In pertinent part, the former, said the Second Circuit, authorizes Congress to ""provide for the common Defence'" and ""to raise and support Armies.'" n42 Consequently, although the actions of the military remain subject to judicial review, the Supreme Court has historically granted great deference to the content and implementation of armed forces' policies calculated to [\*196] enhance military readiness and promote national safety. n43 In seeking to strike this balance of powers, the Second Circuit wrote: Caution dictates when a matter provided for by Congress in the exercise of its war power and implemented by the Army appears reasonably relevant and necessary to furtherance of our national defense it should be treated as presumptively valid and any doubt as to its constitutionality should be resolved as a matter of judicial comity in favor of deference to the military's exercise of its discretion. n44

Judicial limits will degrade our fighting force

Henriksen 96 (Kelly E., J.D. Candidate, 1996, Washington College of Law of The American University Administrative Law Journal Winter, 9 Admin. L.J. Am. U. 1273 Lexis) ELJ

B. The Military as a Separate Community As another justification in support of the principle of deference, the Supreme Court has regularly referred to the military as a "separate community" n27 in which the judiciary must approach restrictions on individual liberties with deference. n28 Based on the need to maintain an effective fighting force, n29 courts have recognized that limits on constitutional rights which may not have a rational basis in our civilian society may survive in the military "society" because the war-making purpose of the military [\*1279] makes those limits compelling. n30 Courts have noted that the military has developed its own practices, laws and traditions in preparation for its ultimate responsibility - war-making. n31 Courts have also framed this particular justification for its deference in terms of the difference in autonomy between being in the civilian community and the military's "separate society." n32 C. The Limited Competence of the Courts A third justification commonly forwarded in support of the doctrine of deference centers on the perceived limits of the courts' competence in dealing with the complex aspects of the military establishment. n33 The professional judgment and experience of those familiar with the military is the primary source for determining the climate of obedience and discipline necessary to sustain an effective fighting force. Traditionally, courts have deemed themselves unable to master these complexities. n34 [\*1280]

Deference Good – Terrorism

Second guessing by the courts kills any chances to fight terrorism

Sekulow 4 (Jay Allen, American Center for Law and Justice Chief Counsel, March 17, http://www.wiggin.com/db30/cgi-bin/pubs/American%20Center%20for%20Law%20%20Justice.pdf) ELJ

We are facing an enemy which willingly commits the most horrendous, suicidal acts against innocent civilians and which will do so again if it can. Because this situation is without historical precedent, no one can know for sure how much success emerging policies will have. As such, it would be inappropriate for the courts of the United States to enter the political fray and attempt to second-guess the policies adopted by the President to meet this threat. Any appearance of official opposition to decisions within the discretion of the President will surely bring aid and comfort to the enemy while demoralizing the men and women in the U.S. armed forces who are daily putting their lives at risk to track down and destroy the confederates of those who planned the 9-11 attacks and seek to repeat them.

Terrorism must be fought by the elected government

The Washington Times 3 (June 18, http://www.washtimes.com/national/20030618-013148-4079r.htm) ELJ

"The Constitution would indeed be a suicide pact if the only way to curtail enemies' access to assets were to reveal information that might cost lives," the majority said in an opinion written by Circuit Judge David B. Sentelle, who was nominated by President Reagan. In declaring that tactical decisions in the war on terror must be made by "the government's top counterterrorism officials," not judges, Judge Sentelle was joined by Circuit Judge Karen LeCraft Henderson, a nominee of President Bush in 1990.

Judicial intervention kills war-making authority that is key to fight terrorism

Yoo 3 (John C., Visiting Professor of Law, University of Chicago Law School, The George Washington Law Review 72 Geo. Wash. L. Rev. 427, December, Lexis) ELJ

Instead, the legality of the war with al Qaeda has arisen in actions challenging the detention of Americans captured fighting in league with the enemy. In these cases, the courts have refused to second-guess whether the nation is at war, but instead have deferred to the judgment of the political branches. In Hamdi v. Rumsfeld, n49 Yaser Esam Hamdi, who was born in Louisiana but grew up in Saudi Arabia, was captured in Afghanistan fighting on the side of the Taliban militia. Hamdi's father, acting as his next friend, filed a petition for a writ of habeas corpus seeking his release because he was not held on criminal charges. n50 In dismissing the writ, Judge Wilkinson, writing for a unanimous panel in the United States Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit, did not question whether the United States was in a state of armed conflict in Afghanistan, nor whether that war was properly authorized under the Constitution. n51 Indeed, the court emphasized that its role was limited to reviewing whether the executive branch had properly classified Hamdi as an enemy combatant, under the standards set out by Ex Parte Quirin, and hence could be detained under the laws of war until the end of the conflict. As Judge Wilkinson wrote, "the political branches are best positioned to comprehend this global war in its full context, and neither the absence of set-piece battles nor the intervals of calm between terrorist assaults suffice to nullify the warmaking authority entrusted to the executive and legislative branches[.]" n52 The Fourth Circuit limited the scope of its review not to whether the war was properly begun, which was a decision for the political branches, but to the legal ramifications of the decision to go to war. n53

Deference Good – Separation of Powers

Deference is key to separation of powers

Henriksen 96 (Kelly E., J.D. Candidate, 1996, Washington College of Law of The American University Administrative Law Journal Winter, 9 Admin. L.J. Am. U. 1273 Lexis) ELJ

A. Separation of Powers Among several traditional justifications for the judiciary's deference to the military, the Supreme Court has repeatedly stated that the Constitution mandates some form of deference by providing for a separation of powers. n22 The Constitution expressly vests power over military affairs in Congress n23 and the Executive. n24 While the Supreme Court has considered article I, section 8, clauses 12-16 a plenary grant of power not subject to [\*1278] unjustified second guessing by the judiciary, n25 it has not completely abandoned its power of review. n26

Judicial interference hurts separation of power

Gerschwer 93 (Lawrence, Columbia Law Review, May 93 Colum. L. Rev. 996, Lexis) ELJ

3. Separation of Powers and Procedural Statutes. -- Separation of powers concerns counsel judicial restraint when litigants attempt to transform constitutional provisions into judicially enforceable proscriptions on government action. n249 The argument for judicial restraint in such cases draws force from the antimajoritarian aspect of judicial review and the struggle to reconcile the role of the judiciary with the democratic underpinnings of our political system. n250 In a democracy, the exercise of judicial power to interfere with legislative outcomes is and should be rare. n251

Deference Good – Pres Powers

Deference is key to presidential power

Masur 5 (Jonathan, Law clerk to the Honorable Richard A. Posner , Hastings Law Journal, February, 56 Hastings L.J. 441, Lexis) ELJ

The perceived duty of courts and judges to defer to the factual assertions and judgments of executive branch actors in times of war represents the unifying principle of all modern wartime cases. "Deference" has become a shibboleth that courts believe they must invoke if their wartime rulings are to have any hope of withstanding appellate (and public) scrutiny. Even a court that eventually concludes that no deference is due the executive branch often appears compelled to recite a statement of judicial fealty to the deference principle for fear of signaling an inappropriate lack of respect for the authority of the coordinate branches in wartime. n14 Judicial deference to administrative decision-making in times of war remains inescapably and intuitively attractive. This Article should not be understood to suggest that courts should exercise anything approaching de novo review over executive decisions in military situations. Yet within wartime jurisprudence, the doctrine of judicial deference has overwhelmed the legal strictures established to constrain the operation of executive power. Courts sitting in judgment of the Executive's wartime actions have permitted the military to effectively define the constitutional scope of its own authority.

Deference is key for the president to declare war

Masur 5 (Jonathan, Law clerk to the Honorable Richard A. Posner , Hastings Law Journal, February, 56 Hastings L.J. 441, Lexis) ELJ

Within the legal lexicon, the phrase "judicial deference" captures a broad swath of court' attitudes and actions united by a single generalized principle: courts will require some heightened measure of proof or surety before overturning a conclusion reached or a judgment made by a different branch of government. n15 Much attention has been given to what one might describe as "legal deference" to the military, or juridical acceptance of the executive branch's extraordinarily broad construction of its own statutory and constitutional powers during wartime. n16 The President's extant power to declare war sua sponte (and [\*446] without an act of Congress) stands as a paradigmatic example of this phenomenon. n17

Deference key to presidential power

Masur 5 (Jonathan, Law clerk to the Honorable Richard A. Posner , Hastings Law Journal, February, 56 Hastings L.J. 441, Lexis) ELJ

For nearly one hundred and fifty years, the judiciary's conception of the reach of the Executive's war-making powers has known few bounds. Beginning with The Prize Cases n20 in 1862, the Supreme Court has read the President's commander-in-chief power broadly to encompass nearly any necessary war-related actions, even without a formal declaration of war. n21 The Court's maxim, gleaned from Hirabayashi v. United States, that "the war power of the Government is "the power to wage war successfully,'" n22 has given rise to an understanding of presidential power that encompasses activities that do not involve the deployment of troops in the field, n23 such as the Japanese-American internment, as well as [\*449] foreign policy making authority not directly tied to national security or the military. n24 In some cases, the Supreme Court has refused even to entertain cases that attempt to demarcate limitations on the President's constitutional military powers. n25 This expansive understanding of the President's wartime authority has led the Executive to argue that an entire range of military questions or executive measures are entirely beyond the court' reach as either non-justiciable or otherwise unsuitable for judicial review. Courts have accepted this argument most decisively in areas that hew closely to the actual mechanics of armed conflict, such as presidential decisions committing American forces to battle or selecting the means and mechanisms of waging war. n26 Yet the judiciary has hardly confined its [\*450] deferential posture to such intimately military questions. n27 Courts have concluded that even administrative decisions implicating traditional judicial authority and significant constitutional or statutory legal structures must command substantial judicial deference. Prominent among the actions receiving such deference are detentions of American citizens who have not been charged with crimes. n28

Deference Good – AT: CMR

Deference key to civil military relations

Sulmasy and Yoo 7 (Glen Sulmasy and John Yoo, UCLA Law Review, 7/22/07, “CHALLENGES TO CIVILIAN CONTROL OF THE MILITARY: A RATIONAL CHOICE APPROACH TO THE WAR ON TERROR”, http://works.bepress.com/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1019&context=johnyoo)

Since the founding of the republic, the military justice system was considered distinct and separate from the civilian system. Warfare operations were clearly regarded as distinct from civilian enterprises and therefore demanded a separate judicial system with a reduced expectation of constitutional protections. The Supreme Court consistently deferred to this unique system designed to respect the unique demands of warfare and of the role of the military.

Separation of Powers Turn

CP violates separation of powers

Hudson 99 (Walter, Major, US Army, Military Law Review 159, March <http://www.loc.gov/rr/frd/Military_Law/Military_Law_Review/pdf-files/277C75~1.pdf>) ELJ

The Supreme Court cites the separation of powers doctrine as a basis for deferring to either Congress or the military to create military policy. n219 The idea of separation of powers comes from the text of the Constitution itself. The articles of the Constitution assign each branch distinct roles and functions. The Constitution gives the power to raise, to support, and to train the armed forces to the legislative branch n220 and the authority to command [\*46] them to the executive branch. n221 The Constitution assigns no such role to the judiciary. n222

Collapse of constitutional balance of power risks tyranny and reckless warmongering

Martin Redish, Professor of Law and Public Policy at Northwestern, and Elizabeth Cisar, Law Clerk at the Seventh Circuit Court of Appeals, 1991 41 Duke L.J. 449

In any event, the political history of which the Framers were aware tends to confirm that quite often concentration of political power ultimately leads to the loss of liberty. Indeed, if we have begun to take the value of separation of powers for granted, we need only look to modern American history to remind ourselves about both the general vulnerability of representative government, and the direct correlation between the concentration of political power and the threat to individual liberty. [127](http://www.lexis.com/research/retrieve?_m=1294fa69dc670006b0722c9a5da42022&docnum=18&_fmtstr=FULL&_startdoc=11&wchp=dGLbVzb-zSkAV&_md5=31ba2d0ed3fa3e2ddd0a08e25ee6928b&focBudTerms=&focBudSel=all" \l "n127#n127" \t "_self) [\*473] The widespread violations of individual rights that took place when President Lincoln assumed an inordinate level of power, for example, are well documented. [128](http://www.lexis.com/research/retrieve?_m=1294fa69dc670006b0722c9a5da42022&docnum=18&_fmtstr=FULL&_startdoc=11&wchp=dGLbVzb-zSkAV&_md5=31ba2d0ed3fa3e2ddd0a08e25ee6928b&focBudTerms=&focBudSel=all" \l "n128#n128" \t "_self) Arguably as egregious were the threats to basic freedoms that arose during the Nixon administration, when the power of the executive branch reached what are widely deemed to have been intolerable levels. [129](http://www.lexis.com/research/retrieve?_m=1294fa69dc670006b0722c9a5da42022&docnum=18&_fmtstr=FULL&_startdoc=11&wchp=dGLbVzb-zSkAV&_md5=31ba2d0ed3fa3e2ddd0a08e25ee6928b&focBudTerms=&focBudSel=all" \l "n129#n129" \t "_self) Although in neither instance did the executive's usurpations of power ultimately degenerate into complete and irreversible tyranny, the reason for that may well have been the resilience of our political traditions, among the most important of which is separation of powers itself. In any event, it would be political folly to be overly smug about the security of either representative government or individual liberty. Although it would be all but impossible to create an empirical proof to demonstrate that our constitutional tradition of separation of powers has been an essential catalyst in the avoidance of tyranny, common sense should tell us that the simultaneous division of power and the creation of interbranch checking play important roles toward that end. To underscore the point, one need imagine only a limited modification of the actual scenario surrounding the recent Persian Gulf War. In actuality, the war was an extremely popular endeavor, thought by many to be a politically and morally justified exercise. But imagine a situation in which a President, concerned about his failure to resolve significant social and economic problems at home, has callously decided to engage [\*474] the nation in war, simply to defer public attention from his domestic failures. To be sure, the President was presumably elected by a majority of the electorate, and may have to stand for reelection in the future. However, at this particular point in time, but for the system established by separation of powers, his authority as Commander in Chief [130](http://www.lexis.com/research/retrieve?_m=1294fa69dc670006b0722c9a5da42022&docnum=18&_fmtstr=FULL&_startdoc=11&wchp=dGLbVzb-zSkAV&_md5=31ba2d0ed3fa3e2ddd0a08e25ee6928b&focBudTerms=&focBudSel=all" \l "n130#n130" \t "_self) to engage the nation in war would be effectively dictatorial. Because the Constitution reserves to the arguably even more representative and accountable Congress the authority to declare war, [131](http://www.lexis.com/research/retrieve?_m=1294fa69dc670006b0722c9a5da42022&docnum=18&_fmtstr=FULL&_startdoc=11&wchp=dGLbVzb-zSkAV&_md5=31ba2d0ed3fa3e2ddd0a08e25ee6928b&focBudTerms=&focBudSel=all" \l "n131#n131" \t "_self) the Constitution has attempted to prevent such misuses of power by the executive. [132](http://www.lexis.com/research/retrieve?_m=1294fa69dc670006b0722c9a5da42022&docnum=18&_fmtstr=FULL&_startdoc=11&wchp=dGLbVzb-zSkAV&_md5=31ba2d0ed3fa3e2ddd0a08e25ee6928b&focBudTerms=&focBudSel=all" \l "n132#n132" \t "_self) It remains unproven whether any governmental structure other than one based on a system of separation of powers could avoid such harmful results. In summary, no defender of separation of powers can prove with certitude that, but for the existence of separation of powers, tyranny would be the inevitable outcome. But the question is whether we wish to take that risk, given the obvious severity of the harm that might result. Given both the relatively limited cost imposed by use of separation of powers and the great severity of the harm sought to be avoided, **o**ne should not demand a great showing of the likelihood that the feared harm would result. For just as in the case of the threat of nuclear war**,** no one wants to be forced into the position of saying, "I told you so."

Separation of Powers ext.

Only Congress and the President can make foreign policy – CP violates separation of powers

Frazier 7 (Bart, program director at The Future of Freedom Foundation, Freedom Daily, July 2007, <http://www.fff.org/freedom/fd0707e.asp>) NK

So how were the Framers to protect this nation from unjust wars? They knew that too much power concentrated in the hands of any one man, or group of men, eventually leads to despotism. What provisions did the Constitution have that would attempt to limit the government to only the most necessary of wars? Like so many other functions of the Constitution, the powers that were needed to implement foreign policy were divided between the executive and legislative branches. The power to declare war was given to Congress, but the president was the one with the power to wage it. The president might wish to wage war, but he needed to get a declaration of war from Congress before he could do so. And even if a president was successful in getting a war started, Congress had the power to stop it by cutting off the money that funded it. The system of checks and balances so highly regarded by historians was supposed to prevent the ascension of a tyrannical government. Instead of enabling one man or one body of men to determine when the country was to go to war, the Constitution saw to it that different parts of the federal government would have to debate and ultimately agree among themselves that war was the proper route.

Activism/Legitimacy Turn

Activist decisions undermine court legitimacy

**Earle 93** (Caroline S., J.D. Candidate – Indiana University, Bloomington, “The American Judicial Review Quagmire: A Canadian Proposal”, Indiana Law Journal, Fall, 68 Ind. L.J. 1357, Lexis)

**[core_up](http://www.lexis.com/research/retrieve?_m=ddbf2510b880732585956899367e8d09&docnum=20&_fmtstr=FULL&_startdoc=1&wchp=dGLbVlW-zSkAt&_md5=c4f15a2e7705174729c1bc344a6f8617&focBudTerms=supreme%20court%20w/25%20judicial%20activis!%20w/15%20legitima!&focBudSel=all#r26)**n26 John Hart Ely notes that commentators have been ominously portending the "destruction" of the activist Supreme Court for years. He notes that the Court has thrived despite these predictions, and suggests that it will continue to do so. ELY, *supra* note 9, at 46-48. Ely's attention, however, is directed toward executive and/or legislative reaction to Supreme Court activism. In contrast, my point is that the Supreme Court is sowing the seeds of its own "destruction." Judicial activism has served to undermine the Supreme Court's legitimacy with the people. Minorities, who in the past have looked to the Court for protection of their rights, may feel that the Court is increasingly susceptible to majority impulse. Similarly, those in the majority may fear the influence of special interest groups on the Court and also may view the politicization of the Court as inconsistent with its unelected and effectively unchecked status.

Court legitimacy key to prevent terrorism

Shapiro 3 (Jeremy, Associate Director and Research Associate – Brookings Institute, March “French Lessons: The Importance of the Judicial System in Fighting Terrorism http://www.brookings.edu/fp/cusf/analysis/shapiro20030325.htm)

The unique nature of terrorism means that maintaining the appearance of justice and democratic legitimacy will be much more important than in past wars. The terrorist threat is in a perpetual state of mutation and adaptation in response to government efforts to oppose it. The war on terrorism more closely resembles the war on drugs than World War II; it is unlikely to have any discernable endpoint, only irregular periods of calm. The French experience shows that ad-hoc anti-terrorist measures that have little basis in societal values and shallow support in public opinion may wither away during the periods of calm. In the U.S., there is an enormous reservoir of legitimacy, established by over 200 years of history and tradition, in the judiciary. That reservoir represents an important asset that the U.S. government can profit from to maintain long-term vigilance in this type of war. Despite the unusual opportunity for innovation afforded by the crisis of September 11, the U.S. government has not tried to reform American judicial institutions to enable them to meet the threat of terrorism. To prevent the next wave of attacks, however far off they might be, and to avoid re-inventing a slightly different wheel each time will require giving life to institutions that can persist and evolve, even in times of low terrorist activity. Given the numerous differences between the two countries, the U.S. cannot and should not simply import the French system, but it can learn from their mistakes. Their experience suggests a few possible reforms: A specialized U.S. Attorney tasked solely with terrorism cases and entirely responsible for prosecuting such cases in the U.S. Direct and formal links between that U.S. Attorney’s office and the various intelligence agencies, allowing prosecutors to task the intelligences agencies during judicial investigations Special procedures for selecting and protecting juries in terrorism cases and special rules of evidence that allow for increased protection of classified information in terrorist cases Creating a normal, civilian judicial process that can prosecute terrorists and yet retain legitimacy is not merely morally satisfying. It may also help to prevent terrorist attacks in the long run. Not incidentally, it would demonstrate to the world a continuing faith in the ability of democratic societies to manage the threat of terrorism without sacrificing the very values they so desperately desire to protect.

The impact is extinction

Gordon 2 (Harvey, Visiting Lecturer in Forensic Psychiatry – Tel Aviv University, “The ‘Suicide’ Bomber: Is It a Psychiatric Phenomenon?” , Psychiatric Bulletin, 26, http://pb.rcpsych.org/cgi/content/full/26/8/285)

Although terrorism throughout human history has been tragic, until relatively recently it has been more of an irritant than any major hazard. However, the existence of weapons of mass destruction now renders terrorism a potential threat to the very existence of human life (Hoge & Rose, 2001). Such potential global destruction, or globicide as one might call it, supersedes even that of genocide in its lethality. Although religious factors are not the only determinant of ‘suicide’ bombers, the revival of religious fundamentalism towards the end of the 20th century renders the phenomenon a major global threat. Even though religion can be a force for good, it can equally be abused as a force for evil. Ultimately, the parallel traits in human nature of good and evil may perhaps be the most durable of all the characteristics of the human species. There is no need to apply a psychiatric analysis to the ‘suicide’ bomber because the phenomenon can be explained in political terms. Most participants in terrorism are not usually mentally disordered and their behaviour can be construed more in terms of group dynamics (Colvard, 2002). On the other hand, perhaps psychiatric terminology is as yet deficient in not having the depth to encompass the emotions and behaviour of groups of people whose levels of hate, low self-esteem, humiliation and alienation are such that it is felt that they can be remedied by the mass destruction of life, including their own.

Activism/Legitimacy Links

Controversial decisions undermine legitimacy

**Gibson and Caldiera 7** (James L., Professor of Government – Washington University and Fellow – Centre for Comparative and International Politics, and Gregory A., Distinguished University Professor in Political Communications and Policy Thinking – Ohio State University, “Supreme Court Nominations, Legitimacy Theory, and the American Public: A Dynamic Test of the Theory of Positivity Bias”, 7-4, http://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract\_id=998283)

Social scientists have taught us a great deal about the legitimacy of the U.S. Supreme Court. Unfortunately, however, most research fails to consider how the public’s views of political institutions like the Court change over time. But opinions can indeed change, with at least two types of “exogenous” sources — controversial Supreme Court decisions and politicized confirmation hearings — providing engines for attitude change. Events such as these may awaken attitudes from their hibernation, allowing for the possibility of updating. Two types of change seem possible: Attention to things judicial may be associated with exposure to highly legitimizing symbols of judicial power (e.g., robes), symbols that teach the lesson that the Court is different from ordinary political institutions and therefore is worthy of esteem. Gibson and Caldeira refer to this as “positivity bias.” Alternatively, events may teach that the Court is not different, that its role is largely “political,” and that the “myth of legality”really is a myth. Since so few studies have adopted a dynamic perspective on attitudes toward institutions, we know little about how these processes of attitude change take place.

Overturning a constitutional precedent or controversial decision subverts Court legitimacy

**Peters, 8** (Christopher J., Associate Professor of Law @ Wayne State University Law School and Visiting Professor of Law @ Loyola Law School Los Angeles, Symposium: The Roberts Court at Age Three: Under-The-Table Overruling, The Wayne Law Review, Fall, Lexis)

But the Court also went farther. In a remarkable passage-remarkable because it directly engaged the question of the Court's role in a constitutional democracy to a degree rarely seen in majority opinions  [\*1080]  of the Court n54 -it argued that overruling Roe would undermine the Court's own legitimacy. N55The Court's power, it asserted in Casey, "lies . . . in its legitimacy, a product of substance and perception." n56 In tying its legitimacy to "substance," the Court appeared to mean that part of its power depends on widespread public acceptance of the content of its decisions, on the impression that the Court is getting things right most (or at least an acceptably high percentage) of the time. n57 In citing "perception," however, the Court meant something different and perhaps more complex. Some segment of the public inevitably will disagree with the substance of any constitutional decision by the Court; as the Court put it, "not every conscientious claim of principled justification [for a Court decision] will be accepted as such." n58Thus "something more"-more than agreement with the substance of Court decisions-"is required" to support the Court's power. n59 That something more is a widespread perception that the Court is procedurally legitimate, that the way it makes constitutional decisions is generally acceptable, even to those who disagree with the substance of particular decisions. n60 And this procedural legitimacy "depends on making legally principled decisions," decisions that are "grounded truly in principle, not . . . compromises with social and political pressures." n61Frequent overrulings of the Court's own constitutional precedents-or overrulings of highly controversial decisions that have produced extraordinary "social and political pressures," like Roe-would foster the impression that the Court is giving in to those pressures rather than making decisions of principle. n62 This "would subvert the Court's legitimacy" and thus its power. n63

CIL Can’t Solve – Vague

Customary international law is not precise.

Guzman 6 (Andrew, Professor of Law and Director of the Advanced Law degree Programs at Berkeley Law School, *Michigan Journal of International Law* 27(115), February 26th, 2006, <http://students.law.umich.edu/mjil/article-pdfs/v27n1-guzman.pdf>) NK

A central theme in many traditional critiques is the imprecise character of CIL. Karol Wolfke, for example, argues that the problem with custom “lies in the intangibility of custom, in the numerous factors which come into play, in the great number of various views, spread over centuries, and in the resulting ambiguity of the terms involved.”42 Vagueness about legal rules, however, need not be fatal. After all, common law adjudication is in significant part about the clarification or establishment of rules that are applied to disputes ex post. That said, the lack of precision in CIL rules does indeed undermine the force of the rules and generate skepticism about their importance.

Customary international law has many problems, including its inherent circularity.

Guzman 6 (Andrew, Professor of Law and Director of the Advanced Law degree Programs at Berkeley Law School, *Michigan Journal of International Law* 27(115), February 26th, 2006, <http://students.law.umich.edu/mjil/article-pdfs/v27n1-guzman.pdf>) NK

Beyond vagueness, there is a laundry list of problems with CIL that have long been understood. Anthony D’Amato made perhaps the best presentation of those concerns in his well-known book, The Concept of Custom in International Law.43 One of the most vexing problems discussed by D’Amato is the inherent circularity of CIL.44 It is said that CIL is only law if the opinio juris requirement is met. That is, it is only law if states believe it is law.45 But why would a state believe something to be law if it does not already have the requisite opinio juris? So it appears that opinio juris is necessary for there to be a rule of law, and a rule of law is necessary for there to be opinio juris.

CIL can’ solve – no internal consistency

Guzman 6 (Andrew, Professor of Law and Director of the Advanced Law degree Programs at Berkeley Law School, *Michigan Journal of International Law* 27(115), February 26th, 2006, <http://students.law.umich.edu/mjil/article-pdfs/v27n1-guzman.pdf>) NK

Other problems with the conventional definition of CIL are easy to find. Like the opinio juris requirement, the state practice norm is said to be unworkable. There is no agreement on the amount or consistency of practice that is required.46 It is clear that universal state practice is not necessary, but beyond that the opinions of commentators diverge.47 For example, it is unclear whether a single inconsistent act is sufficient to conclude that there has not been “continuous” state practice. Furthermore, if a single inconsistent act is not enough to undermine the consistency of the practice, how much inconsistency is required?48 Even if agreement could be reached on the consistency element, it is difficult to determine how widespread the practice must be. One might hope that the ICJ would provide guidance here, but when the court has addressed the issue it has failed to offer clarity. Judge Lachs, in his dissent in the North Sea Continental Shelf cases, for example, did little more than restate the problem when he commented that a “general practice of States,” which is something less than “universal acceptance,” is sufficient evidence that a practice is accepted as law.49

CIL Can’t solve – Vague

Customary international law lacks a consensus of practice and a definitive evidence base.

Guzman 6 (Andrew, Professor of Law and Director of the Advanced Law degree Programs at Berkeley Law School, *Michigan Journal of International Law* 27(115), February 26th, 2006, <http://students.law.umich.edu/mjil/article-pdfs/v27n1-guzman.pdf>) NK

Ultimately, the question is one of the overall importance of practice, and there is no consensus on that issue. In the Anglo-Norwegian Fisheries case, the ICJ stated that “the Court considers that too much importance need not be attached to the few uncertainties or contradictions, real or apparent, which the United Kingdom Government claims to have discovered in Norwegian practice.”50 Though this quote seems to indicate that practice is of modest consequence, the court then emphasized the importance of “constant and sufficiently long practice.”51 Furthermore, there is no agreement on the forms of evidence that may be used to demonstrate state practice. A liberal view of acceptable evidence of practice includes not only the actual actions of states, but also diplomatic correspondence, treaties, public statements by heads of state, domestic laws, and so on.52 Though there is support for this view, one can also find prominent commentators arguing for a much shorter list.53

Customary international law lacks a definitive evidence base.

Guzman 6 (Andrew, Professor of Law and Director of the Advanced Law degree Programs at Berkeley Law School, *Michigan Journal of International Law* 27(115), February 26th, 2006, <http://students.law.umich.edu/mjil/article-pdfs/v27n1-guzman.pdf>) NK

Even if one could resolve the above problems about what counts as practice and the degree of consistency required, there remains the practical problem that observing all relevant evidence from all relevant states will normally be impossible. At the most mundane level, few nations document their actions and statements in a way that allows for an investigation of their practices.60 Furthermore, it is fantastical to think that lawyers in a case, much less adjudicators deciding a case or policymakers selecting a course of action, can canvass the virtually infinite universe of potential evidence, let alone come to some understanding of the extent to which a practice has been followed.61 The challenge is even greater when one realizes that a proper investigation of state practice would consider instances in which states refrain from taking an action because it would be in violation of international law. This latter category of evidence would be the most relevant to an investigation of CIL. The fact that it is unobservable, how- ever, makes it virtually impossible to include in the evaluation of CIL.62 Even if one can identify instances in which states claim to be refraining from certain actions based on CIL, it is difficult to know if they are doing so out of a sincere concern for CIL or if expressions of concern are simply a convenient rhetorical justification for their decision. The interpretation of observable evidence of state action is also problematic. The most visible evidence consists of statements made by countries, including votes in international fora such as the UN General Assembly. Unfortunately, this evidence is also the least reliable, as states may have incentives to misrepresent their beliefs about CIL. In practice, such statements are at times used as evidence by international courts, including the ICJ.63

CIL Can’t Solve – No enforcement

Not enforceable – lacks consistency and coherence

Guzman 6 (Andrew, Professor of Law and Director of the Advanced Law degree Programs at Berkeley Law School, *Michigan Journal of International Law* 27(115), February 26th, 2006, <http://students.law.umich.edu/mjil/article-pdfs/v27n1-guzman.pdf>) NK

Finally, in addition to these problems of evidence, attempts to determine state practice inevitably face time and resource constraints, preventing a serious canvassing of all relevant information. The result is that judgments are based on cursory reviews of a few states, biased toward the practices of states with readily available statements about their behavior written in a language understood by the relevant judges,64 heavily influenced by the particular background of the judge, and often inconsistent with the behavior of many states.65 These problems, along with others that are omitted from this brief discussion, make it difficult to take traditional theories of CIL seriously if one approaches the subject with even mild skepticism.66 One illustration of this problem appears in an article by Kelly, who concludes that CIL is “a useless, incoherent source of law that is of little guidance in determining norms.” Even on its own terms, CIL is a problematic area. The basic definitions of CIL are at best difficult to understand and apply and certain to lead to inconsistent judgments about the content of the law; at worst they are incoherent and internally inconsistent.67

Can’t solve: CIL will not be enforced.

McGinnis 6 (John, professor of law at Northwestern University's School of Law, Harvard Journal of Law and Public Policy, Fall 2006, <http://www.law.harvard.edu/students/orgs/jlpp/Vol30_No1_McGinnisonline.pdf>) NK

Third, many treaties and other international declarations are merely empty promises if nations do not actually enforce them. Many nations flout international norms imposed by treaty while others often fail to give them domestic effect. In contrast, Congress expects that the norms it codifies into domestic law will be enforced, providing evidence that those norms are sincerely embraced.

CIL Can’t Solve – No Spillover

No spillover –we’ve incorporated specific provisions before without complete incorporation

Harold Hongju Koh**,** Yale Law Professor**,** 1998,Harvard law Review, Vol. 111, No. 7, May, p. 1839-40

Take, for example, the federal doctrine of foreign sovereign immunity, which originated in the customary international law doctrine of absolute foreign sovereign immunity. Over time, the Supreme Court incorporated that decision into United States law and melded it with a federal common law doctrine of judicial deference to federal executive suggestions of immunity. Eventually, executive policy brought US practice into line with the emerging customary international law doctrine of restrictive sovereign immunity, and Congress codified the new doctrine in the Foreign Sovereign Immunities Act (FSIA), whose gaps federal courts have subsequently filled by declaring rules of federal common law. In short, rules that originate in customary international law are regularly determined by United States courts and incorporated into federal common law, then updated by executive policy as customary law evolves, and codified in federal statutes whose interstices are filled through federal common lawmaking.

CIL Bad – AT: Environment

Treaties solve – don’t need CIL

Daniel W. Drener, Political Science Professor University of Chicago, 2001**,** Chicago Journal of International Law, 2 Chi. J. Int'l L. 321, p. 326-7

Second, the law here is growing largely through treaty ratification, not through customary international law. One could argue that the declarations produced by UN conferences are an attempt to use customary law as a way of bypassing democratic institutions. However, this overlooks the constraints that domestic legal institutions place upon international environmental accords. Case studies of fallout from the 1992 Rio Summit suggest that countries implement environmental accords only to the extent permitted by their domestic political institutions. n24 In the case of the Kyoto Protocol, objections in the United States about the treaty's costs of implementation and the distribution of costs led the Bush administration to reject ratification of the treaty. These actions highlight the fact that when international environmental law has moved forward, it has only occurred with the backing of the great powers. While NGOs do play a role in persuading powerful states to alter their policies, so do other factors, such as the material costs and benefits of such treaties.

CIL Bad – AT: Satellites (Koplow)

Koplow Concedes – CIL is not enough for an ASAT ban

Koplow 9 (David A., Michigan Journal of International Law, Summer, 30 Mich. J. Int'l L. 1187, Lexis) ELJ

In sum, general CIL gets us only halfway toward an effective ASAT ban. There is, I submit, sufficient evidence of congruent behavior by the leading spacefaring States to satisfy the objective criterion; they have in general refrained from testing or using ASAT devices. The observed pattern of conformity is not perfect, but especially in the past two decades (and, specifically, until the U.S. and Chinese events in 2007 and 2008), the aberrations from a "no ASATs" rule have been few. If physical actions alone were sufficient to entrench a CIL rule, then we would have such a standard. On the other hand, the evidence to satisfy the subjective component of the usual definition of CIL is essentially lacking. States have not generally asserted the belief that ASAT testing or use is already a violation of the world community's expectations. The three States that have occasionally conducted ASAT events have certainly not conceded the illegality of their respective programs, and the many other States that observe and comment on those ASAT programs have criticized them with rhetoric that sounds in policy, not in law. To date, there has  [\*1242]  been little affirmative argumentation that an opinio juris already exists to outlaw ASATs under general CIL. [n179](http://www.lexisnexis.com:80/us/lnacademic/frame.do?reloadEntirePage=true&rand=1278706563414&returnToKey=20_T9715755939&parent=docview&target=results_DocumentContent&tokenKey=rsh-20.944061.7857489622" \l "n179)

CIL Bad - Undemocratic

**Customary international law can’t solve because it has democratic deficits built into its definition.**

McGinnis 6 (John, professor of law at Northwestern University's School of Law, Harvard Journal of Law and Public Policy, Fall 2006, <http://www.law.harvard.edu/students/orgs/jlpp/Vol30_No1_McGinnisonline.pdf>) NK

A glaring problem with customary international law, the most important category of raw international law, is that it has a democratic deficit built into its very definition. To be customary international law, a principle must result “from a general and consistent practice of states followed by them from a sense of legal obligation.”7 This definition mentions only the “general and consistent practice of” nation‐states without any reference to representative processes or to the welfare of citizens. Thus, by its very definition, customary international law neglects democratic decision making. In addition to this theoretical problem, customary international law has at least five different democratic deficits that arise in practice.

CIL is undemocratic, nonbinding, and meaningless

**Kelly 00** (J. Patrick, Winter, Law Professor Widener University, Virgina Journal of International Law)

I argue that CIL should be eliminated as a source of international legal norms and replaced by consensual processes. My goal is not to undermine international law, but to encourage the use of more democratic, deliberative processes in formulating this law. My argument has three components. First, the substantive CIL norms of the literature lack the authority of customary law and therefore are not binding on states. CIL lacks authority as law, because such norms are not, in fact, based on the implied consent or general acceptance of the international community that a norm is obligatory. Both implied consent and general acceptance are fictions used at different historical periods to justify the universalization of preferred norms. In a world of many cultures and values, general acceptance is neither ascertainable nor verifiable.

Second, CIL has evolved into a meaningless concept that furnishes neither a coherent nor objective means of determining the  [\*453]  norms of international law, how and when they come into existence, and which nations are bound. As an undefined and indeterminant source, it is unable to perform its assigned function as a relatively objective source of international norms based on social fact.

Third, the CIL process lacks procedural legitimacy. The process of norm formation, as actually practiced, violates the basic notion of democratic governance among states and is a particularly ineffective way to generate substantive norms that will command compliance. Few nations participate in the formation of norms said to be customary. The less powerful nations and voices are ignored. There is little consideration of alternatives and trade-offs in reconciling diverse values and interests. Consequently, CIL should be discarded as a source of law and replaced by consent-based processes that permit wide participation, the discussion of alternatives, and the commitment of nations to their norms.

Can’t solve: CIL has the democratic deficit of not having to assent affirmatively.

McGinnis 6 (John, professor of law at Northwestern University's School of Law, Harvard Journal of Law and Public Policy, Fall 2006, <http://www.law.harvard.edu/students/orgs/jlpp/Vol30_No1_McGinnisonline.pdf>) NK

First, nations do not have to assent affirmatively to the creation of a principle of customary international law. Instead, nations are considered to have consented to a principle if they simply failed to object.8 This measure of assent compares unfavorably with the requirements of domestic democracy, which assure both deliberation and accountability. Domestic political actors cannot create norms by inaction but instead must affirmatively embrace a practice to make it law.

CIL Bad - Undemocratic

Can’t solve: CIL has been influenced by totalitarian countries.

McGinnis 6 (John, professor of law at Northwestern University's School of Law, Harvard Journal of Law and Public Policy, Fall 2006, <http://www.law.harvard.edu/students/orgs/jlpp/Vol30_No1_McGinnisonline.pdf>) NK

Second, undemocratic, even totalitarian, nations wield influence on international law. This influence is most obvious in multilateral human rights treaties, like the U.N. Convention on the Rights of the Child,9 which are often asserted as a basis for customary international law even if not ratified by the United States.10 Totalitarian nations like the Soviet Union and communist China participated in the negotiations of these treaties. One can hardly be confident that the same provisions would have emerged absent the influence of those “evil empire[s].”11 Consider this analogy: Should the United States give domestic effect to provisions of treaties that it did not ratify, but that instead were approved by Nazi Germany and other Axis powers?

