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\_\_\_\*\*Top Level

Strategy Sheet

This file contains several different ‘shift’ CPs. These CPs relocate and consolidate troops and bases rather than removing them.

\*\*\*THE COMMON IMPACT TO SOUTH KOREA AND JAPAN IS GUAM, THE COMMON IMPACT TO IRAQ AND AFGHANISTAN IS KANDAHAR.

For Japan, South Korea, Afghanistan and Turkey – this is fairly simple. The CP takes troops and moves them all to sparsely populated areas or to conflict hotspots.

For Iraq, it’s a little bit trickier – the CP sends withdraw troops to Kandahar, Afghanistan. To get an idea of why this competes, see the ‘2NC CP competition’ shell below.

As for strategy, keep three things in mind…

1. If the Aff only reads theory, they’ve conceded a built-in DA – don’t forget that you are arguing \*troop presence good.\*

2. Use CX to establish Aff concessions, particularly on the Iraq version – the plan isn’t likely to say where the troops go once they’re withdrawn. Fight tooth and nail to earn this concession.

3. Aff teams; against everything but Iraq, your case is a built-in DA to the CP. Against Iraq, just remember; the resolution says remove presence in ONE \*or\* more of the following….

2NC CP Competition

The CP competes –

1. Disproves the resolution; the Aff has to defend \*reduced military presence\* - allowing the Aff to simultaneously increase and decrease presence makes the Aff bidirectional, which makes clash impossible – this shapes and outweighs the 2AC argument that (\_\_\_\_\_)

2. Literature – there is a LARGE distinction between shifting and reducing our military presence – allowing them to illogically cherry-pick between right and left wing stances destroys our ability to access key parts of the literature base, destroying negative ground

3. Only our interpretation allows debaters to discuss theatre strategy – this is the foundation of U.S. forward deployment

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>.

The U.S. plans to eventually relocate 8,000 Marines to Guam, as outlined in the 2009 “Guam International Agreement,” However, this is contingent on the DPJ following through on the U.S.-Japan plan to relocate Futenma air base to a newly built facility at Henoko.33 As argued above, recent tensions on the Korean Peninsula have bolstered U.S. and host government claims to maintain forces in the Asia-Pacific. U.S. bases are not independent units, but part of a network woven together by alliance ties in an effort to maintain U.S. regional hegemony. Recognizing that this strategic web affects base relocation from one locality to another (i.e. Okinawa to Guam), anti-base activists in Asia have moved to support local anti-base initiatives throughout the region.34

4. Affs should have to defend \*global force posture\* - this forms the foundation of anti-base decision-making

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>.

Recent scrutiny of U.S.-Japan base realignment and Okinawan anti-base opposition has overshadowed U.S. military issues in South Korea. As others have argued, the struggle in Okinawa represents only one facet of the larger global struggle against U.S. bases.3 While this article focuses on U.S. base issues in South Korea, base relocation issues in the Asia-Pacific are linked together by U.S. strategic plans for the region, and more broadly, U.S. global force posture and realignment.4 They are also linked by the growing international network of anti-base forces that has spread across the Pacific and beyond. It thus makes sense to put South Korean anti-base movements in comparative perspective with ongoing base issues in Okinawa and Guam.

5. Counter-interpretation; the Aff can defend that they shift to any non-topically designated country. The Neg can defend a shift to any topically designated regional country.

6. We meet – the CP shifts troops from Iraq to Afghanistan

7. Default negative – our interpretation limits the Neg to 3 shift CPs, at most – regional stability advantages, along with strategic advantages like offshore balancing or soft power, allow them to access built-in offense. It’s impossible to be Neg if the Aff can take both sides on presence in a way that is entirely divorced from forward deployment strategy

\_\_\_\*\*Japan

Japan CP – 1NC

**CP Text: The United States federal government should redeploy [whatever the plan removes] to Honshu, Hokkaido, Uruma, Camp Schwab, and northern Okinawa.**

**We could move troops to each area and cause massive controversy**

**A. Hokkaido and Honshu**

**Hanai 5** (Kiroku, editorial writer for the Japan Times, specialzing in IR, Japan Times, http://search.japantimes.co.jp/cgi-bin/eo20051024kh.html)JFS

