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1NC – Kuwait Arifjan DA

The middle east is stable now – high-profile attacks are at their lowest

AFP 10 (June 4, <http://www.google.com/hostednews/afp/article/ALeqM5iliKXlauRMdj1Uijz1Zv-WkJ7RUQ>) LL

WASHINGTON — High-profile attacks and casualty figures in Iraq fell in 2010 to their lowest level since the US invasion, while the number of Al-Qaeda leaders captured or killed soared, the US commander in Iraq said Friday. "All of those statistics for the first five months of 2010 are the lowest we've had on record," General Ray Odierno told reporters in Washington. "Although there has been some violence -- there have been some bad days in Iraq -- every statistic continues to go in the right direction." He said US and Iraqi security forces in the past three months have detained or killed 34 of the top 42 Al-Qaeda in Iraq leaders, following a "significant" infiltration of AQI's apparent headquarters in the city of Mosul. "We've been whittling away at this for a very long time," Odierno said, adding that "we were able to get inside this network." The terror group, he said, "will attempt to regenerate themselves (but) they are finding it more difficult" in the face of persistent joint US-Iraqi security operations and what he described as a rejection of Al-Qaeda by "99.9 percent" of the Iraqi population. The steadily improving security, the intelligence boon and the new statistics -- announced by Odierno two days after his White House meeting with US President Barack Obama -- bode well for Iraq as the US prepares a drawdown from 88,000 troops on the ground today to 50,000 by the end of August. But Odierno stressed: "There are still some very dangerous people out there, and there are some mid- and low-level leaders -- we don't want them to develop into senior leadership." Iraqi security forces in late May announced the arrest of Al-Qaeda's Baghdad military chief Abbas Najem Abdullah al-Jawari, who went by the alias Abu Abdullah, as well as Mohammed Nuri Matar Yassin al-Abadi, who was in charge of Al-Qaeda's assassination units in the capital. In April, AQI's political leader Abu Omar al-Baghdadi and the group's self-styled "minister of war" Abu Ayub al-Masri were killed in a joint US-Iraqi operation. Odierno attributed the successes to dramatic improvements in capability by the Iraqi security forces, which he said are now leading security efforts "across the country," including on most counterterrorism operations.

Removal of Camp Arifjan from Kuwait collapses stability

Global Security Dot Org 5 (26-04-2005, http://www.globalsecurity.org/military/facility/camp-arifjan.htm)KFC

Camp Arifjan is a new $200 million state-of-the-art facility built courtesy of the Kuwaiti government. This new army base has literally risen out of the sand. The base will provide permanent support facilities for American troops in Kuwait, replacing temporary facilities that have been used since the Gulf War. The Army component of US Central Command (USCENTCOM), US Army Forces Central Command (ARCENT), maintains a forward presence in the region. Government-to-government agreements were negotiated with the Qatar and Kuwait to allow the prepositioning of military assets. The Army has met major milestones in its security strategy in the Middle East by completing a prepositioning facility in Qatar, and by the rapid pace of construction on a new installation in Kuwait. These facilities support USCENTCOM's efforts to protect US interests in this region in accordance with the National Security Strategy. US forces use these facilities under a variety of agreements, which include host nation involvement with providing and managing the facilities. A new prepositioning facility is under construction by the Kuwait government at Arifjan, south of Kuwait City [Arifjan is also known as Araifjan, Arefjan and Urayfijan]. When complete, the facility will replace Camp Doha, a former industrial warehouse complex that has been converted for use as an Army installation. Camp Doha was leased by the Kuwait Ministry of Defense and provided to the Army to support its three major missions in Kuwait -- to maintain prepositioned equipment, supplies and materials; direct joint exercises with the Kuwait armed forces; and ensure the security of Kuwait. Camp Doha was intended as a temporary facility until the permanent installation was designed and built at Arifjan. A full brigade set of equipment is stored at Camp Doha, much of it outside. The new facility will have most of the equipment sets stored in large warehouses, similar to the ones built in Qatar, to protect them from the harsh desert environment. While troops jokingly call the pair of tall smokestacks near Camp Doha the "Scud goal posts," commanders have had to install makeshift measures around the facility to keep troops protected from terrorist threats. All that will change when the Army shifts its operations to a new facility now being built south of Kuwait City near the village of Arifjan and the headquarters of a Kuwait armored brigade. It will be absolutely state of the art, from force protection to life support. For starters, troops will live in actual barracks instead of the beehives carved out of the warehouses. Instead of hanging Kevlar netting across windows to protect against blasts, the new facility will use shatterproof Mylar glass. Armored vehicles will get special maintenance bays for the contracted mechanics who keep the equipment at one of the highest availability rates in the Army.

1NC – Kuwait Arifjan DA

Don’t risk triggering the link – the middle east is on the brink of multiple scenarios for nuclear war

London 6/28 (Herbert, president of Hudson Institute, June 28, 2010, <http://www.hudson-ny.org/1387/coming-crisis-in-the-middle-east>)KFC