Can’t solve: CIL law doesn’t have the solvency that domestic law has.

McGinnis 6 (John, professor of law at Northwestern University's School of Law, Harvard Journal of Law and Public Policy, Fall 2006, <http://www.law.harvard.edu/students/orgs/jlpp/Vol30_No1_McGinnisonline.pdf>) NK

Thus, international law has many democratic deficits. Domestic democracy is far from perfect, but elections, deliberation, and the scrutiny of public officials provide substantial assurance that norms beneficial for Americans will develop over time. Defenders of international law sometimes note that the American legal system makes use of undemocratic norms, like custom and the common law. But international law simply does not possess the virtues of domestic custom or the common law. For example, the notion behind efficient custom is that individuals interacting reciprocally and repeatedly will adopt norms that maximize their joint surpluses.15 Because nations rather than people create customary international law, it is not well designed to maximize the welfare of people.16

A2 Executive Order CP

Courts will rollback

Rollback - The Courts

**Cooper 2** [Phillip, Professor of Public Administration @ Portland State University, *By Order of the President: The Use and Abuse of Executive Direct Action”* pg..77]

Despite the apparent deference by the judiciary to the president's orders, this chapter has plainly demonstrated any number of instances in which the White House has lost in court. Executive orders, both legal and illegal, can expose officials to liability. It is an old argument, developed long before the battle over the so-called Nuremberg defense, that illegal orders do not insulate a public official from liability for his or her actions. The classic example harks back to Little v. Barreme 13 1 during the Washington administration. Even legal orders can expose the government to liability. Though the federal courts have often upheld dramatic actions taken by the president during difficult periods, they have not been hesitant to support claims against the government later. The many cases that were brought involving the U.S. Shipping Board Emergency Fleet Corporation after World War I provide examples of just how long such postorder legal cleanup can take and how much it can Cost. 112 Later, in a 1951 case, the Supreme Court subjected government to claims by business for the damages done to their interests during the government's operation of the coal mines during World War II after FDR seized the mines in 1943.133 Thus, the legal issues that may arise are concerned with both the validity of orders and with addressing the consequences of admittedly legitimate decrees.

Future Presidents Rollback

Future Presidents-Rollback

**Cooper 97** [Phillip, Professor of Poli Sci @ University of Vermont, Administration and Society, Lexis]

Even if they serve temporary goals, executive orders can produce a significant amount of complexity and conflict and not yield a long-term benefit because the next president may dispose of predecessors’ orders at a whim. It may be easier than moving a statute through Congress and faster than waiting for agencies to use their rule-making processes to accomplish policy ends, but executive orders may ultimately be a much weaker foundation on which to build a policy than the alternatives.

Presidential Powers –Non Unique

Obama has large amounts of presidential control

Baker 10, (Obama Making Plans to Use Executive Power By PETER BAKER Published: February 12, 2010, [http:/ /www.nytimes.com/2010/02/13/us/politics/13obama.html?\_r=1](http://www.nytimes.com/2010/02/13/us/politics/13obama.html?_r=1))

Any president has vast authority to influence policy even without legislation, through executive orders, agency rule-making and administrative fiat. And Mr. Obama’s success this week in pressuring the Senate to confirm 27 nominations by threatening to use his recess appointment power demonstrated that executive authority can also be leveraged to force action by Congress.

Presidential control increasing

Baker 10, (Obama Making Plans to Use Executive Power By PETER BAKER Published: February 12, 2010, [http:/ /www.nytimes.com/2010/02/13/us/politics/13obama.html?\_r=1](http://www.nytimes.com/2010/02/13/us/politics/13obama.html?_r=1))

Mr. Obama has already decided to create a bipartisan budget commission under his own authority after Congress refused to do so. His administration has signaled that it plans to use its discretion to soften enforcement of the ban on openly gay men and lesbians serving in the military, even as Congress considers repealing the law. And the [Environmental Protection Agency](http://www.epa.gov/) is moving forward with possible regulations on heat-trapping gases blamed for [climate change](http://topics.nytimes.com/top/news/science/topics/globalwarming/index.html?inline=nyt-classifier), while a bill to cap such emissions languishes in the Senate.

Presidential power increasing now

Fox 10, (News, Obama Poised to Use Executive Power to Muscle Through Domestic Agenda

Published February 13, 2010 | FOXNews.com, <http://www.foxnews.com/politics/2010/02/13/obama-poised-use-executive-power-muscle-domestic-agenda/>) WDK

Faced with a resurgent GOP and a largely stalled legislative agenda, President Obama is planning to use his executive powers to forge ahead with his domestic initiatives, including on energy, the environment and the economy, The New York Times reported. "We are reviewing a list of presidential executive orders and directives to get the job done across a front of issues," White House Chief of Staff Rahm Emanuel told the newspaper. But aides told the newspaper that Obama is still hopeful that progress can be made on Capitol Hill, citing the bipartisan summit on health care scheduled later this month. Yet the GOP's stunning capture last month of the Senate seat previously held by Ted Kennedy has prompted the White House to prepare to go solo to break any partisan gridlock heading into the midterm elections. The president has a range of powers -- from executive orders to agency initiatives -- that don't require legislative action, and White House officials argue that the increased focus on executive powers is not uncommon in the second year of any presidency.

Presidential Powers kill SOP (DA) 1/2

Presidential Power destroys the separation of powers

Branum 2 (Tara, Editor in Chief Texas Review of Law and Politics, Texas Review of Law and Politics, “President or King? The Use and Abuse of Executive Orders in Modern-Day America”, http://heinonline.org/HOL/Page?men\_tab=srchresults&handle=hein.journals/jleg28&id=8&size=2&collection=journals&terms=increased&termtype=phrase&set\_as\_cursor=#7) CBC

**The perception of Americans that the President is not only willing, but also able to solve their problems is reinforced by the media and by the political process**…(CONTINUES)… **Congressmen and private citizens besiege the President with demands that action be taken on various issues. To make matters worse, once a president has signed an executive order, he often makes it impossible for a subsequent administration to undo his action without enduring the political fallout of such a reversal. For instance, President Clinton issued a slew of executive orders on environmental issues in the weeks before he left office. Many were controversial and the need for the policies he instituted was debatable.** Nevertheless, **President Bush found himself unable to reverse the orders without invoking the ire of environmentalists across the country. A policy became law by the action of one man without the healthy debate and discussion in Congress intended by the Framers. Subsequent presidents undo this policy and send the matter to Congress for such debate only at their own peril. This is not the way it is supposed to be.** Restoration of our system of separation of powers will require that the public be educated on what does—and does not—constitute a constitutional use of executive orders and other presidential directives.

Presidential Powers kill SOP (DA) 2/2

SOP is critical to liberty

Redish 95

Martin **Redish** - Professor of Law and Public Policy at Northwestern University School of Law, 19**95**: [Martin Redish, published 1995, Oxford University Press, “The Constitution as Political Structure.” pg. 111. <http://books.google.com/books?id=cb_BlipRCVQC&printsec=frontcover&source=gbs_navlinks_s> ]

The most significant problem with the modern attacks on separation of powers is that they completely ignore the very real fears that led to adoption of the system in the first place. No critic has adequately demonstrated either that the fears of undue concentrations of political power that caused the Framers to impose separation of powers are unjustified, or that separation of powers is not an important means of deterring those concentrations. It might be argued that the dangers of tyranny thought to be prevented by the use of separation of powers are at best speculative. After all, no one can predict with certainty that, but for the formal separation of branch power, the nation would be likely to sink into a state of tyranny. It is, then, conceivable that all of the Framers’ efforts to separate and check powers have been wasted. But that is a risk inherent in the use of any form of prophylactic protection: we cannot be sure that, but for the use of protection, the harm we fear would result. The decision regarding whether to employ a particular prophylactic device, then, must come down to a comparison of the costs incurred as a result of the device’s use with an estimate of both the likelihood and severity of the feared harm. Although some undoubtedly believe that separation of powers imposes severe costs on the achievement of substantive governmental goals, it would be inaccurate to suggest that government ahs been paralyzed as a result of separation of powers. Too much legislation is enacted by Congress to accept such a criticism. More importantly, in critiquing the failure of the federal government to act, one must do so behind a Rawlsian “veil of ignorance”: Assuming that abolition of separation of powers would result in an increase in governmental action, we cannot know whether those actions will be ones with which we agree. Moreover, the facilitation of governmental programs could just as easily lead to a withdrawal of existing governmental programs that we deem to be wise and just. For example, but for separation of powers, election of Ronald Regan could have easily led to the abolition of social welfare programs that had been instituted in previous Democratic administrations. Political liberals who criticize separation of powers for the constraints it imposes on governmental actions should therefore recognize how removal of separation of powers could turn into a double-edged sword. Thus, the costs imposed by maintenance of separation of powers are probably nowhere near as great as critics have suggested. Whether the costs that we actually do incur are justified by the system’s benefits requires us to examine the likelihood and severity of harm that could result if separation of powers were removed. AS previously noted, some might question the likelihood of tyrannical abuse of power if separation of powers were abolished. After all, Britain lacks our system of formalistic separation of powers, and democracy still flourishes. Why, the, could we not do the same here? The same could, however, be said of the First Amendment rights of free speech and press: In Britain, speech and press receive no countermajoritarian constitutional protection, yet it is reasonable to believe that for the most part those institutions flourish there. Yet undoubtedly, few would feel comfortable with the repeal of the First Amendment. If we have begun to take the value of separation of powers for granted, we need only look to modern American history to remind ourselves about both the general vulnerability of representative government and the direct correlation between the concentration of political power and the threat to individual liberty. The widespread violation of individual rights that took place when President Lincoln assumed an inordinate level of power, for example are well document. Arguably as egregious were the threats to basic freedoms that arose during the Nixon administration, when the power of the executive branch reached what are widely deemed to have been intolerable levels. Though in neither instance did the executive’s usurpations of power ultimately degenerate into complete and irreversible tyranny, the reason for that may well have been the resilience of our political traditions, among the most important of which is separation of powers itself. In any event, it would be political folly to be overly smug about the security of either representative government or individual liberty. Although it would be all but impossible to create an empirical proof to demonstrate that our constitutional tradition of separation of powers has been an essential catalyst in the avoidance of tyranny, common sense should tell us that the simultaneous division of power and the creation of inter-branch checking play important roles toward that end. To underscore the point, one need only a limited modification of the actual scenario surrounding the recent Gulf War. In actuality, the war was an extremely popular endeavor, thought by many to be a politically and morally justified exercise. But imagine a situation in which a president, concerned about his failure to resolve significant social and economic problems at home, has callously decided to engage the nation in war, simply to defer public attention from his domestic failures. To be sure, the president was presumably elected by a majority of the electorate, and may have to stand for reelection in the future. However, at this particular point in time, but for the system established by separation of powers, his authority as commander in chief to engage the nation in war would be effectively dictatorial. Because the Constitution reserves to the arguably even more representative and accountable Congress the authority to declare war, the Constitution has attempted to prevent such misuse of power by the executive. It remains unproven whether any governmental structure other than one based on a system of separation of powers could avoid such harmful results.

IBC turn 1/2

XO’s cause inter-branch conflict

**Rosen 98** [Colonel Richard**,** Judge Advocate General's Corps, United States Army, “Funding "Non-Traditional" Military Operations: The Alluring Myth Of A Presidential Power Of The Purse” Military Law Review 155 Mil. L. Rev. 1, Lexis]

Finally, if a situation is sufficiently grave and an operation is essential to national security, the President has the raw, physical power--but not the legal authority--to spend public funds without congressional approval, after which he or she can either seek congressional approbation or attempt to weather the resulting political storm. To the President's immediate advantage is the fact that the only sure means of directly stopping such unconstitutional conduct is impeachment. 703 Congress could, however, [\*149] certainly make a President's life miserable through other means, such as denying requested legislation or appropriations, delaying confirmation of presidential appointments, and conducting public investigations into the President's actions.

IBC destroys leadership

**Winik ‘91 [**Jay, Senior Research Fellow, Nat’l Defense U, Washington Quarterly, Autumn, Lexis]

Thus, it is demonstrably clear that, in the absence of bipartisanship, dealing with the new international system will be difficult at best and at times next to impossible. Friends and foes alike, watching U.S. indecision at home, will not see the United States as a credible negotiating partner, ally, or deterrent against wanton aggression. This is a recipe for increased chaos, anarchy, and strife on the world scene. The appeal, then, to recreate anew as the hallmark of U.S. efforts abroad the predictability and resolve that can only come from bipartisanship at home is as critical as during the perilous days following World War II. Bipartisanship in Context The ease of constructing bipartisanship, however, should not be overstated. Its halcyon years are often idealized. People forget that the golden years from Pearl Harbor to the Tet offensive were the exception rather than the rule. Consensus was not a prevailing characteristic in the first 170 years of the Republic. Critics have noted with justification that it was the clear lack of purpose regarding vigorous U.S. involvement in world affairs that led to the U.S. rejection of membership in the League of Nations. In no small measure, this rejection led to the 20-year crisis that resulted in the rise of Hitler. Proponents of bipartisanship point out its crowning achievements. Unprecedented unity between the two political parties made it possible for President Harry S. Truman and a Republican senator, Arthur H. Vandenberg (R-Mich.), to join forces and create such monumental achievements as the Marshall Plan, the Truman Doctrine, the North Atlantic Alliance, and the United Nations Charter. Despite strains between the two parties over the Korean War and China, to name but two issues, that unity held firm and enabled United States to act with continuity and consistency. Allies saw that the United States was strong and reliable, and the unmistakable message to adversaries was that the United States would abide by its commitments. Some argue that it was the foreign policy consensus prevalent during the Cold War that made possible the tragic U.S. involvement in the Vietnam War. But this argument in no way invalidates the benefits of bipartisanship and, in the case of Vietnam, represents an oversimplification of the facts. The failure of U.S. involvement in Southeast Asia had as much to do with the unique circumstances of the war itself, which were exacerbated by the then current theories of limited war fighting. These factors, in conjunction with the profound domestic turmoil on both domestic and foreign policy that was tearing at the U.S. political fabric, made a complicated and protracted war abroad virtually impossible to prosecute. More generally, the fact remains that the perception of strength resting on bipartisan unity has been crucial to the United States in times of crisis. This principle was most vividly displayed by the bipartisan support for President John F. Kennedy during the Cuban missile crisis. Had the Soviets felt the United States was divided, the situation might have ended in tragic defeat or quite possibly in a devastating war. Although history will be the final judge, it could be argued that in the recent Gulf crisis it was precisely the vast chasm that separated the Republicans from the Democrats over whether to use force or to employ sanctions in order to reverse Saddam Hussein's aggression that led him to calculate that the United States would never actually employ significant military power. This encouraged him to ignore the resolutions passed by the United Nations (UN) and wait for the United States to seek a watered-down diplomatic compromise. Certainly Hussein's statements that the American people would have to "face rows of coffins' if there were a war, echoing statements emanating from lengthy Senate hearings and floor debate, were designed to play into the antiwar sentiment that wanted to "give sanctions a chance." Tragically, the perception of division and weakness at home made the necessity for a military solution almost inevitable. Executive-Legislative Relations: The Search for Balance The foundation of sustainable bipartisanship is effective executive-legislative relations. After the Vietnam War, however, the cold war foreign policy consensus, supported by harmonious executive-legislative relations and by both parties in Congress in a manner that minimized conflict over foreign affairs, was rudely shattered. Although it was not completely undone, as is often claimed by the pundits, and central elements of the postwar consensus enjoyed a fair deree of support, it was severely frayed. As a result, a slide began down a slippery slope leading to the balkanization of the U.S. approach to national security, and today this threatens to inject chaos into the foreign policy process. Congress lies at the heart of the issue.

IBC turn 2/2

Global nuclear war

**Khalilzad ‘95** (Zalmay, RAND Corporation, Losing The Moment? Washington Quarterly, Vol 18, No 2, p. 84)

Global Leadership Under the third option, the United States would seek to retain global leadership and to preclude the rise of a global rival or a return to multipolarity for the indefinite future. On balance, this is the best long-term guiding principle and vision. Such a vision is desirable not as an end in itself, but because a world in which the United States exercises leadership would have tremendous advantages. First, the global environment would be more open and more receptive to American values -- democracy, free markets, and the rule of law. Second, such a world would have a better chance of dealing cooperatively with the world's major problems, such as nuclear proliferation, threats of regional hegemony by renegade states, and low-level conflicts. Finally, U.S. leadership would help preclude the rise of another hostile global rival, enabling the United States and the world to avoid another global cold or hot war and all the attendant dangers, including a **global nuclear exchange**. U.S. leadership would therefore be more conducive to global stability than a bipolar or a multipolar balance of power system.

Politics links to the CP

Politics links to the CP—Congress backlashes against XO’s

Mayer 01 (Kenneth, Proff. Of Polt. Science Univ. of Wisconsin, Princeton Univ., “With the Stroke of a Pen: Executive Orders and Presidential Power”, p. 121, http://www.questiaschool.com/read/103282967?title=With%20the%20Stroke%20of%20a%20Pen%3a%20Executive%20Orders%20and%20Presidential%20Power) CBC

In 1954 Richard Neustadt described the expansion of central clearance this way: “**For more than thirty years now, central clearance has persisted, its history marked by a long series of ‘accidental,’ unforeseen accretions. Nothing once absorbed has been wholly displaced; each new element somehow encompasses the old … overall, here is a record of great growth, successful adaptation—this under six successive Presidents, through every variation in national and governmental circumstance** since Harding's term of office.” [57](http://www.questiaschool.com/read/103283224) **The presidential budget and growth of BoB power illustrates the pattern: societal and political pressures serve as the impetus for a new government capability; Congress and the president compete over the question of control; the president prevails and uses the new capability in unanticipated ways to develop even more power, and Congress can do little to stop him. Over time, the new powers—once so controversial—become institutionalized as a routine and accepted part of the presidency. The** **pattern has played out in a number of situations, across presidents and eras, and has less to do with specific presidential initiative than the motivations and incentives, relative positions, and inherent institutional qualities of Congress and the presidency.**

Take years

Executive Orders can take years to happen

Mayer 01 (Kenneth, Proff. Of Polt. Science Univ. of Wisconsin, Princeton Univ., “With the Stroke of a Pen: Executive Orders and Presidential Power”, p. 61, http://www.questiaschool.com/read/103282967?title=With%20the%20Stroke%20of%20a%20Pen%3a%20Executive%20Orders%20and%20Presidential%20Power) CBC

In contemporary practice, **executive orders typically either originate from the advisory structures within the Executive Office of the President or percolate up from executive agencies desirous of presidential action. For** particularly **complex or far-reaching orders, the White House will solicit comment and suggestions from affected agencies on wording and substantive content. Simple executive orders navigate this process in a few weeks; complex orders can take years, and can even be derailed over an inability to obtain the necessary consensus or clearances.**

Congress Checks

Limits to XO are inevitable Congress checks the President from becoming to powerful

Mayer 01 (Kenneth, Proff. Of Polt. Science Univ. of Wisconsin, Princeton Univ., “With the Stroke of a Pen: Executive Orders and Presidential Power”, p. 222-223, http://www.questiaschool.com/read/103282967?title=With%20the%20Stroke%20of%20a%20Pen%3a%20Executive%20Orders%20and%20Presidential%20Power) CBC

**The ultimate check on executive energy is**—and should be—**political. Congress can step in to reclaim the ground it has lost to the executive, and its failure to do so is much more a function of political will than of any flaws in constitutional arrangements.** If, say, the 105th Congress had successfully overturned the affirmative action requirements in Executive Order 11246, the ban on assassinations included in the intelligence orders, or the secrecy regulations in Executive Order 12356, its success would not be viewed as a destruction of constitutional foundations (although, to be sure, there would be vigorous debate about the merits). More important**, a president would be hard pressed to defy such a legislative statement, although we might expect chief executives to exploit any residual discretion that Congress left them. When presidents have ignored statutory limits on their power, as exemplified by the ineffective 1973 War Powers Resolution, they are often able to do so because Congress has either left them with more than enough residual decision space** (or, to use a less technical term, “wriggle room”) **to permit broad discretion or has passed legislation with poorly worded or ineffective restrictions. The history of executive-legislative relations strongly suggests that overreaching by one branch often leads to a clear response from the other.** Fisher notes: “**At some point, after passing beyond a threshold of common sense and prudence, aggressive actions become counterproductive. They trigger revolts, leading to the recapture of ground taken not only in the most recent assault but in earlier offenses as well.”** [**11**](http://www.questiaschool.com/read/103283248) **The boundaries of executive power might be ambiguous, but they are not invisible. The importance of the legal construction of the executive has not been matched by a commensurate level of attention, at least among political scientists, to the empirical, historical, or normative aspects of the question of just how much executive power is enough**.

XO hurt democracy

Executive Orders bad-hurt democracy and undermine the constitution

Mayer 01 (Kenneth, Proff. Of Polt. Science Univ. of Wisconsin, Princeton Univ., “With the Stroke of a Pen: Executive Orders and Presidential Power”, p. 9, http://www.questiaschool.com/read/103282967?title=With%20the%20Stroke%20of%20a%20Pen%3a%20Executive%20Orders%20and%20Presidential%20Power) CBC

Although **the rate at which Clinton issued executive orders dropped after the Republicans won congressional majorities in 1994**, **critics** still **accused him of using the prerogative power to turn the presidency into a dictatorship**. One review of Clinton's use of executive orders concluded that **the president had relied on his decree authority to “act dictatorially without benefit of constitutional color.”** [39](http://www.questiaschool.com/read/103283201) In his 1997 State of the Union Address Clinton announced his “American Heritage Rivers” initiative, in which federal agency officials would help communities find and apply for environmental grants (the program's details were fleshed out in a series of proposed rules, culminating in Executive Order 13061, issued in September 1997). [40](http://www.questiaschool.com/read/103283201) The program did not commit any funds, create new environmental regulations, change any laws, or impose any requirements at all on local governments or the private sector. [41](http://www.questiaschool.com/read/103283201) Still, conservative property-rights groups claimed it was “a massive conspiracy to extend federal, and perhaps foreign, control over the nation's 3.5 million miles of rivers and streams, over watersheds, even over private riverfront property.” [42](http://www.questiaschool.com/read/103283201) Representative Helen Chenoweth (R-Idaho) denounced the initiative as a “flight from democracy,” and attempted (unsuccessfully, so far) to stop the program both legislatively and through the courts. [43](http://www.questiaschool.com/read/103283201) During 1995 Senate hearings held in the aftermath of the Oklahoma City bombing, John Trochman, head of the Militia of Montana, complained that **“the high office of the Presidency has been turned into a position of dictatorial oppression through the abusive use of Executive orders and directives, thus leaving Congress stripped of its authority.** **When the President overrules Congress by Executive order, representative democracy fails.” Despite the apparent importance of executive orders**, **the political science literature has paid scant attention to them.** This position is especially clear within the subfield of presidency studies, which has been dominated by a research paradigm that emphasizes the president's leadership skills and strategic acumen, not the legal basis of presidential power, as the keys to political success.

Presidential powers bad-they hurt democracy and undermine the political system

Branum 2 (Tara, Editor in Chief Texas Review of Law and Politics, Texas Review of Law and Politics, “President or King? The Use and Abuse of Executive Orders in Modern-Day America”, http://heinonline.org/HOL/Page?men\_tab=srchresults&handle=hein.journals/jleg28&id=8&size=2&collection=journals&terms=increased&termtype=phrase&set\_as\_cursor=#7) CBC

**The current use of executive orders and other presidential directives is a fundamental problem in modern-day America. The Constitution does not give one individual an "executive pen" enabling that individual to single handedly mite his preferred policy. Despite this lack of constitutional authority, presidential directive have been increasingly used—both by Republicans and Democrats—to promulgate laws and to support** public **policy initiatives** in a manner **that circumvents the proper lawmaking, body, the United States Congress**. **It would be foolhardy to ignore the danger inherent in situation, simply because one might like the individual currently holding the presidential pen."** It could be hypocritical, as well as dangerous, to seek change when a president from the opposing political party is in power, but to ignore the problem once a president from one’s own party has been elected. **While the current president may back acceptable policies or refrain from using his executive power in a tyrannical fashion, there is no guarantee that all future presidents will continue to do so** as well. Controversy over the nature of executive power and the limitations that should be placed upon it is not new. Since the founding of out country, Presidents, congressman, scholars, and individual citizens have sought to properly define the boundaries of the executive's power. Two Presidents, who served in the early 1900s are often said to exemplify the two opposing views on the proper use of executive power.' President Theodore Roosevelt, a proponent of a powerful executive. once stated:

Congress will Rollback

Congress hates executive orders-they are viewed as totalitarianism

Mayer 01 (Kenneth, Proff. Of Polt. Science Univ. of Wisconsin, Princeton Univ., “With the Stroke of a Pen: Executive Orders and Presidential Power”, p. 8, http://www.questiaschool.com/read/103282967?title=With%20the%20Stroke%20of%20a%20Pen%3a%20Executive%20Orders%20and%20Presidential%20Power) CBC

**Executive discretion cuts both ways**, of course**, and opponents of a particular case of presidential initiative will view these pen strokes quite differently**. **After** President **Clinton issued an executive order that barred government contractors from hiring permanent replacement workers,** [**34**](http://www.questiaschool.com/read/103283200) **congressional Republicans were in no mood to congratulate him** on either his energy or his dispatch. **On the House floor the next day, Representative** Bill **Barrett** (R-Neb.) **condemned the president for overturning fifty years of labor law “with the stroke of a pen.” Observers who are even less sympathetic cast executive orders in an altogether sinister light, seeing in them evidence of a broad conspiracy to create a presidential dictatorship. The common theme of these complaints is that the executive order is an example of unaccountable power and a way of evading both public opinion and constitutional constraints.** In the more extreme manifestations**, executive orders are portrayed as an instrument of secret government and totalitarianism. The president says “Do this! Do that!” and not only is it done, but the government, the economy, and individual freedom are crushed under the yoke of executive decree.**

Prez powers bad-if unchecked leads to war

Eland 7 (Ivan, Sen. Fellow and Dir. of the Center on Peace & Liberty at The Independent Institute, Consortium News, “Bush Out of Line In Scolding Pelosi”, http://www.consortiumnews.com/2007/040307a.htmlQ1) CBC

**This expansive view of wartime presidential power couldn’t be further from the framers’ intent.** In fact, **the founders undoubtedly would have noted that the warlike European monarchs of the day were the sole purveyors of their nations’ foreign policy—the very problem the framers attempted to address with the constitutional separation of powers**. Curiously, although **the expansion of executive power in foreign policy has not served the nation well,** it often has the counterintuitive effect of serving the interests of Congress. **If the President is always in charge** of U.S. foreign policy**, members of Congress can duck responsibility for tough issues that might pose risks to their paramount goal—getting re–elected. For example, by allowing presidents to fight even major conflicts without constitutionally required declarations of war—a phenomenon that began when Harry Truman neglected, with a congressional wink and nod, to get approval for the Korean War—the Congress conveniently throws responsibility for the war into the President’s lap**. **The founders would be horrified at the erosion of a major pillar of their system of checks and balances. To fulfill their constitutional responsibility as a check on the President, members of Congress do have a responsibility to be heavily involved in U.S. foreign policy**. Instead of publicly condemning Speaker Pelosi for carrying out the bipartisan Iraq Study Group’s heretofore–languishing recommendation of actually talking to Syria to resolve bilateral issues, the President should be happy that someone in the U.S. government is willing to take risks with one of America’s major adversaries in the region.

A2 Iraq Conditions CP

Says No

Ahmadinejad puts it best – Iran will not make one iota of concessions on its nukes

Dareini 6/17 (Ali, The Chronicle Herald, The Associated Press, http://thechronicleherald.ca/World/1187652.html)JFS

TEHRAN, Iran — Defying week-old UN sanctions over its nuclear program, Iran promised to expand its atomic research Wednesday as its president vowed to punish the West and force it to "sit at the negotiating table like a polite child" before agreeing to further talks.

Tehran, which insists its nuclear work is peaceful, said it will build four new reactors for atomic medical research. The United States and some of its allies believe Iran is trying to develop nuclear weapons, and the Islamic Republic’s plans to expand research could encourage calls in the West for more economic pressure against the country.

President Mahmoud Ahmadinejad said Iran will not make "one iota of concessions." He said he will soon announce new conditions for talks with the West, but first he wants to punish world powers for imposing sanctions.

Appeasement

**Concessions to Iran accomplish nothing – only force will end the nuclear program**

Helprin 9 (Mark, The Wall Street Journal, http://online.wsj.com/article/SB10001424052970204488304574426880110463194.html)JFS

Added to what would be the instability and potentially grave injury following upon the appearance of Iranian nuclear ICBMs are two insults that may be more consequential than the issue from which they arise. Nothing short of force will turn Iran from the acquisition of nuclear weapons, its paramount aim during 25 years of secrecy and stalling. Last fall, President Mahmoud Ahmadinejad set three conditions for the U.S.: withdrawal from Iraq, a show of respect for Iran (read "apology"), and taking the nuclear question off the table.

We are now faithfully complying, and last week, after Iran foreclosed discussion of its nuclear program and Mojtaba Samareh Hashemi, Mr. Ahmadinejad's chief political adviser, predicted "the defeat and collapse" of Western democracy, the U.S. agreed to enter talks the premise of which, incredibly, is to eliminate American nuclear weapons. Even the zombified press awoke for long enough to harry State Department spokesman P.J. Crowley, who replied that, as Iran was willing to talk, "We are going to test that proposition, OK?"

Not OK. When Neville Chamberlain returned from Munich at least he thought he had obtained something in return for his appeasement. The new American diplomacy is nothing more than a sentimental flood of unilateral concessions—not least, after some minor Putinesque sabre rattling, to Russia. Canceling the missile deployment within NATO, which Dmitry Rogozin, the Russian ambassador to that body, characterizes as "the Americans . . . simply correcting their own mistake, and we are not duty bound to pay someone for putting their own mistakes right," is to grant Russia a veto over sovereign defensive measures—exactly the opposite of American resolve during the Euro Missile Crisis of 1983, the last and definitive battle of the Cold War.

AIPAC DA

**AIPAC opposes concessions to Iran**

Remba 7 (Gidon, Executive Director of Ameinu: Liberal Values, Progressive Israel, http://www.ameinu.net/perspectives/current\_issues.php?articleid=159)JFS

But surely this highly partisan message was Cheney’s own exploitation of the AIPAC stage to peddle the Bush Administration’s line? Think again. AIPAC Executive Director Howard Kohr followed Cheney and demanded that on Iraq and Iran we American Jewish supporters of Israel should show “no divisions, no weakness.” Disagreeing with our war President makes us appear impotent to our enemies. The pro-Israel lobby which often touts its bipartisanship is in reality quite happy to throw its weight against the policy of the Democratic Party on both Iraq and Iran and to shamelessly align itself with the neocon super-hawks in the Bush Administration.   
Not a word was heard from AIPAC—whether from its leaders or in its 2007 policy statement—about attempting to engage Iran and Syria while imposing sanctions, the carrot-and-stick approach favored by most Democrats and moderate Republicans. Though AIPAC’s official focus was on the Iran Counter-Proliferation Act of 2007, new legislation imposing further economic sanctions on Iran, much was heard from AIPAC’s featured plenary speakers about the need for a preemptive military strike, especially former CIA director Admiral James Woolsey and Washington Institute for Near East Policy Director Robert Satloff. Other speakers, like Israel’s UN Ambassador Dan Gillerman, implied as much by saying that Iran cannot be permitted to develop nuclear weapons. AIPAC’s leaders and official spokespersons shied away from overt threats, preferring to obliquely warn Iran of the possibility of a US attack by insisting that no options be taken off the table, and by supporting “all means necessary for the United States, Israel and their allies to prevent Iran and other nations” from developing weapons of mass destruction and the means to deliver them. It was left mainly to Israeli Prime Minister Ehud Olmert to remind the audience that diplomacy with Iran must be vigorously pursued.

**Perceived losses by the Israel lobby lead them to take control of congress**

Mearsheimer and Walt 6 (John, Prof of PolySci @ U of Chi, Stephen, Prof of IR @ Harvard, http://www.lrb.co.uk/v28/n06/john-mearsheimer/the-israel-lobby)JFS

In April 2002 trouble erupted again, after the IDF launched Operation Defensive Shield and resumed control of virtually all the major Palestinian areas on the West Bank. Bush knew that Israel’s actions would damage America’s image in the Islamic world and undermine the war on terrorism, so he demanded that Sharon ‘halt the incursions and begin withdrawal’. He underscored this message two days later, saying he wanted Israel to ‘withdraw without delay’. On 7 April, Condoleezza Rice, then Bush’s national security adviser, told reporters: ‘“Without delay” means without delay. It means now.’ That same day Colin Powell set out for the Middle East to persuade all sides to stop fighting and start negotiating.

Israel and the Lobby swung into action. Pro-Israel officials in the vice-president’s office and the Pentagon, as well as neo-conservative pundits like Robert Kagan and William Kristol, put the heat on Powell. They even accused him of having ‘virtually obliterated the distinction between terrorists and those fighting terrorists’. Bush himself was being pressed by Jewish leaders and Christian evangelicals. Tom DeLay and Dick Armey were especially outspoken about the need to support Israel, and DeLay and the Senate minority leader, Trent Lott, visited the White House and warned Bush to back off.

The first sign that Bush was caving in came on 11 April – a week after he told Sharon to withdraw his forces – when the White House press secretary said that the president believed Sharon was ‘a man of peace’. Bush repeated this statement publicly on Powell’s return from his abortive mission, and told reporters that Sharon had responded satisfactorily to his call for a full and immediate withdrawal. Sharon had done no such thing, but Bush was no longer willing to make an issue of it.

Meanwhile, Congress was also moving to back Sharon. On 2 May, it overrode the administration’s objections and passed two resolutions reaffirming support for Israel. (The Senate vote was 94 to 2; the House of Representatives version passed 352 to 21.) Both resolutions held that the United States ‘stands in solidarity with Israel’ and that the two countries were, to quote the House resolution, ‘now engaged in a common struggle against terrorism’. The House version also condemned ‘the ongoing support and co-ordination of terror by Yasser Arafat’, who was portrayed as a central part of the terrorism problem. Both resolutions were drawn up with the help of the Lobby. A few days later, a bipartisan congressional delegation on a fact-finding mission to Israel stated that Sharon should resist US pressure to negotiate with Arafat. On 9 May, a House appropriations subcommittee met to consider giving Israel an extra $200 million to fight terrorism. Powell opposed the package, but the Lobby backed it and Powell lost.

AIPAC DA

That causes Israeli strikes on Iran – turns the impact to the net benefit

Silverstein 09 (Richard, 3-15, writes Tikun Olam, a blog dedicated to resolution of the Israeli-Arab conflict. He also contributed to the Independent Jewish Voices , “Aipac's hidden persuaders”, <http://www.guardian.co.uk/commentisfree/cifamerica/2009/may/13/aipac-iran-us-obama>)

Israel is in the midst of a massive diplomatic, political and intelligence campaign, both public and covert, that could lead – if those officials behind it have their way – towards a military strike on Iran. It is a war for the hearts and minds of Americans. Or you might call it the war before the war. In intelligence circles, this Israeli project is known as perception management and defined by the department of defence as: Actions to convey and/or deny information … to foreign audiences to influence their emotions, motives and objective reasoning as well as to intelligence systems and leaders … ultimately resulting in foreign behaviours and official actions favourable to [US] objectives. In various ways, perception management combines truth projection, operations security, cover and deception and psychological operations. The Israelis are following the template of the Bush administration's run-up to the Iraq war. First, the US government advocated half-hearted efforts at diplomatic engagement. Then it ratcheted up pressure through sanctions and UN resolutions. That is where the Israeli campaign stands now. Aipac's members carried a unified message to Capitol Hill during their lobbying of US senators and members of Congress. They demanded that Congress pass the most draconian sanctions ever proposed against Iran. They demanded that Iran be offered a limited time in which to respond to an ultimatum insisting it drop its nuclear programme. What then? If you review Aipac's literature and the various commentaries published either by Israeli diplomats or their supporters in the US media, they don't specify what comes next. But any sensible person can guess that the final step will be war: "Israeli leaders have … hinted at pre-emptive military strikes if they decide that diplomacy has failed."

A2 Japan QPQ CP

Arms Race T/

China will start an arms race if it perceives a threat from Japan or the US

Chu 8 (Shulong, Prof of political science and international relations, Brookings, January, <http://www.brookings.edu/~/media/Files/rc/papers/2008/01_east_asia_chu/01_east_asia_chu.pdf>)

However, China may change its national strategy in the future. First, it will accumulate more and more resources to increase its military buildup dramatically. Economically speaking, China today and in coming decades is in the position of the former Soviet Union in the 1970s and 1980s, with the economic and financial resources to engage in a sort of arms race with Japan or the United States. Second, aside from military capacity, China may feel it needs to do much more in the area of military modernization when it changes its assessment of the security environment, and if it sees that Japan or the United States have both the capacity and the will to threaten China’s security and China’s role in Asia and in the world. China may also feel it needs to react to the rise of military power and militarism of Japan, in order to maintain the military balance in Asia, which currently features a degree of some Chinese superiority over Japan. Thirdly, China may need a much stronger military capability to compete with the United States if Chinese nationalism leads China to challenge America’s status and role in Asia or in the world, or if America adopts a strategy of comprehensive containment against a rising China.

Japan-China Alliance Good – 2AC

Japanese and Chinese cooperation would promote prosperity in East Asia

Japan Federation of Economic Organizations 1 (Feb 20, <http://www.keidanren.or.jp/english/policy/2001/006.html>i) LL

In the relationship between Japan and China, from time to time, partly because of historical circumstances, there is a tendency to regard it as a special relationship. Even in business relations, there is a tendency to give China special consideration, on grounds that China is a socialist country and has one-party rule. However, in today's globalized economy, there is increasing pressure for international cooperation in a multilateral setting. China too is actively taking part in world economic affairs on a global basis, as witnessed by its effort to join the World Trade Organization. In a WTO-guided global economy, China has to abide by global standards and increase the transparency of its domestic laws and business practices. This is a challenging job. To enlarge the world economy, Japan and other major developed countries should continue to back up China's efforts and smooth its way into WTO membership. In terms of the regional economy, cooperation between Japan and China, both major economies in Asia, will promote stability and prosperity in the region. In this sense, cooperation between Japan and China in APEC, the ASEAN-plus-three forum and the ASEAN Regional Forum will be good for the stability and prosperity in East Asia. Over the long run, Japan and China could perhaps explore the possibility of setting up an East Asia free trade area and broaden the sphere of economic cooperation in the region. One possibility is to form a cooperative framework among countries adjoining the Sea of Japan, which, one day, could even encompass a unified Korea and Russia's Far Eastern Region. During his visit to Japan in October 2000, Chinese Premier Zhu Rongji, in a meeting with Japanese business leaders, said he wishes Japan would seek to play a larger role in the world and in regional affairs. "China attaches importance to the influence Japan has in the Asian economy and the economic role it plays in the region. We would like to work more closely with the Japanese side under the framework of East Asia cooperation so that it could embark on projects of importance to our region. This is the kind of role we can play to promote economic development in Asia," he said. These remarks, in a departure from the past, suggest that China also hopes Japan would take a leading role to promote regional economic cooperation in East Asia.