**The people of Okinawa**, which remained under U.S. occupation for another 20 years after the Occupation ended on the mainland, **are** becoming increasingly **weary of** the continued heavy **U.S. military presence.** They will be glad to have the Futenma airfield relocated outside the prefecture. **Moving it to Honshu may be difficult, but Hokkaido**, a friendly host to Japan's Self-Defense Forces bases, **is a likely candidate.** If Hokkaido disagrees, the Marine Corps in Okinawa may have to move to somewhere in the U.S. Former Deputy **Prime Minister** Masaharu Gotoda, who died last month, had **said** in a speech to the Ryukyu Forum in May: "At the least, **the Marine Corps should withdraw to U.S. territory. It is unacceptable for a victor** nation **to station its troops in a vanquished nation for an indefinite period and go on to build new bases.**" Koizumi should take this statement to heart.

**B. Camp Schwab and Uruma**

**Japan Today 10** (Japanese News Source, http://www.japantoday.com/category/politics/view/okinawa-kagoshima-locals-angered-by-govt-futenma-plan)JFS

According to diplomatic sources, Foreign Minister Katsuya Okada told U.S. Ambassador to Japan John Roos on Friday that Tokyo is considering a two-stage process, starting with the **building** of **a** 550-meter-long **helipad at** the inland part of the U.S. Marines’ **Camp Schwab** in Nago, Okinawa, **to** temporarily **relocate** some of the helicopter **troops from** the **Futenma** facility. **As for the** final **relocation site, the government is considering an artificial island to be built off** the coast of the U.S. Navy’s White Beach facility in **Uruma**, also in Okinawa, or Tokunoshima Island in Kagoshima Prefecture, the sources said. Nago Mayor Susumu **Inamine told reporters that he rejects the** central government’s reported **plan to** temporarily **move** the **Futenma functions to Camp Schwab. ‘‘There is no chance of that plan being accepted by locals,’’** Inamine said. ‘‘**We cannot trust the government’s policy** of transferring only temporarily. It’s impossible.’‘ ‘‘I have been saying **we are against the Futenma transfer to Camp Schwab** with or without land reclamation,’’ the mayor said.

Guam NB – 1NC

**Normal means dictates the aff redeploys the troops to Guam**

**Straits Times 9** (Feb 17, Asian News Source, http://www.straitstimes.com/Breaking%2BNews/Asia/Story/STIStory\_339485.html)JFS

HOPING to give new momentum to a plan to rework the deployment of US troops in the Pacific, Secretary of State Hillary Rodham **Clinton signed an agreement** Tuesday **with Japan that will move** 8,000 **Marines off** the southern Japanese island of **Okinawa to** the US territory of **Guam. The framework of the transfer had** already **been agreed on** in 2006, but several major points remain to be worked out, including the location of a base to replace Okinawa's Futenma air station, a major hub for the Marines there. **Officials on both sides** have **agreed to relocate** the operations of the base to another, less crowded part of Okinawa, but local opposition has stalled progress.

**Military relocation to Guam causes colonialism, poverty, water shortages, and impedes the democratic process**

**Naiman 6/16** (Robert, Policy Director at Just Foreign Policy, writing for Huff Post, http://www.huffingtonpost.com/robert-naiman/guam-self-determination-o\_b\_614688.html)JFS