The coming storm in the Middle East is gaining momentum; like conditions prior to World War I, all it takes for explosive action to commence is a trigger. Turkey's provocative flotilla, often described in Orwellian terms as a humanitarian mission, has set in motion a gust of diplomatic activity: if the Iranians send escort vessels for the next round of Turkish ships, which they have apparently decided not to do in favor of land operations, it could have presented a casus belli. [cause for war] Syria, too, has been playing a dangerous game, with both missile deployment and rearming Hezbollah. According to most public accounts, Hezbollah is sitting on 40,000 long-, medium- and short-range missiles, and Syrian territory has been serving as a conduit for military materiel from Iran since the end of the 2006 Lebanon War. Should Syria move its own scuds to Lebanon or deploy its troops as reinforcement for Hezbollah, a wider regional war with Israel could not be contained. In the backdrop is an Iran, with sufficient fissionable material to produce a couple of nuclear weapons. It will take some time to weaponize the missiles, but the road to that goal is synchronized in green lights since neither diplomacy nor diluted sanctions can convince Iran to change course. From Qatar to Afghanistan all political eyes are on Iran, poised to be "the hegemon" in the Middle East; it is increasingly considered the "strong horse" as American forces incrementally retreat from the region. Even Iraq, ironically, may depend on Iranian ties in order to maintain internal stability. For Sunni nations like Egypt and Saudi Arabia, regional strategic vision is a combination of deal-making to offset the Iranian Shia advantage, and attempting to buy or develop nuclear weapons as a counterweight to Iranian ambition. However, both of these governments are in a precarious state; should either fall, all bets are off in the Middle East neighborhood. It has long been said that the Sunni "tent" must stand on two legs: if one, falls, the tent collapses. Should this tent collapse, and should Iran take advantage of that calamity, it could incite a Sunni-Shia war. Or feeling empowered, and no longer dissuaded by an escalation scenario, Iran, with nuclear weapons in tow, might decide that a war against Israel is a distinct possibility. However implausible it may seem at the moment, the possible annihilation of Israel and the prospect of a second holocaust could lead to a nuclear exchange.

Uniqueness – War Coming

Another Middle East war is on the brink – **Hezbollah has thousands of missiles and is ready to attack Israel, and US is all that was in the way for a full out retaliation by Israel.**

Gleis 10 (Dr. Joshua international security consultant & political risk analyst, Fall 2010, http://warsclerotic.wordpress.com/2010/06/05/another-middle-east-war-on-the-horizon/)KFG

A new war in the Middle East is looming on the horizon–one that could create a fundamental shift in the region, and whose repercussions would be felt around the world. Israel, Hezbollah, Syria, and Iran are all feverishly preparing for war, even while declaring an interest in maintaining the status quo. One need not look any farther than World War I to remember that millions of lives can be lost due to happenstance. It would not be the first time a region teeming with armies ignited in war despite a stated desire for peace. Rhetoric is at a high, even for the loquacious Middle East. Iran’s vice president recently threatened to “cut off Israel’s feet”, its parliamentary speaker promised a “final and decisive war”, and its president, Mahmoud Ahmadinejad, added that the next conflict would be the “last war launched by the Zionists”. Israeli Prime Minister Netanyahu has warned that Iran is provoking a war between Israel and Syria, while President Shimon Peres has declared the transfer of Syrian scud missiles to Hezbollah as unacceptable. Syria’s Bashar Assad recently chimed in as well, dismissing an Israeli offer made through Russian leader Dmitry Medvedev to cut ties with Iran and “resistance movements” in return for an Israeli withdrawal from the Golan Heights and a final peace agreement. All of this is translating into real actions that could lead to war. The Israeli military is quietly preparing for another conflict, drilling its forces and increasing its surveillance and reconnaissance. Syrian and Hezbollah forces were put on alert along their southern borders with Israel as the Jewish state distributed gas masks to its citizens and prepared their bunkers for war. Weapons transfers continue as Hezbollah militants drill for a fight. At this point, any miscalculation can set off a war. The most likely culprit for war this summer appears to be the continued transfer of advanced weaponry to Hezbollah by Syria and Iran. Hezbollah has tens of thousands of rockets in its arsenal, and has increased the number of projectiles that can reach nearly any point in Israel. So many, in fact, that Secretary of Defense Robert Gates stated last month, “We are at a point now where Hezbollah has far more rockets and missiles than most governments in the world”. Former Director of the CIA George Tenet described Hezbollah as follows: “An organization with capability and worldwide presence, it is al-Qaeda’s equal, if not a far more capable organization… They are a notch above in many respects…” No country is more aware of this than Israel, which remains the main target of Hezbollah’s aggression. This week it was reported that Israel cancelled a planned strike on a Syrian-Hezbollah missile transfer at the last moment, likely under pressure from the United States.

Uniqueness – War Coming

High tensions now – a war is coming

ICFI 10 (International Committee of the Fourth International, http://www.wsws.org/articles/2010/apr2010/pers-a20.shtml, AD: 6/28/10) jl

Recent days have seen a spate of developments that point to the danger of a new military conflagration in the Middle East.

Israel has warned Syria that it will face an Israeli attack if Hezbollah, the Shiite-based Lebanese militia, fires Scud missiles at Israel, the London Times reported Sunday. The newspaper cites an unnamed Israeli cabinet minister as saying, “We’ll return Syria to the Stone Age by crippling its power stations, ports, fuel storage and every bit of strategic infrastructure if Hezbollah dare to launch ballistic missiles against us”.

Israel has accused Syria of supplying Hezbollah with medium-range Russian-made Scud missiles. Damascus has vigorously denied the charge, accusing Israel’s hard-line government of using the Scud missile claim as a pretext for military action.

The Times article closely followed press reports that the Jordanian king, Abdullah II, had warned US congressional leaders in a closed-door meeting last Thursday that a Middle East war is imminent.

While Abdullah may have been the first Arab head of state to bring such warnings to Washington, there have been rumors and rumblings of a new Israeli war for months. Despite destroying the infrastructure of the southern half of Lebanon in 2006, killing more than a thousand civilians, Israel’s month-long invasion failed in achieving its key objective—the destruction of Hezbollah as a serious military force.

Israel’s anxiety and belligerence have been intensified by Washington’s failure to limit and roll back Iran’s growing influence in the region. In response to the American government’s decades-long campaign to subvert and overthrow the Islamic Republic, Tehran has developed extensive ties to the Syrian regime and provides critical political and material support to Hezbollah and Hamas.

Senior figures in the Obama administration and Pentagon have responded to a New York Times report on a secret January memo from Defense Secretary Robert Gates by insisting that Washington is actively considering a full range of actions against Iran, including war.

According to the Times, Gates’s secret three-page memo warned that the administration didn’t have a long-term policy to deal with Iran in the event that Tehran continues to defy the US demand that it forego its rights under the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty to a full-cycle civilian nuclear energy program.