Japan-China Alliance Good – 2AC

Japanese-Chinese economic ties key – Japan would gain more from Chinese prosperity than from American prosperity

Xinhau 9 (June 7, <http://news.xinhuanet.com/english/2009-06/08/content_11504768.htm>) LL

TOKYO, June 7 (Xinhua) -- The second China-Japan high-level economic dialogue closed here Sunday, sending a clear message that the two sides will make continued efforts to forge strategic and mutually beneficial relations in trade and economy. The one-day dialogue, co-chaired by Chinese Vice Premier Wang Qishan and Japanese Foreign Minister Hirofumi Nakasone, focused on a wide range of topics including energy conservation, environmental protection, finance, trade and investment and intellectual property as well as regional and international economic issues. Profound changes have taken place in the international economic and financial sectors since the first China-Japan high-level economic dialogue in December 2007. Coping with the ongoing global financial crisis has become the major concern for both countries. Faced with the grave challenges posed by the crisis, the two countries agreed that they should implement the consensus reached at G20 Washington and London summits and adopt more effective measures to ensure stability in financial markets and promote their own economic growth and contribute to the early recovery of the world economy. As each other's major trade partner, the two nations have become increasingly interdependent in economy and trade. Notably, the current dialogue highlighted potential cooperation in energy conservation and environmental protection. As the world's second largest economy, Japan is also a leader in energy conservation and environmental protection technologies, whereas China is the world's largest developing country with huge market demands. The two countries are highly complementary economically. Both sides have agreed to expand cooperation in environmental protection. Meanwhile, they expressed readiness to further remove barriers of various kinds, and enhance cooperation in such areas as technology trade, small and medium-sized businesses, quality control and food safety. During the current economic dialogue, the two sides signed eight important documents, including the MOU for International Property Protection Exchanges and Cooperation, Meeting Minutes on Agriculture Cooperation between China and Japan, and the MOU on Strengthening Science and Technology Cooperation in the Field of Seismology. As Japan and China are the two largest economies in East Asia, the advancement of their cooperation is of great importance in maintaining the region's economic stability, tackling the global financial crisis and boosting cooperation between developing and developed countries. During the talks, both sides also reached consensus on tackling regional and global economic issues, and reiterated their will to take responsible approach and strive to enhance regional and international economic and financial cooperation. Such consensus and endeavors will undoubtedly play a constructive role in the development of both regional and global economies. The success of the second China-Japan high-level economic dialogue once again proved that such a mechanism is playing an important role in advancing bilateral ties. Under this mechanism, the two sides discussed strategies on economic growth and macroeconomic policies, coordinated cross-sector economic cooperation, and enhanced policy exchanges on major regional and international economic issues. The mechanism is expected to elevate bilateral cooperation in economy and trade to a new high and have even greater positive impact on the economic stability and prosperity of Asia and the world at large.

Japan-China Alliance Good – 2AC

**Japanese econ decline collapses the US econ- forced further into debt, security revenue gone**

**Auslin 9** [Michael Resident Scholar at American Enterprise Institute, February 17, Wall Street Journal http://online.wsj.com/article/SB123483257056995903.html]

Recently, many economists and **scholars** in the U.S. **have been looking backward to Japan's banking disaster** of the 1990s, hoping to learn lessons for America's current crisis. Instead, **they should be looking ahead to what might occur if Japan goes into a full-fledged depression.** [The Opinion Journal Widget](http://www.widgetbox.com/widget/opinion-journal?newBlidget=true&__fsk=1491914529) [Download Opinion Journal's widget and link to the most important editorials and op-eds of the day from your blog or Web page.](http://www.widgetbox.com/widget/opinion-journal?newBlidget=true&__fsk=1491914529) **If Japan's economy collapses, supply chains across the globe will be affected and numerous economies will face severe disruptions, most notably China's. China is currently Japan's largest import provider, and the Japanese slowdown is creating tremendous pressure on Chinese factories.** Just last week, the Chinese government announced that 20 million rural migrants had lost their jobs. Closer to home, **Japan may also start running out of surplus cash, which it has used to purchase U.S. securities for years.** For the first time in a generation, Tokyo is running trade deficits -- five months in a row so far. **The political and social fallout from a Japanese depression also would be devastating.** In **the face of economic instability, other Asian nations may feel forced to turn to more centralized -- even authoritarian -- control to try to limit the damage. Free-trade agreements may be rolled back** and political freedom curtailed. Social stability in emerging, **middle-class societies will be severely tested, and newly democratized states may find it impossible to maintain power**. Progress toward a more open, integrated Asia is at risk, with the potential **for increased political tension in the world's most heavily armed region.** This is the backdrop upon which the U.S. government is set to expand the national debt by a trillion dollars or more. **Without massive debt purchases by Japan and China, the U.S. may not be able to finance the cost of the stimulus package, creating a trapdoor under the U.S. economy.**

**US economic collapse causes nuclear war**

**Cook 7** [Richard C., Writer, consultant, and retired federal analyst in U.S. Treasury Dept.; “It’s Official: The Crash of the U.S. Economy has begun,” Global Research, June 14. Accessed: <http://www.globalresearch.ca/index/php?context=va&aid=5964>]

**Times of economic crisis produce international tension and politicians tend to go to war rather than face the economic music . The classic example is the worldwide depression of the 1930s leading to World War II. Conditions in the coming years could be as bad as they were then**. **We could have a really big war if the U.S. decides once and for all to haul off and let China, or whomever, have it in the chops. If they don't want our dollars or our debt any more, how about a few nukes?**

Japan-China Alliance Good – 1AR Asian Stability XT

China-Japan cooperation key to Asian stability

Xinhua 8 (May 7, <http://www.chinaembassy.org.nz/eng/xw/t450457.htm>) LL

TOKYO, May 7 (Xinhua) -- Chinese President Hu Jintao and Japanese Prime Minister Yasuo Fukuda signed here Wednesday a six-point Sino-Japanese joint statement on all-round promotion of their strategic and mutually beneficial relations. Both sides agree that the Sino-Japanese relationship is one of the most important bilateral ties for both countries. China and Japan have great influence and shoulder solemn responsibilities for peace, stability and development in the Asia-Pacific region and the world at large. Long-term peaceful and friendly cooperation is the only choice of the two countries. Both sides are dedicated to promoting a strategic and mutually beneficial relationship in an all-round way to realize the lofty goal of peaceful coexistence, friendship from generation to generation, mutually beneficial cooperation and common development. Both sides reiterate that the China-Japan Joint Statement issued on Sept. 29, 1972, the China-Japan Treaty of Peace and Friendship signed on Aug. 12, 1978, and the China-Japan Joint Declaration released on Nov. 26, 1998 constitute the political basis for the stable development of Sino-Japanese relations and the opening up of a bright future. The two sides reaffirm their continuous adherence to the consensus reached in joint press communiques between Oct. 8, 2006 and April 11, 2007 and their commitment for the comprehensive implementation of the consensus. The two sides agree to face history squarely, look forward to the future and make continuous joint effort to open up new prospect in their strategic mutually beneficial relations. The two sides will continue to build up mutual understanding and trust, expand mutually beneficial cooperation, and make sure that the future development of Sino-Japanese relations conforms with the trend of the world's development, and jointly create a bright future for Asia-Pacific region and the world at large. The two countries reaffirm that they are cooperation partners, with neither side posing threat to the other. Both countries reiterate that they will support each other in its peaceful development and both are convinced that China and Japan, with both countries committed to peace and development, will bring enormous opportunities and benefits to Asia and the world. Japan highly evaluates China's development since its reforms and opening-up and its commitment to contribute to building a world of lasting peace and common prosperity. While China speaks highly of Japan's adherence to the path of a peaceful country in the past six decades and more since World War II and its contribution, through peaceful means, to world peace and stability. Both sides agree to strengthen dialogue and communication on the U.N. reform and seek more consensus. China values Japan's status and role in the United Nations and is willing to see Japan play a bigger and more constructive role in international affairs. Japan reiterates adherence to its stance declared in the Japanese-Sino Joint Statement on the Taiwan issue. Both sides agree to a mechanism for high-level regular visits between leaders of the two nations, strengthen communication and dialogue between the governments, parliaments and political parties of the two countries, enhance exchange of views on bilateral ties, domestic and foreign policies, and the world situation. The two sides will also increase the exchange of high-level visits in the security sector to promote mutual understanding and trust. The two sides pledge to expand the exchanges of media, sister cities, sports and civilian groups between the two countries, and consistently promote exchanges of youngsters in a bid to enhance mutual understanding between the two peoples. Both sides decide to strengthen mutually beneficial cooperation in various fields, including energy, environment, trade, investment, information and communication technology, finance, food and product safety, protection of intellectual property right and business environment. They are also keen on the development of bilateral cooperation in farming, forestry, fishery, transportation, tourism, water resources, medical care and others sectors. Japan and China will make an effective use of the summit economic talks between the two countries proceeding from a strategic perspective. The two nations also pledge to work together and make the East China Sea a sea of peace, cooperation and friendship. The two sides agree that China and Japan, as two important countries in the Asia-Pacific region, will keep close communication over regional affairs and strengthen coordination and cooperation. The two sides decide to jointly safeguard peace and stability in Northeast Asia and facilitate the process of six party-talks. The two sides agree that the normalization of relations between Japan and the Democratic People's Republic of Korea is of great significance for peace and stability in Northeast Asia. China welcomes and supports the two countries efforts to resolve relevant issues and realize normalization of their bilateral ties. The two sides agree to promote regional cooperation in East Asia and contribute to building a peaceful, prosperous, stable and open Asia in line with the principle of opening-up, transparency and tolerance.

Japan-China Alliance Good – 1AR Asian Stability XT

Japan and China cooperation is key to a peaceful Asia

Burns 0 (Katherine, Stimson: independent, nonprofit, public policy institute, 2000, <http://www.stimson.org/southasia/pdf/burnspdf.pdf>) LL

Japan and China are the giants of Asia. The future of their relationship is absolutely critical to the peace and security of Asia. That relationship is complex: for over two millennia, beginning in the third century BC, the pair has maintained cordial relations. For fifty years during that period, from 1894 to 1945, they were at war. At the dawn of the twenty-first century, both struggle with the legacies of war and peace as they seek to define their roles in a rapidly changing world. Economic relations have played a pivotal role in their relationship, solidifying the foundation on which political relations are built, providing a balm in times of trouble, and marking the way to formal diplomatic relations. This essay explores the interaction of economic and political forces in Sino– Japanese relations. It is divided into five sections corresponding to five distinct phases of the relationship. In the first section, I focus on the building blocks forged by China and Japan over two millennia of interaction until the outbreak of war in 1894. I show how initial trading relations between the mainland and the archipelago blossomed into cultural and political exchange in a process which brought massive learning and change to Japan. I argue that these ties sustained Sino–Japanese relations in times of conflict, as they slipped seamlessly into an informal realm which allowed both countries to keep relations on an even keel even in the face of formal political discord. In the second section, I focus on the fifty years of conflict, showing that during this time, Japan's economic ambitions ran roughshod over past patterns of interaction, even as Japan's imperial armies overran the continent in a devastating war which would scar the relationship indefinitely. In the third section, I discuss Sino–Japanese relations during theCold War era, focusing in particular on the period from the end of the war in 1945 to the normalization of relations in 1972. I describe how the US–Japan Security Treaty dominated relations between China and Japan, and argue that both countries attempted to bolster economic ties with an eye to eventual political reconciliation. In the fourth section, I examine the brief period between 1972 and 1978 when Japan seized the diplomatic initiative to normalize relations and sign a peace treaty with China. I explain how both China and Japan reaped the fruits of their earlier endeavors and experienced a surge in economic interaction. In the final section, I focus on the complex period from 1979—when China "opened its door"—to the present. I argue that economic interaction continues to provide the foundation for the political relationship, but also affirm that both countries are struggling to come to terms with a legacy of war and define their roles in an evolving post-Cold War security framework.

Chinese-Japanese cooperation leads to “peace, stability, and prosperity”

Tang and Satho 8 (Shiping and Haruko, sr fellow at S. Rajaratnam of International

Studies, Nanyang Technological University, Singapore and Adjunct Senior Fellow, Center for Regional Security Studies, Chinese Academy of Social Sciences, China and Ph.D. candidate at the Centre of International Studies, University of Cambridge, and formerly research fellow at the Japan Institute of International Affairs, Japan, 2008, <http://www2.hawaii.edu/~lchung/Can%20China%20and%20Japan%20Think%20Together%20by%20Tang%20and%20Satoh.pdf>) LL

Historical reconciliation between China and Japan would be truly transformational for East Asia, representing the most important development after the Second World War. Franco-German reconciliation and its impact on peace and prosperity of the European continent and beyond are proof of the stakes. Without it, the future of East Asia will be in peril. Asia’s destiny will be in non-Asian hands as it has been in the last two centuries, if mutual suspicion and antagonism continue to shape Sino-Japanese relations. And, one must not lose sight of the fact that enduring peace between China and Japan is no small contribution to world security. There is – at least we hope – now sufficient momentum in the bilateral relationship for the two sides to seriously map a path toward a robust and genuine reconciliation. After Koizumi, it has become difficult for any politician, nationalist, rightwing or otherwise, to gamble with relations with China. Moreover, the nationalist revival that seemed to echo the neo-con revolution in the U.S. has now lost momentum with the abrupt resignation of Prime Minister Abe Shinzo. The trajectory the Japanese leadership has taken since Koizumi via Abe to Prime Minister Fukuda Yasuo suggests that the Japanese elite is finally grasping that Japan, as an Asian country, cannot escape from geography, even though it may cherish ‘special’ ties with extra-regional powers (first with Britain and now the U.S.). On the Chinese side, the new leadership has internalized the notion that only a robust reconciliation between China and Japan can guarantee the peace, stability, and prosperity of East Asia. The visit by Premier Wen and the coming visit of President Hu to Japan symbolize the triumphant return of “New Thinking” toward Japan – in a more sophisticated embodiment – in China. The Chinese leadership and most of its foreign policy elite are ready for and look forward to a true partnership with a “normal” Japan that is based on equality.

Japan-China Alliance Good – 1AR Asian Stability XT

Chinese and Japanese cooperation maintains stability in Northeast Asia

China Embassy 10 (May 30, <http://www.chinese-embassy.org.uk/eng/zgyw/t705311.htm>) LL

The three leaders spoke highly of the rapid expansion and growth of the trilateral cooperation in recent years, made planning for the direction and priority areas of trilateral cooperation for the next ten years, exchanged in-depth views on current major international and regional issues and reached broad consensus. The three leaders pledged to make unremitting efforts in pushing trilateral ties towards the direction of good-neighborly mutual trust, comprehensive cooperation, mutual benefit and common development and advance the cooperation to a new high. In his remarks, Wen said currently the world is undergoing profound and complex changes and this region is facing many new challenges and difficulties. The three countries should proceed from the fundamental interests of the three peoples and long-term prosperity and stability of the region, enhance communication and coordination, take into account one another's major concerns and properly handle sensitive issues so as to enhance political mutual trust and maintain peace and stability in Northeast Asia. This, he stressed, constituted the most important basis for deepening trilateral cooperation. Wen noted that in tackling global financial crisis, the three countries have maintained close communication and coordination in their joint efforts to oppose trade protectionism, deepened and broadened cooperation in all fields, thus achieving economic revival and growth in bilateral trade. The trilateral cooperation has withstood the tests of the crisis and shown a sound momentum of all-round development and constant deepening. Currently there are still many uncertain factors in the world economic recovery. Wen called for greater input by the three countries to consolidate the economic recovery while continuing to implement appropriate policies. Meanwhile, they should adopt a long-term approach to the steady recovery and future growth of region's economy, and work together to create a favorable condition for this end and inject strong vitality into the building of the East Asia Community, Wen said. Premier Wen suggested the three countries make efforts in the following three aspects. First, the Chinese premier called for further efforts to establish the mechanism and framework of cooperation among China, Japan and South Korea in line with a blueprint mapping out cooperation in the region over the next decade. He urged the three countries to encourage joint researches by officials, businessmen and scholars on a free trade area, strive to reach a trilateral investment agreement at an early date, and enhance cooperation on standardization and establishment of a secretariat for trilateral cooperation. Second, while serving as major manufacturing and trade powers, the three countries should push for sustainable development, Wen said. They should accelerate their economic restructuring and the transformation of pattern of economic growth by vigorously developing green economy, recycle economy and conducting scientific and technological innovation in a bid to ensure sound and rapid economic growth of the three countries and push for a new round of economic growth of East Asia, he added. Third, the premier also called for greater efforts to promote cultural and people-to-people exchanges among the three countries. They should join hands to promote the ideas of friendship, tolerance and harmony, broaden the exchange and cooperation in youth, culture, education, tourism, media and encourage friendly exchanges among different cities so that cooperation among the three countries will enjoy broader and more solid popular support. Wen said that as both neighbors and regional powers, the three East Asian nations should treat each other with respect and on an equal footing to achieve a win-win result, which is the only right way. “We have got off to a good start.” said Wen, expressing the confidence that as long as the three nations work together for their common goal, their future will be bright indeed. The South Korean president and Japanese prime minister made it clear that the interests of the three countries have become more interwoven, exchanges between them more frequent than ever before and the three nations share ever greater responsibility. In the new situation, the three nations must uphold the concept of mutual benefit and win-win outcome and enhance pragmatic cooperation. They should further build up mutual understanding and trust, expand cooperation in a wide range of areas including economy, trade, investment, finance, environmental protection and recycle economy and encourage cultural and people-to-people exchanges. The three countries should also keep closer communication and coordination in regional and international affairs, join hands to cope with the global financial crisis, climate change and other major issues and challenges. Lee and Hatoyama said increased cooperation between the three countries will not only benefit their own peoples but will also promote the East Asian cooperation process as well as peace, stability and prosperity in the region and the world at large. The three leaders also exchanged views on the Cheonan incident and offered condolences over the death of the sailors killed in the sinking of the South Korean warship. The Chinese and Japanese leaders said they attach importance to the joint investigation by South Korea and some other countries into the incident, and have taken note of the responses from concerned parties. The three nations promised to maintain communication and properly handle the incident in the interest of regional peace and stability. "We must spare no effort to promote peace and stability in Northeast Asia. Short of this precondition, development will be out of the question, and the hard-won achievements will be lost again," he stressed. "The pressing task for the moment is to properly handle the serious impact caused by the Cheonan incident, defuse tensions in the region, and most importantly of all, avoid possible conflicts," Wen said. "China will continue to enhance communication with relevant parties (over the Cheonan incident) in order to steer the situation toward a direction which is conducive to peace and stability in Northeast Asia. This is in our best common and long-term interests," Wen said. The three leaders agreed that a nuclear-free Korean Peninsula would be conducive to achieving lasting peace, security and economic prosperity in Northeastern Asia. The three pledged to continue to work together through the six-party talks toward the materialization of the goals, set forth by the joint declaration of the six-party talks on Sept. 19, 2005.

Japan-China Alliance Good – 1AR Econ XT

Japan and China relations key to regional cooperation in economics

Masafumi 98 (Iida, Partnership of Friendship and Cooperation for Peace and Development, Nov 28, <http://www.mofa.go.jp/region/asia-paci/china/visit98/joint.html>) LL

China shares significant interests with Japan in enhancing political stability and economic prosperity in East Asia, which makes China regard Japan as an important partner for advancing regional cooperation in the region. The process of APT cooperation, started in 1997, has been mainly led by the ASEAN. Both China and Japan admit the ASEAN’s leading role in regional cooperation. For instance, APT countries expressed their conviction that the APT would be the main vehicle to realize an East Asian community “with ASEAN as the driving force,” in the Kuala Lumpur Declaration on the APT Summit held in December 2005.13 China and Japan let the ASEAN take the initiative in managing the APT because political antagonism between the two countries hampered their policy coordination regarding the APT, while neither China nor Japan had sufficient power to dominate the process of regional cooperation. As the bilateral relationship between China and Japan shifted and improved with a common objective for enhancing a strategic partnership of mutual benefit, there appeared optimistic views among Chinese scholars on possible policy coordination between the two countries for advancing East Asian cooperation. China Foreign Affairs University hosted a symposium entitled “East Asia Cooperation: Progress, Prospect and Procedure” in December 2007. According to a summary report of this symposium, many participants asserted that cooperation between Beijing and Tokyo was indispensable for further promotion of East Asian cooperation.14 For example, one scholar who participated in the symposium maintained that efforts to improve the bilateral relationship and promote East Asian cooperation by both governments would have great significance on the progress of regional integration.15 The Chinese government, as a matter of fact, has initiated some functional cooperation with the Japanese government with a view to deepening regional integration in East Asia. Coordinated economic assistance on infrastructure of regional developing countries is one of the prospective functional cooperation measures between the two governments. There exist various types of countries in East Asia in terms of degrees of economic development. Some of the countries in the region like Cambodia, Laos, Myanmar and Vietnam in Indochina remain far less developed compared to the others including Japan and China. This wide development gap among the countries in the region raises concern that the process of regional integration in East Asia would be constrained. With a common interest in forging East Asia cooperation, China and Japan share a rational reason for assisting less-developed countries in the region that are desperate for foreign capital to build their infrastructures.

Japan and China are economically inseparable; they have also been successful in diffusing Asian tension

Reuters 10 (May 31, <http://arabnews.com/world/article59648.ece>) LL

TOKYO: Japan and China agreed on Monday to set up an emergency hotline and set in place ways to prevent maritime friction sparked by Beijing's growing naval reach from getting out of hand. Chinese Premier Wen Jiabao held to Beijing's cautious stance on the sinking of a South Korean warship, which Japanese Prime Minister Yukio Hatoyama has joined Seoul and Washington in saying was certainly torpedoed by North Korea. Ties between the world's second- and third-largest economies have improved since 2006, when they set aside years of rancor centered on Japan's wartime occupation of Asia. At Monday's summit, wartime historical disputes did not come up. Instead, the two leaders agreed on steps aimed at easing military tensions that have continued to keep a cool distance between the two Asian neighbors. The two nations "must strengthen maritime crisis management and avoid the occurrence of antagonism and clashes," Wen told Hatoyama, according to China's official Xinhua news agency. They also agreed to resume talks on jointly exploring disputed gas fields in seas between them. Hatoyama came to office less than a year ago, vowing a more equal relationship with the United States and closer ties with China and other Asian powers. The summit with Wen, however, brought small steps, not big breakthroughs. The hotline between Beijing and Tokyo would allow leaders to discuss quickly what Wen called "important issues" between the two nations, a Japanese government official said. Wen later told Japanese business executives the huge economic flows between the two nations, with bilateral trade worth $238.7 billion last year, would cement closer ties. "China and Japan have very close economic and trade ties. One could say they are at the point where neither could do without the other," said Wen.

Japan-China Alliance Good – 1AR Econ XT

Japanese and Chinese relations strongly influence development of Asia

Masafumi 98 (Iida, Partnership of Friendship and Cooperation for Peace and Development, Nov 28, <http://www.mofa.go.jp/region/asia-paci/china/visit98/joint.html>) LL

With a view to realizing sustainable development, China needs to make efforts to

assist regional economic growth, overcome the serious problems of energy and

environment and stabilize the regional financial system through enhancing East Asia

cooperation. To promote regional cooperation in East Asia, cooperative relations with

Japan are indispensable for China. On a bilateral basis, China and Japan are faced

with some difficult problems including anti-Japanese sentiment, historical issues, and

discontent over the East China Sea. However, from the East Asian perspective, both

countries share significant interests, which presents Japan as a partner for China.

Japan and China are economically dependent

Japan Federation of Economic Organizations 1 (Feb 20, <http://www.keidanren.or.jp/english/policy/2001/006.html>i) LL

A new century is now upon us. Looking back on the relationship between Japan and China, we see a long history of contact and interaction between the two neighboring countries, particularly so in the economic sphere, where there have been dramatic developments after China adopted reform and opening-up policies in the late 1970s. Today, the economies of Japan and China have become highly complementary to each other. Nevertheless, distrust lingers. Although mutual misgivings lie primarily in the political area, in issues such as "understanding history" and national security, on many occasions the lack of trust between the two countries has turned into barriers for advancing economic ties. We must realize that the relationship between Japan and China has become one of the most important in bilateral relations for both countries, in the political sense as well as in economic and many other ways. As China prepares for membership in the World Trade Organization, the Chinese leadership must tackle many issues that come with the globalization of the world economy. As two countries have strong economic bonds, Japan must work with China to resolve these issues so that the benefits of a globalized economy can be fully enjoyed and both countries become more prosperous. To achieve these goals, we must strengthen mutual trust and remove the barriers that have impeded the development of our economic relations. The Japanese and the Chinese economy are the two largest in Asia, and the shape of their relations has strong repercussions on the prosperity and stability of the region as a whole. With a new century now upon us, we take this opportunity to review our past ties and present a series of recommendations on ways to strengthen mutual trust and further develop our economic relations.

Japan Says No

Japan wouldn’t turn against China- committed to building a new partnership

Japan Times 6/28 (http://search.japantimes.co.jp/cgi-bin/nn20100629a7.html)

TORONTO (Kyodo) Prime Minister Naoto Kan Japan and Chinese President Hu Jintao agreed to beef up defense dialogue to build mutual trust amid recent Chinese military activity around Japanese waters, a Japanese official said. In his first face-to-face meeting with Hu, Kan also called Sunday for China's cooperation in responding to the fatal sinking of a South Korean warship that has been blamed on North Korea. "I would like to send a clear message to North Korea at the U.N. Security Council and I want to ask for a forward-looking response from China," Kan was quoted by the official as telling Hu. Hu said the sinking was "a very unhappy incident." But he told Kan that each nation should respond calmly from a broader perspective on the matter, underlining the gap between the two countries' position on the issue, according to the official. China, one of the five veto-holding permanent members of the Security Council, remains reluctant to take tough action on Pyongyang. In the meeting, held on the sidelines of the two-day Group of 20 summit in Toronto, Hu said he wants to reinforce dialogue between the defense authorities, governments, legislatures and political parties of the two countries, in an attempt to enhance mutual trust. Kan said he agreed with the idea and that he "would like to strengthen dialogue between defense authorities and build a trustful relationship," the official said. Touching on the stalled six-party talks on North Korea's nuclear program, Kan noted the importance of settling the sinking issue. In March, the 1,200-ton Cheonan corvette was sunk in the Yellow Sea. Forty-six South Korean sailors were killed. On the economic front, Kan and Hu reaffirmed the need to launch formal negotiations on signing a bilateral treaty at an early date over gas exploitation in the East China Sea, the official said. The dispute stems from the unsettled demarcation of the East China Sea, where the exclusive economic zones claimed by the two countries overlap. Hu also indicated he will visit Japan when it hosts a summit of the Asia-Pacific Economic Cooperation forum in November, the official said. During the 45-minute meeting, the two leaders agreed to enhance strategic, mutually beneficial relations. They also agreed that Japan and China need to promote a "win-win" relationship through economic cooperation.

Decade long commitment between China and Japan ensure solid alliance

Xinhau 10 (May 29, <http://news.xinhuanet.com/english2010/china/2010-05/29/c_13322927.htm>) LL

JEJU, South Korea, May 29 (Xinhua) -- Leaders of China, Japan and South Korea on Saturday issued a document outlining a blueprint for cooperation within the coming 10 years. Chinese Premier Wen Jiabao, South Korean President Lee Myung-bak and Japanese Prime Minister Yukio Hatoyama, who are meeting in South Korea's southern resort island of Jeju for an annual trilateral summit, made joint pledges to further trilateral cooperation in such areas as economy, security, environmental protection and cultural exchange. The leaders of the three nations agreed that after making clear the detailed objectives and long-term goals within the next decade, all sides need to concentrate efforts on boosting trilateral cooperation to a new height, so as to further consolidate partnership, achieve more in mutually beneficial cooperation in all aspects and enhance friendship between the peoples of the three countries. The three leaders agreed to set up a more cooperative mechanism to increase strategic mutual trust, which involves setting up a trilateral cooperation secretariat in South Korea in 2011 to jointly tackle natural disasters, discuss the possibility of a mechanism of trilateral defense dialogue to enhance security contacts, strengthen political dialogue and cooperation in police affairs, and boost government exchanges at local levels among the three nations. On developing sustainable economic cooperation and common prosperity, the leaders pledged efforts to finish by 2012 a joint feasibility study of trilateral free trade agreement, which was launched in May 2010, and to expand trade volume ahead of 2020 for the benefit of regional economic growth and integration. The leaders said the three countries will complete negotiations on investment agreement and provide a favorable investment environment to facilitate the operation of enterprises in the region. They also reiterated the importance of customs cooperation, and vowed to further cooperation in finance, science and technology, innovation, as well as policy cooperation and negotiations in such areas as energy efficiency and resources. "An open, fair and liberalized multilateral trade system is not only conducive to China, Japan and South Korea, but also important for the world. We must oppose protectionism of any form to safeguard and consolidate the system," said the document. On cooperation in environmental protection, the leaders said the three countries should jointly push for achievements at the climate change summit to be held in Mexico this year, including an effective international cooperation framework in this regard after 2012, under the principles of the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change, especially the principle of common but differentiated responsibilities.

Japan Says No

Japan’s “economy first, politics later” stance on foreign policy ensures that it would not attack China, its largest trading partner

Li 10 (Xue, China Daily, Jan 19, <http://www.chinadaily.com.cn/cndy/2010-01/19/content_9339782.htm>) LL

If Hatoyama makes the trip, he will become the first serving Japanese prime minister to visit Nanjing after World War II. Though Japan's Chief Cabinet Secretary Hirofumi Hirano subsequently denied the news, it is obvious that of late China-Japan relations have progressed fairly. High-level reciprocal visits between the two countries have become frequent over the past two months. Chinese Vice-President Xi Jinping, Defense Minister Liang Guanglie and Foreign Minister Yang Jiechi visited Japan within 25 days of each other. During that time, Japan sent a super-large delegation of 630 people (including 143 Democratic Party of Japan's Diet members) to China. The media said that Ichiro Ozawa had brought "half of Japan's legislature" to China. Economic cooperation between China and Japan is now a matter of interdependence, with China becoming Japan's largest trade partner, largest export market and most favorite outbound investment destination. Japan, on the other hand, is China's third largest trade partner and second largest source of foreign investment. China's investment in Japan has seen a fast growth, too, and the global economic recession could further deepen their interdependence. In the fields of culture, education, science and technology, arts and the media, the two sides have established a closer partnership with frequent exchanges. Take education for example. About 60 percent of the international students in Japan are from China, while Japan is the second largest source of foreign students in China. And the two governments plan to attract more students from each other's country. In politics, since Hatoyama has made it clear that he would not visit the Yasukuni Shrine, Sino-Japanese relations are not likely to experience major fluctuations in the short run. Emperor Akihito's audience with visiting Chinese Vice-President Xi Jinping was an exception and showed that Tokyo attached great importance to maintaining stable political relations with Beijing. The two sides have realized that the establishment of an East Asian Community is inevitable, though China suggests that the process first be conducted within the framework of 10+3 (ASEAN plus China, Japan and the Republic of Korea), while Japan wants India, Australia and New Zealand (or 10+6), too, to be part of it. Military ties act as a barometer of diplomatic relations between any two countries. After the Cold War, countries without military alliances have tried to strengthen military ties through various channels, such as reciprocal visits of generals and warships, joint maritime search and rescue operations and counter-terrorism drills. Viewed from these perspectives, Sino-Japanese military cooperation has progressed, too. During Defense Minister Liang Guanglie's visit to Japan, the two sides reached a few agreements: Japan's defense minister will visit China within 2010, mutual visits between chiefs of the General Staff of the People's Liberation Army and their Japanese counterparts will continue, annual consultations on defense and security will be held, exchange visits of warships will continue, joint maritime search and rescue training will be held at an appropriate time, and maritime liaison mechanism of defense sectors will be established as early as possible. Therefore, we are confident that the Beijing-Tokyo partnership will be further strengthened in the next decade as long as Japanese leaders do not follow "the disastrous road of Junichiro Koizumi". Currently, the urgent task for the two countries is how to build a long-term framework that could steer bilateral relations toward a more solid cooperation. Japan's national development path of "economy first, politics later" was established during Shigeru Yoshida's administration. In the 1980s, based on Japan's global economic status, Yasohiro Nakasone put forward that Japan should become a "political power", but that goal was frustrated by the "lost decade" of the 1990s. At the beginning of the 21st century, Junichiro Koizumi attempted to realize this goal (the amendment of the Japanese Constitution and the bid to be a permanent member of the UN Security Council) by"firmly following the US lead", but achieved no significant results.

Japan Says No

China and Japan are committed to an alliance for the next decade.

China Embassy 10 (May 30, <http://www.chinese-embassy.org.uk/eng/zgyw/t705311.htm>) LL

From May 29 to 30, the third trilateral summit of China, Japan and the Republic of Korea (ROK) was held in ROK's Jeju island. Chinese Premier Wen Jiabao, Japanese Prime Minister Yukio Hatoyama and President of the Republic of Korea (ROK) Lee Myung-bak attended the meeting, which was chaired by Lee Myung-bak. The three leaders spoke highly of the rapid expansion and growth of the trilateral cooperation in recent years, made planning for the direction and priority areas of trilateral cooperation for the next ten years, exchanged in-depth views on current major international and regional issues and reached broad consensus. The three leaders pledged to make unremitting efforts in pushing trilateral ties towards the direction of good-neighborly mutual trust, comprehensive cooperation, mutual benefit and common development and advance the cooperation to a new high.

China and Japan have taken steps toward solidifying an alliance based on strategic and economic interests

Xinhua 9 (Sep 22, <http://frankfurt.china-consulate.org/det/zgyw/t605899.htm>) LL

China and Japan, Hu said, are friendly neighbors separated only by a narrow strip of water. He pointed out that both nations are important countries in Asia and the world. Hu noted that China-Japan relations are among each country's most important bilateral ties. He said cooperation and bilateral exchanges between China and Japan have reached unprecedented levels in a variety of fields since the two countries normalized relations 37 years ago. Leaders of the two countries, Hu said, have maintained close exchanges of visits and contacts, especially since 2006, as they decided to build a strategic and mutually beneficial relationship. "This was the first time that the two sides made positioning and planning of bilateral relations on a strategic level," Hu said. "During the state visit that I paid to Japan last year, the two sides worked out the blueprint for future development of China-Japan relations and pointed out the direction of the growth of bilateral relations in the 21st century by issuing the fourth political document between the two countries," Hu said. The improvement and development of bilateral relations has not only brought major benefits to China and Japan, it also has contributed positively to peace, stability and prosperity in Asia and the world, Hu said. China has always viewed and developed China-Japan relations from a strategic and long-term perspective. Hu said China will continue to pursue its policy of China-Japan friendship and work with Japan to realize the goal of peaceful coexistence, friendship for generations, mutually beneficial cooperation and common development. Hu, noting that the world is currently undergoing complicated and profound changes, said China and Japan are sharing increasing common interests and challenges. "Bilateral relations are facing major opportunities for development at higher levels and in greater space," Hu said. He said China is ready to work with Japan to advance their mutually beneficial relationship based on common strategic interests in a sustained and in-depth way by proceeding from the fundamental interests of both peoples and conforming to the trend of world development. President Hu put forward five propositions on developing China-Japan relations. First, Hu said, the two countries should enhance high-level communication so as to improve political trust. Leaders of the two countries should maintain contact and continuously add political impetus to the development of bilateral ties. Second, Hu said, the two countries should promote trade and economic cooperation and strengthen the ties of interests. China and Japan are both major world economies and important trade partners to each other. Strengthening trade and economic cooperation will be conducive for both countries to overcome the international financial crisis and to encourage recovery for both economies and the economy of the world at the earliest possible date, he said. Hu said the second high-level economic dialogue between China and Japan held in Japan in June set goals of trade and economic cooperation for the future. Relevant government departments of the two countries, Hu said, should take practical measures to fully implement the results of the dialogue so as to advance bilateral trade and economic cooperation to a higher level. Third, Hu said, the two countries should improve the feelings of their people towards each other to consolidate the basis of public opinion. Hu said the two sides should focus on the good trend of China-Japan friendship by carrying out exchanges between their young people, cadres, cultures and media so as to push for the improvement of the feelings of their people towards each other. Fourth, Hu said, the two countries should enhance cooperation on Asian affairs and push for coordination in international affairs. As two important countries in the region, Hu said, China and Japan should jointly work for denuclearization on the Korean Peninsula and safeguard peace and stability in Northeast Asia. The two sides should also carry out dialogue, coordination and cooperation on global challenges such as the international financial crisis, climate change, environment and energy, he said. Fifth, Hu said, China and Japan should properly deal with their differences and maintain their friendship. As neighbors with close contact, China and Japan inevitably have some problems and differences in bilateral relations. The two countries should have an overall point of view and deal with these problems prudently and properly so as to prevent them from affecting the steady development of the bilateral relations.

Japan Says No

**China and Japan have a mutually beneficial and interdependent relationship**

Abe 8 (J, PHP Foreign Policy, February 2008, <http://research.php.co.jp/research/foreign_policy/policy/data/seisaku01_teigen34_01.pdf>) LL

On the one hand there is China, a country continuing to achieve remarkable economic growth and gradually expanding its global “presence.” On the other hand, there is Japan, a nation searching for direction in the context of the collapse of the ’55 system and transformed post-cold war international order. We have entered into an era in which Japan and China must face one another directly and cooperate in creating a mutually-constructive relationship. Economic ties between Japan and China have already achieved a level of interdependence that neither nation wishes to upset. Both countries can ill afford to overlook the interests of the other. Far from limiting cooperation to the economic sphere, the two powers have much to gain by also enhancing collaboration in other areas and contributing to regional and global development. It can be said that the relationship between the two countries is a “mutually beneficial relationship based on common strategic interests.”

No NB – US-Japan Relations High

US-Japanese relations strong now – both countries benefit

AP 10 (June 27, <http://two--plus--two.blogspot.com/2010/06/strong-japan-us-alliance-good-for.html>) LL

(AP) - TORONTO, June 27 (Kyodo) — U.S. President Barack Obama said Sunday a strong alliance between Japan and the United States is good for the security of both countries and Asia as a whole. "The U.S.-Japan alliance remains strong and vibrant. It is good for Japan's security, it is good for America's security," Obama told a press conference following a two-day summit of the Group of 20 advanced and emerging economies in Toronto. Washington and Tokyo marked the 50th anniversary of their security treaty this year. Obama said he expects the bilateral alliance to "sustain itself for another 50 years." Asked whether Japan should be more responsible for peace and security in the Asia-Pacific region, Obama said he wants to make sure that all countries in the area "are meeting their responsibilities" through dialogue at such forums as the Association of Southeast Asian Nations and the Asia-Pacific Economic Cooperation forum. "I think if we adhere to that basic principle, then a strong U.S.- Japan alliance is something that can continue to be a cornerstone of a peaceful and prosperous Asia, which will benefit all people," Obama said.