The Mariana Islands comprise two political entities, the territory of Guam and the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands. **Guam was ceded to the U.S. by Spain** in 1898 after Spain's defeat in the Spanish-American war, while the Northern Mariana Islands were conquered by the U.S. from Japan in World War II. As political entities, the two have several features in common: **while they are ruled by Washington,** and their residents **are U.S. citizens**, many of whom **serve in the** U.S. **military, they have no vote in** Presidential **elections, nor** do they have **a representative in Congress** who can vote on the passage of legislation. In other words: **they are** U.S. **colonies. Guam,** in particular, **is facing a major decision about its destiny, a decision made in Washington** **about which its indigenous population has not** yet **had any** effective **say. The United States is currently planning to relocate 8,000 Marines** and 9,000 dependents **to Guam** by 2014. With an expected influx of foreign workers recruited for military construction projects, Guam's population is expected to increase by some 80,000 people by 2014, a 45% increase from its current estimated population of 180,000. **More than a quarter of the island is already owned by the U.S. military**, the Washington Post noted in March, **while a quarter** of the island's population **lives below the** U.S. **poverty level**. As the Post noted, **Guam was not consulted in the decision to move 8,000 Marines** to the island and has no legal means to block it. Yet an Environmental Protection Agency analysis said **the** U.S. **military buildup could trigger island-wide water shortages.** **The possibility that Guam's** indigenous **residents may suffer** irreparable **harm from** this planned **military buildup** **without** ever **having** had **any** effective **say about it heightens the responsibility of Americans who do have voting representation** in Washington to know something about the military buildup and its historical background. Thanks to PBS, until Sunday we have the opportunity to catch up a little on the history they didn't teach us in school.

**Democracy key to preventing 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.**

Kan NB (1/3)

**Both the DPJ and Kan are losing all credibility in the status quo**

**Koh 6/15** (Yoree, writer for fins.com economics dept., Wall Street Journal,

 http://blogs.wsj.com/japanrealtime/2010/06/15/the-end-of-the-honeymoon-for-kan/) JPG

**Japan’s romance with the Democratic Party of Japan under** the new helm of Prime Minister Naoto **Kan may be losing its sizzle**, at least **according to a pair of public opinion polling results** released earlier this week. A third one, however, suggests ongoing strong support.Just 29.4% of respondents said they planned to tick the box for DPJ-backed candidates in the upper house election scheduled for July 11, down from 43.8% five days earlier, according to the latest weekly poll conducted by Kyodo News. A similar sentiment was shared by those surveyed by the Yomiuri newspaper with 31% of respondents leaning towards the DPJ, down from 36% on June 10. **The Liberal Democratic Party enjoyed a lift in the** Yomiuri **ratings,** rising three percentage points to 16% this week, but was denied a bump in the Kyodo results – falling below the 20% threshold to 14.5%.**The DPJ’s strength** going into the upcoming election **is essential for the party** to capture an upper house majority, enabling it **to push its own policy agenda** for the next three years **without the need to rely on coalition partners**, a crutch that caused angst for Mr. Kan’s predecessor, former Prime Minister Yukio Hatoyama. Indeed, the party jettisoned expectations of achieving a majority amid Mr. Hatoyama’s sinking popularity, but **the surge in public support since Mr. Kan’s induction into office revived DPJ’s hopes of reaching its** original **goal.** Looking to ride Mr. Kan’s wave of popularity while it was at its highest, the party even rebuffed calls from one coalition partner to delay the election a couple weeks.The DPJ received a burst of much-needed support in poll results — both Kyodo News and Yomiuri ratings climbed over ten percentage points each week — after Prime Minister Kan replaced Mr. Hatoyama, who abruptly resigned earlier this month. But **the latest drop in ratings suggests that within a time period comparable to the average shelf life of a carton of milk**, the new DPJ’s appeal is already in decline. The results released by Kyodo News are based on phone calls placed to 1,000 randomly selected households that are eligible to vote nationwide, according to the media company’s polling research center while Yomiuri randomly contacted 1,738 eligible voters, with 1,088 people, or 63%, giving valid responses in a nationwide, telephone-based opinion poll.

**The plan allows Kan to focus on economic reforms and increases DPJ credibility**

Kyodo News 6/25 (Japan Times Online, 6/25/10, <http://search.japantimes.co.jp/cgi-bin/nn20100625a1.html>) JPG