“The fact”, said Obama’s National Security Advisor General James Jones, “that we don’t announce publicly our entire strategy for the world to see doesn’t mean we don’t have a strategy that anticipates the full range of contingencies—we do”.

Gates and the White House have downplayed the significance of the January memo—the defense secretary claims that the Times misconstrued “its purpose and content”—and have denied the suggestion that the Obama administration is, or has been divided, over its Iran policy.

But there has been no denial of the Times’ contention that Gates’ memo was part of “an intensifying effort inside the Pentagon, the White House and the intelligence agencies to develop new options”, including “a set of military alternatives…should diplomacy and sanctions fail to force Iran” to heel.

The Times report indicates that the Obama administration has accepted one of the key points Gates is said to have argued in his memo: the need for Washington to establish a bar or trigger for military action against Iran well short of Tehran actually developing a nuclear weapon. It cites a “senior administration official” as saying that the US would “ensure that Iran would not ‘acquire a nuclear capability’”.

Speaking at Columbia University Sunday, the chairman of the US joint chiefs of staff, Admiral Mike Mullen, declared that the Pentagon was continuously planning for a military strike against Iran and stands ready to strike if that is the president’s “call”. But he warned, “striking” can “generate unintended consequences that are difficult to predict”. Later Mullen added, “If there was an easy answer, we would’ve picked it off the shelf”.

Mullen’s remarks speak to the strategic dilemma facing US imperialism.

Washington views the current Iranian regime as an intolerable obstacle to its strategic dominance of the Middle East, its drive to gain access to and control over oil-rich Central Asia, and its plans to strengthen its world position by shaping global energy flows.

During the past decade, Washington has ratcheted up its pressure against Iran—through the invasions and occupations of the neighboring states of Iraq and Afghanistan, through a program of economic sanctions, and by lending support to opposition groups, from Balochi nationalist terrorists to the bourgeois opposition Green movement.

In the final years of the Bush administration, the US political and military-security establishment engaged in an acrimonious debate as to whether to attack Iran.

What has thus far stayed the hand of the Obama administration—which has continued the war in Iraq, dramatically expanded the “AfPak” War, and in its recent nuclear weapons strategy statement refused to exclude using nuclear weapons against a non-nuclear Iran—is the recognition that there can be no successful “surgical strike” against Iran.

The Iranian regime—given the country’s size, strategic location, and its international allies—has the potential to seriously damage the US and its client regimes and disrupt Persian Gulf oil exports, thereby delivering a body blow to the world economy.

Uniqueness – Stable Now

Iraq is the most stable its been in years

Pessin 10 (Al, VOA News, June 4, <http://www1.voanews.com/english/news/Odierno-Iraq-Moves-Toward-Stability-US-Drawdown-on-Track-95646044.html>) LL

General Odierno says the number of violent incidents, the number of casualties and the number of high-profile attacks in Iraq are all at their lowest levels since the conflict started. He attributes the change to increased competence by the Iraqi security forces and a joint operation in the town of Mosul about three months ago that broke a key al-Qaida cell and led to a series of attacks on some of the group's leaders and the arrests of several more. "We were able to get inside of this network, pick a lot of them up, and we will continue, with our Iraqi security force partners, to go after them," said General Odierno. "But there are still some very dangerous people out there. And there are some mid-and low-level leaders. We don't want them to develop into senior leadership. And that's what we're working towards now." Odierno says al-Qaida will try to overcome the setback, and he says it is still capable of carrying out attacks, particularly against undefended civilian targets. But he says the group is having more trouble recruiting fighters and leaders, and is finding it more and more difficult to destabilize the Iraqi government. The general says the plan is on track to reduce the U.S. troop presence in Iraq from 88,000 now to 50,000 by September first, and he does not expect the move to affect the security situation. "The Iraqis are in the lead," he said. "We are not. They have taken over the lead. What we're doing now is we are training, advising and assisting them. We continue to support our Provincial Reconstruction Teams and the UN for civil capacity. And we conduct partnerned counter-terrorism operations. That's what we do today. And that's what we'll do post-One September [after 09/01]" General Odierno says in addition to security, the other key to long-term stability in Iraq is politics. He called the certification of the election results a very important step, and also said he is pleased with talk of forming a government that includes all political factions. "Most of the security issues will come from what spawns out of the political realm," said Odierno. "That's why it's important to have a unity government. We don't want to see any group that feels it's been disenfranchised and even contemplates moving back to an insurgency." General Odierno also says Iran appears to have changed its strategy in Iraq in a way that contributes to the reduction in violence, but still seeks to gain influence. "They clearly moved away from a heavy lethal strategy to one that involves some lethal, and then some non-lethal, trying to almost gain monopolies in some economic areas as well as through heavy diplomatic and security collection influence inside of Iraq," he said. "So they're still doing it, but at a lower level."

**Stability in Iraq has progressed to the point that troops are being withdrawn and more civil service projects are being implemented**

Kemp 10 (Jason, USDS Public Affairs, Mar 10, <http://www.army.mil/-news/2010/03/10/35575-stability-operations-in-iraq-making-headway/>) LL