No NB – Japan Wouldn’t Side with China

In the event of a war, Japan’s relationship with the US takes precedence over its relationship with China

Singh 10 (Assistant Prof @ S. Rajaratnam School of International Studies Nanyang Technological University, Singapore, April 8, <http://www.policyinnovations.org/ideas/commentary/data/000185>) LL

Despite these problems, Japan is not tilting toward China. The U.S.-Japan relationship is still very strong politically, economically, and, increasingly, in strategic terms as well. On this 50th anniversary of the U.S.-Japan security alliance, the relationship continues to display strong shared objectives and interests, which are institutionalized in many ways. All relationships suffer from ups and downs, and the U.S.-Japan relationship is no different. The nature of the relationship is strong enough to weather occasional disagreements, which are necessary to recalibrate the way the relationship functions. The important point to note here is that strategic military issues will increasingly become sources of tension as the bilateral security relationship matures. Japan sees the value of a strong bilateral relationship with the United States. The United States has successfully provided security cover for Japan since the onset of the post-war period. This function has become even more pronounced in light of Japan's main security challenges today—North Korea's nuclear and ballistic missile program and China's economic, political, and military rise. Moreover, Japan has made significant strides toward assuming a more active security role in international affairs. Much of this development has materialized through the active support of the United States. The continued support of Washington for Japan's bigger security role is essential for Tokyo, as well as its neighbors who harbor suspicion and mistrust against Japan stemming from their colonial history.

No NB – Japan Wouldn’t Side with China

Japan-China tensions mean Japan would likely assist the US in the event of a China-US war

Caryl 10 (Christian, Foreign Policy, May 18, <http://www.foreignpolicy.com/articles/2010/05/18/naval_gazing_in_asia?page=0,1>) LL

There's undoubtedly an element of truth to this. Yet one suspects that parochial interests don't explain the whole story. As Kaneda points out, the Japanese government's defense policy over the past decade has been anything but hawkish: The Japanese military has watched defense spending slide for each of the past seven years. China's defense budget, meanwhile, has risen sharply -- admittedly from a relatively small base. And the trend of Chinese naval ships pushing their way into areas they used to shun is clear enough. One Japanese government official told the Financial Times that the incidents involving Chinese vessels passing through that same area off Okinawa has been steadily climbing over the past three years. Beneath the two countries' wrangling on the high seas lies a complicated tangle of legal and political issues. There are, for example, still unresolved territorial disputes between the two governments -- especially the one involving a set of islands (known as Diaoyutai to the Chinese and as the Senkakus to Japan) located between Taiwan and the tip of Japan's southern Ryukyu Island chain (of which Okinawa Island is part). Perhaps even more contentious, though, is the issue of natural resources. Both China and Japan are desperate for energy to power their industries. (The jury is still out, by the way, but it looks likely that China overtook Japan as the world's second-largest economy recently -- which presumably makes the tensions between the two a matter of some relevance to the world at large.) Tokyo and Beijing adhere to starkly different definitions of their respective EEZs -- and both fear establishing bad precedents if they give up so much as a square inch of ocean. In short, even though many economic issues bring the two closer together, there are others that drive them apart. There is one more layer to the maneuvering, though, and that has to do with Japan's role as America's closest and most powerful ally in the Western Pacific. China's present leadership seems to have made a strategic decision that the Middle Kingdom no longer has to hide its light under a bushel-- and that projecting military power is a legitimate way of defending its expanding interests. John Tkacik, who headed China intelligence analysis at the U.S. State Department during the Clinton administration, says, "China is now asserting that it, not Japan, is the preeminent Asian power and that both the Chinese people and the masses of Asia must acknowledge China's new preeminence." He notes that many of the recent Chinese maneuverings have taken place in waters near those islands that are claimed by both China and Japan. The Chinese, he says, are testing to see how far the Americans are really prepared to stand up for Japan's side of the argument. "China is probing the U.S.-Japan alliance for fissures." Of late the Chinese military has become more assertive in Southeast Asia, unnerving some countries there by using naval forces to assert its claims to the contested Spratly Islands, for example. Beijing has also demonstrated that it's prepared to stake out strategic strong points in the Indian Ocean region, even when that aggravates its biggest regional rival, India. And, of course, ensuring Taiwan's eventual accession to mainland rule remains a paramount goal of Chinese state policy -- so the PLA has been busily working to acquire the technology (like long-range anti-ship missiles) to ensure that it can push back against the U.S. Seventh Fleet if it needs to. (Chinese leaders have a painfully clear memory of how the Clinton administration forced them into a humiliating climbdown over Taiwan back in the mid-1990s, when the United States deployed its then-unassailable fleet to the Taiwan Strait. That was then.) Sumihiko Kawamura, another Japanese ex-admiral, says that the U.S., Japan, and their regional allies should respond by conducting more joint naval maneuvers, coordinating efforts to monitor Chinese naval movements, and pushing the Chinese "to observe the international standard of modus operandi at the high sea." Kawamura also points out that the Chinese have been mysteriously reluctant to conclude an "incidents at sea" agreement with the Japanese and the Americans. The first such agreement, concluded between the United States and the Soviet Union at the height of the Cold War, succeeded in dramatically reducing the sorts of in-your-face naval maneuvers that could have easily led to accidental escalation with potentially disastrous consequences. Establishing some sort of hotline between naval headquarters on both sides of the East China Sea might not be a bad idea, either.

No NB – Japan Not Key – US Would Win

China is twenty years behind in military capabilities

Brown et al 3 (Harold, Council on Foreign Relations, May 2003, <http://www.cfr.org/content/publications/attachments/China_TF.pdf>) LL

The Council on Foreign Relations Independent Task Force on Chinese Military Power finds that the People’s Republic of China is pursuing a deliberate and focused course of military modernization but that it is at least two decades behind the United States in terms of military technology and capability. Moreover, if the United States continues to dedicate significant resources to improving its military forces, as expected, the balance between the United States and China, both globally and in Asia, is likely to remain decisively in America’s favor beyond the next twenty years. There are multiple drivers of China’s military modernization. The PLA, along with the People’s Armed Police and the People’s Militia, helps maintain domestic stability and ensure regime security. China is developing limited power-projection capabilities to deal with a range of possible conflict scenarios along its periphery, especially in maritime areas. The PLA is acquiring military capabilities designed to defend Chinese sovereignty and territorial interests and to pose a credible threat to Taiwan in order to influence Taiwan’s choices about its political future; or, failing that, to prevent Taiwan from achieving political independence. These capabilities are also intended to deter, delay, or complicate U.S. efforts to intervene on behalf of Taiwan. In addition, military modernization is expected to enhance China’s international prestige. China is a regional power, and the Task Force does not envisage China becoming a globally committed military power in the next two decades. If current trends continue (e.g., if Japan continues to eschew a role as a major regional military power), the Task Force expects that China will become the predominant military power among the nations of East Asia. China’s current force structure and doctrine provide effective “defense-in-depth” against any effort to invade and seize Chinese territory. The PLA possesses power projection across land borders against smaller region- al powers and the ability to dislodge those powers from nearby disputed land and maritime territories. In the next two decades, the Task Force expects China will acquire a greater capability to hold and seize such territories against combined regional forces. However, the Task Force also notes that although China will have the enduring advantage of proximity to Asia, Beijing has traditionally been weakest and the United States has traditionally been strongest in the maritime, aerospace, and technological dimensions of military power. Consequently, although China is already the strongest continental military power in East Asia and destined to become an even greater power beyond its littoral borders, a sustained and robust U.S. naval and air presence can offset the ability of Beijing to leverage future military capabilities into a real advantage against U.S. and allied interests in the Asia-Pacific region over the next twenty years, if not longer.

Taiwan Conflict ≠ Escalate

Taiwan conflict won’t escalate- US won’t use nukes and China would control the conflict

Roberts 5 (Brad, member of the research staff at the Institute for Defense Analyses, Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, 1/26 http://www.carnegieendowment.org/events/?fa=eventDetail&id=740

In Roberts' assessment, there are at least five elements in this picture. While there is no official Chinese description of a possible nuclear confrontation, these elements seem to inform the thinking of Chinese experts both inside and outside their government. The first is the assumption that the burden of crisis escalation would fall on the U.S. The Chinese believe that they would largely hold the initiative in a crisis and would be able to choose the time and manner of engagement. In other words, it would be left to the United States to react to a losing situation by choosing whether or not to escalate. The second element is a belief that that because of the asymmetry of interests, it is unlikely that the United States would be willing to use nuclear weapons in a Taiwan crisis. Whereas Taiwan is vital to Beijing’s sense of national sovereignty and territorial integrity, as well as its regime survival, the U.S. interest in Taiwan is seen as less than vital. Thus, they believe that the United States would be unwilling to “trade Los Angeles for Taipei.” Third, the Chinese believe that the threshold for U.S. nuclear retaliation is high. As a consequence, they debate the possibility that there might be ways that China could use nuclear weapons without facing U.S. retaliation. Fourth, Chinese analysts tend to believe that any unwanted escalation would be manageable on their part. This has something to do with Chinese strategic culture and their belief in China’s skill in creating, exploiting, and if necessary prolonging crisis. Moreover, some Chinese analysts cite the experience of 1968 when China confronted the Soviet Union as proof of China’s nuclear crisis management ability. In particular, Beijing could seek to counter U.S. nuclear deterrence by demonstrating its resolve through its own nuclear attacks. The essence of such a tactic would be to exert escalation control by instilling escalation uncertainty. Fifth, and finally, Chinese analysts seem to believe that the final outcome of a worst case scenario in a nuclear Taiwan crisis would be the reversion to the status quo ante. Beijing, thus, would be no worse off than what it started with.

No China-US War

China is not a threat; no escalation

Steketee 8 (Mike, The Australian, Aug 19, <http://www.theaustralian.com.au/news/china-wont-fight-over-taiwan-expert/story-e6frg6t6-1111117233275>) LL

CHINA is unlikely to be a military threat and the chances of a conflict over Taiwan are diminishing, according to a US defence expert. Jonathan Pollack, professor of Asian and Pacific studies at the US Naval War College, told The Australian that China would become a much more potent military force in the long run. "They see this as an inevitable and logical outgrowth of their economic emergence," Professor Pollack said. "For all the shiny new systems they are acquiring, China has not gone to war for 30 years. I don't see them as a kind of budding overlord of East Asia. I don't think that is the way they conceptualise these things." China has reported average real increases in military spending of 9.6per cent in the 15 years to 2005; outside estimates are much higher. The US Defence Department has been among those expressing concern about a military build-up that could put regional balances at risk. Professor Pollack, who has been visiting China for 30 years, said he could not preclude China becoming a military threat, but added: "I just don't see it as terribly likely." Professor Pollack is in Australia as a guest of the Centre for International Security Studies and the US Studies Centre, both at Sydney University. He recently visited Taiwan, whose Government, elected this year, comprised realists who knew they had to try to find a means of dealing with China. "They have to find a way to give China clear incentives to collaborate with them, hopefully in a transition to some longer-term accommodation, the terms of which they don't know yet," Professor Pollack said. "As long as you have a Government in Taipei that is going to work hard to not provoke the Chinese, I would see the probability (of China using military force against Taiwan) diminishing, not increasing, even as China becomes much more capable militarily."

China’s No First Use policy prevents escalation into nuclear warfare

Lieggi 5 (Research Associate, East Asia Nonproliferation Program, [http://www.nti.org/e\_research/e3\_70.html#fn4#fn4](http://www.nti.org/e_research/e3_70.html#fn4)) LL

Keeping in mind Beijing's rebuff of Zhu's comment, the question remains as to what his statement meant—if anything—about Chinese nuclear doctrine.[20] To fully assess the current status of China's NFU policy, it is important to go beyond the rhetoric coming from all sides of the debate. The NFU policy has been a part of China's nuclear doctrine for over four decades. Despite massive changes in China since then, many of the factors that dictated Beijing's doctrine in the past still impact policies today. These factors—including deterrence capabilities, resource limitations, regional stability, and perceptions of what is best for China strategically—continue to guide China's nuclear doctrine.

China has nothing to gain in a conflict with the US

Lieggi 5 (Research Associate, East Asia Nonproliferation Program, [http://www.nti.org/e\_research/e3\_70.html#fn4#fn4](http://www.nti.org/e_research/e3_70.html#fn4)) LL

There is no doubt that Taiwan remains the top most national security issue for the Chinese leadership and Beijing is willing (though not anxious) to risk a military conflict with the United States to keep the island from permanent separation. But this acknowledgement does not equate to Beijing discarding decades-old doctrines, such as NFU. Chinese political leaders, as well as many military leaders, recognize that China has nothing to gain if a conflict with the United States turned nuclear. At that point, China would quickly lose any ability to control the escalation of the conflict. If Beijing were to attack first with nuclear weapons, even in a situation where Chinese conventional forces were certain to lose the fight for Taiwan, there is no way for the leadership to predict the extent to which Washington would retaliate. The United States would see any nuclear attack by China, even on purely military targets, as provocation to escalate the conflict further, a step that could likely mean the collapse of the current leadership in Beijing. Ultimately, Taiwan would be lost either way. The NFU policy has served China well by assuring strategic stability, assisting in a relatively more efficient allocation of limited resources, and allowing Beijing to take the high moral ground on nuclear weapons use. Despite speculation about a shift in China's nuclear doctrine, a careful analysis of official Chinese positions and recent trends in Chinese nuclear weapons modernization would suggest Major General Zhu Chenghu's remarks do not provide any new clues to China's nuclear doctrine, nor do they indicate a move towards building a more offense-capable and war-fighting nuclear posture. A look at the history of China's no-first-use policy, nuclear program, and doctrine, along with its current military planning and modernization, indicate that a move away from the NFU policy is not likely in the near-to-mid-term. Even in the long-term, China's resources and planning will likely be considered better spent on other priorities, and not the costly expansion of its nuclear arsenal.

No China-US War

U.S.-China war won’t happen- 4 reasons

Dyer 9 (Gwynne, Jakarta Post, Mar 29, <http://www.thejakartapost.com/news/2005/03/12/china-unlikely-engage-military-confrontation.html>) LL

Given America's monopoly or huge technological lead in key areas like stealth bombers, aircraft carriers, long-range sensors, satellite surveillance and even infantry body armor, Goss's warning is misleading and self-serving. China cannot project a serious military force even 200 miles (km) from home, while American forces utterly dominate China's ocean frontiers, many thousands of miles (kilometers) from the United States. But the drumbeat of warnings about China's ""military build-up"" continues. Just the other week U.S. Defense Secretary Donald Rumsfeld was worrying again about the expansion of the Chinese navy, which is finally building some amphibious landing ships half a century after Beijing's confrontation with the non-Communist regime on the island of Taiwan began. And Senator Richard Lugar, head of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, warned that if the European Union ends its embargo on arms sales to China, the U.S. would stop military technology sales to Europe. It will come as no surprise, therefore, that the major U.S. defense review planned for this year will concentrate on the rising ""threat"" from China, or that this year for the first time the joint U.S.-Japanese defense policy statement named China as a ""security concern"", or that the Taiwan government urged the ""military encirclement"" of China to prevent any ""foreign adventures"" by Beijing. It comes as no surprise -- but it still makes no sense. China's defense budget this year is 247.7 billion yuan: Around US$30 billion at the official exchange rate. There are those in Washington who will say that it's more like $60 billion in purchasing power, but then there used to be ""experts"" who annually produced hugely inflated and frightening estimates of the Soviet defense budget. Such people will always exist: to justify a big U.S. defense budget, you need a big threat. It's true that 247.7 billion yuan buys an awful lot of warm bodies in military uniform in the low-wage Chinese economy, but it doesn't actually buy much more in the way of high-tech military systems. It's also true that the Chinese defense budget has grown by double-digit increases for the past fourteen years: This year it's up by 12.6 percent. But that is not significantly faster than the Chinese economy as a whole is growing, and it's about what you have to spend in order to convert what used to be a glorified peasant militia into a modern military force. It would be astonishing if China chose NOT to modernize its armed forces as the rest of the economy modernizes, and the end result is not going to be a military machine that towers above all others. If you project the current growth rates of military spending in China and the United States into the future, China's defense budget catches up with the United States about the same time that its Gross Domestic Product does, in the late 2030s or the early 2040s. As to China's strategic intentions, the record of the past is reassuring in several respects. China has almost never been militarily expansionist beyond the traditional boundaries of the Middle Kingdom (which do include Tibet in the view of most Chinese), and its border clashes with India, the Soviet Union and Vietnam in the first decades of Communist rule generally ended with a voluntary Chinese withdrawal from the disputed territories. The same moderation has usually applied in nuclear matters. The CIA frets that China could have a hundred nuclear missiles targeted on the United States by 2015, but that is actually evidence of China's great restraint. The first Chinese nuclear weapons test was forty years ago, and by now China could have thousands of nuclear warheads targeted on the U.S. if it wanted. (The United States DOES have thousands of nuclear warheads that can strike Chinese targets.) The Beijing regime is obsessed with economic stability, because it fears that a severe downturn would trigger social and political upheaval. The last thing it wants is a military confrontation with its biggest trading partner, the United States. It will go on playing the nationalist card over Taiwan to curry domestic political favor, but there is no massive military build-up and no plausible threat of impending war in East Asia.

No China-US War

US cooperation and diplomatic strength can prevent confrontation

Rosemont 8 (Henry, Asia Times, Feb 12, <http://www.atimes.com/atimes/China/JB12Ad01.html>) LL

Head to Head? A significant number of people profit greatly from the present U.S. defense budget. Since even people with little knowledge of military tactics realize that aircraft carriers and nuclear attack submarines are worthless for deterring ideologically driven young people from strapping IEDs to their waists, a more compelling threat must be conjured up is to justify increased Pentagon spending. Since the end of the Cold War, China has become the candidate of choice among illusionist hawks.15 Confrontation with China is not, however, inevitable. Perhaps the best reason for China not to seek a blue-ocean navy comes from an initially most unlikely source: The U.S. Navy. Its former head, Admiral Michael Mullen proposed a “Thousand Ship Navy” (TSN) that would mark “a new chapter in cooperation as it emphasizes the management of shared security interests of all maritime nations.” China could become a significant component of this TSN, and thus keep its shipping lanes secure at relatively little cost beyond present expenditures. Given the fact that 90% of all world trade and almost 70% of all petroleum is transported by sea, it clearly behooves both countries to cooperate closely to keep the maritime commons free of pirates, terrorists, and drug traffickers. Cooperation at sea is equally needed for missions of humanitarian assistance and disaster relief. Unfortunately, the highly invasive foreign policies of the United States, combined with its overwhelming military superiority, provide the Chinese with very good reasons to continue distrusting U.S. motives (including the TSN). It is therefore the responsibility of the United States to take meaningful initiatives to build support for closer cooperation with the soon-to-be world’s second largest economic power. Some of those initiatives would deal directly with China, such as providing materiel and advanced training for the Chinese military to conduct search-and-rescue missions. The United States could also foster far greater trust and cooperation specifically with the Chinese by clarifying the U.S. position toward Taiwan. Taipei should understand that the United States will come to its immediate aid in case of attack. But should Taipei seek independence and a seat at the UN, Washington will use all its diplomatic strength to insure that other nations do not recognize these claims. The United States could also signal to China that it is willing to be a more cooperative international player. For instance, the United States could significantly reduce its nuclear stockpile and renounce the first-strike use of nuclear weapons, as China did long ago. It should also sign and ratify the UN Convention on the Law of the Sea as 155 nations have done (including China) since it was promulgated in 1982. Ending the brutal occupation of Iraq is another global measure, as would placing U.S. troops in Afghanistan under UN administration and signing a peace treaty with North Korea (55 years after the cease-fire). Holding out an olive branch to Iran, and stopping the one-sided U.S. support of the Israelis would also provide clear signals to the Chinese and the rest of the world of a major shift in U.S. foreign policy. A reduction of U.S. threats to the world – from nuclear weapons, regional wars such as Iraq and Afghanistan, and potential conflicts with Iran and North Korea – would decrease the likelihood of confrontation with China as well as undercut any rationale for China’s own increased military spending. Such a shift in U.S. national security strategy would not only increase the security of China and the United States but the world as well.

A2 Offsets Counterplans

Japan CP

Solvency Takeout/Turn

**Not only is relocation impossible, it would erode JASA and East Asian deterrence**

**Foster 5/6** (Malcolm, Marine Corps Times, http://www.marinecorpstimes.com/news/2010/05/ap\_okinawa\_050410/)JFS

Japan’s prime minister said for the first time Tuesday that at least part of **a key U.S. military base will remain on** the southern island of **Okinawa**, a move that could reduce tension with Washington but dent his sinking popularity and raise the ire of island residents. **A dispute over** the relocation of Marine Corps Air Station **Futenma has become the focal point of U.S.-Japan ties** **since** Yukio Hatoyama took office in September promising to move the base off Okinawa — contrary to **a 2006 agreement** with Washington **that called for it to be moved to a less crowded, northern part of the island**. But on his first visit to Okinawa as prime minister, Hatoyama conceded **it would be** difficult if not **impossible to move Futenma’s facilities off the island,** which hosts more than half **the** 47,000 American troops stationed in Japan under a security pact. Hatoyama essentially acknowledged that his **government has been unable to come up with any other viable alternatives** to Nago, the proposed relocation site in the north, and is shifting back toward the 2006 plan. “**Realistically speaking, it is impossible,”** he said, wearing a traditional Okinawan short-sleeved shirt. “We have reached a conclusion that **it is difficult to relocate all of Futenma’s functions** outside the country or the island **because of a need to maintain deterrence under the Japan-U.S. alliance**.” Hatoyama’s backtracking will likely drag down his public approval ratings, which have fallen to about 20 percent amid a political funding scandal and perceived lack of leadership, and could even hurt his party’s prospects in July upper house elections. The prime minister, who had set an end-of-May deadline for a final decision on Futenma, asked for residents’ understanding in keeping some of the base’s functions on Okinawa, while possibly moving other functions outside the island — a division that Washington would likely find unacceptable.

Guam Presence Good – Heg/Prolif

**Presence in Guam key to power projection, checking proliferation, and protecting sea lines**

**Caryl 7** (Christian, Newsweek International, MSNBC, http://tinyurl.com/33cdzqh)JFS

In the complicated post-9/11 world, **the United States** believes it **must be able to respond to various threats** as flexibly as possible. **This means keeping its forces close to the action. In the past that's required basing** them **in other countries'** territories. But **Guam offers a**n almost **unique combination of a good location,** excellent facilities (including a topnotch harbor, vast warehouses and massive airfields) **and a lack of political restraints.** As Kurt Campbell, a former White House staffer and Defense Department official now at the Center for a New American Security, says, "[**Guam is] a point from which you can do a variety of things.** And it's a place to remind people that you're still focused on the region." Campbell points out that these **secondary missions, such as protecting sea lanes, countering** weapons **proliferation** and conducting relief missions, **remain important**; the U.S. military's humanitarian efforts after the tsunami of December 2005 gave a huge boost to the country's reputation in Asia. Brad Glosserman, executive director of Pacific Forum CSIS, a Hawaii-based think tank, agrees. **The Asia-Pacific region,** he says, "**is a jigsaw puzzle** where all the pieces are changing shape and size all the time. **China's the big story—but there are also** changes going in on **Japan, India, South Korea, Taiwan**." **The island has already become** a **convenient** base **for fighting Washington's "Global War on Terror"** in Indonesia and the Philippines. Small wonder that Brig. Gen. Douglas H. Owens, the commanding officer of Guam's Andersen Air Force Base, describes **the island as "an unsinkable aircraft carrier."** It's also well positioned for possible trouble to come. As Rear Adm. Charles Leidig, U.S. Navy commander on Guam, points out, if you take a map and draw a circle with **Guam at the center** and a radius of 1,500 nautical miles—equivalent to three hours' flying time or two to three days by ship—you come close to the main islands of Japan, Okinawa, Indonesia and the Philippines. China and the Korean Peninsula are only a bit farther off. So are several **of the world's most important sea lanes**, **such as the Strait of Malacca, through which some 50 percent of the world's oil passes each year.**

**Proliferation leads to extinction**

**Utgoff, 2** (Deputy Director of Strategy, Forces, and Resources Division of Institute for Defense Analysis Victor A., Summer 2002, Survival, p.87-90)

In sum, widespread **proliferation is likely to lead to an occasional shoot-out with nuclear** **weapons**, and that **such shoot outs will have a substantial probability of escalating to the maximum destruction possible** with the weapons at hand. **Unless** nuclear **proliferation is stopped, we are headed towards a world that will mirror the American** Wild **West** of the late 1800s. **With most, if not all, nations wearing nuclear “six shooters**” on their hips, the world may even be a more polite place than it is today, but every once in a while **we will all gather together on a hill to bury the bodies of dead cities or even whole nations.**

**Hegemony prevents nuclear war.**

**Khalilzad 95** (Zalmay, Rand Corporation, Spring 1995. RAND Corporation. “Losing the Moment?” The Washington Quarterly 18.2, Lexis.)

Under the third option, the United States would seek to retain global leadership and to preclude the rise of a global rival or a return to multipolarity for the indefinite future. On balance, this is the best long-term guiding principle and vision. Such a vision is desirable not as an end in itself, but because **a world in which the U**nited **S**tates **exercises leadership** would have tremendous advantages. First, the global environment would be more open and more receptive to American values -- democracy, free markets, and the rule of law. Second, such a world **would have a better chance of dealing cooperatively with** the world's major problems, such as **nuclear proliferation, threats of regional hegemony** by renegade states, **and low-level conflicts**. Finally, **U.S. leadership would help preclude the rise of another hostile global rival, enabling the U**nited **St**ates **and the world to avoid another global cold or hot war and all the attendant dangers, including a global nuclear exchange**. U.S. leadership would therefore be more conducive to global stability than a bipolar or a multipolar balance of power system.

Guam Presence Good – Heg/Prolif

Troops in Guam would be better situated to intervene in conflict areas

Bandow 2000 (Doug, Foreign Policy Briefing for the CATO Institute, http://www.cato.org/pubs/fpbriefs/fpb59.pdf, date accessed: 7/6/2010) AJK

In fact, some people look to the United States for answers to such problems. Many Christian leaders are calling for American or United Nations action to stop the slaughter of Christians, with the apparent acquiescence of factions of the local government and military, in the Molucca Islands, for instance. Conversations in Jakarta, Indonesia, July 8–11, 2000. But Washington is, rightly, not prepared to coerce the world’s fourth most populous nation and could not solve the conflict even if it attempted to do so. Even if the United States was ready to intervene, forces located on the Korean peninsula are far from today’s principal arenas of turmoil—such as Fiji, Indonesia, and the Solomon Islands. Units stationed in Guam, Wake Island, and even Hawaii would be closer or roughly as close.

Moving troops to Guam key to better foreign policy

Bandow (Doug, CATO handbook for Congress, http://www.cato.org/pubs/handbook/hb104/104-31.pdf, date accessed: 7/6/2010) AJK

Jettisoning antiquated alliances and commitments does not mean the United States would no longer be a Pacific power. After withdrawing its forces from Korea and Japan, America should center its reduced force structure around Wake Island, Guam, and Hawaii. That strategy would maintain forces in the Central Pacific, with an ability to move farther west if an unexpected threat to America's security emerged. But the United States would no longer be subsidizing wealthy allies who face fading threats. After decades of protecting other nations from an enemy that no longer exists, it is time for America to develop a more cost-effective defense strategy in East Asia.

Moving troops to Guam solves readiness

Roh 4 (Jane, staff writer for FOX news, http://www.foxnews.com/story/0,2933,133728,00.html, date accessed: 7/6/2010) AJK

U.S. defense officials have argued that pulling American troops out of the North's immediate line of fire would better position them for a counterattack. Rumsfeld has already told Seoul of plans to bring the Army's 2nd Infantry Division, stationed just south of the DMZ, farther south from the border — an idea that coincides with South Korea's plans to pull its capital down toward the tip of the peninsula to reduce the threat from the North. Rather than rely so heavily on ground troops to protect the South, the United States is expected to bolster air units in neighboring Japan, Singapore and especially Guam, a nearby U.S. territory. Should Pyongyang strike first, U.S. warplanes stationed in Guam can be in fighting position within a matter of hours.

Guam Presence Good – Economy

Moving troops to Guam is key to their economy

**Potter 10** (Matthew, Bnet, BA at Defense Acquisition University, former aviator in the Air Force, http://industry.bnet.com/government/10004825/us-militarys-move-from-japan-to-guam-underway/)JFS

**The United States has** based **troops** on Okinawa and **in Japan** since the end of World War II. The 3rd U.S. Marine Division and large amounts of air assets are based on the island seized in a bloody battle in April through June of 1945. **The U.S. and Japanese governments have been negotiating** for years **to close** the air base at **Futenma and moving** most of the **troops off of the island**. A new airbase will be built on Okinawa in a less built up area. In 2006 it was decided that the U.S. Territory of **Guam would** be the site **chosen**. Japan has long desired the removal of U.S. troops and proper integration of the island back into it. This is one of the largest changes to the U.S. military’s facilities and basing as part of the last round of Base Realignment and Closure (BRAC). Guam is already providing heavy support to U.S. operations in Afghanistan and Iraq by supporting fixed wing Air Force assets as well as transport flights. The plan is to expand the base to allow the 3rd Marines to be stationed their as well as increased support assets including a pier for aircraft carriers. Along with Marine and Navy assets an Army air defense organization will also be moved. All **this will require new bases and facilities paid for by** both **the U.S.** and Japanese governments. **The building boom will be a big plus to the island’s economy** although there are many in the Territory who are worried about the massive influx of new U.S. forces and their dependents.

Guam Presence Good – China and Terror (1/2)

Presence in Guam good – deters China and solves terror

**Caryl 7** (Christian, Newsweek International, MSNBC, http://tinyurl.com/33cdzqh)JFS

At a time when most of the world's attention is focused on the United States' misadventures in Iraq and Afghanistan, **Pentagon planners are quietly working** on ways **to fortify** the **U.S. presence in East Asia.** And **they're looking to** do so in ways that will give them a free hand in a wide range of contingencies—including **fight**ing **regional terrorists and** **a possible showdown with China.** **Guam offers the U.S. military** both **proximity to potential hot spots** **and the advantages of operating off U.S. soil.** **The transfer** of forces to the island also **reflects the** Pentagon's **determination** **to give regional allies such as South Korea and Japan more responsibility** for their own security. Guam, a sleepy but diverse place that looks like a cross between Micronesia and Middle America, has long served as a U.S. air base and way station for troops traveling through the Pacific. At the end of the cold war, the Pentagon began shutting down some facilities on the island. But then came September 11, and a dramatic reassessment of America's global forces. Former secretary of Defense Donald Rumsfeld began to advocate the lily-pad strategy: rather than relying on large, static bases in Germany and South Korea, **the Pentagon** **should create a global network of jumping-off points for quick responses to unpredictable attacks. Guam is** an **ideal** lily pad, **since the United States can act there without seeking permission from allies,** says Honolulu-based defense analyst Richard Halloran. Declares Carl Peterson of the Guam Chamber of Commerce: "**This is the U.S. in Asia**. This is the tip of the spear." **The island has already become** a **convenient** base **for fighting** Washington's "Global War on **Terror**" in Indonesia and the Philippines. Small wonder that Brig. Gen. Douglas H. **Owens**, the commanding officer of Guam's Andersen Air Force Base, **describes the island as "an unsinkable aircraft carrier."** It's also well positioned for possible trouble to come. As Rear Adm. Charles Leidig, U.S. Navy commander on Guam, points out, **if** **you** take a map and **draw a circle with Guam at the center** and a radius of 1,500 nautical miles—equivalent to three hours' flying time or two to three days by ship—**you come close** **to** the main islands of **Japan**, Okinawa, **Indonesia and the Philippines. China and** the **Korea**n Peninsula **are only a bit farther off**. So are several of the world's most important sea lanes, such as the Strait of Malacca, through which some 50 percent of the world's oil passes each year. So why all the fuss over a tropical island just 30 miles long, known mainly for its white- sand beaches and glorious sunsets? The answer: **the Pentagon has begun a major redeployment of** U.S. **forces** in the region, pulling troops and equipment out of sometimes unreliable allies and beefing up its presence in more-congenial locales. **First on its list is Guam**, a U.S. territory since 1898 that is fast becoming the linchpin of Washington's new Asia strategy. Current U.S. forces on the island number just a few thousand but within a decade will total well over 20,000—about the same size as the Bush administration's planned surge in Iraq. By comparison, there are some 29,000 U.S. troops left in South Korea, yet despite the dangers of a nuclear-armed North, that number is expected to drop significantly. The nature of the **U.S. reorganization reinforces this point. Washington and Tokyo have agreed to** move 8,000 Marines **to Guam from Okinawa** by 2014, at a cost of $10 billion (60 percent of which will be paid for by the Japanese government). But this is only the most public part of a broader buildup that has largely escaped notice. If all the pieces come together, it could mean billions more in Defense Department funds and a total increase in Guam's population (which is currently just 170,000) of 35,000.

Guam Presence Good – China and Terror (2/2)

**Chinese US war leads to extinction**

**Strait Times 2k** (The Straits Times (Singapore), “No one gains in war over Taiwan”, June 25, 2000, L/N)

**The doomsday scenario** THE high-intensity scenario **postulates a cross-strait war escalating into a full-scale war between the US and China**. If Washington were to conclude that splitting China would better serve its national interests, then **a full-scale war becomes unavoidable. Conflict** on such a scale **would embroil other countries** far **and** near and -- horror of horrors -- **raise the possibility of a nuclear war**. Beijing has already told the US and Japan privately that it considers any country providing bases and logistics support to any US forces attacking China as belligerent parties open to its retaliation. In the region, this means South Korea, Japan, the Philippines and, to a lesser extent, Singapore. If China were to retaliate, east Asia will be set on fire. And the conflagration may not end there as opportunistic powers elsewhere may try to overturn the existing world order. With the US distracted, **Russia may** seek to **redefine Europe's** **political landscape**. The balance of power in the Middle East may be similarly upset by the likes of Iraq. In south Asia, **hostilities between India and Pakistan**, each armed with its own nuclear arsenal, **could enter a new and dangerous phase.** Will a full-scale Sino-US war lead to a nuclear war? According to General Matthew Ridgeway, commander of the US Eighth Army which fought against the Chinese in the Korean War, the US had at the time thought of using nuclear weapons against China to save the US from military defeat. In his book The Korean War, a personal account of the military and political aspects of the conflict and its implications on future US foreign policy, Gen Ridgeway said that US was confronted with two choices in Korea -- truce or a broadened war, which could have led to the use of nuclear weapons. If the US had to resort to nuclear weaponry to defeat China long before the latter acquired a similar capability, **there is little hope of winning a war against China** 50 years later, **short of using nuclear weapons**. The US estimates that China possesses about 20 nuclear warheads that can destroy major American cities. Beijing also seems prepared to go for the nuclear option. A Chinese military officer disclosed recently that Beijing was considering a review of its "non first use" principle regarding nuclear weapons. Major-General Pan Zhangqiang, president of the military-funded Institute for Strategic Studies, told a gathering at the Woodrow Wilson International Centre for Scholars in Washington that although the government still abided by that principle, there were strong pressures from the military to drop it. He said military leaders considered the use of nuclear weapons mandatory if the country risked dismemberment as a result of foreign intervention. Gen Ridgeway said that **should that come to pass, we would see the destruction of civilisation.** There would be no victors in such a war. While **the prospect of a nuclear Armaggedon over Taiwan** might seem inconceivable, it **cannot be ruled out** entirely, for China puts sovereignty above everything else.

**Terrorism Causes Extinction**

**Sid-Ahmed 4** (Mohamed, political analystManaging Editor for Al-Ahali, “Extinction!” August 26-September 1, Issue no. 705, http://weekly.ahram.org.eg/2004/705/op5.htm)

**What would be the consequences of a nuclear attack by terrorists? Even if it fails, it would further exacerbate the negative features of the** new and frightening **world in which we are now living.** Societies would close in on themselves, police measures would be stepped up at the expense of human rights, **tensions between civilisations and religions would rise and ethnic conflicts would proliferate.** It would also speed up the arms race and develop the awareness that a different type of world order is imperative if humankind is to survive. But the still more critical scenario is **if the attack succeeds. This could lead to a third world war, from which no one will emerge victorious.** Unlike a conventional war which ends when one side triumphs over another, this war will be without winners and losers. **When nuclear pollution infects the whole planet, we will all be losers.**

Guam Presence Good – Asian Stability

Troops stationed in Guam solves Asian instability

Rivera 2 (Jerry, Colonel in the United States Army, http://www.dtic.mil/cgi-bin/GetTRDoc?Location=U2&doc=GetTRDoc.pdf&AD=ADA404522, date accessed: 7/6/2010) AJK

Nevertheless, once the Japanese are able to take total responsibility for the defense of their country, U.S. forces should also move from Japan and Okinawa to Guam. The primary reasons for our continued presence in Japan in the first place are to provide supporting forces in 9 the event of a North Korean invasion of South Korea and for the defense of Japan against attack by a hostile power. Again, since we are only hours away from Japan and Korea by plane and several days by ship or submarine, U.S. military forces can still respond in a timely manner from Guam. It is inconceivable to believe that all our military assets in Guam would be idle at the same time, waiting for a crisis to happen. The U.S. military can still maintain a forward presence in Asia by dispatching its military assets on a continuous basis from Guam. With the permanent basing of at least two aircraft battle groups in Guam, one battle group can be patrolling Asian waters while the other stays in port for maintenance and welfare and morale purposes. Each would alternate with the other. Longrange bombers and jet aircraft could also be flying training missions in the Asia Pacific region. The U.S. Navy is currently expanding its naval assets on Guam with the planned, permanent basing of more than a dozen cruise nuclear submarines on that island, starting with the USS San Francisco and USS City of Corpus Christi this year.38 The U.S. Congressional Budget Office recommended moving seven submarines to Guam by 2015 and another four by 2025 for a total permanent basing of 14 submarines3? Even if Japan fails to amend its constitution to allow foran expanded military role by Japanese armed forces, the U.S. Navy should still move some of its aircraft carrier battle groups to Guam. Guam has already experienced several visits by the U.S.S. Kitty Hawk and the U.S.S. Independence proving Guam's harbor is deep enough for Navy carriers to navigate through. Admittedly, Apra Harbor would need additional dredging in several areas and hundreds of millions of dollars invested to provide home port facilities for these giant ships as well as community infrastructure expansion for the entire island of Guam. The bottom line is that if Guam and the Marianas could harbor 1500 ships and 500,000 military personnel during World War II, then it makes no sense to think it would be unable to homeport two or more carrierbattle groups.