**Kan took over** earlier this month **from** Yukio **Hatoyama, who quit after sparking public outrage** for breaking a promise to move a U.S. airbase off the southern island, reluctant host to about half the 49,000 U.S. military personnel in [Japan](http://www.reuters.com/places/japan).**The dispute over where to relocate the U.S. Marines' Futenma airbase has distracted** Washington and **Tokyo** as the close allies try to cope with an unpredictable [North Korea](http://www.reuters.com/places/north-korea) and a rising China. **It has also hurt the popularity of the** ruling Democratic Party of [Japan](http://www.reuters.com/places/japan) **(DPJ)** with voters ahead of a July 11 upper house election, **which it needs to win for smooth policymaking, including efforts to rein in huge public debt.**"I want to express my gratitude for the fact that this burden contributes to the peace and security of the Asia-Pacific region," Kan said at ceremony to mark the 65th anniversary of the Battle of Okinawa at the end of World War Two, in which about 150,000 Okinawan men, women and children were killed."**I promise to** seriously **try** all the more **to reduce Okinawa's burden related to the U.S. bases** and eliminate the associated dangers."Kan, visiting Okinawa for the first time as prime minister, spoke at a memorial park where rows of black stones are engraved with names of those who died in the 82-day battle -- civilians and soldiers on both sides.**Kan has made fiscal reform a top priority ahead of the election, but opposition parties have used the base dispute to blast the DPJ's diplomatic policies since the party took power for the first time last year.**

**CP tanks credibility**

**PTI 7/5** (Press Trust of India, Staff Writer, http://www.ptinews.com/news/735775\_Kan-visits-Okinawa-amid-row-over-US-base-relocation-)JFS

Japanese Prime Minister Naoto **Kan made a visit to Okinawa** Prefecture Wednesday, **amid** strong **criticism** from locals **for** **an agreement** reached between Tokyo and Washington in May, **to relocate a** key US **military base within the island prefecture.** **This is Kan's first visit to Okinawa** since he took office earlier this month. He attended a ceremony to mark the 65th anniversary of the end of the Battle of Okinawa that killed over 200,000 Japanese soldiers and civilians in the closing days of World War II. Kan is expected to hold talks with Okinawa Gov Hirokazu Nakaima later today. **The premier says he will respect the** Japan-US **accord** announced May 28 **to move the** US Marine Corps **Futemma** Air **Station from a** crowded **residential area to a less populated** coastal **area** in Okinawa, **despite calls** from locals **to relocate the base outside the prefecture**.

Kan NB (2/3)

**Economic reforms kill a Japanese economic recovery – lack of opposition, fiscally unsound policies and lack of competition**

**Bremmer and Roubini 9** (Ian and Nouriel, Ian - president of Eurasia Group & Nouriel - professor of economics at New York University's Stern School of Business and chairman of RGE Monitor Wall Street Journal, http://online.wsj.com/article/SB10001424052748704779704574553491570666698.html) JPG

In some ways, Mr. Hatoyama's victory was even more historic than the American election. His Democratic Party of Japan (DPJ) ousted the Liberal Democratic Party (LDP) that had held power virtually without interruption for more than five decades. Like Mr. Obama, he's had to come to grips with enormous immediate challenges, beginning with the need to kick start a stalled economy. Japan's public debt is approaching 200% of gross domestic product—by far the largest debt-to-GDP ratio in the industrialized world. Mr. **Hatoyama's promises were ambitious, and sometimes even contradictory. Recognizing Japan's financial limitations**, **he and his party pledged to slash wasteful state spending**. Yet he has also called for "an economy of the people" that includes considerable state subsidies, and his government put forward a record high initial budget request of 95 trillion yen.The government has now moved ahead with a new bond issuance, with a promise to cap the new debt at about 44 trillion yen. Mr. **Hatoyama has announced plans to halt the privatization of Japan Post bank, an enormous enterprise with more than $3 trillion in assets** that helps finance state spending. And he has reiterated **a pledge that Japan will reduce carbon emissions** 25% below 1990 levels by 2020, a promise that **will soon prove too costly to keep**. On foreign policy, the new prime minister has argued that the U.S.-Japan relationship should develop toward a partnership of equals. But despite some blunt warnings from Washington, DPJ officials have yet to resolve the standoff over the controversial relocation of a helicopter base and 8,000 Marines from Japan to Guam. This is a deal the U.S. believes it settled with the previous Japanese government in 2006. In Washington, the prime minister's critics are becoming more vocal. Former National Security Council director for counterproliferation strategy Carolyn **Leddy recently accused the Hatoyama government of "increasing security policy schizophrenia."**Mr. Hatoyama's domestic approval numbers have taken a tough hit: A Kyodo News poll last weekend found that disapproval of the government surged to 38.1% this month from 25% in November. And **the risk remains that he will try to keep too many of his campaign promises, deepening Japan's debt without actually spurring growth**. He also risks undermining a security relationship with Washington that remains essential for East Asian stability. There are two main reasons why Mr. **Hatoyama's unrealistic goals are** more **worrisome** than any of the economic plans Mr. Obama has proposed.First, **there are far fewer political checks on Mr. Hatoyama's ability to pursue them**. Mr. Obama faces a hostile Republican Party, a divided electorate, and moderates within the Democratic congressional caucus skeptical of his plans. He has accepted compromise on important issues like health-care reform and troop deployments to Afghanistan because he knows he must. Recognizing the complexities involved, he's taken a go-slow approach on domestic climate change legislation and the closing of the prison at Guantanamo Bay. Fiscal conservatives in both parties make a second stimulus package all but politically impossible. **The DPJ**, meanwhile, **has built a strong single-party majority in the lower house and relies on a pair of coalition partners to dominate the upper house**. Mr. Obama's party has majorities too, but Mr. Hatoyama faces fewer institutional obstacles, like the filibuster, to setting a political agenda and pushing it forward. Finally, the U.S. has a two-party system that allows business and industry groups to hedge their bets by lobbying both sides. Five months ago, Japan had a one-party system—one in which business elites negotiated legislative language with an LDP-dominated bureaucracy. **For the commercial elite, it now has a no-party system, a ruling coalition of mostly new faces with far fewer connections in the business world.** Mr. Obama's innate caution and his willingness to compromise are likely to serve him well. **To spare Japan an unnecessarily turbulent 2010, Mr. Hatoyama needs to become "Hatobama**," a pragmatist ready to disappoint ideological allies and assuage centrist fears of a policy agenda his country simply can't afford. **Japan's recovery is riding on it.**