Though the U.S. has been building up the civilian infrastructure of Iraq since 2003, the sense of ownership and level interest of the people has never been as great as it is now, and that makes all the difference. For Lt. Col. Paul Schmidt, a civil affairs officer with 1st Infantry Division, the change over the years has been noticeable. "My last tour ended just as the surge was beginning in late 2006 so the change is primarily in the atmosphere," he said "There are still the same great, courageous people to work with, but I sense a much greater feeling of pride and hope for the future now than before." That pride is being demonstrated in the expectations of the people. "This country is becoming more and more stable because the Iraqi people are demanding it now in greater numbers," he said. And that demand is being met by the local government and Iraqi Security Forces in the provinces overseen by United States Division-South, of which 1st Infantry Division is the headquarters. "We are really at a point where stability operations and building civil capacity is extremely important," Schmidt said. "Local government officials are very effective across the USD-S AO [area of operations], but with increasing stability and effectiveness of ISF, we can really make great progress in assisting the Iraqis with providing services to the people and solving problems." In order to achieve that progress, USD-S and the U.S. Department of State's Provincial Reconstruction Teams are working together to build effective relationships that not only thrive and mature, but thoroughly benefit the country of Iraq. "The State Department is the lead for building civil capacity, but they are not resourced to do everything we need to accomplish, so it is accomplished through a partnership between DoS and DoD," Schmidt said. "They provide leadership of the PRTs as well as subject matter experts in governance, economic development, rule of law, agriculture and others, and we provide them the ability to move safely in order to perform their critical functions with Iraqi officials." The cooperation between U.S. civilian and military elements is crucial, Schmidt said. "The relationship is important and based on strong communication," he said. "I think we do a good job capitalizing on the strengths of each organization in order to maximize and synchronize our efforts to assist the Iraqis in building capacity for themselves." As Iraq has stabilized, the work done in the civilian sector has moved to the forefront, and everyone is getting involved. "With increased stability and security, the civil affairs mission becomes more important," Schmidt said. "This doesn't mean the civil affairs forces have to be the only units doing civil-military operations; just the opposite is true. U.S. forces at all levels have become very effective in conducting those missions so CA forces are being withdrawn from Iraq, with the exception of small planning teams at brigade and above."

Uniqueness – Stable Now

**Stable Iraq means stable Middle East**

UPI 10 (June 25, <http://www.upi.com/Top_News/Special/2010/06/25/General-Middle-East-goes-as-Iraq-goes/UPI-24361277491860/>) LL

WASHINGTON, June 25 (UPI) -- A stable and self-reliant Iraq is essential to stability in the Middle East and Southwest Asia, a top military commander told U.S. lawmakers. U.S. Army Lt. Gen. Lloyd Austin testified before the Senate Armed Services Committee in his confirmation hearing to take over command of U.S. forces in Iraq from Army Gen. Ray Odierno. Austin told the Senate that the future of Iraq is inseparable from the future of the Middle East. "A sovereign, stable and self-reliant Iraq will contribute to the stability in the region and will be a major ally in our fight against al-Qaida and its extremist allies," he said in a statement provided by the Pentagon.

Links – Arifjan 🡪 ME Stability – General/Troops

Arifjan is key to the troops in Iraq

Bryce 6 (Robert, Managing Editor for The Energy Tribute, Aug. 09, 2006, http://www.energytribune.com/articles.cfm?aid=179)KFC

The flares near the Iraq border are just one aspect of the many challenges – in energy, politics, and religion – that are now facing Kuwait. How it resolves those issues will have big impacts on the global energy market and on Kuwait’s main sponsor (some would say colonial master) the United States. Kuwait is America’s single most important ally within OPEC, not to mention in the Persian Gulf, particularly given the war in Iraq. Kuwait is America’s main logistical base for that war, and some 20,000 U.S. troops are based there. And having bases in Kuwait, particularly Camp Arifjan, ensures that American troops in Iraq get the supplies they need. The Kuwaitis also provide huge amounts of free fuel to American forces in Iraq. By some estimates, the Kuwaitis have given the U.S. $500 million worth of free fuel since the start of the Second Iraq War. Indeed, as the meltdown in Iraq continues, Kuwait becomes even more critical to the U.S. military. No longer publicly welcome to put its bases in Saudi Arabia, the U.S. must instead rely on installations like Arifjan, a hot, dusty, 2,500-acre mix of Humvee parking lots and low-slung warehouses, that is located just a few miles south of the sprawling refineries at Shuaiba and Mina al-Abdullah.

This time is key – Troops in Iraq are essential to stability

China View 9 (http://news.xinhuanet.com/english/2009-04/08/content\_11145736.htm, AD: 6/28/10) jl

   BAGHDAD, April 7 (Xinhua) -- Visiting U.S. President Barack Obama on Tuesday told his troops in Iraq to be critical in next 18-month period of their mission in the war-torn country.

    Obama, who arrived in the Iraqi capital earlier in the day, made the remarks in a speech to the troops while he inspected the sprawling U.S. military base, Camp Victory, on the outskirts of Baghdad, according to media reports.

    The next 18 months "is going to be a critical period," Obama said, referring to the deadline for the withdrawal of all U.S. combat troops from Iraq by August 2010.

    He urged the U.S. troops to bear responsibilities to make sure Iraq is stable before the withdrawal, saying Iraq "is not a safe haven for terrorists, and we can start bringing our folks home."

Links – Arifjan 🡪 ME Stability – Equipment

Camp Arifjan is the United States only port for heavy equipment access to the Middle East.

White 7 (Josh, Washington Post Staff Writer, August 2, 2007, <http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/content/article/2007/08/01/AR2007080102371.html>)KFC

KUWAIT CITY, Aug. 1 -- U.S. commanders in Kuwait said Wednesday that they have enormous capability to handle the tens of thousands of troops and their equipment that would stream out of Iraq during a U.S. withdrawal. On a Middle East tour to discuss security cooperation with Iraq's neighbors, Defense Secretary Robert M. Gates flew over Camp Arifjan, about 40 miles south of Kuwait City, and facilities nearby at Shuaiba, the military's only port conduit for heavy equipment such as tanks and armored vehicles. Defense officials said that Gates was here to meet Kuwaiti leaders and that his first visit to the country was not specifically geared toward examining withdrawal options. Lt. Gen. R. Steven Whitcomb, commanding general of the 3rd Army, said the Kuwait facilities have handled as many as 240,000 troops moving into and out of Iraq in as little as a three-month period during the war's major rotations. About 160,000 U.S. troops are currently deployed in Iraq.

Links – Arifjan 🡪 ME Stability – Training

Camp Arifjan is key to the US military training.