Guam Wants Presence

The people of Guam want military presence

**Brooke 3** (James, New York Times, March 10, Lexis)JFS

Last December, when all of South Korea seemed to be in the streets protesting the accidental deaths of two teenage girls killed by an American military vehicle, **Guam's leaders pointed out that this island**, the largest between Hawaii and the Philippines, **had plenty of unused** military **land for building bases.** In January, **when Japanese politicians greeted plans for American** warplane **training** **with** "not in my backyard" **arguments**, **Guam authorities said** in effect, **Come** on **down here**, just a three-hour flight from Tokyo. And in February, **people in** **Guam welcomed the news** that the Pentagon was going to send 12 B-52 bombers and 12 B-1 bombers here. Most of the bombers have arrived. "**While many communities** may **shun** having **the military** in their backyards, **we on** **Guam welcome them**, embrace them," **said** Felix P. Camacho, **the** newly elected **governor** of this American territory of 150,000 residents. "Guam can play an increased role in taking up the slack," said Mr. Camacho, a Republican. Fresh from visiting Navy and Air Force commanders here and openly bidding for American military units now based in Japan and South Korea, the governor predicted, "As they downsize in those regions, **Guam will benefit."** The island's welcome is an about-face from the resentment a decade ago. Although protests never grew as strong as the movement that helped end in early February the United States Navy's use of a bombing range in Vieques, P.R., the dissatisfaction here was symbolized by a much publicized photograph of an activist who climbed the fence of the naval air station and spat in the face of a sentry. Emboldened by a rising tide of tourists and hotel construction, protesters called for cutbacks in American troops here and the transfer of land from the military, which controls almost one-third of Guam's 209 square miles. During the military cuts of the mid-1990's, several units left the island.

CP Results in Guam Transfer

**No solvency – relocating the base to northern Okinawa is the first step for a Guam transfer**

**Shuster 6/21** (Mike, National Public Radio, Morning Edition, http://www.npr.org/templates/story/story.php?storyId=127932447)JFS

**Washington wants** Japan **to** stick to an agreement made with the previous administration in Tokyo to **relocate the base farther north on a less populated part of Okinawa, and says the transfer** of the 8,000 Marines **to Guam cannot move forward until the new site on Okinawa is finalized**.

Long Timeframe

**Relocation takes years – costs, environment, and lack of construction**

**Weekly Japan News 6/3** (A Japanese News Service, http://www.japanupdate.com/?id=10355)JFS

**Money, environmental issues and a** simple **lack of** enough **construction capabilities in Guam appear to be forcing the United States** and Japan **to** **consider postponing the relocation** of 8,000 U.S. Marines **from Okinawa to Guam, now scheduled for 2014** at the latest.

Afghanistan/Iraq CP

No Withdrawal – Stuck in Afghanistan

No withdrawal anytime soon – Petraeus

Reidel 10 (Brian Expert on Pakistan and Afghanistan at the Brookings Institution 6/28 Interview conducted by Gregor Peter Schmitz http://www.spiegel.de/international/world/0,1518,703243,00.html TBC 7/6/10)

Riedel: I think that issue was resolved. The July 2011 date will now be very notional and Petraeus has, in effect, gotten what he wanted. SPIEGEL: So a serious plan for US withdrawal is off the table? Riedel: Petraeus would not have taken on the job without being reasonably certain that it is not a hard and fast deadline but an aspiration. SPIEGEL: Do you think this was a condition Petraeus set, before accepting the job? Riedel: I know David Petraeus pretty well, and I don’t think he would have (made that demand publicly). But by turning to Petraeus, the president has signaled that he understands that that deadline is an aspiration, not a fixed point.

Non-Unique

Kandahar focus now

Shah 10 (Saeed 21 February Guardian http://www.guardian.co.uk/world/2010/feb/21/kandahar-arena-showdown-afghanistan-war TBC 7/5/10)

Kandahar is the likely arena for what is being billed as the decisive clash between Nato forces and the Taliban in Afghanistan this summer, with the current high-profile operation in Helmand province just a preparation for the showdown to come, officials have said. Nato officials told the Guardian that the focus of international forces will shift from Helmand to Kandahar, which, with a population of more than a million, is the big prize for both the Taliban and the coalition. A senior Nato official said: "This moves to Kandahar. That's the next main objective."

Non-Unique – troop surge to Kandahar in the SQUO

**Farmer 10** (Ben, The Telegraph, Mar. 30 2010, http://www.telegraph.co.uk/news/worldnews/asia/afghanistan/7538510/Nato-to-launch-surge-against-Taliban-in-Kandahar.html)IM

Operation Omaid, or hope, is the cornerstone of Gen Stanley McChrystal's troop surge strategy to reverse the eight-year-old Taliban insurgency's momentum. Thousands of American and Afghan troops are being sent to the city and surrounding province, which is home to the Taliban movement and has threatened to slide into anarchy. However, the Taliban, which controls swathes of the province, has threatened strong resistance and responded to the announcement of the offensive earlier this month with a string of suicide bombings. Troops are arriving and key routes have been secured, with up to 70 significant Taliban commanders seized or killed ahead of the operation a senior Nato military official in Kabul claimed. "There's roughly today on the ground about 8,000 coalition troops and 12,000 Afghans in the Kandahar fight," he said. A new US brigade will increase international troop strength to 11,000 by June. Thousands of international troops, led by a Canadian task force, have been garrisoned in the province since 2006, but security has only worsened. The official said: "We have never had the force density in Kandahar to really own all the extreme approaches. "With forces that have gone in there we have been able to really slice down on a lot of the traditional avenues into Kandahar itself." The June start date is timed to try and finish the fighting phase before Ramadan begins in August. Resistance is expected to be stiffest in the rural districts of Arghandab, Panjwayi and Zhari, while the city will be largely secured by Afghan police and soldiers.

Non-Unique – there are already about 35,000 troops in Kandahar

**AP 10** (Jan. 2 2010, Associated Press, http://www.newsmax.com/Headline/troop-surge-afghanistan/)IM

KANDAHAR, Afghanistan – The U.S. is preparing to pour at least 20,000 extra troops into southern Afghanistan to cope with a Taliban insurgency that is fiercer than NATO leaders expected. The new troops will augment the 12,500 NATO soldiers — mainly British, Canadian and Dutch — in what amounts to an Afghan version of the surge in Iraq. New construction at Kandahar Air Field foreshadows the upcoming infusion of American power. Runways and housing are being built, along with two new U.S. outposts in Taliban-held regions of Kandahar province. And in the past month the south has been the focus of visiting U.S. and other dignitaries — Sen. John McCain, Defense Secretary Robert Gates, U.S. congressional delegations and leaders from NATO headquarters in Europe. For the first time since NATO took over the country in 2006, an experienced U.S. general, Brig. Gen. John Nicholson, is assigned to the south. He says U.S. Gen. David McKiernan, NATO's commander in Afghanistan, has made the objectives clear in calling the situation in the south a stalemate and asking for more troops, on top of the 32,000 Americans already in Afghanistan. "By introducing more U.S. capability in here we have the potential to change the game," Nicholson said. The Army Corps of Engineers will spend up to $1.3 billion in new construction for troop placements in southern Afghanistan, said the corps commander in Afghanistan, Col. Thomas O'Donovan. Violence in Afghanistan has spiked in the last two years, and Taliban militants now control wide swaths of countryside. Military officials say they have enough troops to win battles but not to hold territory, and they hope the influx of troops, plus the continued growth of the Afghan army, will change that. U.S. officials hope to add at least three new brigades of ground forces in the southern region, along with assets from an aviation brigade, surveillance and intelligence forces, engineers, military police and Special Forces. In addition, a separate brigade of new troops is deploying to two provinces surrounding Kabul.

Non-Unique

Non-Unique – Obama and NATO already sent a surge into Kandahar

**VOA News 10** (26 May 2010, http://www1.voanews.com/english/news/asia/U-S-and-NATO-Forces-Plan-Kandahar-Offensive--94916094.html)IM

Thousands of additional American forces are heading into southern Afghanistan, part of the troop surge that President Barack Obama has deployed to help end the Taliban-fuelled insurgency. Already, U.S. and coalition troops are increasing pressure in and around the southern city of Kandahar, where the Taliban have re-emerged and are threatening the population. Military officials say the strategy behind the operation in Kandahar is to establish security so that ordinary Afghans can live their lives without fear of the Taliban. U.S. Major General James Terry will take command of southern Afghanistan forces in the fall. He is visiting Kandahar to get a sense of what is happening and describes what the coming weeks will bring. "You are going to see an uplift of forces come in and I think you'll start to see this tightening ring of security in and around Kandahar city that I think will then provide the security bubble for governance to start to take in and development to start to take root in Kandahar city," the major general said. In Kandahar city itself, Afghan police and military forces are to take the lead in the operation. Their military units, called "Kandaks," will be supported by coalition troops. Afghan security forces have improved a lot since General Terry was last here in 2006. "Very encouraging, I think they've made a lot of significant progress especially in command and control and the quality of their Kandaks and their efficiency," he said.

No Solvency – Flawed Strategy

No Solvency – Taliban have changed their tactics

Moradi 10 (Ehsanollah Dawlat headlined "The attacks in Kandahar and the new strategy of the Taleban" published by Afghan independent paper Hasht-e Sobh 15 March Lexis Nexis TBC 7/6/10)

According to some analysts, the Taleban have now discerned that their coordinated attacks can have extensive effects, therefore, it was seen that the terrorists entered Kandahar city in group and committed suicide attacks there. Some news sources quoting the Taleban's spokesperson have announced that as the Taleban claim, a terrorist group comprising of 16 terrorists entered Kandahar in a group and carried out their attacks. It seems that the new strategy of the Taleban requires a new and appropriate strategy by the Afghan and international forces as well. The Taleban have now concluded that they cannot be successful in the face-to-face fighting with the Afghan and foreign forces. However, such conditions had previously been seen during Operation Moshtarak [together] in the district of Marja in Helmand when the Taleban could not resist against the Afghan and foreign forces for a long time. Taking that point into consideration that it has previously been announced by the NATO forces that a military operation similar to the one in Marja will also be conducted in Kandahar, the Taleban have now changed their fighting tactic and are making efforts to carry out such organized and coordinated attacks in order to disrupt the preparations of the massive military operation in Kandahar.

No Solvency – Troops Not Key

No Solvency – Real problem can’t be solved by troops

Benoit 10 (Daphne (AFP) – Jun 19, http://www.google.com/hostednews/afp/article/ALeqM5h99Di4oujOF\_GorMcW2\_NiRi7PGA TBC 7/5/10)

It is a phrase often used by American commanders: "Kandahar city is not burning." In the hub of southern Afghanistan, birthplace and stronghold for the Taliban, US-led NATO forces are using a gentle approach, training police and attempting to restore the authority of a government accused of absenteeism. "No one really fights us in the city. The problem is, there is no governance. Militias, gangs, criminal groups govern the city. The solution is going to be a government solution," said a US military official in Kandahar.

No Solvency – McChrystal Was Key

Alt Cause – McChrystal removal kills Kandahar offense

Malik 10 (Maqbool June 25 The Nation http://www.nation.com.pk/pakistan-news-newspaper-daily-english-online/Politics/25-Jun-2010/McChrystals-removal-a-blow-to-Kandahar-op TBC 7/6/10)

The removal of US General McChrystal and the subsequent change of command in the NATO-led ISAF efforts seeking peace and stability, particularly in Afghanistan, have met serious blow, thus giving rise to the fear that US and its western allies are likely to fail to realise the objectives of the eight years long war against terror. Background discussions and interviews with diplomats, political analysts and security experts revealed that dramatic developments would have far-reaching military and political consequences on the US-led international war against terror. The removal of the NATO-led ISAF commander who had planned a decisive crackdown on Kandahar, the headquarter of Afghan Taliban, ostensibly in an effort to create conducive conditions in Afghanistan so that the US could victoriously embark on its troops pullout plan slated to begin from July 2011. “Politically, the US move to replace General McChrystal would boost Taliban’s morale who were lately feeling more alienated as result of the US-sponsored Afghan Taliban’s reintegration,” the sources informed. Security experts were of the view that departure of commander who planned the Kandahar offensive and was set to execute it with the surge of 30,000 US troops due to arrive in Afghanistan by August would make it more difficult for the new Commander General David Petraeus to realise the critical objectives, notwithstanding the US continues with the same war strategy.

McChrystal removal kills Kandahar operation

Malik 10 (Maqbool June 25 The Nation http://www.nation.com.pk/pakistan-news-newspaper-daily-english-online/Politics/25-Jun-2010/McChrystals-removal-a-blow-to-Kandahar-op TBC 7/6/10)

“President Karzai being the main supporter of Kandahar offensive would now have to think twice whether he should continue supporting the same or keep a low key profile ostensibly for political interest and security of his family,” some sources informed. They pointed that President Karzai and his younger brother could not visit their hometown in Kandahar province primarily because of security threats posed by their closely related Taliban. They warned that the proposed US-led military operation in Kandahar would remain a distant dream as long as it fails broad based public support, which they believed would not be possible for General David Petraeus.

No Solvency – Diplomacy First

Diplomacy has to come before military action in Afghanistan

**Pakistan Daily 10** (June 13 2010, http://www.daily.pk/kandahar-operation-will-not-break-the-back-of-taliban-18711/)IM

Peace jirga of tribal elders called by Karzai was initially scheduled in April. It was postponed to May 2 and then to May 29 essentially because of arrest of some important members of Taliban Shura by security forces in Pakistan. It was finally held on 5 June which was attended by as many as 1600. Although the Jirga is being claimed as a roaring success since his plans were endorsed by the participants, none can deny that Karzai is still an unpopular and unwanted leader seen as a surrogate of USA. Rather than first holding talks and then resorting to fighting in case negotiations prove unproductive, the US is putting the cart before the horse by fighting first and talking later. Many among coalition partners do not subscribe to this strategy. Even there are rumblings and dissent within US administration. What if the back of the militancy is not broken after Kandahar operation? Presently US policy makers are working on single hope of sufficiently weakening Taliban, which in their perception will propel Taliban fighters to reach out to Karzai and abandon their leaders and thus weaken the position of Mullah Omar and Haqqani. Like other imprudent plans this plan is also bound to fail.

Alt Cause – Reforms

Reforms are key to long-term stability in Afghanistan

**The Nation 9** (Nov. 11, 2009, http://www.nation.com.pk/pakistan-news-newspaper-daily-english-online/International/11-Nov-2009/UN-body-urges-Karzai-to-fight-corruption)IM

UNITED NATIONS - The UN General Assembly has urged the government of re-elected Afghan President Hamid Karzai to press ahead with “strengthening of the rule of law and democratic processes, the fight against corruption (and) the acceleration of justice sector reform.” The 192-member assembly made that call Monday night by unanimously adopting a resolution that also declared that Afghanistan’s presidential election “credible” and “legitimate”, despite allegations of widespread fraud that led Karzai’s main challenger Abdullah Abdullah to pull out of the run-off round of the election. But the UN assembly raised no doubts about Karzai’s mandate or his right to continue leading the war-torn country. The resolution welcomed “the efforts of the relevant institutions to address irregularities identified by the electoral institutions in Afghanistan and to ensure a credible and legitimate process in accordance with the Afghan Election Law and in the framework of the Afghan Constitution.” It appealed to the international community to help Afghanistan in countering the challenges of the militants’ attacks that threaten its democratic process and and economic development. Before the assembly approved the resolution, 24 countries, including Pakistan, spoke in the debate on the deteriorating situation in Afghanistan in which they stressed the need for the Afghan Government and the global community to work closely together. Pakistan’s Acting Permanent Representative Amjad Hussain Sial said the core of violence and conflict in Afghanistan emanated from terrorist groups, foreign militants such as Al-Qaeda, and militant Taliban who were not prepared to reconcile and give up fighting. The nexus with drug traders was increasingly discernable. The key to long-term stability in Afghanistan, he said, was reformation of the country’s corrupt governmental systems. Equally important was building the civilian institutions at the central and subnational levels.

Conflict is inevitable absent reforms

**The World Bank et. al 7** (Asian Development Bank, UK Dpt. For Int. Development, UN Development Programme, UN Office on Drugs and Crime, Feb. 16 2007, www.unodc.org/pdf/afg/anti\_corruption\_roadmap.pdf)IM

Corruption is generally considered to be a symptom and outcome of weak governance, in the case of Afghanistan reflecting in large part the legacy of a quarter-century of conflict and erosion of state institutions, irregular financing of the conflict from various sources, worsening tensions among ethnic and tribal groups, and the growth of informal/illicit economic activities. Hence in the Afghan context corruption has been intimately linked with the development (and destruction) of the state (see Box 1 for a brief history). Since 2001 the burgeoning drug economy (combined with unintended adverse side effects of counter-narcotics efforts) and large inflows of aid have greatly increased opportunities for corruption, including, to some extent, through the revival of the economy (in that regulations and red tape provide scope for corrupt activities). Corruption has multiple and severe adverse effects on Afghanistan. In addition to the direct financial costs of corruption (higher costs of contracts and public services, loss of public funds due to theft or misuse of government facilities and assets) there are substantial costs related to time devoted to corrupt practices by government officials, private businesses, and the public as well as, especially in the case of the security sector, the human costs (e.g. of threats, intimidation, victimization of people by security forces). Moreover, widespread corruption (or perceptions about the level of corruption in Afghanistan) deters and distorts private investment. But perhaps most important, are the adverse implications of corruption, and popular perceptions of widespread corruption, for the effective functioning, credibility, and legitimacy of the state. A particular problem in this regard is drug-related corruption, allegedly involving senior Government officials, which interacts destructively with corruption in the security sector (especially the police) and justice sector. And finally, corruption in Afghanistan, which is morally rejected on the grounds of being against the basic principles of Islam, further undermines the social fabric and erodes trust, contributing to persistence or resurgence of conflict. All in all, corruption comprises one of the main obstacles to state-building and development in Afghanistan and, indeed, threatens the overall success of the ambitious program of political normalization, reconstruction, and development now underway.

Links to Politics

The war in Afghanistan faces serious opposition both from the public and Congress

**Think Progress 10** (Faiz Shakir, Amanda Terkel, July 6 2010, http://pr.thinkprogress.org/)IM

There are a handful of conservatives who have stood up against the rise of ultra-hawks in their movement. While most Republicans were either staying neutral or demanding Steele's resignation, Rep. Ron Paul (R-TX) -- a longtime Iraq war foe -- defended the embattled chairman, saying that he is "absolutely right" and that Republicans "should stick by him." In a private e-mail obtained by the Huffington Post, Jon Fleischman, the vice chairman of the California GOP, is quoted expressing the same skepticism about the war as Steele. "For what it is worth, I'm an officer with the CA Republican Party and I can't figure out what we are achieving in Afghanistan," he wrote. And during the recent vote on the war supplemental bill, nine House Republicans joined nearly 2/3 of the House Democratic caucus to vote for the McGovern-Obey amendment that would have required Obama to submit a timetable for withdrawal from Afghanistan. Although nearly every Republican in Congress voted to authorize Bush to attack Iraq, and most major conservative institutions -- like the American Enterprise Institute and the Heritage Foundation -- backed the war, a handful of conservative voices, like the libertarian CATO Institute and paleoconservative The American Conservative magazine, strongly opposed the conflict. While it is clear that the conservative movement has an obsession with war, the American people do not. A recent USA Today/Gallup poll found that 58 percent of Americans agree with Obama's stated timeline of July 2011 to begin a withdrawal from Afghanistan. It is up to the President to hold to the timeline and provide an alternative to the right's foreign policy philosophy and addiction to war.

A2: Aff Fails

Sweeping redeployment is key to defeat the Taliban insurgency

**Blanchfield 10** (Mike, Canwest News Service, May 24 2010, http://www.nationalpost.com/news/world/afghanistan/story.html?id=9885002

OTTAWA -- The security situation in Afghanistan has not improved, according to Gen. Walt Natynczyk, Canada’s top soldier, and the U.S. troop surge is essential to defeating the Taliban insurgency. Speaking to the Canadian Club of Ottawa, Gen. Natynczyk said the recent attack on innocent Afghan schoolgirls by attackers throwing battery acid shows that the insurgency does not value life and is a formidable foe. The chief of the defence staff also said the cost of the mission has been high because the Forces capability had been allowed to erode for years before defence spending was restored.

AT: December Review

December review is irrelevant

DeYoung 10 (Karen June 17 The Washington Post Lexis Nexis TBC 7/6/10)

Senior defense and military officials Wednesday played down the importance of an end-of-year review that President Obama has described as crucial to assessing whether his Afghanistan war strategy is working, saying that it would have little bearing on decisions about troop withdrawals scheduled to begin in July 2011. "I would not want to overplay the significance of this review," Gen. David H. Petraeus, head of the U.S. Central Command, told lawmakers. The military, he said, "would not make too much out of that." Undersecretary of Defense Michele Flournoy said the December assessment would be "a bit deeper" than the regular monthly reviews Obama now receives, but essentially the same. The remarks appeared at odds with senior administration officials' past descriptions of the review as a "proof of concept" moment and a potential turning point in the war effort.

December review is irrelevant – no withdrawal decision

DeYoung 10 (Karen June 17 The Washington Post Lexis Nexis TBC 7/6/10)

Petraeus played down the significance of the assessment, saying: "We do reviews all the time. We're constantly doing assessments." He added: "I would not want to overplay the significance of this review," which would come only "three or four months" after full deployment and "six or seven months before what President Obama has described as the point . . . of the process beginning, at a pace to be determined by conditions on the ground, a responsible drawdown of the surge forces." McKeon asked whether the review would be "used by the president to determine the pace and scope for redeployment" of U.S. troops. Petraeus said he thought December was "probably way too far out to be making those kinds of judgments."

A2: Kundahar Key

Success in Kundahar will not mean defeat of the Taliban or success in Afghanistan

**Pakistan Daily 10** (June 13 2010, http://www.daily.pk/kandahar-operation-will-not-break-the-back-of-taliban-18711/)IM

The second US troop surge of 30000 was meant to recapture the lost space in southern and eastern Afghanistan, break the linkage between Taliban and Al-Qaeda, divide and weaken Taliban, train and equip Afghan National Army (ANA) enabling it to takeover frontline duties, make India guardian of Afghanistan, negotiate with Taliban from position of strength and then withdraw leaving behind US friendly regime. Millions of dollars are being doled out to Taliban by US security companies to buy their loyalties. Another operation was launched in Marjah with 15000 foreign troops and ANA with high expectations that it would turn the tide. After the operation ran into snags, attention got riveted towards Kandahar. The much hyped Kandahar operation has been postponed from June to August since the planners are developing cold feet. To cover up another embarrassment, its success has been made contingent upon an operation in North Waziristan, (NW) described as the hub of terrorism wherefrom militants in Afghanistan are guided. A false picture is being given to the world that Kandahar is the bastion of Taliban and its capture will break their back and its outcome will decide the future strategy. This assumption has been made on the premise that Mullah Omar and most Shura members belong to this city. It should be well understood that only Kabul and Kandahar are in effective control of government forces and they have a large presence and well fortified positions. Most militant attacks in this city like the one on 7 June in which seven US and three NATO soldiers were killed and another on police training centre are conducted by raiders coming from outside and not from within. Having announced the operation and the likely month, it will be foolish on part of the Taliban believing in strategy of guerilla tactics to wait for them and offer a pitched mismatched battle in Kandahar. Moreover, Kandahar is poised towards Balochistan and not NW. It was only when very little actionable intelligence could be yielded from arrested Mullah Baradar that Quetta Shura story got punctured. Soon after, Faisal Shahzad fairy-tale was concocted to drum up NW.

South Korea CP

SoKo – Aff Ans

Activists block the CP

Andrew Yeo, 6-23-10. Assistant Prof of Politics @ Catholic University. “Anti-Base Movements in South Korea: Comparative Perspective on the Asia-Pacific,” FPIF, <http://www.fpif.org/articles/anti-base_movements_in_south_korea>.

Both the Maehyangri and Pyeongtaek anti-base movements were initially successful in forming a broad-based coalition, attracting large numbers of activists from multiple movements, and drawing national media attention. In retrospect, the Maehyangri anti-base coalition was more effective in gaining concessions from Seoul and Washington than KCPT. Several reasons may account for these differences as internal movement dynamics and external circumstances varied while movement episodes unfolded. For instance, in Maehyangri, tactics such as illegally breaking into a USFK firing range to disrupt training exercises captured national attention and effectively pressured Seoul and Washington to consider concessions. Similar radical tactics in Pyeongtaek, however, resulted in violence, generating negative publicity for activists and revealing divisions within the movement. KCPT activists also cited greater momentum in anti-USFK sentiment in 2000 than 2005-2006. The Maehyangri issue erupted during a period of extra scrutiny regarding USFK issues. Seoul and Washington were in the middle of negotiating revisions to SOFA. The momentum in 2000, in short, favored civil societal actors, providing activists a favorable domestic political climate. Additionally, even though activists cite greater solidarity between local residents and civic groups in 2005 than 2000, the pace of events in Maehyangri in 2000 required the coalition to act quickly. There was little room for debate.22 In Pyeongtaek, long delays between movement action and the government’s deliberate strategy of drawing out the negotiation process over time took a toll on KCPT. Movement fatigue had set in by 2006. This was compounded by the general weakening of South Korean social movements, stemming from corruption and in-fighting among labor unions, and a decline in South Korean student activism. KCPT was also competing for attention with other coalition movements by 2006, most notably anti-FTA mobilization. Protests against base closure as opposed to base opening or expansion may have also affected movement framing. As one activist joked, some horrible accident or crime was needed to draw the nation’s attention to base-related problems.23 The public could easily connect the dots between low flying jets performing strafing exercises and the potential dangers confronted by nearby residents. On the other hand, stopping the expansion of an already existing base did not grab public attention in quite the same way as a campaign to shut down a noisy firing range.

EVEN IF the government has legal authority, activists will become squatters

Andrew Yeo, 6-23-10. Assistant Prof of Politics @ Catholic University. “Anti-Base Movements in South Korea: Comparative Perspective on the Asia-Pacific,” FPIF, <http://www.fpif.org/articles/anti-base_movements_in_south_korea>.

Although the South Korean government had legally acquired the majority of base expansion land by the end of 2005, residents and activists squatting in abandoned homes prevented the MND from physically taking control of the land. Facing U.S. pressure and fearful of weakening the U.S.-South Korean alliance, the MND stepped up pressure to acquire land for base expansion. On several occasions in spring 2006, the MND sent workers to Daechuri village to erect barbed wire and prevent activists from entering the expanded base land. Residents and activists continued to resist. Preparing the nation for potential violence, on May 1, the South Korean Prime Minister and the Minister of Defense announced on national broadcast the dispatch of riot police to Pyeongtaek while explaining the necessity for U.S. base expansion. Three days later, the MND sent 2,800 engineering and infantry troops to dig trenches and set up barbed wire around the perimeter. The troops were accompanied by 12,000 riot police.19 As morning approached, riot police physically removed activists and students barricading themselves inside an elementary school used as a makeshift anti-base campaign headquarters. Meanwhile, activists and government forces clashed as activists broke through the barbed wire perimeter.

SoKo – Aff Ans

Empircally, this halts base realignment

Andrew Yeo, 6-23-10. Assistant Prof of Politics @ Catholic University. “Anti-Base Movements in South Korea: Comparative Perspective on the Asia-Pacific,” FPIF, <http://www.fpif.org/articles/anti-base_movements_in_south_korea>.

Each anti-base episode retains its own local flavor as residents and activists confront the challenges of U.S. overseas bases. However, South Korean, Guahan (Guam), and Okinawan campaigns face similar constraints as host governments seek to balance domestic demands and pressure from the U.S. to maintain alliance responsibilities. This is not to minimize the achievements of anti-base movements. Anti-base campaigns in South Korea, Okinawa, the Philippines, and Guam past and present have pushed host governments to at least justify why such a continued large U.S. military presence is still necessary, and in certain circumstances have won important concessions.31 In Guam, Governor Felix Camacho and Guam’s Congressional Representative Madeline Bordallo have shied away from unqualified support for additional U.S. Marines after the outpouring of public opposition to the planned expansion of U.S. bases.32 Activists have also forced greater public scrutiny on U.S. alliance-related policies, demanding greater accountability and transparency on issues which are often decided without public debate or explication under the cover of national security.

Turkey CP

Strat Sheet

Winning the affirmative side of this logical, nuanced counterplan requires a few things:

1. Win that there’s no net benefit. The impact defense included should help with that, but you should definitely not rely on that alone.

2. Argue that combating the PKK is not the best way to stop the violence along the border. The PKK leader wants negotiations, but using general analytics about how it would only make the problem worse will help.

3. Spin your/their evidence. The aff and neg cards talk about how Turkey already has troops on the border. If you can make it sound like the status quo solves the net benefit, that’s a step in the right direction.

4. DEFEND YOUR AFF. If your aff takes troops out of Turkey entirely, defend why that is good and use that as leverage against the counterplan. If you can’t say why pulling troops out of Turkey is good and/or why keeping them there is bad, then it’s going to be difficult to beat this CP even if you can reduce the risk of the net benefit.

With some good arguments and some spin on the evidence, you should be able to beat this CP. Have fun!

No Solvency – Negotiations Key

The leader of the PKK only wants a peaceful, democratic solution – the only alternative is more violence

Aqrawi 7/4 (Shamal, reporter for Reuters, http://www.globalpost.com/breaking-news/global/jailed-pkk-leader-says-peace-turkey-possible-report) GAT

The jailed leader of the PKK Kurdish guerrilla group said peace with Turkey was possible if Prime Minister Tayyip Erdogan reformed the constitution and abolished anti-terror laws in the mainly Kurdish southeast. The Kurdistan Workers Party (PKK) has stepped up attacks on the Turkish military after it ended a 14-month ceasefire in June. More than 80 soldiers have been killed this year so far, more than the total in 2009, in one of the deadliest offensives in recent years in the decades-old conflict. Erdogan's government refuses to negotiate with the PKK, which is listed as a terrorist group by Turkey, the European Union and the United States. It does not consider jailed PKK leader Abdullah Ocalan an interlocutor in the Kurdish conflict. "I reiterate my call to Erdogan that a peaceful solution is still possible and that parliament is the correct venue for that," Ocalan, who is serving a life sentence in prison in Turkey, said, according to a statement released by a PKK media office in northern Iraq after a lawyer visited him Wednesday. The PKK has bases in northern Iraq, from where it launches attacks on Turkish soil. It frequently releases statements through PKK offices in northern Iraq. A lawyer for Ocalan in Turkey said he was not aware of such a statement. Ocalan has several lawyers. Ocalan also said Turkey should lower the 10 percent threshold of the vote parties have to gain to be represented in parliament and said Kurdish activists detained in recent police raids in Turkey's southeast should be freed. He also called on the government to release Kurdish children serving sentences on charges of supporting terrorism. All such demands have been made before by the PKK. "My approach regarding the solution is clear. I could deepen the Kurdistan Revolution which would have left millions of people dead... I, however, prefer a democratic solution based on a democratic constitution." Erdogan's government has passed laws to expand cultural and political rights of minority Kurds in the hope of ending a conflict that has killed 40,000 people. The PKK called off a unilateral ceasefire early in June after accusing Erdogan of not being serious about reforms.

No Solvency – Negotiations Key/No US Involvement

The PKK will fight, but their ultimate goal is peace – US involvement only risks more fighting

Cagaptay 9 (Soner, researcher, http://www.turkishforum.com.tr/en/content/2009/08/05/in-their-own-words-pkk-leaders-on-peace-dialogue-and-the-united-states/) GAT

Intent on resolving its ongoing Kurdish problem, Turkey launched a peace initiative last spring that includes measures to disarm the Kurdistan Workers Party (PKK), a group listed by the State Department as a foreign terrorist organization. But does the PKK want peace? The following statements by top PKK leaders provide insight into the group’s intentions, the prospects for peace, and the implications for the United States. On Violence and Peace • “Some intellectuals and writers are renewing calls for the disarmament of the PKK and pulling it outside Turkey’s borders. But what they do not understand is that the most that can happen is a ceasefire, and for a ceasefire to take place, there must be the desire to do so.” – Abdullah Ocalan, founder and leader of the PKK, currently imprisoned in Turkey, January 4, 2009 • “If a solution does not develop, I will withdraw myself from the process. In a month or month and a half, things might take a different direction. Until autumn, much might change. If a war breaks out, ‘Kurdistan’ will secede. We defend peace, and those who do not bring peace will be responsible. The Kurds cannot accept the status quo in Turkey. A war would cause both sides to lose, the people would lose. Afghanistan and Pakistan’s situation is clear, for example.” – Abdullah Ocalan, July 17, 2009 • “On the other hand, surrendering weapons is not even a subject of discussion. The guerillas [his term for PKK members] will never surrender their weapons. Within a democratic system, guerillas would take up a position of responsibility and duty. This is because guerillas are the true defense forces of the Kurdish people. If the guerillas gave up their weapons, then we will go back to the situation thirty years ago, to the time before the PKK.” “Without an indigenous defense — in other words, without the guerillas — the Kurdish people would surrender themselves to imperialists and murderers. The Kurdish people would, of course, never accept that.” “If a general amnesty would include giving leader Apo [Abdullah Ocalan] his freedom, then the PKK might consider a ceasefire, like in 1999, but it will not give up its weapons.” – Duran Kalkan, senior PKK leader, June 23, 2009 • “We always talk about the struggle for peace. The people are leading the fight for peace, they call for peace. Our stance has been and remains: ‘The road to peace goes through resistance in the mountains.’ Those who want to win peace must take to the mountains. I believe the situation is very clear. If there are peace talks now, this is only because there has been freedom fighting in the mountains, and they derive from the strength of the guerillas. Therefore, for peace to win, the guerilla forces must become even stronger.” – Duran Kalkan, June 24, 2009 • “First off, such a thing as disarmament is meaningless. Instead of disarmament, we can talk of undertaking new duties. Within this framework, the reorganization of the guerillas can be kept on the agenda . . . [and] of course the Kurdish people will always need to be defended. In order to live free and democratically, to be organized, to ensure their survival, to look toward the future securely, they need their own defense forces. Without this, how can our community defend itself?” – Duran Kalkan, March 18, 2009 • “Our people must prepare for 2009 as if it is going to be a year of war, and get ready for all out resistance against attacks meant to destroy and massacre them. Our people must build on their inherent defense knowledge and organization to prepare themselves.” “We have never asked to be pardoned, and do not want to be either.” – Feyman Huseyin (Bahoz Erdal), top military leader in the PKK, January 2, 2009 On What the PKK Wants • “Either the Kurds will become independent or not live at all. This is the decision reached by the Kurdish people.” – Cemal Bayik, senior PKK leader, June 18, 2009 • “So if there are Kurds and a Kurdish problem, then this is a problem on a societal level. It is now being said that this problem will be solved not at such a level but as an individual rights problem. Besides that, they say the PKK is a terrorist organization and must be eliminated by force. . . . this means war.” – Murat Karayilan, acting leader of the PKK, June 8, 2009 On the U.S. and International Role • “If the will of resistance of the Kurds is broken, Europe, Turkey, the United States, and Israel are waiting in ambush. They would finish us off.” – Abdullah Ocalan, June 19, 2009 • “The United States and England are still trying to conduct politics over my back. They might bring more dangerous and effective leaders against us [Kurds]. The conspiracy continues, and this bothers me greatly.” – Abdullah Ocalan, July 17, 2009 • “Capitalism has turned human beings into donkeys. . . . What about this system is defensible? The United States and Europe are those responsible for this order. They have caused a situation worse than the Greek occupation.” – Abdullah Ocalan, July 10, 2009 • “If Turkey had realistic politicians, they would ask themselves and consider why the United States and France do not want a solution to the [Kurdish] problem. Instead, Turkish politicians think, ‘how nice, these countries are supporting us.’ They think that with the military, economic, and political support given to them they can dispatch the PKK. But I must respond to them that you cannot eliminate the PKK; this is impossible. . . . Those who support Turkey know very well that the PKK cannot be destroyed. Their goal is to ensure that the status quo remains, so that things remain unresolved. It is for this reason that they support Turkey.” – Murat Karayilan, June 27, 2009 • “The Turkish government already has a joint political agenda with ‘Southern Kurdistan,’ the United States, and Iraq. Purportedly in the south there are currently efforts being made to make the PKK either lay down their arms or destroy them.” – Cemal Bayik, June 19, 2009 • “We are doing everything we can in the name of dialogue and a peaceful resolution. But against us is an approach that does not accept peace for the Kurds. And the United States wants things to stay unresolved, to stay as they are. They are to blame for this.” – Murat Karayilan, June 16, 2009 Policy Implications for the United States The PKK’s anti-Americanism, an often overlooked phenomenon rooted in the group’s persistent communist pedigree, has led the PKK to ratchet up its rhetoric against the United States. Washington should continue to monitor the group, as the PKK’s anti-Americanism will only grow stronger given that the United States does not support its stance. Ultimately, it is up to Turkey to decide how to deal with the PKK. Washington, however, might be well served to stay out of the current initiative. If the United States is seen as shepherding the process while PKK violence continues in the background, Turks may perceive — however falsely — that a U.S.-supported peace initiative is a sham. Washington should be careful not to take ownership of the current initiative to prevent the already debilitated U.S. image from being further damaged in Turkey.

No Impact – No Middle East Escalation

Middle East wars can’t escalate

Yglesias 7 (Matthew, Associate Editor of the Atlantic Monthly, 12 Sep 2007, http://matthewyglesias.theatlantic.com/archives/2007/09/containing\_iraq.php) GAT

Kevin Drum tries to [throw some water](http://www.washingtonmonthly.com/archives/individual/2007_09/012050.php) on the "Middle East in Flames" theory holding that American withdrawal from Iraq will lead not only to a short-term intensification of fighting in Iraq, but also to some kind of broader regional conflagration. Ivo Daalder and James Lindsay, as usual sensible but several clicks to my right, also [make this point briefly](http://www.democracyjournal.org/article.php?ID=6555) in Democracy: "Talk that Iraq’s troubles will trigger a regional war is overblown; **none of the half-dozen civil wars the Middle East** has **witnessed over the past half-century led to a regional conflagration**." Also worth mentioning in this context is the basic point that **the Iranian and Syrian militaries** just **aren't able to conduct** meaningful **offensive military operations**. **The Saudi, Kuwait, and Jordanian militaries are even worse. The IDF has plenty of Arabs to fight closer to home**. What you're looking at, realistically, is that our allies in Kurdistan might provide safe harbor to PKK guerillas, thus prompting our allies in Turkey to mount some cross-border military strikes against the PKK or possibly retaliatory ones against other Kurdish targets. This is a real problem, but it's obviously not a problem that's mitigated by having the US Army try to act as the Baghdad Police Department or sending US Marines to wander around the desert hunting a [possibly mythical](http://www.washingtonmonthly.com/features/2007/0710.tilghman.html) terrorist organization.