Kan NB (3/3)

**Japanese economic collapse causes nuclearization**

**Burkert 9** (Michael, The Garner Ted Armstrong Evangelistic Association, 7/1/9 http://www.garnertedarmstrong.org/Mark\_Wordfroms/manews0122.shtml) JPG

Garner Ted Armstrong warned of worldwide financial collapse and it’s upon us now. He also warned us that **collapsing governments create a power void that is quickly filled by extremists** bent on righting the wrongs of the previous government, **often with violent and tragic results**. I urge each of you to read his comments published at this website in 2002. His commentary, [IS GLOBAL ECONOMIC MELTDOWN UNDERWAY](http://www.garnertedarmstrong.org/GTA_Wordfroms/gtanews63.htm), is as valid today as it was when he wrote it. Mr. Armstrong wrote, “**Japan is frantically trying to save its entire banking system, which had its own chicanery and scandals. Japan is now awash in a sea of bad debt**, struggling to make reforms after 10 years of falling prices and recession. Will a military government soon take over in Japan? "**What are the odds that Japan will once again become a** [**militaristic**](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Militaristic) nation; one that reveres the emperor, bows to authority and honors a strong army and navy? Sadly, **the odds are good for this very event to happen and happen quickly** right before our eyes. **Japan continues to have many enemies**. Many nations once occupied by Japanese forces have NEVER forgotten the brutal ways in which their peoples were treated by the invading Japanese forces. In the West, “[political correctness](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Political_correctness)” has seen to it that most Japanese atrocities committed against British, [Australian](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Australia), [New Zealand](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/New_zealand), and American personnel were warranted and justified, due to the rampant anti-Japanese “[racism](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Racism)” in the [Commonweath nations](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Commonwealth_Nations) and the United States. **Wartime brutality and atrocities directed against the Chinese and other Asian peoples are glossed over and conveniently ignored by most in our Western** partisan and liberal **media.** However **the Chinese have not forgotten**. The [Koreans](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Korea), [Vietnamese](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Vietnam), and [Burmese](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Burma) have not forgotten how barbaric, occupying Japanese troops behaved. Accordingly, **there is little sympathy for Japan today in most of Asia.** **Japan sees herself in a “go-it-alone” situation**. Today in Japan, **numerous radical political groups want to seize power and rule.** Most are extreme national movements that revere the emperor, swear allegiance to everything that smacks of Japanese royalty and absolutely are willing to “die for the emperor and the Japanese nation!” **They want a large, modern, and strong army**. They demand a new [Imperial Navy](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Imperial_Japanese_Navy) that can rival any navy in the world. **They believe that they** have an economic plan that will put Japanese back to work, create jobs in the armaments industry and **return Japan once again to a nation feared and respected.** **Japanese militarism is on the rise and the collapse of the democratic government** in [Tokyo](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Toyko) may well usher in a new prime minister selected from the military high command. The militarist groups have received little media coverage over the years and in the West were mostly thought of as kooks. Now, however, **the aggressive nationalism they espouse is becoming mainstream**. A resurgent nationalism among some mainstream politicians and **North Korea’s** recent **nuclear testing have meant right-wing groups are now being listened to at the highest levels**. **Many of the policies they promote are now on the government’s agenda. Traditionally sensitive topics** that have recently become open to political and public discourse, **such as stripping the constitution of its pacifist components, developing nuclear weapons**, and promoting patriotism in schools, **are the** very **issues** right-wing **extremists have been pushing** for decades. They know that Japan was able to rapidly expand her economy and bring about prosperity during the militaristic era of earlier times. They hope to repeat what their grandfathers accomplished and are likely to do so if Tokyo defaults on her huge debt and the government collapses. Already, **Japanese militarists are responsible for several riots**, sabotage against police stations and other government installations as well as political assassinations**. Don’t be surprised if political assassinations by Japanese militarists eventually paralyze the elected government and cause chaos and terror in Tokyo** and other Japanese cities.