Jontz 5 (Sandra, Stars and Stripes, April 11, 2005, http://www.stripes.com/news/army-preparing-to-close-camp-doha-shift-operations-to-other-kuwait-bases-1.31807)KFC

“We need to bypass the populated area of Kuwait City, and we want to be less disruptive to the civilian population,” said Maj. Jeffrey Doll, the base’s operations officer. “We’re moving away from populated areas.” The roughly 3,000 to 5,000 stationed troops at Doha will move primarily to Camp Buehring in the north and Camp Arifjan in the south, Smith said. The U.S. military has between 15,000 and 20,000 troops at 10 installations throughout Kuwait. Camp Arifjan, about an hour’s drive from Camp Doha, now serves as the main staging ground for all coalition forces involved in Operation Iraqi Freedom. Troops will arrive in and depart from the region via Ali Al Salem Air Base nearby. When built two years ago, the U.S. military envisioned Camp Arifjan as a permanent base, Smith said. Even if the country were not at war, the United States wants to keep bases in U.S.-friendly Kuwait as training sites, giving troops an opportunity to drill in the harsh heat and dusty environment that mirror battlegrounds in the region, said Sgt. Maj. Michael Phoenix, Camp Doha’s command sergeant major. “Units will be coming here to train, whether they’re going to war or not,” he said. By August, most of the southern half of Camp Doha will be closed, and the largely logistical functions there will move to Camp Buehring, Camp Virginia and Camp Arifjan. The Army has set February as the target month to completely vacate the site, Doll said. Camp Doha’s AAFES exchange, which soldiers there dubbed the best in Kuwait, will hold its “fire sale” over Memorial Day weekend, and will close by the end of June, Phoenix said. Camp Doha’s loss is Camp Arifjan’s gain. The base continues to add permanent and semipermanent structures to join its already sprawling compound of barracks, gym, community center, Morale Welfare and Recreational facilities, chow halls and even a swimming pool.

Impacts – Terrorism Impact Module

Nuclear terrorist attacks are imminent and probable

Wilson 10 (Valerie, Staff Writer, http://www.cnn.com/2010/OPINION/04/08/plame.wilson.nuclear.danger/index.html, AD: 6/28/10) jl

We know that terrorist groups have been trying to buy, build or steal a bomb.

In the past two decades, there have been at least 25 instances of nuclear explosive materials being lost or stolen. There is enough highly enriched uranium, or HEU, in the world today to build more than 100,000 bombs.

Terrorists looking to buy or steal HEU could look to the approximately 40 countries with nuclear weapons materials. And then there are rogue individuals out there who are running black markets selling nuclear materials and technology.

Pakistan's Dr. A. Q. Khan did it for years before my group at the CIA brought him down in December 2003 after catching him red-handed selling a full-scale nuclear bomb to Moammar Gadhafi's regime in Libya.

If terrorists manage to get their hands on enough HEU, they could smuggle it into a target city, build a bomb and explode it. A hundred pounds of highly enriched uranium could fit in a shoebox, and 100,000 shipping containers come into the United States every day.

That causes US nuclear retaliation – the impact is extinction

Corr 4

(Anders, Ph.D. Candidate at the Department of Government @ Harvard University http://www.foreignpolicysociety.org/workingpapers/WP7--Corr.pdf, AD: 6/27/10) jl

If a smuggled nuclear explosive detonates in a major American city, how would the United States respond? The most likely targets are New York City and Washington, D.C. In either case, hundreds of thousands would die and hundreds of billions of dollars of damage would be suffered. A severe economic depression would occur. If the blast were in DC, nearly the entire political and/or military leadership would need to be replaced, depending on the kilotonnage. If in New York, the long-term economic impact would be massive. In either case, the international relations of the United States would drastically change course. When the Japanese attacked Pearl Harbor and killed 2,403 Americans, the US was roused from its largely isolationist and pacifist mood overnight. America became the most formidable war machine on earth, beating Japan in the Pacific and Germany in Western Europe.2 When the September 11 attacks cost approximately 3000 lives and over $100 billion in property damage, the nation responded by invading and overthrowing regimes in Afghanistan and Iraq.3 In both cases, US public opinion was inflamed and fully supported offensive military retaliation. How much greater would be the response of public mood and offensive military action to an unexpected incident of nuclear terror that caused, at a minimum, 50 times the casualties and property damage of Pearl Harbor and September 11 combined? The response would be unprecedented and very likely nuclear, even if the United States had no ex ante doctrine that ensured retaliation. In this case, the United States would bear all the expected costs of military retaliation, without deriving the expected benefits of deterrence that flow from ex ante threats of retaliation.

US forces in Kuwait are critical to regional stability and preventing terrorism

Leverett 7 (Flynt, The American Prospect, http://www.prospect.org/cs/articles?article=the\_way\_out\_of\_iraq, AD: 6/28/10) jl

The forces in Kuwait, plus the offshore balancing of the carrier battle groups and the Marine Expeditionary Force, would give us sufficient military power to protect our existential interests in the Gulf, that is, preventing Iraq from becoming a launching pad for international terrorism or a catalyst for regional instability that is so great that it jeopardizes U.S. economic or security interests.

Impact Calc – No Turns

No turns – Instability is inevitable it’s just a question of whether or not we can suppress it

Reuters 9 (http://www.reuters.com/article/idUSTRE57A35F20090811, AD: 6/28/10) jl

The planned withdrawal of U.S. troops from Iraq has not discouraged al Qaeda from planning attacks on U.S.-allied Arab countries, including Kuwait, political analyst Shafiq Ghabra said.

"Their issue is not the withdrawal of the U.S. (troops), it's also their ... regime, the existing elite, the existing ruling families," he said.

Al Qaeda is now struggling to show they exist after setbacks in Iraq and Pakistan, Ghabra added. "They are trying to hit wherever they feel there is a weakness."