Terminal impacts empirically denied

David 97 (Steven R., expert on international politics and security studies, U.S.-Israeli Relations at the Crossroads, pp. 95) GAT

It is no great revelation to identify the Middle East as an unstable region. Since the establishment of Israel there have been at least six Arab-Israeli wars, several inter-Arab conflicts, and countless assassinations, coups, insurgencies and civil wars. This is in marked contrast to the “developed” world (North America, Western Europe, Japan, Australia and New Zealand) where here has been no major conflict since the end of the Second World War.

No Impact – Squo Solves PKK

**After recent PKK attacks, Turkish forces have deployed along the border – there’s no need for US troops there**

Karadeniz 6/21 (Tulay, Ankara correspondent for Reuters, http://www.reuters.com/article/idUSTRE65K2YU20100621) GAT

Turkish commandos backed by helicopters deployed along the Iraqi border on Monday after Kurdish guerrillas killed 11 soldiers at the weekend in one of the deadliest attacks for years in their separatist war. In Ankara, President Abdullah Gul chaired an emergency security meeting, attended by Prime Minister Tayyip Erdogan and military leaders, as pressure mounted for the government to rein in escalating violence in the mainly Kurdish southeast. In fresh violence, Kurdistan Workers' Party (PKK) guerrillas attacked two military police units on Monday in Diyarbakir, the largest city in the southeast, killing one soldier and wounding another, security sources said. Four rebels died in the clashes. Elite troops rappelled down from helicopters and poured out in mechanized infantry units to surround Kurdish rebels in an operation along the Iraqi border, security sources said. The deployment has boosted troop numbers well into the thousands along the border with Iraq, where rebels are based.

No Impact – Squo Solves PKK

The US is already committed to helping Turkey against the PKK through non-violent means – this solves best

Bozkurt 3/20 (Abdullah, writer for the Turkish Press, http://www.todayszaman.com/tz-web/news-204904-united-states-vows-to-put-pkk-out-of-business.html) GAT

Drawing an analogy to notorious American gangster Al Capone, who was convicted on charges of tax evasion, a senior US counterterrorism official has vowed to bring down the terrorist Kurdistan Workers’ Party (PKK) organization operating on Turkish soil through financial instruments available to authorities. “We want to put the PKK out of business. We put Al Capone out of service for tax evasion. This is what we want to do [for the PKK as well],” Shari Villarosa, deputy coordinator for regional affairs in the State Department’s Counterterrorism Office, told Today’s Zaman in Ankara on Thursday. “It is a very effective way. Our desire is to stop the flow of funds to terrorists,” she said, adding, “We regard a threat to Turkey as a threat to the US.” The United States, which already classifies the PKK as a terrorist organization, imposed further sanctions on the group to cut off its funding under an anti-drug smuggling law in 2008 and designated three top leaders of the organization as narcotics traffickers last year. “This would enable us to take action against any of those individuals and to close their bank accounts and seize their assets,” Villarosa explained, noting federal prosecutors can also go after individuals who donate to fundraising campaigns by the terrorist group. Senior US counterterrorism official Shari Villarosa has vowed to bring down the terrorist PKK operating on Turkish soil through financial instruments available to authorities. ‘We regard a threat to Turkey as a threat to the US,’ she said, noting they want to put the PKK out of business to stop the flow of funds to the terrorists She stressed that the action would put pressure on non-US banks as well because she said those banks that have accounts belonging to someone on the US terror list would not want to jeopardize their ties with the US banking system. “They will also cut off this funding. We found this an extremely effective measure in cutting [off the] sources of funds. If there are no funds, it is going to be very difficult to mount future attacks,” Villarosa underlined. Commenting on a recent wave of arrests targeting PKK-affiliated businesses in France, Belgium, Italy and Germany in recent weeks, Villarosa acknowledged that the US strongly urged Europeans to take action against PKK. “We encouraged more cooperation between Turkish and European legal officials, prosecutors and law enforcement people. We can claim [some] credit for helping bring people together with positive results,” she said. Turkey and the US have significantly increased cooperation on the PKK threat since 2007. The US has started to share intelligence on PKK activities and relayed real-time actionable intelligence to the Turkish military so that security operations can pinpoint terrorist hideouts. The State Department also intensified what Villarosa called a “diplomatic outreach” program to explain to European partners the threat PKK activities pose. The senior counterterrorism official further noted that US officials have regular meetings with their European counterparts on global terror threats and gave assurances that the PKK has always been on the agenda of those discussions. “I have regular twice-a-year talks with the EU. The last one was in the US in November. I will go to Brussels in April. The PKK was part of our discussions as well,” she remarked. Though she declined to comment on any specifics of intelligence operations and played down differences of opinion between the two NATO allies, Villarosa emphasized that the US has increased its cooperation in “many fashions.” She said the US officials have raised the issue of the PKK threat with both the central Iraqi government and Kurdistan regional administration officials. “They are very well aware of our concerns that the PKK poses a real threat to stability,” she said, adding that a “terrorist group operating freely is not good for the stability of either Turkey or Iraq.” She vowed to continue raising US concerns with the relevant authorities in Iraq.

No Impact – US-Turkish Relations Resilient

Despite major disagreements, both sides recognize that cooperation is necessary

Ergin 6/30 (Sedat, writer for the Daily News, http://www.hurriyetdailynews.com/n.php?n=what-did-come-out-of-the-obama-erdogan-meeting-2010-06-30) GAT

President of the United States Barack Obama met Turkish Prime Minister Recep Tayyip Erdoğan over the weekend in Canada. But in order to make an assessment on the consequences of this meeting I better underline the following fact: The meeting took place Saturday evening. In fact, the day before U.S. Assistant State Secretary Philip Gordon made a statement to the Associated Press that was kind of a cold shower for Turkish public opinion. What more Obama said, compared to Gordon Gordon, reminding that questions have been asked about political shift in Turkey, said, "We think Turkey remains committed to NATO, Europe and the United States, but that needs to be demonstrated." That was not an ordinary remark made in a hurry. It was a calculated move aiming to reflect the frame of the Obama-Erdoğan meeting and show at the same time that the American side is seriously disturbed by the latest developments. Did Obama repeat to Erdoğan what Gordon said in his message? According to the Americans, Obama adopted a similar but more general approach. Although he was not as tough as Gordon, Obama was very clear on Turkey’s “No” vote against sanctions on Iran in particular. Considering statements issued by the Turkish side afterward, such as “Both parties have understood each other very well,” one can say that both Obama and Erdoğan did not hesitate to say whatever they were thinking. Can Obama convince Netanyahu? Another subject that disturbed Obama was Turkey-Israel relations. The U.S. President said they do not want to see Turkish-Israeli ties deteriorated but rather expect normalization. Erdoğan, in return, asked for an apology from Israel, compensation for the families of the nine people who died in the Israeli raid and for the blockage on Gaza to be lifted. Obama supports Turkey’s demands. That doesn’t mean, however, a positive result can be obtained. Obama will probably convey expectations of the Turkish side to Israeli Prime Minister Benjamin Netanyahu, who is to pay a visit to Washington soon. It is difficult to say how Netanyahu will react. I can only say that relations between the Obama administration and Israel are not perfect. One of the most critical items also on the agenda was obviously the outlawed Kurdistan Workers’ Party, or PKK. We see that the U.S. administration will take action regarding the PKK issue. It is also important that Erdoğan said a few steps are expected beyond sharing intelligence. In the days to come, with the cooperation of the Kurdish groups under Massoud Barzani in the Regional Kurdish Administration, there will be developments that will narrow the PKK’s ability to maneuver. Controlled-relation structure The meeting in the end showed that, despite serious disagreements, the parties couldn’t take the risk of harming Turkey-U.S. relations due to mutual interests. The Obama administration has to cooperate with Turkey in many problematic regions of the world, starting with Iraq and Afghanistan. For this reason, Washington prefers to stress differences of opinion in an environment of dialogue although they are offended by Erdoğan’s attitude toward Israel and Iran. Apparently, Obama’s naïve look on Erdoğan now is being replaced by a more realistic approach. In the Ankara camp, we see that Erdoğan is not happy either with escalating tension lately. He doesn’t like to give an impression of a leader weakening in dialogue with Obama. Erdoğan now is taking steps more carefully and more controlled in order not to harm Turkey-U.S. relations any further.

No Impact – US-Turkish Relations Resilient

**Nothing is able to harm US-Turkey relations**

Azerbaijan Today 6/18 (Azerbaijan Today News, 6/18/10, http://www.today.az/news/regions/69875.html) GAT

Nobody and nothing can spoil the historical relations between the U.S. and Turkey, Turkish Ambassador to Azerbaijan Hulusi Kilic said. "The countries have historically strategic and mutually beneficial relations. No one can hurt them, the relations will be expanded and strengthened," the Turkish diplomat said. U.S. Congressmen from the Republican and Democratic parties, on Wednesday warned Turkey about the high price that it must pay if it continues the rapprochement with Iran, and takes harsh criticism towards Israel, the Arabic website Al Arabiya reported with reference to the Israeli media. Congressmen's statements are connected with the actions of the Turkish government towards Israel after the events with "Freedom Flotilla". The humanitarian convoy, transporting about 600 international activists and moving to Gaza to break the naval blockade of the enclave, was stopped by the Israeli Navy in the neutral waters of the Mediterranean Sea. The requirements of Israeli commandos to check whether there are weapons on board escalated into clashes. As a result, nine Turkish activists were killed. This led to a serious deterioration in relations between Turkey and Israel, which were military allies in the region in the past. On Thursday Israeli newspaper Haaretz reported that representatives of some Jewish organizations in the United States refused from meeting with Turkish officials to discuss the current crisis in bilateral relations. The newspaper quotes one of the representatives of the Jewish lobby, who expressed willingness to conduct a dialogue only if the Turkish government headed by Recep Tayyip Erdogan reconsiders relations with Israel. Turkish Ambassador to Azerbaijan doubts that the Jewish lobby can damage relations between Ankara and Washington. "Personal interests of the country are important for the U.S. Turkey and the United States are allies in NATO. Moreover, we are cooperating in various fields. Everybody knows the position of President Obama towards Turkey, as well as the position of Ankara towards the U.S", Ambassador said. On Thursday, it was known about the cancellation of a joint Turkish-U.S meeting in Ankara, dedicated to the fight against terrorism, to be held this month, upon Washington's initiative. The White House spokesman Phillip Crawley said at a press-conference that the event was canceled because the delegation from the States, headed by the U.S. State Department Coordinator for Counter-Terrorism Daniel Benjamin was unable to attend the meeting as scheduled. "Turkey is an important ally in the fight against terrorism. The U.S. are waiting for a new program of this event", Crowley said.

Phaseout CP

2AC – Top Level

1. Doesn’t compete – PERM: do both AND Perm: do the CP.

1. Topicality doesn’t establish competition – the CP \*also\* initiates a reduction – even if interpret ‘reduce’ differently, the CP still isn’t textually competitive.
2. Textual competition is necessary to form competition – allowing CPs that only compete based on the function of the Aff creates a slippery slope that rewards Consult and QPQ CPs – this crushes Aff ground and topic education.
3. Their interp of normal means is backwards – if they’re right that troop reductions are usually conditional or gradual, that makes their solvency evidence another defense of the Aff
4. The plan is a rough draft, not a blueprint – their interpretation requires the Aff to specify thousands of details, making it impossible to debate – this flips their CP ground arguments because the Aff would constantly break new, lengthy plan texts to prevent the 1NC from having time to write CPs – we solve their offense DAs to withdrawal but not the MECHANISM of withdrawing

2. Doesn’t solve the Aff –

1. An immediate, complete withdrawal of troops is key – that’s the < > evidence
2. Doesn’t solve perception – quick topic FYI – NONE of the military bases are permanent – this is why the topic didn’t include European bases – the CP is perceived as \*tinkering\* with withdrawal rather than \*accelerating\* withdrawal

3. They’re cheating – the CP is just delay in drag – they’re in a DOUBLE BIND – EITHER

1. The CP doesn’t remove all troops and a built-in solvency deficit outweighs OR
2. The CP still removes all troops and just delays the date of transaction – this makes it impossible to be Aff because there are thousands of events like elections, key operations, etc. that we could never generate predictable offense to

4. No risk of offense the other way – we’ll defend immediacy for purposes of their DAs but not their CPs

2AC – Top Level

There are tons of interpretations of reduce – NONE of them are synonymous with eliminate, they’re all synonymous with reduce

Princeton Wordnet, ’10. wordnetweb.princeton.edu/perl/webwn

cut down on; make a reduction in; "reduce your daily fat intake"; "The employer wants to cut back health benefits"

make less complex; "reduce a problem to a single question"

bring to humbler or weaker state or condition; "He reduced the population to slavery"

simplify the form of a mathematical equation of expression by substituting one term for another

lower in grade or rank or force somebody into an undignified situation; "She reduced her niece to a servant"

be the essential element; "The proposal boils down to a compromise"

shrink: reduce in size; reduce physically; "Hot water will shrink the sweater"; "Can you shrink this image?"

lessen and make more modest; "reduce one's standard of living"

make smaller; "reduce an image"

SoKo – AFF Ans

Withdrawing as early as possible is key – this outweighs any risk of the net benefit

KIM JOHNG SOHN, ‘9 – Tongil Korea Net, “US Should Terminate Military Presence in S Korea As Early As Possible,” 9-8, <http://tongilkorea.net/2009/09/08/us-should-terminate-military-presence-in-s-korea-as-early-as-possible/>.

Pyongyang — It has passed 64 years since the U.S. imperialists’ occupation of south Korea. If the United States persistently enforces its policy of military presence in south Korea, lending a deaf ear to the voices of the peoples of Korea and other countries of the world demanding the earliest withdrawal of the U.S. forces from south Korea, it will face bitterer rebuff and denunciation at home and abroad. The U.S. forces’ landing in south Korea was aimed at keeping it under its occupation and turning it into its colony, dividing Korea into two parts and using its southern half as a military appendage for executing its policy of aggression. The U.S. moves to seek its forces’ permanent presence in south Korea and bolster up its combat capability are a challenge to the demand of the times for the withdrawal of foreign troops and their trend. The U.S. should pull its forces out of south Korea as early as possible as demanded by international law and the times. The termination of the U.S. forces’ presence in south Korea would remove the basic factor of threatening the peace in Korea and the biggest hurdle lying in the way of national reunification. The pullback of the U.S. forces from south Korea would result in eliminating the most dangerous hotbed of war in the world and thus help create environment favorable for ensuring peace and security on the Korean peninsula and the rest of Asia and the world. How to approach the issue of the U.S. forces’ withdrawal from south Korea serves as a barometer judging whether the U.S. has a will to rectify its hostile policy towards the DPRK or not and whether it wishes to see Korea’s reunification and peace or not. The world is waiting for the U.S. to make a switchover in its attitude.

SoKo – AFF Ans

Total withdrawal is crucial

PMAINDF, ‘4. “Totally withdraw the US military bases in south Korea,” Pyongyang Mission of the AINDF, News Report: No. 11

June, <http://ndfsk.dyndns.org/kuguk8/pym/nr0406-11/total.htm>.

There is a map of the facilities of the US Forces Korea on the USFK homepage (www.korea.army.mil.) The facilities cover south Korea as a net. The information officer of the US 8th Army said. “Now there are 90 facilities related to the US troops in south Korea. They involve 41 main bases, 38 military communication installations and 11 training camps. The land used by the USFK covers 6,770 thousand pyeongs. (One pyeong equals 3.3 square meters)” The US troops in south Korea number more than 35,000. This means that about 1,900 pyeongs of land is allotted to every GIs. It is equivalent to 61 apartment houses of 31 pyeongs. The Yongsan Garrison in central Seoul alone covers 780,000 pyeongs. The largest training camp of the USFK is “Bulls Eye”, the US 2nd Division training ground in Paju, Gyeonggi Province, which covers 28 million pyeongs of land. All the US military bases have inflicted disasters upon the Korean people for 60-odd years. The south Korean people have suffered from loss of lives and properties and human rights violation owing to the brigandish arbitrariness, atrocities and the war exercises of the US troops there for over half a century. In a word, they have suffered all kinds of misfortunes. Numerous are the damages caused by the US military bases including the case of “Cooney bombing firing range” in Maehyang-ri where several south Koreans were wounded by the wrong bombing by planes of the US 7th Air Force and the case of the US military base in Pyeongtaek where toxic oil was discharged due to damage of oil pipe. Keenly realizing that they cannot live comfortably leaving the US military bases intact, the south Korean people have turned out in the struggle to withdraw the military bases. Alarmed by the fierce anti-US resistance of the south Korean people, the United States schemes to calm down their anti-US sentiments by relocating some military bases. Its aim is not abandonment of the military bases in south Korea but transfer. And it is nothing but the relocation of its troops to the southern area of Han River in keeping with the new security strategy for preemptive attack against north Korea. The south Korean people do not want the US military presence in this land any longer. The Yankees must not relocate but totally withdraw the military bases and return home. The south Korean people will further intensify the struggle for the total withdrawal of the US troops under the banner of “by our nation itself.”

North Korea won’t trust the CP – they still view the remaining presence as a threat to national and regional security

Defense Talk, ‘6. “North Korea Demands US Troops Pull Out Of South,” Defense Talk, 8-14, <http://www.defencetalk.com/north-korea-demands-us-troops-pull-out-of-south-7104/>.

North Korea urged South Korea Sunday to push for the withdrawal of US troops and said the military presence could bring disaster. The communist state's Minju Joson newspaper said the South would "not be free from any misfortune and disasters" arising from the US military presence which dates back to the 1950-1953 Korean War. "The South Korean authorities should take a step to force the US troops to withdraw from South Korea as demanded by the people," Minju Joson said. The United States is reducing its forces in South Korea from 37,000 to 25,000, with 2008 set as the deadline for the troop cut, and wants to be able to redeploy them outside the country in time of need. South Korea is pushing to secure wartime control over its troops which are currently under a US-led combined command. US troops are stationed in the South to help its 650,000-strong army face up to North Korea's 1.2 million-strong army. Rodong Sinmun, newspaper of the North's communist party newspaper, repeated Sunday that US "imperialists" were preparing an invasion by stepping up propaganda and military drills. "They are engrossed in a vicious anti-DPRK (North Korea) smear campaign based on sheer lies. ... It is an operation to be carried out by them prior to invading it by force of arms," Rodong said. "These reckless moves against the DPRK have created such a tense situation on the Korean Peninsula that a war may break out there any moment." The United States has flatly denied planning to go to war against North Korea despite a long-running standoff over its nuclear and missile development programs.

Condition CP

\*\*Generic Aff\*\*

Aff- Generic- Doesn’t Solve US leadership

And consultation kills US credibility and Heg

Carroll 9 (James FF, Notes & Comments Editor – Emory International Law Review, J.D. with Honors – Emory University School of Law, “*Emory International Law Review*, 23 Emory Int'l L. Rev. 167) ET

n221. See Thomas Friedman, Op-Ed., 9/11 is Over, N.Y. Times, Sept. 30, 2007, § 4, at 12. This does not mean, however, that foreign countries should hold a veto over U.S. foreign or domestic policies, particularly policies that are not directly related to their national survival. Allowing foreign countries or international institutions to veto or modify unrelated U.S. policies would make a mockery of our foreign policy and destroy the credibility of American leadership. International cooperation does not require making our policy subservient to the whims of other nations. See generally The Allies and Arms Control (F.O. Hampson et al. eds., 1992). See also Khalilzad, supra note 177.

Aff- Generic- Links to Politics

Obama must be an absolute leader in military missions or be seen as politically weak- counter- plan links to politics

Todd, Murra, & Montanaro June 24th (Chuck, Mark, and Domenica- staff writers, 6.24.10, *NBS News*, http://firstread.msnbc.msn.com/\_news/2010/06/24/4555507-first-thoughts-obamas-leadership-moment ) ET

\*\*\* Obama's leadership moment: Talk about turning a lemon into lemonade. President Obama's firing yesterday of Gen. Stanley McChrystal -- and replacing him with Gen. David Petraeus -- provided him with a leadership moment at a time he desperately needed it. Our brand-new NBC/WSJ poll (conducted before the Rolling Stone article came out) shows that Obama's scores on being able to handle a crisis, on being decisive, and having strong leadership qualities all have plummeted since last year. What's more, the Petraeus move also potentially gives Obama a parachute if Afghanistan is indeed unwinnable. Indeed, check out what GOP Sen. Lindsey Graham said yesterday: "Dave Petraeus is our best hope. If things don't change, nobody can pull it out in Afghanistan." So in terms of giving him a leadership moment, er, commander-in-chief moment, as well as political cover if the situation in Afghanistan doesn't improve, that Rolling Stone article might turn out to be the best thing to have happened to President Obama in quite some time.

Obama must not be seen as compromising or he will not have political support from parties

Barone June 24th (Michael, *Critical Bias*, 6.24.10, http://www.criticalbias.com/2010/06/24/whether-he-likes-it-or-not-obama-must-command/ ) ET

Obama’s decisionmaking on Afghanistan so far could be characterized as splitting the difference. He added troops early on and opted for McChrystal’s counterinsurgency strategy while propitiating his party’s left with something in the nature of a deadline for withdrawal. While backing McChrystal, he also appointed as our civilian leader in Afghanistan retired Gen. Karl Eikenberry, who disagreed with McChrystal’s strategy. By all accounts, including Rolling Stone’s, they have not had the close cooperative relationship that Gen. David Petraeus and civilian honcho Ryan Crocker had in Iraq in 2007 and 2008. A president is entitled to take political factors into consideration in making military decisions. Franklin Roosevelt, who of all our presidents showed the greatest gift for selecting the right general or admiral for particular assignments, ordered the invasion of North Africa in 1942 against the unanimous advice of the Joint Chiefs of Staff. He believed that the American people and our allies needed to see America taking decisive action in the European Theater, even in a peripheral location. Obama leads a political party that before his election argued that Afghanistan was the good war (and Iraq the bad one) but which is now divided on whether we should persevere there. He faces an opposition party that mostly supports our course in Afghanistan but is worried about our prospects there and fears a premature withdrawal. He is not the first president to head a national security establishment that is divided and distrustful, as the Rolling Stone article confirms. And he is surely not the first president to be the subject of disparaging remarks by his military subordinates. But unfortunately those remarks have come out into the open in a way that makes it very hard to go on splitting the difference. With Gen. McChrystal gone, it may be time to consider other changes in personnel. And it may be time for Obama to embrace a word he has been reluctant to utter: victory. His duty is to set a course that will produce success, to install the people who can achieve that goal and to give them the backing they need.

Aff- Generic- Links to Politics

Obama must stop attempting to compromise in national defense issues or see the decline of his administration

Mead 10 (Walter Russell, he Henry A. Kissinger senior fellow for U.S. foreign policy at the Council on Foreign Rel, *Foreign Policy*, http://www.foreignpolicy.com/articles/2010/01/04/the\_carter\_syndrome , Jan/Feb 10) ET

Neither a cold-blooded realist nor a bleeding-heart idealist, Barack Obama has a split personality when it comes to foreign policy. So do most U.S. presidents, of course, and the ideas that inspire this one have a long history at the core of the American political tradition. In the past, such ideas have served the country well. But the conflicting impulses influencing how this young leader thinks about the world threaten to tear his presidency apart -- and, in the worst scenario, turn him into a new Jimmy Carter. Obama's long deliberation over the war in Afghanistan is a case study in presidential schizophrenia: After 94 days of internal discussion and debate, he ended up splitting the difference -- rushing in more troops as his generals wanted, while calling for their departure to begin in July 2011 as his liberal base demanded. It was a sober compromise that suggests a man struggling to reconcile his worldview with the weight of inherited problems. Like many of his predecessors, Obama is not only buffeted by strong political headwinds, but also pulled in opposing directions by two of the major schools of thought that have guided American foreign-policy debates since colonial times.

And, obama’s military strategy faces opposition- he must be perceived as strong

Mead 10 (Walter Russell, he Henry A. Kissinger senior fellow for U.S. foreign policy at the Council on Foreign Rel, *Foreign Policy*, http://www.foreignpolicy.com/articles/2010/01/04/the\_carter\_syndrome , Jan/Feb 10) ET

Yet as Obama is already discovering, any president attempting such a Jeffersonian grand strategy in the 21st century faces many challenges. In the 19th-century heyday of Jeffersonian foreign policy in American politics, it was easier for U.S. presidents to limit the country's commitments. Britain played a global role similar to that of the United States today, providing a stable security environment and promoting international trade and investment. Cruising as a free rider in the British world system allowed Americans to reap the benefits of Britain's world order without paying its costs.

Aff- Generic- Links to Politics

And Obama’s deliberations on foreign policy draws in criticism from both sides- counterplan links to politics

Mead 10 (Walter Russell, he Henry A. Kissinger senior fellow for U.S. foreign policy at the Council on Foreign Rel, *Foreign Policy*, http://www.foreignpolicy.com/articles/2010/01/04/the\_carter\_syndrome , Jan/Feb 10) ET

The widespread criticism of Obama's extended Afghanistan deliberations is a case in point. To a Jeffersonian president, war is a grave matter and such an undesirable course that it should only be entered into with the greatest deliberation and caution; war is truly a last resort, and the costs of rash commitments are more troubling than the costs of debate and delay. Hamiltonians would be more concerned with executing the decision swiftly and with hiding from other powers any impression of division among American counsels. But Obama found harsh critics on all sides: Wilsonians recoiled from the evident willingness of the president to abandon human rights or political objectives to settle the war. Jacksonians did not understand what, other than cowardice or dithering," could account for his reluctance to support the professional military recommendation. And the most purist of the Jeffersonians -- neoisolationists on both left and right -- turned on Obama as a sellout. Jeffersonian foreign policy is no bed of roses.

Obama’s indecisiveness forced by counterplan will bring republican attack- empirical proof

Mead 10 (Walter Russell, he Henry A. Kissinger senior fellow for U.S. foreign policy at the Council on Foreign Rel, *Foreign Policy*, http://www.foreignpolicy.com/articles/2010/01/04/the\_carter\_syndrome , Jan/Feb 10) ET

In recent history, Jeffersonian foreign policy has often faced attacks from all the other schools of thought. Kissinger's policy of détente was blasted on the right by conservative Republicans who wanted a stronger stand against communism and on the left by human rights Democrats who hated the cynical regional alliances the Nixon Doctrine involved (with the shah of Iran, for example). Carter faced many of the same problems, and the image of weakness and indecision that helped doom his 1980 run for re-election is a perennial problem for Jeffersonian presidents. Obama will have to leap over these hurdles now, too.

And, attempts to listen to other nations when determining foreign policy undermines Obama’s legitimacy worldwide

Mead 10 (Walter Russell, he Henry A. Kissinger senior fellow for U.S. foreign policy at the Council on Foreign Rel, *Foreign Policy*, http://www.foreignpolicy.com/articles/2010/01/04/the\_carter\_syndrome , Jan/Feb 10) ET

It is not only Americans who will challenge the new American foreign policy. Will Russia and Iran respond to Obama's conciliatory approach with reciprocal concessions -- or, emboldened by what they interpret as American weakness and faltering willpower, will they keep pushing forward? Will the president's outreach to the moderate majority of Muslims around the world open an era of better understanding, or will the violent minority launch new attacks that undercut the president's standing at home? Will the president's inability to deliver all the Israeli concessions Arabs would like erode his credibility and contribute to even deeper levels of cynicism and alienation across the Middle East? Can the president execute an orderly reduction in the U.S. military stake in Iraq and Afghanistan without having hostile forces fill the power vacuum? Will Venezuelan leader Hugo Chávez be so impressed with American restraint under Obama that he moderates his own course and ceases to make anti Yanquismo a pillar of his domestic and international policy? Will other countries heed the president's call to assume more international responsibility as the United States reduces its commitments -- or will they fail to fulfill their obligations as stakeholders in the international system? A Jeffersonian policy of restraint and withdrawal requires cooperation from many other countries, but the prospect of a lower American profile may make others less, rather than more, willing to help the United States.

Aff- Generic- Links to Politics

And, obama must back up his foreign policy goals or be viewed as a liar

Mead 10 (Walter Russell, he Henry A. Kissinger senior fellow for U.S. foreign policy at the Council on Foreign Rel, *Foreign Policy*, http://www.foreignpolicy.com/articles/2010/01/04/the\_carter\_syndrome , Jan/Feb 10) ET

Obama may well believe what he said in his inaugural speech -- "we reject as false the choice between our safety and our ideals" -- but as any president must he is already making exactly those tradeoffs. Why else refuse to meet the Dalai Lama? Why else pledge support to the corrupt regime of President Hamid Karzai in Afghanistan or aid Pakistan despite the dismal track record of both the civil and military arms of the Pakistani government when it comes to transparent use of U.S. resources? Did the administration not renew its efforts to build a relationship with the regime in Tehran even as peaceful democratic protesters were being tortured and raped in its jails? Is Obama not taking "incentives" to Khartoum, a regime that has for more than a decade pursued a policy in Darfur that the U.S. government has labeled genocidal?

And obama must abandon his compromising ways or risk political opposition

Mead 10 (Walter Russell, he Henry A. Kissinger senior fellow for U.S. foreign policy at the Council on Foreign Rel, *Foreign Policy*, http://www.foreignpolicy.com/articles/2010/01/04/the\_carter\_syndrome , Jan/Feb 10) ET

It is hard to reconcile the transcendent Wilsonian vision of America's future with a foreign policy based on dirty compromises with nasty regimes. If the government should use its power and resources to help the poor and the victims of injustice at home, shouldn't it do something when people overseas face extreme injustice and extreme peril? The Obama administration cannot easily abandon a human rights agenda abroad. The contradiction between the sober and limited realism of the Jeffersonian worldview and the expansive, transformative Wilsonian agenda is likely to haunt this administration as it haunted Carter's, most fatefully when he rejected calls to let the shah of Iran launch a brutal crackdown to remain in power. Already the Wilsonians in Obama's camp are muttering darkly about his failure to swiftly close the Guantánamo prison camp, his fondness for government secrecy, his halfhearted support for investigating abuses of the past administration, and his failure to push harder for a cap-and-trade bill before the Copenhagen summit.

And, lack of strong action by obama will cause discontent

Mead 10 (Walter Russell, he Henry A. Kissinger senior fellow for U.S. foreign policy at the Council on Foreign Rel, *Foreign Policy*, http://www.foreignpolicy.com/articles/2010/01/04/the\_carter\_syndrome , Jan/Feb 10) ET

Over time, these rumblings of discontent will grow, and history will continue to throw curveballs at him. Can this president live with himself if he fails to prevent a new round of genocide in the Great Lakes region of Africa? Can he wage humanitarian war if all else fails? Can he make these tough decisions quickly and confidently when his closest advisors and his political base are deeply and hopelessly at odds?

\*\*Aff- Afghanistan\*\*

Aff- Afghanistan- Says NO

And the US will say no- they will withdraw when and only when they want to

BreitBart 9 (*BreitBart,* july 8, 2009, http://www.breitbart.com/article.php?id=080708173950.vpy06uxo&show\_article=1 ) ET

The United States on Tuesday rejected a demand from Iraq for a specific date for pullout of US-led foreign troops from the country, saying any withdrawal will be based on conditions on the ground. "The US government and the government of Iraq are in agreement that when we, the US government, we want to withdraw, we will withdraw. However, that decision will be conditions-based," State Department spokesman Gonzalo Gallegos said. Iraq said on Tuesday it will reject any security pact with the United States unless it sets a date for the pullout of US-led troops. "We will not accept any memorandum of understanding if it does not give a specific date for a complete withdrawal of foreign troops," national security advisor Muwaffaq al-Rubaie told reporters in the holy city of Najaf. The controversial demand from Baghdad's Shiite-led government underlines Iraq's new hardened stand in complex negotiations aimed at striking a security deal with Washington.

\*\*Aff- Iraq\*\*

Aff- Iraq- Says No- Democrats

We’ll say no- democrats are way opposed to withdrawal

Theisen 7 (Kenneth, organizer with the World Can't Wait, *The World Can’t Wait*, 10-2-7, http://www.worldcantwait.net/index.php?option=com\_content&task=view&id=4351&Itemid=220 ) ET

In a number of articles on this site we have emphasized that the leading Democratic contenders for president will keep U.S. troops in Iraq for many years and will not end the war there. This was reinforced during the Democratic presidential debate on September 26, 2007 At the beginning of the debate, debate moderator Tim Russert asked Senators Hillary Clinton and Barack Obama, as well as former Senator John Edwards whether they would promise to have all U.S. troops out by January 2013. All three refused to make such a promise even though that is more than five years from now. Obama responded, "We would get combat troops out of Iraq. The only troops that would remain would be those that have to protect U.S. bases and U.S. civilians, as well as to engage in counterterrorism activities in Iraq." He failed to mention that this would allow tens of thousands of troops, if not more, to remain in Iraq for the indefinite future. Clinton echoed Obama when she stated, "I will drastically reduce our presence there to the mission of protecting our embassy, protecting our civilians, and making sure that we're carrying out counterterrorism activities there." Clinton claimed that the only combat missions she would permit would be those aimed at "eradicating al Qaeda in Iraq." John Edwards also refused to pledge withdrawal while attacking Clinton. He said her stand allows "a continuation of the war. I do not think we should continue combat missions in Iraq." But he did not explain how he would stop the war if he refuses to withdraw troops in the next five plus years. I guess we are just supposed to believe him when he says, "I believe this war needs to come to an end." Relying on the democrats to end the war crimes of the Bush regime is clearly an illusion. They have repeatedly shown that they will continue the Iraq war. Only you, and millions like you, can end this war and all the crimes of the Bush regime. Do it now!

Aff- Iraq- Says No

And, Iraq has demanded withdrawal of presence- US ignores- counterplan will say no

CNN July 1st (*CNN News*, 7.1.10, http://www.cnn.com/2009/WORLD/meast/07/01/iraq.kirkuk.bombing/index.html ) ET

The ongoing presence of U.S. troops in Iraq "shows that the (Iraqi) government and the occupation are not serious about the withdrawal," a key Shiite cleric in the country said Wednesday. A crowd gathers Tuesday after a deadly bombing in the northern Iraqi city of Kirkuk. Muqtada al-Sadr made the statement on his Web site a day after U.S. forces withdrew from Iraqi cities and towns in accordance with the security agreement between the United States and Iraq. About 131,000 American troops remain in the country, on bases and in outposts outside of population centers. "The withdrawal should include all the occupation forces: army, intelligence, militias, and security companies and others. Otherwise, the withdrawal will be uncompleted and useless," al-Sadr said. "We want a withdrawal and stopping the interference with Iraqi political, social and economic affairs," the statement said. Al-Sadr commands the loyalty of the Mehdi Army, one of the largest independent militias in the country. His agreement to a cease-fire with the government and its allies is considered a key factor in reducing the level of violence in the country. But he seemed to suggest Wednesday that Iraqis had the right to attack foreign forces in the country -- if not Iraqi security forces. "If the occupation forces violate this claimed withdrawal, even with a government cover, then the people of Iraq will have all the right to express their opinion in a peaceful way, and the right to self-defense on condition of not harming the Iraqi people and the security forces," he said.

\*\* Aff- Japan\*\*

Aff- Japan- Says No

US would say no- alliance talks prove

Kajita 10 (Takehiko, Kyodo News Editor, *Japan Today*, http://www.japantoday.com/category/commentary/view/course-unclear-for-japan-us-alliance , 10) ET

Despite last week’s accord between Foreign Minister Katsuya Okada and U.S. Secretary of State Hillary Clinton to further deepen the Japan-U.S. alliance, it is unclear what will actually be achieved in light of a disagreement over a U.S. military air base that has strained bilateral relations. Both the top Japanese and U.S. diplomats spoke highly of the bilateral alliance, saying it has underpinned security in the Asia-Pacific region for the past 50 years. They formally agreed to launch talks to further deepen the alliance, with foreign and defense ministers from the two nations holding a meeting in the first half of this year for a midterm review and seeking a final conclusion in November. Noting that this year marks the 50th anniversary of the current bilateral security arrangements, Clinton said, ‘‘It is an opportunity to mark the progress we have achieved together for our people and for the people of the region and the world.’‘ Okada said he hopes the upcoming talks will result in a new document replacing the 1996 Japan-U.S. security declaration, which expanded the scope of the bilateral alliance from one configured for the Cold War era to one encompassing the entire Asia-Pacific region. But questions arise on whether the project will proceed as hoped for, in light of the tension spawned by the bickering over where the U.S. Marine Corps’ Futenma Air Station in Okinawa Prefecture should be relocated. Prime Minister Yukio Hatoyama of the Democratic Party of Japan has delayed the decision on the relocation issue until May, indicating that Tokyo could renege on the previously agreed plan to transfer Futenma’s helicopter functions to another site in Okinawa by 2014. There is no guarantee, however, that the Tokyo government and the ruling coalition can reach a decision by then because the Social Democratic Party, a minor coalition partner, insists that the air base facility be moved off the southernmost island prefecture entirely. Hatoyama appears determined to keep the three-way coalition intact, which also includes the People’s New Party, another small party, as the DPJ lacks a majority in the House of Councillors even though it is an overwhelmingly dominant force in the more powerful House of Representatives.

There is large resentment over Okinawa and US still won’t leave- proves cp fails

Kajita 10 (Takehiko, Kyodo News Editor, *Japan Today*, http://www.japantoday.com/category/commentary/view/course-unclear-for-japan-us-alliance , 10) ET

Another reason for doubts is Okinawa’s lingering resentment about what its residents see as an unfair burden in maintaining the Japan-U.S. alliance. Okinawa hosts about half the 47,000 U.S. military personnel in Japan. While the city of Nago has offered to be home to the facility to Futenma, a mayoral election there on Jan 24 could turn the tide. In the election, an incumbent who accepts the relocation plan under a 2006 bilateral deal will face off with a contender who is opposed to it. Should the central government decide to go ahead with the Nago plan by the election, it would face difficulties in carrying it out because environmental assessment procedures at the planned transfer site in a coastal area will likely be disturbed by local protests. ‘‘I’m afraid the net result of what the Hatoyama government is doing would be that the Futenma base will remain put permanently,’’ said a Japanese government official who requested anonymity. Apart from the Futenma dispute, there is another source of doubt about the alliance talks—why it is necessary at this point and in which direction Japan wants to navigate them. The Hatoyama government has pledged to deal with the United States on a more ‘‘equal’’ basis, while emphasizing closer relations with China. After the talks with Clinton, Okada was vague about what will be among major elements to be considered to strengthen the alliance. He said security environments in East Asia, including China’s moves, should be scrutinized, but admitted it is difficult to predict how the talks will evolve. Asked about his own vision for a future alliance with the United States, he said only, ‘‘It may be better for you to pose the question to the prime minister.’’