**Japanese rearmament leads to a destabilizing Asian arms race.**

**Chanlett-Avery and Nikitin 9** (Emma, specialist in Asian affairs, and Mary Beth, analyst in non-proliferation, “Japan’s Nuclear Future: Policy Debate, Prospects, and U.S Interests,” CRS Report for Congress, February 19, 2009, [<http://www.fas.org/sgp/crs/nuke/RL34487.pdf>] AD: 6/4/10, jm)

To many security experts, **the most alarming possible consequence of a Japanese decision to develop nuclear weapons would be the development of a regional arms race**.33 The fear is based on the belief that **a nuclear-armed Japan could compel South Korea to develop its own program**; **encourage China to increase and/or improve its relatively small arsenal; and** possibly **inspire Taiwan to pursue nuclear weapons.** **This** **in turn** might **have spill-over effects on** the already nuclear-armed **India and Pakistan**. **The** prospect—or even **reality**—**of several nuclear states rising in a region that is already rife with** historical grievances and contemporary **tension** **could be deeply destabilizing**. The counter-argument, made by some security experts, is that nuclear deterrence was stabilizing during the Cold War, and a similar nuclear balance could be achieved in Asia. However, most observers maintain that **the risks outweigh potential stabilizing factors**.

Japan CP S – 2NC

Relocation is a more feasible policy option in Japan – maintains alliance connections while resolving dissent

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>.