\*\*AFF\*\*

No Middle East Escalation

Middle East stable – empirically, wars have not escalated

Fettweis 7 (Christopher, Prof. of National Security Affairs @ National Security Decision Making Department of the US Naval War College, Dec 2007, <http://www.informaworld.com/smpp/content~content=a783986391~db=all~order=page>) LL

No matter what the outcome in Iraq, the region is not likely to devolve into chaos. Although it might seem counter-intuitive, by most traditional measures the Middle East is very stable. Continuous, uninterrupted governance is the norm, not the exception; most Middle East regimes have been in power for decades. Its monarchies, from Morocco to Jordan to every Gulf state, have generally been in power since these countries gained independence. In Egypt Hosni Mubarak has ruled for almost three decades, and Muammar Gadhafi in Libya for almost four. The region's autocrats have been more likely to die quiet, natural deaths than meet the hangman or post-coup firing squads. Saddam's rather unpredictable regime, which attacked its neighbours twice, was one of the few exceptions to this pattern of stability, and he met an end unusual for the modern Middle East. Its regimes have survived potentially destabilising shocks before, and they would be likely to do so again. The region actually experiences very little cross-border warfare, and even less since the end of the Cold War. Saddam again provided an exception, as did the Israelis, with their adventures in Lebanon. Israel fought four wars with neighbouring states in the first 25 years of its existence, but none in the 34 years since. Vicious civil wars that once engulfed Lebanon and Algeria have gone quiet, and its ethnic conflicts do not make the region particularly unique.

**Middle East wars don’t escalate and US forces do little to prevent escalation**

Yglesias 7 (Matthew, Associate Editor of The Atlantic Monthly, Sept 12, , <http://matthewyglesias.theatlantic.com/archives/2007/09/containing_iraq.php>) LL

Kevin Drum tries to throw some water 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 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 terrorist organization.

Several conflicts prove – no escalation

Dru, 7 (Kevin, CBS, Sept 9, <http://www.cbsnews.com/stories/2007/09/09/politics/animal/main3244894.shtml>) LL

Having admitted, however, that Iraq is a problem that can't be solved by the U.S. military, Chaos Hawks nonetheless insist that the U.S. military needs to stay in Iraq for the foreseeable future. Why? Because if we leave the entire Middle East will become a bloodbath. Sunni and Shiite will engage in mutual genocide, oil fields will go up in flames, fundamentalist parties will take over, and al-Qaeda will have a safe haven bigger than the entire continent of Europe. Needless to say, this is nonsense. Israel has fought war after war in the Middle East. Result: no regional conflagration. Iran and Iraq fought one of the bloodiest wars of the second half the 20th century. Result: no regional conflagration. The Soviets fought in Afghanistan and then withdrew. No regional conflagration. The U.S. fought the Gulf War and then left. No regional conflagration. Algeria fought an internal civil war for a decade. No regional conflagration.

US Presence 🡪 ME Conflict

US presence interferes in Iran’s sphere of influence – the impact is extinction

ICFI 10 (International Committee of the Fourth International, http://www.wsws.org/articles/2010/apr2010/pers-a20.shtml, AD: 6/28/10) jl

Virtually nothing is said of this publicly. But the strategists of US imperialism recognize a war with Iran could ignite a military-political firestorm that would engulf the entire region, from Afghanistan and Iraq to Israel-Palestine—a conflict that in its size and scope could be the largest since at least the Korean War.

To limit this potential, a US strike against Iran would from the outset have to take the form of a “shock and awe” campaign aiming at destroying Iran’s infrastructure and ability to function as a modern state.

Washington’s launch of such a war would invariably have an explosive impact on world geopolitics, on the relations of the US with all the other great powers, and on class relations in the US. Russia and China, in particular, would in all likelihood see such a war, directed as it would be in ensuring US control over the world’s principal oil-exporting region and projecting US power into Eurasia, as constituting a fundamental threat to their strategic interests.

By the same token, however, the US cannot retreat from the drive to assert its domination over the Middle East. If this was imperative in the decades after World War II when the position of American capitalism was unchallenged, it is all the more so now that its world position has been so demonstrably undermined.

Thus the White House and Pentagon continue to prepare for “all contingencies” and invoke these war plans to strong-arm the other great powers into supporting yet another round of punishing sanctions against Tehran.

Whatever its particular form, a new Middle East war would have catastrophic consequences for the people of the Middle East—Iranian, Arab, and Jewish—and potentially the world.

US Intervention 🡪 Terrorism

US overseas intervention leads to more terrorist attacks

Eland 98 (Ivan, CATO: Foreign Policy, Dec 17, <http://www.cato.org/pubs/fpbriefs/fpb50.pdf>) LL

According to Secretary of State Madeleine Albright, terrorism is the most important threat the United States and the world face as the 21st century begins. High-level U.S. officials have acknowledged that terrorists are now more likely to be able to obtain and use nuclear, chemical, and biological weapons than ever before. Yet most attention has been focused on combating terrorism by deterring and disrupting it beforehand and retaliating against it after the fact. Less attention has been paid to what motivates terrorists to launch attacks. According to the Pentagon's Defense Science Board, a strong correlation exists between U.S. involvement in international situations and an increase in terrorist attacks against the United States. President Clinton has also acknowledged that link. The board, however, has provided no empirical data to support its conclusion. This paper fills that gap by citing many examples of terrorist attacks on the United States in retaliation for U.S. intervention overseas. The numerous incidents cataloged suggest that the United States could reduce the chances of such devastating--and potentially catastrophic-- terrorist attacks by adopting a policy of military restraint overseas.