Aff- Japan- Says No

Japanese want the US off- they refuse- counterplan can’t solve

France24 June 5th ( *France24- International news service*, http://observers.france24.com/en/content/20100506-american-soldier-japan-only-minority-think-we-monsters-okinawa-futenma , 6.5.10) ET

I want to put US military on Torishima! That way we can really know if depleted uranium is healthy or not. The US says it is ok but is it really? US military should build a base on Torishima to prove it to us Okinawans. We know US military is liars. Just a few weeks ago they launched dangerous prohibited scud missiles into our ocean. Okinawa is famous for high cancer rate. No wonder, right? Who is to blame? The US military know we are indigenous peoples of Japan and they know that Japan doesn't care about us. So, the US military also know they can get away with hurting us. We don't hate the average Americans who are innocent from this knowledge. We know you are not to blame. But the ones to blame are the ones playing the game. (US military) We have helicopters crashing into my university. When we tried taking pictures the soldiers stole our cellphones and broke them so the crash took time to get to the press. They tried hiding the information. This is when I began wondering …Are these guys really here to protect us? The old Japanese Army didn’t protect us either. How can these US military protect us? (common knowledge that they cannot) They are crashing into our university! They are hurting us and our nature and playing games with our human rights, mammal rights, and natural rights. We have the right to be happy but we are not happy. We do not have a happy environment. This Constitutional right is taken away from Okinawans by US military and Japan. Organized crime of US soldiers are very deep. Just a few weeks ago in Okinawa there was a US marine who injured a taxi driver with a knife and stole about 300 dollars from this taxi driver. This US soldier told authorities that his motive was to be in the Green Berets so he committed the crime to impress his commander. This is clear organized crime. Who is to blame? Yes, US military. This commander still hasn't been prosecuted. The Japanese would never prosecute the commander because the Japanese don't care about Okinawans. The US military is just playing the game to find new ways to hurt innocent Okinawans.

Aff- Japan –Says No

And, local Okinawans have been pleading the military to leave and they refuse- counterplan fails

France24 June 5th ( *France24- International news service*, http://observers.france24.com/en/content/20100506-american-soldier-japan-only-minority-think-we-monsters-okinawa-futenma , 6.5.10) ET

The US military said they would catch but nothing was done. The US military say they are protecting us. But are they? Will they? They can’t protect two little girls in 2008 and in 1995. Both raped. Just a few months ago, a woman was driving home on her bike and US military children put a rope across a street. The poor women was choked into critical condition. She is still hospitalized. The US military children’s parents were watching what their kids did but didn’t stop them, because we don’t matter, right? We Okinawans are humans to. We have human rights. We have families with dreams we have expectations in longevity. We do matter! We really do matter. We are just like you. The blame is simple, it is not the average American people but the nasty US Defense Department that cannot defend us, they hurt us Okinawans. We know US military organized crime cannot defend us because you just abuse us. The US military is not a hero but an invader. You US military organized crime say: "We are in Okinawa to protect Japan and your government wants us there". But we Okinawans never asked you US military to be on our island. You just stole the land. You just force yourselves on Okinawans. We want US military to leave. US military does not protect Okinawans. US soldiers are rapists and baby killers. US soldiers are educated to be natural born killers. Good average Americans please, lobby and rally to get US military off our island and make the US military go home to America. I'm sure these soldiers would be more comfortable and return to their original average good Americans in the US. Your country is a good country but your soldiers are crooked. Only apple pie can make them better. You should remove US military off of Okinawa and have your boys return to US. This is the best way. All we Okinawans need is peace. Please give us peace and freedom. We want liberty.

Japanese have called for troop withdrawal before- America will refuse- counterplan fail

Leonard 8 (John, *Filipino Expats Qatar*, http://qa.filipinoexpats.com/ofw-group-backs-japanese-activists-call-us-troop-withdrawal , 2-28-8) ET

Amid allegations of rape and abuse of women by US servicemen in Okinawa, a group of overseas Filipino workers (OFWs) based in the Middle East echoed the calls of Japanese activists for the immediate pull out of US bases which they claimed has brought “mayhem" in the east-Asian country. Migrante Middle East (Migrante-ME) sought the exit of US troops stationed in Japan after a report that a 21-year-old Filipino was raped by an American soldier in Okinawa, just two days after her departure from the Philippines. “We strongly condemn in the strongest possible terms this atrocious act committed by US military servicemen, who after the crimes have been committed, can simply and freely leave Japan without paying the crimes they have committed against the victims," John Leonard Monterona, Migrante-ME regional coordinator, said on Thursday. Prior to the incident involving the Filipina, a 14-year-old Japanese schoolgirl was allegedly raped by 38-year-old Marine staff sergeant Tyrone Luther Hadnott in a parked car. The soldier has denied the accusation but has admitted to forcibly kissing the girl. He has not been charged. “We are in solidarity and supporting the calls of Japanese citizens and activists in their legitimate demand address to the Bush administration to immediately pull out its military bases and troops which has been staying in Japan for quite sometime and bringing mayhem to the Japanese citizens in their own homeland," Monterona said.

Aff- Japan- Says No

And Japan has demanded forces will leave before- empirically denied

AFRICOM 8 (http://africaagainstafricom.org/article.php?story=ustrooprape , Feb 18,8, *AFRICOM)* ET

Japan's southern island of Okinawa on Thursday demanded the US military rein in the thousands of troops stationed there after a US Marine was arrested for allegedly raping a girl. The prefectural assembly of Okinawa unanimously adopted a resolution asking the US military to take action to improve ethical training for its forces.

US will say no- resolution after resolution proves

AFRICOM 8 (http://africaagainstafricom.org/article.php?story=ustrooprape , Feb 18,8, *AFRICOM)* ET

But opposition assembly members demanded that Nakaima, a government ally, demand tougher action, noting that the US government has promised tighter discipline before. The Okinawa police have reported to an assembly committee that 14 rapes allegedly by US soldiers have occurred in the tiny province since 1995. "He has not shown enough anger," opposition assembly member Chosei Taira told AFP. "We have adopted resolutions of protest over and over again, but they hardly have made any changes," Taira said. "We demand the entire withdrawal of the US military. Unless all Marines go, we wouldn't be rid incidents like this no matter how many times we protest." Nakaima was elected in 2006 promising to improve the island's troubled economy and signalling a more conciliatory policy towards the US military and its global realignment plan.

\*\*Aff- S Korea\*\*

Aff- S Korea- Backlash @ Pres

And, south Koreans want troops there- counterplan causes backlash against leader

ROK Drop 10 ( Mar 5-10, *ROK Drop- Korea from North to South*, http://rokdrop.com/2010/03/05/are-us-troops-still-needed-in-south-korea/ ) ET

Generally South Koreans think the US presence is needed,’ Cheong says, though he adds the 2000 summit between then South Korean President Kim Dae-jung and North Korean leader Kim Jong-il made people ‘rethink the necessity of US soldiers in Korea.’ He also says that feelings toward troops reflect overall sentiment towards the US government, and that attitudes have turned more positive since Barack Obama’s inauguration as US president. And as with the controversy surrounding US military stationing in Japan’s Okinawa, Cheong acknowledges there’s still significant concern here about environmental degradation caused by bases and crimes committed by US soldiers.

Aff- S Korea- Says No

US will say no- empirics and secretary of defense proves

Flemming 9 (*Reuters*, Staffwriter, http://www.inreview.com/archive/topic/767.html) ET

The United States for half a century has maintained a stabilizing military presence in South Korea, since the Korean War.New South Korean President Roh Moo-hyun has asked the United States to study the bilateral relationship. The presence of American troops has become increasingly controversial in the past year, with some critics in South Korea saying the Bush administration has hindered closer ties with North Korea. There also is concern in South Korea about alleged crimes committed by U.S. troops. White House and defense officials last month said the United States was considering shifts in global military deployments, including the thousands of U.S. troops in Europe. About 70,000 of the nearly 110,000 U.S. troops in Europe are in Germany, a vocal foe of a possible U.S.-led war against Iraq. Rumsfeld did not state when a decision would be made, but said the Pentagon is "almost through the process of looking at our force structure" around the world. He added that whatever changes would not change that "we are engaged in the world (and) we care about assisting our friends and allies."

And, south korea has asked for american troops to leave in the past- they say no

Johnson 4 ( Chalmers, author of *Sorrow of the Empire*, *History News Network* , http://hnn.us/articles/2867.html , 1-5-4) ET

In the months since Japan and the U.S. gave up on the SOFA, there have been endless rumors that the United States is planning a substantial reform of its basing policies in East Asia. In South Korea, possibly the most anti-American democracy on earth today, there have been major street demonstrations calling for a revised SOFA or, more pointedly, for all American forces to leave the country. Secretary of Defense Donald Rumsfeld announced plans to move the U.S.'s Yongsan Base from the old Japanese military headquarters in downtown Seoul to some remote area and to relocate the 2nd Infantry Division, based close to the demilitarized zone with North Korea, to undisclosed locations south of the Han River. Senator Daniel Inouye (D.-Hawaii) hinted to a delegation of LDP politicians that the U.S. might move some Okinawa-based Marines to Hawaii as a way of revitalizing the Hawaiian economy. Many consultations between the Ministry of Foreign Affairs and U.S. Deputy Secretary of State Richard Armitage have dwelt on "streamlining the U.S. military presence in Okinawa." The Japanese press has observed that in the past this subject was usually brought up by the Japanese side in a pro-forma way but that after the United States declared its "war on terror" and invaded Afghanistan and Iraq, it has shown greater interest in doing something about it

Aff- S Korea- Says No

South korea doesn’t want us there- if we were going to say yes we would have

Stanton 10 (Josh, the new ledger staff writer, *CBS News,* http://www.cbsnews.com/stories/2010/04/11/opinion/main6386737.shtml ) ET

The South Korean people do not appreciate the security our soldiers provide. The way some of them treat our soldiers ought to be a national scandal. Many off-post businesses don’t even let Americans through their front doors. The degree of anti-Americanism in South Korea is sufficient to be a significant force protection issue in the event of hostilities. South Korea does not have our back. South Korea made much of the fact that it sent 3,000 soldiers to Iraq, where they sat behind concrete barriers in a secure Kurdish area of Iraq, protected by peshmerga, making no military contribution and taking no combat casualties. Their contribution to the effort in Afghanistan has been negligible, which is more than can be said of their contribution to the Taliban (previous President Roh Moo Hyun reportedly paid them a ransom of up to $20 million in 2007 to free South Korean hostages who took it upon themselves to charter a shiny new bus to bring Christianity to Kandahar). South Korea has been an equally unsteady ally against China. The American security blanket has fostered a state of national adolescence by the South Korean public. Too many of them (some polls suggest most) see America as a barrier to reunification with their ethnic kindred in the North. Maybe nothing short of a North Korean attack on the South can encourage more sober thinking by South Koreans about their own security, but I suspect a greater sense of self-reliance and even vulnerability might.

South Korea Condition CP

AFF – Conditions Bad

Conditioning CP’s are voting issues-

Infinitely Regressive- the negative can put thousands of conditions on the plan- impossible to predict and kills ground and ruins fairness.

Artificially competitive –No literature on whether or not to do the plan vs plan conditioned with \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_. Wrecks impact assessment and creates artificial education

Limits- Destroys Plan Focus by shifting the debate on the condition instead of the actual plan

Education- CP creates bad model for policy making, which wrecks real world Education

AFF - Politics NB – CP Unpopular

CP Links to Politics

Negotiations with North Korea would spend political capital

Sigal 9 (Leon, Director of the Northeast Asia Cooperative Security Project at the Social Science Research Council, “What Obama Should Offer North Korea”, January 28th 2009)

As president, however, Obama will be preoccupied with the economic crisis and will have to depend on appointees with the courage of his convictions. Thus, the question remains, will he be willing to expend the political capital to deal with North Korea, challenging the reigning orthodoxy in Washington and the irreconcilables in Congress?

DPRK Says No

North Korea doesn’t want to give up its nuclear program – it needs a bargaining chip and no other options are being presented.

Foster 10 (Peter, Daily Telegraph’s Beijing Correspondent, <http://www.telegraph.co.uk/news/worldnews/asia/northkorea/7306075/North-Korea-talks-gain-momentum.html> ) GAT

Pressure is building on North Korea to return to the negotiating table as its already bankrupt economy wilts further under UN sanctions imposed on Pyongyang last year as punishment for its decision to conduct a second nuclear test. The US special envoy for North Korea, Stephen Bosworth, was expected to meet with Chinese nuclear envoy Wu Dawei after arriving in Beijing on Wednesday en route to Tokyo and Seoul for further meetings.   At the same time, a North Korean delegation has travelled to Beijing to engage in high-level dialogue, with China effectively acting as middleman between the parties. On Tuesday the head of the North Korean delegation, Kim Yong-Il, met his Chinese counterpart Wang Jiarui and China's President Hu Jintao, delivering a message from leader Kim Jong-il to Hu, according to the state-controlled China Daily newspaper. The frenetic diplomatic activity comes after months of negotiations with Pyongyang aimed at getting the North to return to the Chinese-hosted six party talks which include Japan, Russia, China, the US and North and South Korea. However despite the multilateral engagement, analysts remain cautious about the long-term prospects of the talks which broke down last April after disputes on verifying whether North Korea was abiding by earlier disarmament pledges. Many analysts doubt that North Korea militarist leadership is serious about giving up the nuclear program which is its principle bargaining chip in a perpetual game of strategic brinkmanship with the outside world. Pyongyang has set out its preconditions for a return to talks, including a formal peace treaty with the US and a lifting of UN sanctions, both of which have already been rejected by Washington. Both the US and South Korea have made clear that they will not repeat the 'mistakes' of previous rounds of negotiations by handing out political and economic concessions to Pyongyang before it demonstrates it is willing to take meaningful steps towards disarmament. For its part, China has said that the future of the talks depends on the willingness of Pyongyang and Washington to work together. The US State Department, which is said to be playing a game of "strategic patience" on the issue, has said it strongly supports efforts to restart the talks, but gave no indication of possible US concessions or how the current deadlock might be broken. "The key to getting to that point is for North Korea to come back to the six-party process, which they're struggling to do," J P Crowley, a State Department spokesman said on Tuesday.

**No matter how many quid pro quos or negotiations we enter, North Korea will not make concessions on its nuclear problems.**

Kirk 9 (Donald, Asia Times Online, http://www.atimes.com/atimes/Korea/KJ07Dg01.html)JFS

It was "not right", he said, for North Korea to "discuss the nuclear issue only with the US and economic cooperation alone with South Korea". His government, he promised, would press China for details on the commercial agreements that clearly were the quid pro quo for North Korea seeming to go along with China on multilateral talks.  
Whatever happens in negotiations, bilateral or multilateral, separate from the six-party talks or on the sidelines, nobody seriously expects North Korea to give up its nuclear program, much less to jettison the six to 12 nuclear devices that it's already believed to have fabricated.

If we pull out, North Korea will be emboldened in negotiations over the nuclear program.

**AP 4** (Associated Press, http://www.msnbc.msn.com/id/5155285/)JFS

North Korea was silent Monday on news of the U.S. plan to withdraw troops, but some South Koreans are concerned that their communist neighbor will view the development as a sign of weakness on the part of Washington, its longtime adversary. If that is the case, North Korea could feel emboldened to push harder for concessions in the dispute over its nuclear program.

**AFF – No Solvency – Conditions Bad**

**Quid pro quo negotiations fail to address the North Korea nuclearization issue.**

Niksch 3 (Larry, YaleGlobalOnline, Specialist in Asian Affairs at the U.S. Congressional Research Service, http://yaleglobal.yale.edu/content/washington-needs-roadmap-peace-north-korea)JFS

Other governments will have to recognize their responsibilities if a formula like "five plus five" is to succeed. Even while advocating US-North Korean negotiations and US reciprocity, other governments will have to recognize the credibility of the Bush Administration position that nuclear negotiations should not be a quid pro quo proposition and that North Korea must agree and act first to roll back its provocative acts since mid-December 2002, end its uranium enrichment program, and place its entire nuclear program under IAEA safeguards. Other nations also will have to recognize the credibility of economic sanctions if North Korea refuses to negotiate on this basis or crosses "red lines" with new provocations.

Negotiating the NPT with North Korea fails and increases provocations

Bajoria 9 (Jayshree, Council on Foreign Relations, <http://www.cfr.org/publication/13593/sixparty_talks_on_north_koreas_nuclear_program.html>)JFS

According to the September 2005 pact, Pyongyang would eventually abandon its nuclear program, rejoin the NPT, and allow IAEA monitors to return. In exchange, North Korea would receive food and energy assistance from the other members. The statement also paved the way for Pyongyang to normalize relations with both the United States and Japan, and for the negotiation of a peace agreement for the Korean peninsula.

However, negotiations hit a roadblock in November 2005 after the U.S. Treasury Department placed restrictions on Macao-based Banco Delta Asia, which Washington accused of laundering $25 million in North Korean funds. The Macanese government subsequently froze Pyongyang's roughly fifty accounts held in the bank. As the talks fell apart, North Korea stepped up its provocative behavior, conducting missile tests in July 2006 and a nuclear test in October 2006.

AFF – No Solvency – Can’t Solve Nukes

We cannot solve North Korean nuclearization – empirically proven – 5 examples

Dunn 6 (Lewis, Nonproliferation Review, 13(3), The Monterey Institute of International Studies Center for Nonproliferation Studies)JFS

U.S. proliferation policy first confronted the threat of a North Korean nuclear weapons program in the early 1980s. In 1985, the Soviet Union, encouraged by the United States, pressured Pyongyang to join the NPT. The North Korean nuclear threat had been ‘‘solved’’ - for the first of five times. (The next four solutions involved: North Korean receipt of an IAEA full-scope safeguards agreement but for technical reasons implementation of full-scope safeguards was delayed for several years; North Korean implementation of full-scope safeguards; the 1991 South Korea ÁNorth Korea agreement to denuclearize the Korean Peninsula; and the 1994 Agreed Framework.) Repeatedly, the conclusion that the North Korean nuclear threat had finally been dealt with has been proved wrong by North Korea’s defiant actions.

AFF - NPT Fails

**The NPT fails – lack of enforcement**

**Choe 6** (Julia, Harvard International Review, June 22 2006, http://www.allbusiness.com/sector-92-public-administration/national/1187444-1.html)IM

At first glance, the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty (NPT) seems to offer a concrete solution to the problem posed by nuclear weaponry. As the most widely accepted arms-control agreement, the NPT attempts to codify the prevention of arms proliferation among states. However, a major weakness of the NPT lies in the enforcement of its policies. This weakness has been highlighted by the current defiance of two states and has brought into question the overall effectiveness of the treaty. Iran's continuing non-cooperation emphasizes the problems of measuring compliance and of determining the course of action to take toward uncooperative states. North Korea's past actions and withdrawal from the NPT question the treaty's usefulness as a means of coping with states that no longer find abiding by the agreement worthwhile. Both cases represent the NPT's ineffectiveness in establishing a consistent and forceful system for preventing nuclear proliferation. Surely future efforts should promote stronger consensus among participating states and uniform mechanisms for addressing illegitimate state action, but it is still uncertain how these goals should be incorporated into a working treaty. Difficulties in NPT enforcement are not necessarily the fault of the treaty itself. Rather, they are intrinsic to the nature of arms control. The NPT would be best served by clearer mechanisms of enforcement that are less dependent on the vicissitudes of current global politics. Mechanisms that might include a clearer agenda of how to address noncompliant states or more concrete punishments for misbehavior could prevent the escalation of potentially dangerous situations.

The NPT fails to hold signatories to their obligations

**Council on Foreign Relations 9** (Nov. 20 2009, http://www.cfr.org/publication/9663/usindia\_nuclear\_deal.html)IM

What effect will the U.S.-India deal have on the NPT? It could gut the agreement, some experts say. Article I of the treaty says nations that possess nuclear weapons agree not to help states that do not possess weapons to acquire them. David Albright, president of the Institute for Science and International Security, says without additional measures to ensure a real barrier exists between India's military and civilian nuclear programs, the agreement "could pose serious risks to the security of the United States" by potentially allowing Indian companies to proliferate banned nuclear technology around the world. In addition, it could lead other suppliers-including Russia and China-to bend the international rules so they can sell their own nuclear technology to other countries, some of them hostile to the United States. On the other hand, experts like Gahlaut argue the NPT was already failing in its mission to prevent proliferation. She says many countries-including North Korea, Libya, Iran, and Iraq-have cheated while being signatories of the NPT.

AFF – Say No - Korea Won’t Sign the NPT

North Korea isn’t interested in rejoining the NPT and won’t give up its nuclear capabilities

**Squassoni 10** (Sharon, Senior Associate @ Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, Jan 10 2010, www.nautilus.org/DPRKPolicy/SquassoniMcGoldrick.pdf)IM

With North Korea’s second nuclear test in May 2009, the prospects for achieving U.S. nonproliferation goals for that country seem to fade further into the background. A long- standing goal has been to bring North Korea into compliance with its Nuclear Nonproliferation Treaty (NPT) obligations – in effect, nuclear disarmament. The elements include, roughly, a freeze on production capabilities (plutonium production and separation and uranium enrichment), securing (and removing or eliminating) weapons- usable fissile material and/or nuclear weapons, and full-scope safeguards on all nuclear material to ensure peaceful use. Since 2002, an additional goal has been to ensure that North Korea does not engage in onward proliferation – the transfer to other states or non- state actors of WMD-related materials, technology, equipment, or actual weapons. With North Korea’s declaration in 2003 of withdrawal from NPT, its compliance is now no longer a “simple” question of verifying disarmament and the absence of undeclared activities, facilities and materials. Instead, it begins to look much more like U.S. policies toward India, Pakistan and Israel. The ultimate goal must remain a recommitment to the NPT. North Korea is not about to rejoin the NPT any time soon. However, it may be possible to persuade North Korea to adopt a declaration akin to the obligation of nuclear weapon states under Article I of the NPT: not to transfer nuclear weapons or encourage, assist or induce any non-nuclear weapon state in the manufacture, transfer, or acquisition of nuclear weapons. This is an obligation that India, Pakistan and Israel have yet to make. On the negative side, some critics could argue that it would have little meaning as a simple declaration and could help legitimize North Korea’s nuclear weapons.

NPT Bad – Opaque Prolif

Proliferation is inevitable – the NPT makes it opaque and therefore more destabilizing

Wesley 5 ( Austrailian Journal of International Affairs Vol. 59 No.3, p. 283-284)IM

My central argument is that the horizontal proliferation of nuclear weapons will probably continue at the rate of one or two additional nuclear weapons states per decade, whether or not the NPT is retained. Persisting with the NPT will make this proliferation much more dangerous than if the NPT is replaced with a more practical regime. I argue that the NPT is a major cause of opaque proliferation, which is both highly destabilising and makes use of transnational smuggling networks which are much more likely than states to pass nuclear components to terrorists. On the other hand, scrapping the NPT in favour of a more realistic regime governing the possession of nuclear weapons would help put transnational nuclear smuggling networks out of business and stabilise the inevitable spread of nuclear weapons. The NPT was always a flawed regime, based on an unequal distribution of status and security. Its apparent effectiveness in containing nuclear proliferation was largely due to other factors. The events of the past 15 years have only magnified the NPT’s flaws. The end of the Cold War decoupled the possession of nuclear weapons from the global power structure. While many commenta- tors were applauding the expansion of the number of NPT signatories, and South Africa, South Korea, Brazil and Argentina renounced plans to acquire nuclear weapons, deeper and more insistent proliferation pressures were building among the emerging great powers of Asia. The succession of Persian Gulf wars demonstrated to many insecure states that only nuclear\*/not chemical or biological\*/weapons deter conventional military attack. The international community was repeatedly surprised by the extent and sophistica- tion of Iraq’s, Pakistan’s, North Korea’s and Libya’s progress in acquiring nuclear materials and know-how, each time underlining the inadequacies of the non-proliferation regime. After the 1998 South Asian nuclear tests, India’s highly effective rhetorical defence of its policy and the world’s half-hearted and short-lived sanctions against India and Pakistan damaged the moral authority of the NPT regime, perhaps terminally. Even worse than being ineffective, the NPT is dangerous, because it increases the pressures for opaque proliferation and heightens nuclear instability. Equally flawed, I argue, is the current counter-proliferation doctrine of the United States. I advocate scrapping the NPT (and the doctrine of counter-proliferation) and starting again, because the NPT is a failing regime that is consuming diplomatic resources that could be more effectively used to build an alternative arms control regime that is responsive to current circumstances. We need to confront the practicalities of scrapping the NPT\*/the positives and the negatives\*and think clearly about the requirements of a replacement regime.

NPT Bad – Mini-Arsenal Turn

Non-proliferation creates mini-arsenals, upsetting power balances

Schofield 2k (Canadian journal of political science, vol 33 p. 769)IM

Nonproliferation regimes, epitomized by the 196811995 Non-Pro- liferation Treaty, seek to contain the spread of weapons through a combination of supplier controls, technology access incentives and multilateral co-ordination. Critics of arms control have argued that contagion can actually enhance security because it brings into play the balance of power. According to balance of power theory the international system is self- regulating, so that if any one state becomes too powerful, the remain- ing key states will balance against it to minimize its possible gains. Blainey has argued that the single most important reason rivalries do not erupt into war is that would-be aggressors are deterred by the pres- ence of unpredictable third-party states; he calls this the "waterbird dilemma."87 States therefore rely on the contagion effect of conflicts to third parties to deter attacks on themselves. By containing a conflict geographically, arms control may remove this disincentive for aggres- sion. Balance of power can both increase and decrease the spread of rivalries and war. As long as there are third-party states (typical of a multipolar environment), states will restrain competition with their primary rivals to avoid exploitation. But as a system tends toward bipolarity, the balance of power may actually increase the possibility of war as states become locked into alliances that can be triggered by their small-power members. Offers of extended deterrence may halt weapons proliferation, decrease incentives for pre-emptive and pre- ventive wars, and limit further search for external allies. But similar behaviour by a competitor can force smaller states to balance or band- wagon, as appropriate, thereby denuding the international system of significant third-party states and their restraining influence. Arms control agreements that attempt to limit the spread of rivalries may also increase the probabil- ity of war by denying the entry of a stabilizing extended deterrence. In a bipolar environment, arms control and balance of power measures against the lateral contagion of rivalry or war are, by definition, irrele- vant. In a multipolar environment, the tendency of arms control to limit the entry of stabilizing third parties must be weighed against the tendency of the balance of power mechanism to transform the system into a bipolar one. This arms control function is therefore both circum- stantially complementary and contradictory with the balance of power mechanism.

Mini-arsenals lead to higher levels of proliferation – that turns the CP

James 2k (Canadian journal of political science vol. 33 pg. 733)IM

Automatically equating nuclear risk taking with irrational decision-making is not feasible at all levels of nuclear capability. It is highly rele- vant that policies for preventing nuclear use could omit potential solu- tions. The likelihood of horizontal and vertical proliferation based on a balance of terror can even increase. Scholars who support this view are in the minority, yet alternatives have yet to be based upon a solid foundation of deterrence theory. The fact that nuclear deterrence the- ory was developed in one scenario does not mean that it cannot be instructive in others, if properly applied. By considering a state's level of nuclear capability as an independent variable with multiple varia- tions, the causal effects on crisis behaviour can be more accurately assessed and tested. In this manner, other policies, such as those that promote confidence-building measures or other lunds of security assurances, can be identified and put forward with increased confi- dence. In illustration, the next section offers a brief description of a dyad with a capability furthest removed from the Cold War superpow- ers-the mini-arsenal states of Iran and Iraq. This is followed by a potential, and more discerning, coding of nuclear capability with a sample application. The history of the Cold War is exemplified in the US policy of nuclear deterrence. The lessons from the period of super-arsenal contest con- tinue to influence policy toward other states. At the beginning of the twenty-first century, however, potential targets include states below super-arsenal capability, including the quasi-nuclear states of Iran and Iraq. Therefore there may be misdirected efforts that not only fail to meet the objective of removing nuclear use as a crisis option, but actu- ally increase the likelihood of it, such as the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty (NPT)

NPT Impact Takeout – Regional Non-Prolif Solves

There’s a move to regional non-proliferation now, which solves better than the NPT

Kuppuswamy 6 ( journal of conflict and security law, 11(1))IM

At the Wilton Park Conference, regional approaches to nuclear non-prolifera- tion were favoured as perhaps being the way forward, because the global approach is not delivering. Stasis in the global scene means that we have to find new ways of moving forward. This was in keeping with the change in the atmosphere observed at the 2005 review conference where doubts were expressed about the underlying culture of the treaty. The NPT has put up a divide that is not working. Forums where participants would have an equal sta- tus were recommended.28 This will be essential to take Resolution 1540 forward and invigorate international efforts towards non-proliferation. As one speaker put it: ‘this is the only way you will take out some of the venom and anger that is there in nations’. A true regional approach should come from within the region rather than from the outside as it is the case at present. In the Middle East, a track-2 approach involving the people, NGOs and the Arab League was recommended where small undramatic steps should be taken. This, it was felt, would eventually help the move towards a grand bargain on non-proliferation. The Euro Mediter- ranean dialogue was seen as a forum to advance regional dialogue on nuclear issues. India’s growing role in the region as a responsible nuclear power, although de facto was recognised. In the light of the failed six-party talks on North Korea, a role for India in the Democratic Peoples Republic of Korea (DPRK) issue was identified as also a role in the wider context of South East Asia.

North Korean Appeasement DA – Iran Module

**Appeasement of North Korea causes Iranian proliferation – we will be seen as weak**

Phillips 9 (Melanie, The Spectator, http://www.spectator.co.uk/melaniephillips/3647756/the-fruits-of-appeasement.thtml)JFS

So now **we can see** once again **the fruits of appeasement. North Korea has tested a second set of nuclear bombs and the west throws up its hands in horror. What did it expect? Once the** Bush **administration** cravenly **decided to give up on North Korea** (following the similarly short-sighted approach taken by Bill Clinton), **Kim Jong-il** duly **took the opportunity to press** full steam **ahead with his nuclear program**. Now the same ‘new realists’ who came to power at the tail-end of the Bush presidency and decided to ‘live with’ a North Korean bomb – just as they have apparently decided the US could ‘live with’ an Iranian bomb – are serving in the Obama administration, which of course has taken such imbecility to unprecedented depths. **Obama has been abasing himself to every despot on the planet, proclaiming America’s weakness through his ‘hand of friendship’ and infantile belief that talking to tyrants is the route to peace.**

The result of such epic cringing is two fingers from North Korea, with yet further threats today. **Iran in particular will now be watching intently to see whether America will once again display weakness** and impotence; **if the US won’t even act to stop North Korea from going nuclear, Iran will be reinforced in its belief that it can develop its own nuclear weapons** with impunity. So far, Obama has ‘rushed out a special statement’ in which he said ‘I strongly condemn [North Korea’s] reckless action’ and promised to ‘redouble’ America’s efforts to stop Pyongyang from acquiring nuclear weapons. Well, that will have them quaking in their boots, for sure. Redoubling weakness simply results in twice as much weakness.

Iranian proliferation spurs regional proliferation while causing a conventional and nuclear war in the Middle East.

Takeyh et al 10(Ray Takeyh senior Fellow at the Council on Foreign Relations and James M. Lindsay Senior Vice President, Director of Studies, and Maurice R. Greenberg Chair at the Council on Foreign Relations, “After Iran Gets the Bomb” <http://www.foreignaffairs.com/articles/66032/james-m-lindsay-and-ray-takeyh/after-iran-gets-the-bomb>) JL

The Islamic Republic of Iran is determined to become the world's tenth nuclear power. It is defying its international obligations and resisting concerted diplomatic pressure to stop it from enriching uranium. It has flouted several UN Security Council resolutions directing it to suspend enrichment and has refused to fully explain its nuclear activities to the International Atomic Energy Agency. Even a successful military strike against Iran's nuclear facilities would delay Iran's program by only a few years, and it would almost certainly harden Tehran's determination to go nuclear. The ongoing political unrest in Iran could topple the regime, leading to fundamental changes in Tehran's foreign policy and ending its pursuit of nuclear weapons. But that is an outcome that cannot be assumed. If Iran's nuclear program continues to progress at its current rate, Tehran could have the nuclear material needed to build a bomb before U.S. President Barack Obama's current term in office expires. The dangers of Iran's entry into the nuclear club are well known: emboldened by this development, Tehran might multiply its attempts at subverting its neighbors and encouraging terrorism against the United States and Israel; the risk of both conventional and nuclear war in the Middle East would escalate; more states in the region might also want to become nuclear powers; the geopolitical balance in the Middle East would be reordered; and broader efforts to stop the spread of nuclear weapons would be undermined. The advent of a nuclear Iran -- even one that is satisfied with having only the materials and infrastructure necessary to assemble a bomb on short notice rather than a nuclear arsenal -- would be seen as a major diplomatic defeat for the United States. Friends and foes would openly question the U.S. government's power and resolve to shape events in the Middle East. Friends would respond by distancing themselves from Washington; foes would challenge U.S. policies more aggressively.

North Korean Appeasement DA – Turns Net Benefit

Making concessions undermines non-proliferation – turns the net benefit

Hwang 4 (Balbina, February 25th, The Heritage Foundation, Policy Analyst for the Asian Studies Center of the Heritage Foundation)JFS

Thus, a North Korean "freeze" of the Yongbyon facility will be inadequate, and the United States should not accept it even as a temporary measure, let alone make concessions. To do so would seriously undermine the principled U.S. stand on global non-proliferation, and would allow North Korea to revert to its old pattern of extorting concessions from the international community. Any freeze by Pyongyang is a necessary but insufficient condition for the permanent goal of denuclearizing the Korean peninsula.

North Korean Appeasement DA – Laundry List

Diplomacy cannot produce change and only serves to worsen every problem in the Koreas

Journo 6 (Elan, Capitalism Magazine, writer at the Ayn Rand Institute, http://tinyurl.com/2davfgt)JFS

The pattern of America's suicidal diplomacy is clear: the North threatens us, we respond with negotiations, gifts and concessions, and it emerges with even greater belligerence.

Without economic aid, technical assistance and protracted negotiations affording it time, it is unlikely that the North--continually on the brink of economic collapse--could have survived. It is also unlikely that it could have built the fourth-largest army in the world. The North is believed to have sold long-range ballistic missiles to Iran, Yemen, Pakistan and Syria. By some estimates, North Korea already has the material to create eight nuclear bombs. As it doubtless will continue engaging in clandestine nuclear development, the North may soon be wielding--and selling--nuclear weapons.

What made this cycle of appeasement possible--and why do our political and intellectual leaders insist that further "diplomacy" will work? Because they cling to the amoral fiction that North Korea shares the basic goal of prosperity and peace. This fantasy underlies the notion that the right mix of economic aid and military concessions can dissuade North Korea from its nuclear ambition. It evades the fact that the North is a militant dictatorship that acquires and maintains its power by force, looting the wealth of its enslaved citizens and threatening to do the same to its neighbors. This abstract fact, the advocates of diplomacy believe, is dispensable; if we ignore it, then it ceases to exist.

Notice how, in preparing the way for renewed talks, the Bush administration ceased describing North Korea as part of an "axis of evil"--as if this could alter its moral stature.

What the advocates of diplomacy believe, in effect, is that pouring gasoline onto an inferno will extinguish the fire--so long as we all agree that it will. Thus: if we agree that North Korea is not a hostile parasite, then it isn't; if we pretend that this dictatorship would rather feed its people than amass weapons, then it would; if we shower it with loot, it will stop threatening us. But the facts of North Korea's character and long-range goals, like all facts, are impervious to anyone's wishful thinking. Years of rewarding a petty dictatorship for its belligerent actions did not disarm it, but helped it become a significant threat to America.

There is only one solution to the "North Korea problem": the United States and its allies must abandon the suicidal policy of appeasement.

Israel Relations DA 2AC

**The US has to make a choice between having good relations with Israel and pursuing nonproliferation efforts – the NPT specifically breaks relations**

Borger 9 (Julian, diplomatic editor for the Guardian, http://www.guardian.co.uk/world/2009/may/06/israel-us-nuclear-non-proliferation) GAT

A diplomatic row broke out today between the US and Israel after Washington's chief nuclear arms negotiator called on Israel to sign the Non Proliferation Treaty (NPT), breaking a US tradition of discretion over Israel's nuclear arsenal. Israeli officials said they were puzzled by a speech to an international conference in New York by Rose Gottemoeller, an assistant secretary of state, who said: "Universal adherence to the NPT itself - including by India, Israel, Pakistan and North Korea - also remains a fundamental objective of the [United States](http://www.guardian.co.uk/world/usa)." By including Israel on a list of countries known to have [nuclear weapons](http://www.guardian.co.uk/world/nuclear-weapons). Gottemoeller broke with normal US diplomatic practice. Since 1968 when the CIA reported Israel had developed a nuclear weapon , Washington has pursued a policy of not demanding transparency from its close ally, and in return Israel agreed not to test a bomb or declare its nuclear capability - a policy of "strategic ambiguity". "As far as we are concerned, there is no change to the close dialogue we have with Washington," Yossi Levy, Israeli foreign ministry spokesman, told Reuters. Privately, Israeli officials played down the importance of the NPT as a means of controlling proliferation. Attempts to stop spread of nuclear weapons face a critical moment over the next year before the NPT comes up for review in 2010, at a time when North Korea has declared the resumption of its nuclear weapons programme, and fears over Iran's intentions threaten to trigger a Middle East arms race. Gottemoeller's speech was made at a meeting to prepare the way for next year's critical NPT review conference. Daryl Kimball, the executive director of the Arms Control Association in Washington, said that Gottemoeller had not changed the long-held US position - that all states should join the NPT. However, she spelt that position out more explicitly in relation to Israel.

US support for Israel is key to democracy and peace.

ADL, 6 (Anti Defamation League

http://www.adl.org/israel/advocacy/how\_to\_respond/us\_israel\_relations.asp?xflag=1

The United States is a longstanding strong ally of Israel based on shared democratic values and strategic interests including the rejection of terrorism and violence. The United States has a great interest in the stability of the Middle East, a region that is afflicted by extremists who violently oppose the U.S., Israel and democracy, rogue states with large military arsenals which include non-conventional weaponry, and other authoritarian regimes. Bolstering and supporting peace, stability and democracy in the region through relations with Israel is in America’s strategic interest. Indeed, public opinion polls have consistently demonstrated that Americans of all backgrounds support strong U.S.-Israeli relations and view Israel as a key ally of the United States.

Democracy key to preventing inevitable extinction

Diamond, 95 (Larry, Promoting Democracy in the 1990s: Actors and Instruments, Issues and Imperatives, senior research fellow at Hoover Institution, A Report to the Carnegie Commission on Preventing Deadly Conflict, December 1995, p. 6)

This hardly exhausts the lists of threats to our security and well-being in the coming years and decades. In the former Yugoslavia nationalist aggression tears at the stability of Europe and could easily spread. The flow of illegal drugs intensifies through increasingly powerful international crime syndicates that have made common cause with authoritarian regimes and have utterly corrupted the institutions of tenuous, democratic ones. Nuclear, chemical, and biological weapons continue to proliferate. The very source of life on Earth, the global ecosystem, appears increasingly endangered. Most of these new and unconventional threats to security are associated with or aggravated by the weakness or absence of democracy, with its provisions for legality, accountability, popular sovereignty, and openness.