The U.S. plans to eventually relocate 8,000 Marines to Guam, as outlined in the 2009 “Guam International Agreement,” However, this is contingent on the DPJ following through on the U.S.-Japan plan to relocate Futenma air base to a newly built facility at Henoko.33 As argued above, recent tensions on the Korean Peninsula have bolstered U.S. and host government claims to maintain forces in the Asia-Pacific. U.S. bases are not independent units, but part of a network woven together by alliance ties in an effort to maintain U.S. regional hegemony. Recognizing that this strategic web affects base relocation from one locality to another (i.e. Okinawa to Guam), anti-base activists in Asia have moved to support local anti-base initiatives throughout the region.34 While it may be far-fetched to envisage elimination of all U.S. bases in the region anytime soon, anti-base resistance against Futenma is very much alive. Even though the DPJ aims to move forward with the Henoko plan, the past fifteen years of anti-base resistance in Okinawa suggests that the fate of Futenma’s relocation still remains open-ended. Henoko residents, with the support of Okinawan and Japanese activists, continue to resist. Okinawans continue to voice their opposition to base relocation in Okinawa. Strong protests on Tokunoshima Island in Kagoshima Prefecture amidst earlier rumors that Futenma would locate to this island also attest to the widespread opposition to U.S. bases by local actors in many communities. The lessons of South Korean anti-base movements speak directly to ongoing movements in Okinawa and Guam. Base relocation to Guam entails additional live-fire training sites as in Maehyangri. The possibility of a missile defense system for Guam resonates with the potential inclusion of Aegis destroyers on Jeju Island’s future naval base. The expansion of Camp Schwab in Henoko, while extending into the sea rather than taking additional land, parallels the expansion of Camp Humphreys in South Korea.35 The links between military base issues in the Asia-Pacific, and the corresponding cross-national ties formed between anti-base actors are poignantly summarized in a September 2009 letter to President Obama following the Second East Asia International Symposium on Environmental Problems Caused by U.S. Military Bases. The executive committee of the symposium writes: U.S. troops stationed near our dwellings are operating combat training in the name of the security of the Pacific-Asia region… Recently U.S. troops are expanding their bases and building new facilities under the cloak of "relocation." If the new base constructions in Pyeongtaek, Henoko, Takae, and Iwakuni [and Guam] are completed, they will again take away our land, which provides our livelihood, and destroy our environment. As overseas US military bases are promoting new construction projects, we are about to lose our dwellings and even our seas.36 The anti-base center of gravity in the Asia-Pacific shifts as current events unfold. In the early 1990s, the Philippines commanded much attention. In the mid-1990s, Okinawa rose to the fore. In the post-9/11 period, U.S. global force realignment brought significant attention to South Korea, Japan, Okinawa, and Guam. As the U.S. continues to reshuffle its military presence within and outside the Asia-Pacific region, scholars, activists, and policymakers will need to turn to comparative analyses to understand the full scale and scope of overseas base issues and anti-base movements.

Japan CP S – 2NC Say Yes

**Kan would agree to the plan**

**Thompson 6/8** (Mark, Time Magazine, Staff Writer, http://www.time.com/time/nation/article/0,8599,1994798,00.html?xid=rss-topstories)JFS

Japan's new Prime Minister, Naoto **Kan**, confirmed his nation's inherent conservatism on Sunday. In a 15-min. phone call with President Obama, the new Japanese leader **pledged that he would** work to **fulfill** **the** 2006 **deal under which the** U.S. Marines' **Futenma** air **base on Okinawa would be relocated** from its current cramped quarters **to a** more **remote part of the island.** **Kan honored the agreement by confirming** on Tuesday that **he would move the base to a less-crowded part of Okinawa,** as well as try to reduce the burden on the island for hosting the many U.S. military bases that are part of the joint security pact.

Normal Means = Relocation to Guam

**It’s normal means that troops will be relocated to Guam**

**Yoshida 6/28** (Kensei, The Asia-Pacific Journal: Japan Focus, http://japanfocus.org/-Yoshida-Kensei/3378)JFS

Marine Corps Air Station **Futenma**, located in the middle of a residential area of the city of Ginowan (population 91,000) north of the capital Naha, reportedly **stations** 2000 to **4000 personnel** of the 1st Marine Aircraft Wing of the III Marine Expeditionary Force. **Helicopters** and fixed/wing aircraft **are constantly flying low in** circles **over the residences**, schools and hospitals for embarkation and touch-and-go exercises, **creating** roaring noise and **the danger of crashes.** People are so concerned that they have long been demanding its closure and return, with particular urgency since 2004 when one of Futenma’s heavy helicopters spiraled into the wall of the administration building of a university right across the fence and splattered its broken pieces all over during the summer break. In 2006, **the Japanese and U.S. governments agreed to relocate** many **Okinawa-based Marines to Guam** by 2014 to lessen the Okinawan people’s burdens or to accommodate “the pressing need to reduce friction on Okinawa.” MCAS Futenma would be returned, but only after being replaced by a new facility that Japan would construct within Okinawa.

**Normal means is relocation**

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

"**The U.S. government** [has] repeatedly said that [it **wants] to relocate** to a place where [it] will be welcome. That welcome is simply not there in Okinawa at the moment," Nakano says. **The U.S. says it will transfer** 8,000 Marines **to Guam** and move a portion of the base to another part of Okinawa.