US intervention attracts terrorism

Eland 98 (Ivan, CATO: Foreign Policy, Dec 17, <http://www.cato.org/pubs/fpbriefs/fpb50.pdf>) LL

The logic behind the claim that there are other primary causes for terrorism against the United States needs to be examined. Many other Western nations are wealthy; have an extensive industrial and commercial presence overseas; export their culture along with their products and services; and believe in religious freedom, economic opportunity, and respect for the rights of the individual. Yet those nations-- Switzerland and Australia, for example--seem to have much less of a problem with worldwide terrorism than does the United States. According to the U.S. State Department's Patterns of Global Terrorism: 1997, one-third of all terrorist attacks worldwide were perpetrated against U.S. targets.11 The percentage of terrorism targeted at the United States is very high considering that the United States--unlike nations such as Algeria, Turkey, and the United Kingdom--has no internal civil war or quarrels with its neighbors that spawn terrorism. The major difference between the United States and other wealthy democratic nations is that it is an interventionist superpower. As Betts notes, the United States is the only nation in the world that intervenes regularly outside its own region. The motives for some terrorist attacks are not easy to discern. They may be protests against U.S. culture or overseas business presence. Two incidents in 1995--the deadly attack by two gunmen on a van from the U.S. consulate in Karachi, Pakistan, and the bombing of a "Dunkin Donuts" in Bogotá, Colombia--could fit into those categories. But with no statement of motives by the terrorists, such attacks could just as easily have been responses to the perceived foreign policies of a global superpower. Even if some terrorist attacks against the United States are a reaction to "what it is" rather than "what it does," the list of incidents later in this paper shows how many terrorist attacks can be traced back to an interventionist American foreign policy. A conservative approach was taken in cataloging those incidents. To be added to the list, a planned or actual attack first had to be targeted against U.S. citizens, property, or facilities--either at home or abroad. Then there had to be either an indication from the terrorist group that the attack was a response to U.S. foreign policy or strong circumstantial evidence that the location, timing, or target of the attack coincided with a specific U.S. intervention overseas. Although the Defense Science Board noted a historical correlation between U.S. involvement in international situations and an increase in terrorist attacks against the United States, the board apparently believed the conclusion to be so obvious that it did not publish detailed data to support it. Some analysts apparently remain unconvinced of the relationship. The data in this paper provide the empirical evidence.

No Nuclear Terrorism

Nuclear terrorism is all hype – it’s not based on data

Gertz and Lake 10 (Bill - a reporter covering foreign policy and international developments for The Washington Times, Eli - Washington Times Staff Writer, http://www.washingtontimes.com/news/2010/apr/14/obama-says-terrorist-nuclear-risk-is-growing/, AD: 6/28/10) jl

The Obama administration is warning that the danger of a terrorist attack with nuclear weapons is increasing, but U.S. officials say the claim is not based on new intelligence and questioned whether the threat is being overstated.

President Obama said in a speech before the 47-nation Nuclear Security Summit, which concluded Tuesday, that "the risk of a nuclear confrontation between nations has gone down, but the risk of nuclear attack has gone up."

The two-day meeting concluded with an agreement by participants to take steps to prevent non-state actors like al Qaeda from obtaining nuclear weapons, either through theft of existing weapons or through making their own with pilfered nuclear material.

The joint statement called nuclear terrorism one of the most challenging threats to international security and called for tougher security to prevent terrorists, criminals and others from acquiring nuclear goods.

But Henry Sokolski, a member of the congressional Commission on the Prevention of Weapons of Mass Destruction Proliferation and Terrorism, said that there is no specific intelligence on ongoing terrorist procurement of nuclear material.

"We were given briefings and when we tried to find specific intelligence on the threat of any known terrorist efforts to get a bomb, the answer was we did not have any."

Arifjan Doesn’t Deter

Arifjan doesn’t deter aggression – terrorist try to bomb it

Reuters 9 (http://www.reuters.com/article/idUSTRE57A35F20090811, AD: 6/28/10) jl

An Interior Ministry statement said all six members of the al Qaeda-linked cell had confessed after being arrested. It did not say if the targeted facilities included oil industry plants in Kuwait, the world's fourth-largest oil exporter.

"The state security has uncovered a terrorist network following al Qaeda, and includes six (Kuwaiti) citizens who have planned to carry out a plan to bomb Arifjan Camp, the state security building and other important facilities," the ministry said.

Camp Arifjan is located south of Kuwait City and serves as a staging ground for forces deploying in Iraq.

In Washington, Pentagon press secretary Geoff Morrell applauded the Kuwaiti government action and said it looked like an attack on U.S. interests had been imminent.

"I can just tell you at this point, with what little information I have, that -- that it does, indeed, look as though this group was attempting to target U.S. forces," Morrell said.

"I don't think it is clear at this point that Camp Arifjan was necessarily where they were plotting their attack, but clearly U.S. forces were among those they wanted to hit, based upon our initial assessment."

Terrorism – No Impact

No impact to terrorism

Milholin 2 (Gary, Director of the Wisconsin Project on Nuclear Arms Control, http://www.wisconsinproject.org/pubs/articles/2002/terror-bomb.htm, AD: 6/27/10) jl