Israel Relations DA - Link Extension

Efforts to strengthen nonproliferation regime put pressure on Israel

Cobban 9 (Helena, Exec. Director for the Council for the National Interest, http://ipsnews.net/news.asp?idnews=46773) GAT

Israel is judged to have between 100 and 200 advanced nuclear weapons either ready to deploy, or only a few minutes away from being so.  Gottemoeller’s words sparked speculation that this arsenal might re-emerge as an issue in Israel’s relations with Washington. That would end a 40-year period in which Washington colluded with Israel in maintaining the fiction that Israel’s nuclear weapons capabilities were unknown, and anyway should never be openly discussed.  Throughout those years, Washington was also vigorously combating the acquisition by any other Middle Eastern state of "weapons of mass destruction" (WMD), including chemical or biological weapons, as well as the far more lethal nuclear weapons. Many around the world accused Washington of maintaining a damaging "double standard" on nuclear weapons and all other WMD.  Israel has always fended off calls that it join the NPT. Beyond that, most Israeli leaders have gone actively on the offensive against the NPT, arguing that it has not been effective in preventing the proliferation of nuclear weapons worldwide. (The NPTs many supporters strongly contest that assertion. One hundred and eighty-nine states are members of the treaty.)  When George W. Bush was U.S. president, he seemed largely persuaded by the Israelis’ view of NPT ineffectiveness. His administration downgraded the support Washington previously gave the NPT. The NPT’s approach stresses the ultimate goal of a nuclear weapons-free world, the need for negotiations among nations as a way to get there, and the universality of this effort.  In place of an active commitment to the NPT approach, Bush pursued the very different policy of "counter-proliferation." That policy stressed U.S. domination of efforts to directly counter the nuclear programmes of countries Washington disapproved of, using a variety of means, including direct military destruction of suspected installations.  Obama’s Prague speech marked a sharp shift back to the NPT approach. And Gottemoeller’s speech then showed that the Obama administration intends to apply it in the Middle East, as well as elsewhere. This will have a strong effect on the administration’s diplomacy regarding both Iran and Israeli-Arab peacemaking.

Isreal Relations DA – WoT Impact Module

(A.) U.S.-ISRAELI TIES ARE CRITICAL TO WINNING THE WAR ON TERRORISM.

THOMPSON 2K1, Former Governor of Wisconsin and Presidential Candidate,

Tommy, “Thompson affirms US ties with Israel”, former governor of Wisconsin, http://www.ujc.org/page.html?ArticleID=24725 JFS

Tommy G. Thompson today called close U.S.-Israeli ties "essential" for the victory over terrorists and the vitality of democratic values in both countries and around the world. "Supporting Israel is absolutely essential to the security of the United States and to the advancement of freedom and democracy in our time," Thompson said at the closing session of the 2001 United Jewish Communities (UJC) General Assembly (GA) in Washington, DC. "It's not an overstatement to say that we are fighting the same spirit of tyranny today that we fought in the Second World War," the former Wisconsin governor continued. "And so much of that tyranny is committed under the pretext of religion. Many of you in this room understand and empathize with the suffering of those persecuted for their religious beliefs. And should Bin Ladin have his way, the Jewish people would be persecuted yet again. "While he might strike the Jewish state, he will not defeat it. On behalf of President Bush, I can tell you that America will stand with Israel - period. We cannot, and will not, let those who would hurt us, hurt our friends and allies, and hurt their own people, succeed." Thompson's remarks were delivered just hours after the UJC Delegates Assembly meeting at the GA adopted a resolution that, among other steps, condemns international terrorism, supports U.S. government efforts to defeat it, and condemns stereotyping and scapegoating of Muslim-Americans and Arab-Americans and calls on leaders of those groups to denounce anti-Semitic pronouncements.

(B.) LOSING THE WAR ON TERROR CAUSES THE UNITED STATES TO TURN THE MIDDLE EAST INTO A PARKING LOT.

EASTERBROOK, 2K1, (The New Republic, Greg, http://transcripts.cnn.com/TRANSCRIPTS/0111/01/gal.00.html)JFS

Terrorists may not be held by this, especially suicidal terrorists, of the kind that al Qaeda is attempting to cultivate. But I think, if I could leave you with one message, it would be this: that the search for terrorist atomic weapons would be of great benefit to the Muslim peoples of the world in addition to members, to people of the United States and Western Europe, because if an atomic warhead goes off in Washington, say, in the current environment or anything like it, in the 24 hours that followed, a hundred million Muslims would die as U.S. nuclear bombs rained down on every conceivable military target in a dozen Muslim countries

Turkey Condition CP

A2: Solvency – Reunification

Reunification is impossible

**Morelli 10** (Vincent, Congressional Research Service, Section Research Manager, Apr. 1 2010, www.fas.org/sgp/crs/row/R41136.pdf)IM

Attempts to resolve the Cyprus problem and reunify the island have undergone various levels of negotiation for almost 40 years. Prospects for a settlement that would end the political division of Cyprus appear to have reached a stalemate and may now enter a period of retrenchment possibly dominated by harder-line views by both sides and more difficult negotiations. Despite a positive and concerted effort over the past 18 months and through 60 meetings between Cypriot President Dimitris Christofias, a Greek Cypriot, and Turkish Cypriot leader Mehmet Ali Talat to reach some type of acceptable solution, time and politics appear to be no longer on either’s side. On April 18, 2010, Turkish Cypriot leader Talat faces reelection as “president” of northern Cyprus; by all accounts by observers of the Cyprus issue, he could have a difficult time winning. Polls taken in late March show Talat at least 15 percentage points behind his rival. His likely successor, Dervis Eroglu of the National Unity Party (UBP), while insisting that negotiations would continue, appears to have taken a harder-line posture toward a negotiated settlement, and there are even some in his party who are advocating a permanently divided island and international recognition for the Turkish Republic of Northern Cyprus (TRNC). For his part, Republic of Cyprus President Christofias has recently experienced his own internal political difficulties as one of his governing coalition partners, the Socialist Party (EDEK), quit the governing coalition on February 9, 2010, reportedly over disagreements with the President’s negotiating strategy. Almost immediately following the EDEK decision, hard-liners in the other coalition partner, the Democratic Party (DIKO), forced a vote of the party’s central committee on whether to abandon the coalition as well. DIKO hard-liners had also criticized Christofias for what they considered to be too many concessions to the Turkish Cypriot side. In the end, DIKO voted to remain in the coalition, but the outcome of both votes seemed to indicate that Christofias was no longer guaranteed support for whatever negotiated solution he could have achieved in the near term. Despite these political setbacks, and although both sides appeared to remain far apart on the most critical issues for any settlement, both Christofias and Talat pledged to continue the negotiations right through the end of March. With the last formal negotiating session on March 30, Talat left the negotiations in order to step up his political campaign in a final attempt to win reelection. Some observers were hoping that at the last negotiating session a joint statement would have been issued by both sides outlining the extent to which progress has been achieved on the major issues under consideration. And, while both sides did issue a statement at the conclusion of the session, it did not contain any details or outline of the “important progress” both sides continue to refer to.

Reunification is impossible – too many differences and too much domestic political strife

**Morelli 10** (Vincent, Congressional Research Service, Section Research Manager, Apr. 1 2010, www.fas.org/sgp/crs/row/R41136.pdf)IM

Although the visit of the U.N. Secretary-General failed to produce any tangible results, the two Cypriot leaders kept the negotiation process going with an agreement to meet at least four or five times through March 2010. However, it was clear that the gap between their respective positions seemed to be insurmountable and domestic political troubles continued to mount for both. In the north, opinion polls continued to suggest that Talat might not win reelection. In the south, Christofias’s coalition partner EDEK threatened to quit the government over the very fundamental issue of whether a new, united Cyprus should have a rotating presidency, an issue long on the table. On February 9, 2010, EDEK’s central committee voted to leave the coalition, claiming that, in their opinion, “the President has been following a mistaken strategy which the other side is using to its own advantage.”13 EDEK argued that the concessions Christofias made regarding a rotating presidency and the acceptance of 50,000 settlers had to be withdrawn. Soon after the EDEK decision, some factions within the DIKO party, the other member of the governing coalition, began agitating for a similar vote to leave the government, citing very similar reasons, including their disagreement over a rotating presidency. On February 23, the DIKO central committee met but decided to remain in the coalition for the present. There are too many differences in opinion to be able to achieve effective reunification.

A2: Solvency – Reunification

Leads to partition – the CP causes ethnic violence and negative effects for everyone involved

**Morelli 10** (Vincent, Congressional Research Service, Section Research Manager, Apr. 1 2010, www.fas.org/sgp/crs/row/R41136.pdf)IM

The inability of these two pro-solution leaders to reach an acceptable accommodation has led some observers to question whether a settlement can actually be achieved at all. In fact, the International Crisis Group (IGC), in a report published in the fall of 2009, suggested that after all the fits and starts of the current round of negotiations, “the island may be accelerating a slide toward permanent partition and that some elements in both communities given 36 years of futility and the wide differences of opinion over each item on the table from property rights to Turkish settlers to governance, may be willing to concede the possibility of a permanently divided island.”18 Such a final outcome is one many observers feel would be a disaster for all sides on the island, as well as those with direct interest in a solution, such as the EU and Turkey. In his March 18 speech to the nation, Christofias referred to such talk and stated that abandoning the negotiations “would be a disastrous mistake ... and that he would not seek reelection to a second term as President if there was no solution to the Cyprus problem by 2013.”19 Some say the lack of a final settlement would not necessarily affect the benefits enjoyed by the people of the Republic of Cyprus as a member of the European Union and thus there is less of an incentive to negotiate away parts of their authority and power to govern. Yet, without a settlement, it would seem that potential economic opportunities and growth across the entire island may not materialize. In addition, Greek Cypriots will be less likely to reclaim contested property in the north or at least receive fair compensation for it. A recent decision by the European Court of Human Rights (ECHR) to recognize the Immovable Property Commission (IPC) in the north means that all efforts to settle claims for compensation or restitution by Greek Cypriots who fled to the south as a result of events in 1974 and lost their property would have to be exhausted in the IPC before claims could be filed with the ECHR. This decision by the ECHR, however, could force many Greek Cypriots who had hoped to avoid dealing with Turkish Cypriots or Turkey in seeking compensation or restitution for their property, to now demand a political settlement that includes remedies for property claims. Finally, the failure to reach a settlement would mean that Greek Cypriots may forever face a large and powerful Turkish army just a few kilometers away from infamous “green line.”

Reunification talks have already failed – if these leaders couldn’t do it no one can

**Morelli 10** (Vincent, Congressional Research Service, Section Research Manager, Apr. 1 2010, www.fas.org/sgp/crs/row/R41136.pdf)IM

As March 2010 began, little progress had been achieved or, at least, had been acknowledged by both sides. In a March 19, 2010, speech to the citizens of Cyprus, President Christofias admitted that “the negotiations had not yet produced the anticipated result ... and that while the convergences have been achieved in the governance chapter, fewer have been achieved in the economy and EU chapters and even less in property.”17 And, with only a few negotiating sessions remaining before the April 18 elections in the north, few observers expected much to happen between then and the agreed final formal negotiating session before the break for the elections, which was scheduled for March 30. The election of President Christofias in 2008 ushered in a period of higher expectations for a settlement than at any time since 2004, when the Annan Plan was considered by both Cypriot communities. The personal relationship between Christofias and Talat and their personal commitments to finding a solution to the Cyprus problem suggested that if these two leaders could not achieve a negotiated settlement, not perfect for either side but acceptable to both, then it might take a long time before two like-minded leaders would again find themselves in a position to find a way to unify the people of Cyprus. Yet, after 18 months and more than 60 meetings and despite the strong commitment, good intentions, and warm relations between the two leaders, progress in the talks seems to have fallen victim to the harsh realities of almost four decades of separation, mistrust, misunderstanding, and in some cases, indifference to the need for a final settlement and unification of the island. Even a possible change in leadership in the north, and thus perhaps a different negotiating strategy and more uncertainty for the future, did not appear to be enough of an incentive to overcome the differences to find a final solution.

A2: Solvency – Reunification

No reunification – Greek Cypriots oppose

**Morelli 10** (Vincent, Congressional Research Service, Section Research Manager, Apr. 1 2010, www.fas.org/sgp/crs/row/R41136.pdf)IM

Turkish Cypriots have always been wary about federal reunification with the more numerous and historically dominant Greek Cypriots, who number roughly four fifths of the island’s million people. At the same time, the closer Greek Cypriots look at a federal reunification deal, the more it seems to them unfair, disruptive and risky to share a new republic so equally with the Turkish Cypriots, who are half as rich and a much smaller group.60 Federal reunification has, therefore, long been a distant second-best option for both communities.61 It bodes ill for reunification that it would be the younger segments of both communities that would vote “no” in the largest numbers in any referendum on the UN-mediated settlement plan. The idea of settling for a confederal or two-state solution is rarely publicly debated among Greek Cypriots and is strongly opposed by the archbishop of the powerful Orthodox Church.62 Nevertheless, private discussion about whether or not to formalise the current partition has become more common as Greek Cypriots have be- gun to realise that the present talks are the last chance to opt for a federal settlement, or, more importantly, that choosing a federal settlement might risk losing their relatively homogenous, prosperous, well-functioning, EU-member state. Nearly four fifths of the community rejects the idea of negotiated unification.

No reunification – Turkish Cypriots oppose

**Morelli 10** (Vincent, Congressional Research Service, Section Research Manager, Apr. 1 2010, www.fas.org/sgp/crs/row/R41136.pdf)IM

Turkish Cypriot ideas about a settlement are increasingly moving away from federal reunification to debates between nationalists, who would like to see two fully independent states side by side, and those who want to retain a multi-ethnic Cypriot identity and support a light confederation.69 The negative mood on both sides has discouraged even one of the most important coordinators of Turkish Cypriot strategy, a leader of the “yes” cam- paign for the Annan Plan: “We don’t talk about ‘B’ sce- narios. [Talat] wouldn’t want to utter those words … but now more and more I am hearing talk of partition. As I get more and more frustrated, I think we can’t live without a fall-back position. What did we get when the Annan Plan failed? Nothing! Somebody has to think of a Plan B”.70 A senior official, firmly committed to reunification and trying hard to create a workable federation, said that he is only helping design the cumbersome apparatus because Greek Cypriot objections make it the sole practical and internationally acceptable solution.71 A former member of the Turkish Cypriot negotiating team put it this way: Only 23 per cent of Greek Cypriots support this idea. Even when Cyprus was mixed, we had separate in- stitutions, from coffee shops to football teams. There was no intermarriage. It was never an integrated so- ciety. Why are you trying to force this marriage? We squabbled, quarrelled and shed blood, and we had a divorce. Can permanent division be worse than what we have today, particularly in terms of our isolation? And is Kosovo more or less independent than us? Should this set of negotiations be the end? Absolutely. Everyone knows the parameters of a deal, so if it hasn’t happened since negotiations started in 1968, then there is a lack of will. The Greek Cypriots are just too comfortable, and we are the ones carrying the burden of the lack of a settlement. This is the end of the road. It’s either the swallowing of these bitter pills or accepting the division of Cyprus. 72

A2: Solvency – Reunification

Resolution of Cyprus controversy has empirically failed – too many disagreements

Paul 10 (Amanda, Feb 2010, Today's Zaman:-language dailies based in Turkey. http://www.todayszaman.com/tz-web/columnists-200802-does-anybody-really-believe-the-cyprus-problem-will-be-resolved.html) LL

The Cyprus issue is one of the longest-running problems on the agenda of the UN, with the organization being involved since 1950 and spending thousands of hours and huge sums of money on it.

Over the years, many rounds of negotiations have taken place. All have failed. Each side has blamed the other. After all these years, the island has become two states: the Republic of Cyprus, recognized by the world, and the Turkish Republic of Northern Cyprus (KKTC), only recognized by Turkey. While some of the older generation still reminisce over the good old days when Greek and Turkish Cypriots lived by side by side, the majority of the younger generation have no such memories. All they have are stories that have been recited, a thousand times over, of murder and terror. They have no real desire to reunify. They have no feelings of “Cypriotism,” no nice stories to tell and, to a large extent, no desire to share power. Nevertheless, the search for a solution goes on -- apparently it’s what is best for the islanders -- and to this end the leaders of the two communities, Mehmet Ali Talat and Dimitris Christofias, have been negotiating a new deal since September 2008 based on the long-standing UN agreement of a bi-zonal, bi-communal federation. While there is talk of optimism and progress, most people (inside and outside of the island) don’t believe a solution will be found. While the two leaders claim to be old friends and united in their desire for a solution, at the same time they continue to blame each other for the lack of progress. Indeed, the Cyprus problem has for a long time become a vicious circle of blame which is increasingly difficult to break or move on from.

At the end of last week, Mehmet Ali Talat came to Brussels to give an update on developments from a Turkish Cypriot perspective because, for sure, Christofias would have a different story to tell. Indeed, Talat finds himself in a rather uncomfortable position because of the forthcoming presidential elections in the north in April. This election has become a sort of deadline for the talks, and there is fear that if no deal is reached by then Talat will not be re-elected and his successor will have no interest in the sort of deal that is currently being negotiated. The international community is well aware of this, which is why increased pressure is being put on the two leaders to move the process along, and more than likely, diplomatic traffic to the island will continue to increase in the coming weeks.

While Talat agreed that progress had been made in many areas, he also admitted that many difficulties remained -- such as on property -- and that some topics, like security, had not even been discussed. While both Turkish and Greek Cypriots agree that they would like to see the island demilitarized in the long term, in the short term the Turkish Cypriots continue to say that the withdrawal of the 35,000 Turkish soldiers should be phased over a number of years and that in the meantime, there is no possibility to replace the Turkish troops with “international forces” because they don’t trust them. On the other hand, many Greek Cypriots continue to fear the Turkish military presence and view it as an ongoing threat. And with the remaining short time frame, there is an urgent need to speed up and intensify the talks, which means both leaders need to be far more ready to close gaps and give and take on difficult issues.

New problems should not be thrown in -- such as demands from Turkish Cypriots that the two constituent states should have the right to sign international agreements. This sort of suggestion is simply not serious and just wastes precious time. This view was also expressed by the UN secretary-general during his visit to the island earlier in the week, when he made it very clear the talks need to move at a quicker pace if they were to bear fruit. Talat continues to insist that Christofias is keeping the talks at a slow pace as a way of extracting more concessions from the Turkish Cypriots. Talat reported that he had suggested to Christofias that the venue for the negotiations should be transferred to another location outside of the island in order that the talks are not disturbed by internal politics, but apparently Christofias rejected this idea, stating that he was far too busy. Nevertheless, the introduction of the three days of intensified talks that began in January seems to have had a positive impact and progress has been made on some thorny issues. Both of them face tough opposition, and while Christofias may not have an election to face, his coalition forces are increasingly unsupportive and oppose his concessions on many issues.

Back in 2004, it seemed victory was within reach, but at the last minute, everything crashed and burned thanks to the Greek Cypriot no vote. This time around the situation is even more difficult -- not least because of the Republic of Cyprus’ membership in the European Union -- and it will be a real miracle if the two leaders succeed.

A2: Solvency – Withdrawal

Conflict resolution impossible – Turkey won’t remove troops

**Kadritzke 8** (Niels, Eurozine, Aug. 12 2008, http://www.geomarineconsult.de/?p=88)IM

The generals, unlike Erdogan, were always skeptical about the Annan plan because they knew it would mean withdrawing all their troops from northern Cyprus. The commanders of the navy, air force and police even planned a coup to stop the negotiations, but the chief of the general staff, General Hilmi Özkök, would not allow it because it would end Turkey’s prospect of joining the EU[4]. The military authorities in Ankara are still resolutely opposed to any solution to the problem of Cyprus because it would entail the withdrawal of Turkish troops. After Talat and Christofias announced new talks beginning 3 September, General Büyükanit declared his anxiety about the talks and warned the Turkish Cypriots on the need for caution. So Talat needs to be careful about what he says regarding the current conflict in Ankara[5]. Asked whether he might ask for some Turkish troops to be withdrawn, as a gesture of goodwill to the Greek Cypriots, he referred to an article in the constitution confirming that the Turkish army is responsible for security in the TRNC, omitting to mention that, before he took office, he and his party wanted the article repealed. The question now is whether the Annan plan will be the basis for the forthcoming negotiations. And if not, what is to replace it? Christofias thinks the plan is dead. Talat thinks not. Officially, both have stated that they are prepared to negotiate on the basis of any “relevant” UN plan, including the Annan plan but not precluding others.

Withdrawal will cause bloodshed and violence

**Hellenic Resources Network 10** (Feb. 24 2010, http://www.hri.org/news/cyprus/tcpr/2010/10-02-24.tcpr.html)IM

Foreign Minister Huseyin Ozgurgun has strongly criticized the Greek Cypriot House of Representatives resolution rejecting guarantorship rights in Cyprus. If Turkish troops withdraw from Cyprus now, fighting breaks out and many people die, Mr Ozgurgun told the NTV news channel. He said the fact that the Turkish Armed Forces brought peace to the island in 1974 should not be forgotten. Mr Ozgurgun said that the Greek Cypriots prepared the resolution with the aim of gaining concessions or under the psychological depression in Greece. On the Cyprus negotiation process, the Minister complained that the main aspects of the Cyprus problem have not been brought to the negotiation table. Mr Ozgurgun also criticized the European Parliaments resolution on Turkeys Progress Report, which calls on Ankara to withdraw its troops from the island. Reminding that the Turkish Armed Forces brought peace to the island in 1974, he warned that bloodshed --similar to what happened before that date-- could break out again if Turkish troops withdraw. He noted that Turkey has been making it clear that its troops will remain on the island just until a comprehensive solution is reached. They have been saying that they will both withdraw their troops and give way to an agreement once a comprehensive settlement is reached. But the Greek Cypriot side maintains its intransigent attitude, he said.

A2: Solvency – Withdrawal

Solvency deficit – 3 preconditions to resolving the Cyprus crisis are not met

BBC 9 (Sep 10, Lexis) LL

Perugia, 9 September: President of the Republic of Cyprus Demetris Christofias [Dhimitrios Khristofias] has urged Turkey to change its policy on Cyprus and allow the Turkish Cypriot side to negotiate for a solution of the Cyprus problem on the basis of the agreed framework.

President Christofias, who concluded Wednesday his official visit in Italy, was speaking at the University of Perugia, where he was awarded an Honorary Doctorate of communication systems in international relations by the University for Foreigners of Perugia.

"In order to pave the way for a Cyprus solution, three preconditions have to be met," he said, adding that Ankara has to change its policy and allow the Turkish Cypriot leader to negotiate on the basis of the agreed framework.

"Ankara has a motive to change its policy. It is its ambition to enter the EU. In order for its European course to have perspective, it has to practically contribute to efforts to reach a solution of the Cyprus problem. As long as the problem remains unresolved, Ankara will be faced with an additional and important obstacle during its European course," he pointed out.

President Christofias added that the government of Cyprus is not willing to give every time its consent with regards to EU -Turkey relations, if Ankara continues to follow the same policy on Cyprus.

The second precondition, President Christofias added, is that the Turkish Cypriot side must submit to the negotiating table proposals and positions, which promote and serve the aim of a solution based on a federal state and not proposals, which lead to confederal approaches.

The third precondition is for the international community to exert pressure on Turkey, the Cypriot President went on to add.

He said that the international community has to bear in mind that not only its geostrategic interests have to be served, which have to do with Turkey, but also international law has to be served, so that "a problem ceases to exist, a problem which endangers for decades now peace in the region of the Eastern Mediterranean."

A2: Solvency – Concessions

Solvency deficit – no concessions would be made

Deliso 1 (Christopher, journalist and travel writer who covers SE Europe for United Press International, Oct 5, http://www.antiwar.com/orig/deliso9.html) LL

The Cyprus stalemate is so longstanding now that any concession on either side would inevitably be seen as a sign of weakness and failure. Therefore, a unified Cypriot state, ineluctably to be dominated by its more affluent, educated and Europeanized Greek majority, would be considered a step backwards. The loss of control of the northern section of the island would come as a tremendous military setback and admission of weakness. Indeed, could there be any scenario more distressing to the Turks than a unified Cyprus?

No concessions in relation to Cyprus will be made

BBC 0 (Apr 4, Lexis) LL

Washington: State Minister Sukru Sina Gurel has said that Turkey cannot make concessions in Cyprus for the solution of the Turkish-Greek problems.

Gurel, who is participating in the 19th conference of the Turkish-US Council in Washington, held a news conference and replied to reporters' questions.

In reply to a question on the fact that Turkey is expected to open a Greek Orthodox religious school in Heybeliada or to make a gesture in Cyprus to ensure the continuation of the Turkish-Greek rapprochement, Gurel said he did not share this view, adding: "No concessions will be made in Cyprus for the sake of the solution of the Turkish-Greek problems. It is impossible for Turkey to accept a so-called solution in Cyprus for the sake of EU membership negotiations."

A2: Solvency – Concessions

Neg’s scenario outlines the wrong condition – if a concession were made, it would be a trade for Turkey admission into the EU for Turkey’s withdrawal from Cyprus

Cyprus Mail 10 (Feb 11, http://m.cyprus-mail.com/cyprus/ep-calls-turkey-withdraw-troops-cyprus/20100211) LL

IN A strongly worded resolution, the European Parliament yesterday set a number of preconditions on Turkey’s EU accession, calling on Ankara to immediately withdraw its occupation forces from Cyprus and facilitate the ongoing peace talks for a political settlement.

The EP adopted a resolution on Turkey's Progress Report, based on a report drafted by Dutch MEP Ria Oomen-Ruijten, which states that the Turkish government should contribute “in concrete terms” to the comprehensive settlement of the Cyprus issue, based on a bizonal, bicommunal federation, in line with the relevant UN Security Council resolutions and the principles on which the EU is founded.

Cypriot MEP Ioannis Kasoulides described the resolution as the strongest yet to come out of the Brussels parliament. It urges Turkey to facilitate a suitable climate for the Cyprus negotiations by immediately starting to withdraw its forces from Cyprus, by addressing the issue of the settlement of Turkish citizens on the island and by enabling the return of the sealed-off section of Famagusta to its lawful inhabitants in compliance with UN Security Council resolutions.

The EP “deplores” the non-implementation of the Additional Protocol to the EC-Turkey Association Agreement for the “fourth consecutive year” and warns that failure to implement it fully and without delay, in a non-discriminatory way, could seriously affect its accession negotiations. The MEPs also referred to the “limited” progress on concrete reforms in 2009.

During the debate before voting, Spanish Minister for European Affairs Lopez Garrido stressed that implementation of the Ankara Protocol, which requires Turkey to open its ports and airports to Cypriot ships and vessels, was a necessity for the continuation of accession negotiations.

“If there is no progress on this, no more chapters can be opened,” Garrido underlined. He also said that one of the decisive factors for Turkey's assessment included its contribution to the efforts to reach a solution in Cyprus.

**QPQs with Turkey over withdrawal fail – it’s NATO’s decision**

Hershberg 95 (jim, the cold war international history project bulletin, issue 5, http://www.gwu.edu/~nsarchiv/nsa/cuba\_mis\_cri/moment.htm)JFS

He asked me what offer the United States was making, and I told him of the letter that President Kennedy had just transmitted to Khrushchev. He raised the question of our removing the missiles from Turkey. I said that there could be no quid pro quo or any arrangement made under this kind of threat or pressure and that in the last analysis this was a decision that would have to be made by NATO. However, I said, President Kennedy had been anxious to remove those missiles from Italy and Turkey for a long period of time. He had ordered their removal some time ago, and it was our judgment that, within a short time after this crisis was over, those missiles would be gone.

A2: Turkey Says Yes

Turkey will never withdraw its forces – it’s a national cause for the country, and they establish peace

**Xinhua 10** (Feb. 11 2010, http://english.peopledaily.com.cn/90001/90777/90853/6893324.html)IM

Turkey said Wednesday it would not withdraw troops from the divided island of Cyprus, rejecting a call from the European Parliament (EP), the semi-official Anatolia news agency reported. European lawmakers on Wednesday endorsed a resolution that urged Turkey to start prompt withdrawal of troops from Cyprus, a Mediterranean island divided into the Turkish north and Greek south since 1974. Turkey's Chief Negotiator for the European Union (EU) talks Egemen Bagis said Wednesday it was impossible for Turkey to accept the sections regarding Cyprus in the resolution. "Turkey does not have a plan or view to withdraw troops from the island," Bagis was quoted as saying before meeting Atlantic Council President Frederick Kempe in Ankara. Bagis said the EP resolution on Turkey, an EU aspirant, lost its impartiality and "reflected a compromise among political groups in the parliament rather than the facts in Turkey." Not only Turkey but also other sides have troops in Cyprus, Bagis said, referring to the United Nations peacekeepers. He said Turkish presence also assumes a role in restoring peace and stability on the island. "EU process is important for Turkey, however, it is not as important as to make us sacrifice Cyprus. Cyprus is a national cause for all of us," he said. The EU agreed to launch accession talks with Turkey in October 2005 but progress was slow as the 27-nation bloc has urged Ankara to normalize relations with Cyprus and speed up reforms to improve human rights and democracy. Turkey supports the ongoing peace talks between the Greek and Turkish communities in Cyprus aimed at finding a solution, Bagis added.

Turkey Admission into the EU increases the likelihood of Turkey withdrawing from Cyprus

Evriviades 5 (Evriviades, ambassador of Cyprus to the United States, The Washington Times, Oct 11, Lexis) LL

But notwithstanding these provocations, Cyprus this week chose to stay the course toward a peaceful solution to the division of Cyprus based on the rule of law. My country extended once again the hand of friendship to Turkey.

Eight days ago, the EU ratified its decision to begin accession talks with Turkey. The 25 EU member states - including Cyprus - agreed on a "negotiation framework" for Turkey's accession. Cyprus' reasons for continuing on its course remain the same as they were last year.

First, the prospect of EU membership is important to Turkey's development and can potentially foster a more secure and economically robust Eastern Mediterranean and Middle East. Second, Cyprus shares the view of its allies - our European partners, as well as the United States and Canada - regarding the benefits of Turkey joining the EU. And perhaps most importantly, Cyprus supported Turkey's bid because its accession process continues to offer the most promising path to resolving the longstanding division of my country.

The EU accession process that Turkey will now undertake requires the resolution of outstanding issues, including the recognition of the Republic of Cyprus, the normalization of bilateral relations between the two countries and the removal of all Turkish occupying troops from Cyprus. It is simply inconsistent with the values that bind EU partners for an acceding EU country to have an occupying force in the territory of another and to fail to recognize its sovereignty.

Cyprus's positive decision on Monday demonstrates what my government has long said: All Cypriots, whether of Greek or Turkish ancestry, strive for a genuine reunification of the island on the right terms. The government of Cyprus has been taking steps to integrate the two communities. Eight million incident-free visits have taken place across the shameful line that divides our country. We look forward to the day that all the people of Cyprus are reunited and living under a bizonal, bicommunal federal solution. Cyprus had many issues to look past when deciding twice in favor of Turkey's EU bid. But we are committed to reaching out to Turkey in constructive ways. It is now Turkey's turn to prove that it takes its commitments seriously by fully complying with EU requirements.

**A2: Turkey Says Yes**

Turkey will not withdraw from Cyprus – their foreign minister agrees

Trend Magazine 6/6 (2010, http://en.trend.az/regions/met/turkey/1636825.html)JFS

Turkish State Minister & Chief Negotiator for EU talks Egemen Bagis said on Wednesday that it was not possible for Turkey to accept the sections regarding Cyprus in Turkey report of European Parliament, Anadolu Agency reported.

"Turkey does not have a plan or opinion to withdraw troops from the island," Bagis said while commenting on the EP report prior to his meeting with Atlantic Council President Frederick Kempe in Ankara.

Not even the promise of EU accession will get Turkey to withdraw

**Cao 10** (Xinhua, http://english.cri.cn/6966/2010/02/11/1721s549673.htm)JFS

Turkey said Wednesday it would not withdraw troops from the divided island of Cyprus, rejecting a call from the European Parliament (EP), the semi-official Anatolia news agency reported.

European lawmakers on Wednesday endorsed a resolution that urged Turkey to start prompt withdrawal of troops from Cyprus, a Mediterranean island divided into the Turkish north and Greek south since 1974.

Turkey's Chief Negotiator for European Union (EU) talks Egemen Bagis said Wednesday it was impossible for Turkey to accept the sections regarding Cyprus in the resolution.

"Turkey does not have a plan or view to withdraw troops from the island," Bagis was quoted as saying before meeting Atlantic Council President Frederick Kempe in Ankara.

Bagis said the EP resolution on Turkey, an EU aspirant, lost its impartiality and "reflected a compromise among political groups in the parliament rather than the facts in Turkey."

Not only Turkey but also other sides have troops in Cyprus, Bagis said, referring to the United Nations peacekeepers. He said Turkish presence also assumes a role in restoring peace and stability on the island.

"EU process is important for Turkey, however, it is not as important as to make us sacrifice Cyprus. Cyprus is a national cause for all of us," he said.

The EU agreed to launch accession talks with Turkey in October 2005 but progress was slow as the 27-nation bloc has urged Ankara to normalize relations with Cyprus and speed up reforms to improve human rights and democracy.

A2: Impact – Turkey-Greece War

Turkish-Greek relations improving – risk of war is minimal

Seiber 10 (Thomas, foreign correspondent, The National, May 12, http://www.thenational.ae/apps/pbcs.dll/article?AID=/20100513/FOREIGN/705129926/1013/rss) LL

ISTANBUL // Long-standing rivals Turkey and Greece may be about to take a historic step to end their enmity – by no longer teaching children in both countries to hate their neighbour.

A reform of history sections in primary and middle school textbooks in both countries will be on the agenda during a ground-breaking visit of Recep Tayyip Erdogan, Turkey’s prime minister, to Athens, Turkish diplomats said.  
Mr Erdogan will meet his Greek counterpart, George Papandreou, tomorrow and will take almost a dozen of his ministers to Greece for the first Greek-Turkish meeting of its kind. Meetings of the two cabinets are planned yearly from now on, with individual ministers getting together twice a year. Mr Erdogan’s visit could usher in a new era in bilateral relations, Turkish press reports said.

Both prime ministers face difficult times at home and could use a foreign-policy success. Mr Papandreou, in the midst of a severe financial crisis that threatens to bankrupt Greece and undermine the euro, is about to put tough austerity measures into action amid widespread unrest that killed three people in Athens last week.   
Mr Erdogan is facing resistance against plans to reform the Turkish constitution, a row that could trigger a new effort to ban his ruling party. The fact that neither Mr Papandreou nor Mr Erdogan has been willing to postpone their meeting despite their difficulties shows how important an improvement in bilateral ties has become in both countries.

Turkey and Greece are traditional rivals in the eastern Mediterranean and in the Cyprus conflict. Both countries regularly accuse each other of ignoring the needs of their respective ethnic minorities – Christian Greeks in Turkey and Muslim Turks in Greece. In 1996, the two Nato countries came close to war in a dispute over an uninhabited islet in the Aegean. Since then, relations have improved greatly, even though the main problems between the two countries, the Cyprus dispute and conflicting territorial claims in the Aegean, remain unsolved.

There have been new hopes for a breakthrough since Mr Papandreou, an architect of the first Turkish-Greek rapprochement during his time as foreign minister in the late 1990s, came to power as prime minister in Athens last year. He met Mr Erdogan during a short trip to Istanbul shortly after his election victory.   
Now Mr Erdogan is travelling to Athens. Ten ministers, from the foreign minister to the transportation minister, are accompanying the Turkish prime minister, media reports say.

According to the reports, Mr Erdogan is also considering taking Bartholomew I, the Greek Orthodox Patriarch, with him to Athens as a gesture of reconciliation. Bartholomew, the spiritual leader of hundreds of millions of Orthodox Christians around the world, resides in Istanbul. There has been no official word on whether the patriarch will be on the prime minister’s plane.  
Education is another sensitive issue. According to Turkish diplomats, the education ministers of both sides are to sign an agreement to strengthen “mutual understanding” and Turkish-Greek friendship in textbooks for primary and middle schools.

The Turkish side is promising to change passages in textbooks that describe Greece as a threat in the Cyprus conflict, the Aksam newspaper reported. Another textbook that the Turkish side wants to change says that Greece is still harbouring dreams to one day take possession of Turkish territory. Other books portray Greeks both in Greece and Turkey, as well as the Greek Orthodox Church, as threats to Turkey. A high-ranking Turkish diplomat, speaking on condition of anonymity, confirmed the newspaper report.

Given the financial turmoil in Greece, economic issues will also figure prominently during the talks. Turkey, which went through a severe banking crisis in 2001 and had to adopt a tough reform programme designed by the International Monetary Fund to avoid bankruptcy, has offered its crisis management expertise to its neighbour.  
“We are ready to help in any capacity, whether technical expertise or any other way but it will be up to the Greek authorities to ask for it,” a Turkish diplomat said on condition of anonymity because of the sensitivity of the issue.

“We do not want a weak neighbour as it might affect us in the long run as well.”  
Turkish officials have also said that both countries should stop the expensive build-up of armed forces in the Mediterranean. 

A2: Impact – EU Accession

Turkey’s accession to the EU would be harmful to the EU

**Baykal 10** (Arda, House of Commons – International Affairs and Defense, Feb. 5 2010, www.parliament.uk/briefingpapers/commons/lib/research/.../snia-05348.pdf)IM

In addition, it has been argued by the president of the EU Herman Van Rampuy that Turkey might negatively affect the EU’s cultural harmony due to its Muslim nature. During a meeting at the Belgian parliament in 2004 he stated that “The universal values which are in force in Europe, and which are also fundamental values of Christianity, will lose vigour with the entry of a large Islamic country such as Turkey”.63 Moreover, the Republic of Cyprus has stated that Turkey’s stance on the Cyprus problem will result in a Cypriot ‘no’ vote for Turkish accession. In November 2009 Greek President Karolos Papoulias stated that he would not support Turkey's accession "as long as Ankara behaves as an occupying force in Cyprus."64 These comments made a notable impact on Turkish foreign policy and public opinion vis-à- vis the EU, contributing to an eastward turn in Ankara’s foreign affairs.

**Conditions Bad**

Conditioning CP’s are voting issues-

Infinitely Regressive- the negative can put thousands of conditions on the plan- impossible to predict and kills ground and ruins fairness.

Artificially competitive –No literature on whether or not to do the plan vs plan conditioned with \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_. Wrecks impact assessment and creates artificial education

Limits- Destroys Plan Focus by shifting the debate on the condition instead of the actual plan

Education- CP creates bad model for policy making, which wrecks real world Education