Despite the reports, and despite the attendant warnings, the risk that a terrorist group like al Qaeda could get the bomb (or a "dirty" substitute) is much lower than most people think. That is the good news. There is also bad news: the risk is not zero. THERE ARE essentially two ways for a terrorist group to lay its hands on a nuclear weapon: either build one from scratch or somehow procure an already manufactured one or its key components. Neither of these is likely. Building a bomb from scratch would confer the most power: a group that could build one bomb could build several, and a nuclear arsenal would put it front and center on the world stage. But of all the possibilities, this is the unlikeliest--"so remote," in the words of a senior nuclear scientist at the Los Alamos National Laboratory, "that it can be essentially ruled out." The chief obstacle lies in producing the nuclear fuel--either bomb-grade uranium or plutonium--that actually explodes in a chain reaction. More than 80 percent of the effort that went into making America's first bombs was devoted to producing this fuel, and it is no easy task. To make bomb-grade uranium, a terrorist group would need thousands of high-speed gas centrifuges, machined to exact dimensions, arranged in series, and capable of operating under the most demanding conditions. If they wanted to produce the uranium by a diffusion process, they would need an even greater number of other machines, equally difficult to manufacture and operate. If they followed Saddam Hussein's example, they could try building a series of giant electromagnets, capable of bending a stream of electrically charged particles--a no less daunting challenge. For any of these, they would also need a steady supply of natural uranium and a specialized plant to convert it to a gaseous form for processing. Who would sell these things to would-be nuclear terrorists? The answer is: nobody. The world's nuclear-equipment makers are organized into a cooperative group that exists precisely to stop items like these from getting into unauthorized hands. Nor could a buyer disguise the destination and send materials through obliging places like Dubai (as Iran does with its hot cargoes) or Malta (favored by Libya's smugglers). The equipment is so specialized, and the suppliers so few, that a forest of red flags would go up. And even if the equipment could be bought, it would have to be operated in a place that the United States could not find. If manufacturing bomb-grade uranium is out of the picture, what about making plutonium, a much smaller quantity of which is required to form a critical mass (less than fourteen pounds was needed to destroy Nagasaki in 1945)? There is, however, an inconvenient fact about plutonium, which is that you need a reactor to make enough of it for a workable bomb. Could terrorists buy one? The Russians are selling a reactor to Iran, but Moscow tends to put terrorist groups in the same category as Chechens. The Chinese are selling reactors to Pakistan, but Beijing, too, is not fond of terrorists. India and Pakistan can both build reactors on their own, but, for now, these countries are lined up with the U.S. Finally, smuggling a reactor would be no easier than buying one. Reactor parts are unique, so manufacturers would not be fooled by phony purchase orders. Even if terrorists somehow got hold of a reactor, they would need a special, shielded chemical plant to chop up its radioactive fuel, dissolve it in acid, and then extract the plutonium from the acid. No one would sell them a plutonium extraction plant, either. It is worth remembering that Saddam Hussein tried the reactor road in the 1970's. He bought one from France--Jacques Chirac, in his younger days, was a key facilitator of the deal--hoping it would propel Iraq into the nuclear club. But the reactor's fuel was sabotaged in a French warehouse, the person who was supposed to certify its quality was murdered in a Paris hotel, and when the reactor was finally ready to operate, a squadron of Israeli fighter-bombers blew it apart. A similar fate would undoubtedly await any group that tried to follow Saddam's method today. IF MAKING nuclear-bomb fuel is a no-go, why not just steal it, or buy it on the black market? Consider plutonium. There are hundreds of reactors in the world, and they crank out tons of the stuff every year. Surely a dedicated band of terrorists could get their hands on some. This too is not so simple. Plutonium is only created inside reactor fuel rods, and the rods, after being irradiated, become so hot that they melt unless kept under water. They are also radioactive, which is why they have to travel submerged from the reactor to storage ponds, with the water acting as both coolant and radiation shield. And in most power reactors, the rods are welded together into long assemblies that can be lifted only by crane. True, after the rods cool down they can be stored dry, but their radioactivity is still lethal. To prevent spent fuel rods from killing the people who come near them, they are transported in giant radiation-shielding casks that are not supposed to break open even in head-on collisions. The casks are also guarded. If terrorists managed to hijack one from a country that had reactors they would still have to take it to a plant in another country that could extract the plutonium from the rods. They would be hunted at every step of the way. Instead of fuel rods, they would be better advised to go after pure plutonium, already removed from the reactor fuel and infinitely easier to handle. This kind of plutonium is a threat only if you ingest or inhale it. Human skin blocks its radiation: a terrorist could walk around with a lump of it in his front trouser pocket and still have children. But where to get hold of it? Russia is the best bet: it has tons of plutonium in weapon-ready form, and the Russian nuclear-accounting system is weak. Russia also has underpaid scientists, and there is unquestionably some truth behind all the stories one hears about the smuggling that goes on in that country. But very little Russian plutonium has been in circulation, with not a single reported case of anything more than gram quantities showing up on the black market. This makes sense. Pure plutonium is used primarily for making nuclear warheads, it is in military hands, and military forces are not exactly keen to see it come back at them in somebody else's bombs. One source of pure plutonium that is not military is a new kind of reactor fuel called "mixed oxide." It is very different from the present generation of fuel because it contains weapon-ready material. But precisely because it is weapon-ready, it is guarded and accounted for, and a terrorist group would have to win a gun battle to get close to it. Then they would probably need a crane to move it, and would have to elude or fight off their pursuers. If terrorists did procure some weapon-ready plutonium, would their problems be over? Far from it: plutonium works only in an "implosion"-type bomb,
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which is about ten times more difficult to build than the simple uranium bomb used at Hiroshima. In such a device, a spherical shock wave "implodes" inward and squeezes a ball of plutonium at the bomb's center so that it explodes in a chain reaction. To accomplish all this, one needs precision machine tools to build the parts, special furnaces to melt and cast the plutonium in a vacuum (liquid plutonium oxidizes rapidly in air), and high-precision switches and capacitors for the firing circuit. Also required are a qualified designer, a number of other specialists, and a testing program. Considering who the participating scientists are likely to be, the chances of getting an implosion bomb to work are rather small. THE ALTERNATIVE to plutonium is bomb-grade uranium--and here things would be easier. This is the fuel used in the Hiroshima bomb. Unlike the implosion bomb dropped on Nagasaki, this one did not have to be tested: the U.S. knew it would work. The South Africans built six uranium bombs without testing; they knew their bombs would work, too. All these devices used a simple "gun" design in which one slug of uranium was shot down a barrel into another. The problem with buying bomb-grade uranium is that one would need a great deal of it--around 120 pounds for a gun-type bomb--and nothing near that amount has turned up in the black market.

The odds of terrorists constructing and detonating a nuclear weapon is one in over three billion

Choong 9 (William, Senior Writer at The Straits Times, Lexis) jl

This leaves the second route: terrorists building a nuclear device themselves. And arguably, nuclear terrorists can find do-it-yourself instructions for a nuclear weapon, albeit crude ones, on the Internet.

Having the blueprint for a weapon, however, does not guarantee the production of that weapon. In the estimation of Professor John Mueller, a political scientist at Ohio University, terrorists will have to successfully navigate about 20 steps to build an improvised nuclear device - and all the steps must be achieved. These include processes centred on producing, transporting and detonating the device.

If the terrorist group has a 50 per cent chance of success for each step, the odds of the group pulling off all the steps would be one in a million. If each step involves a 33 per cent chance of success, the odds of pulling off all of them would drop to one in over three billion, Prof Mueller says in an e-mail in reply to questions by this newspaper.