**And, the Pentagon will allow more troops to be sent to Guam than originally planned**

**Turkish Weekly 7/5** (Journal of Turkish Weekly, http://www.turkishweekly.net/news/27920/about-8-000-us-marines-to-move-to-guam-from-okinawa.html)JFS

**The** US **military will move** around 8,000 **marines from Okinawa to Guam** by 2012 as part of an agreement on the realignment of US forces there, a Pentagon spokesman said. **The number of marines to be relocated is** about **1,000 more than the Pentagon originally estimated** when it signed an agreement on October 29 with Japan regarding the US military presence in Japan, said Lieutenant Colonel Brian Maka.

Kan Credibility – 2NC XT

**Keeping the base in Okinawa tanks credibility –**

**A. Locals and the governor hate it – it’s why Hatoyama resigned**

**XNA 6/23** (Xinhua News Agency, http://news.xinhuanet.com/english2010/world/2010-06/23/c\_13365297.htm)JFS

**Kan told the people of Okinawa that he was** **committed to** abiding by the Japan-U.S. accord announced on May 28 to **move** the U.S. Marine Corps **Futenma** Air Station from a crowded residential area in the city of Ginowan **to a less populated** coastal **area in Henoko** also in Okinawa Prefecture, local reports said. **Okinawa residents and** prefectural **officials have** voiced their ardent opposition to the relocation plan, the bungled handling of which caused Kan's predecessor Yukio Hatoyama to hastily resign as prime minister following his failureto make good on his numerous pledges to move the Futenma facility "at least" outside Okinawa. **Okinawa** **Governor** Hirokazu Nakaima, who was in attendance at the ceremony, **said that the base hosting burden** on Japan's southernmost prefecture **was disproportionate compared to the rest of the country.** "I would like the burden on Okinawa to be visibly reduced," he said.

**B. Causes civil disobedience and forces Kan’s resignation**

**Bandow 6/18** (Doug, The National Interest, Senior Fellow @ CATO Institute, http://www.nationalinterest.org/PrinterFriendly.aspx?id=23592)JFS

Yet **the win may prove hollow.** Although Hatoyama’s replacement, Prime Minister Naoto **Kan,** **gives lip service to** the plan to **relocate** the Marine Corps Air Station at **Futenma within Okinawa**, the move may never occur. There’s a reason Tokyo has essentially kicked the can down the road since 1996. Some **90,000** **people**, roughly one-tenth of Okinawa’s population, **turned out for a protest** rally **in April**. With no way to satisfy both Okinawans and Americans, the Kan government may decide to follow its predecessors and kick the can for a few more years. Moreover, **there is talk of** activists mounting a campaign of **civil disobedience**. **Public frustration is high: in** mid-**May, a human chain of 17,000 surrounded Futenma. Local government officials oppose** the **relocation** plan and would hesitate to use force against protestors. Naoto Kan could find himself following his predecessor into retirement if he forcibly intervened. **Even a small number of demonstrators** would embarrass U.S. and Japanese officials alike.

AT: CP = Kan Win

The CP is unpopular, even post-Cheonan

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>.

In Japan’s case, the Cheonan incident does not appear to have significantly swayed domestic attitudes regarding Futenma’s relocation. A Mainichi Shimbun opinion poll conducted on May 31 indicated only 41% of respondents favoring relocation to Henoko, whereas 52% stated they opposed the plan.30 However, Japanese political leaders, including the now disgraced former Prime Minister Hatoyama, suggest that the Cheonan incident underscored the importance of U.S. military presence in Okinawa. Initial signs suggest that Prime Minister Kan Naoto will attempt to follow through on his predecessor’s final decision to keep Futenma’s relocation within Okinawa. News reports following Kan’s first telephone conversation with President Obama indicate his acceptance of U.S. plans in relocating at least part of Futenma’s functions to Henoko. However, Prime Minister Kan will confront the same problem that his predecessors failed to resolve: strong Okinawan opposition to base construction on the island that has produced a formidable, sustained movement.

Not a win if they stay on Okinawa

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>.

Much recent discussion on anti-base opposition in the Asia-Pacific has focused on island-wide protests against the relocation of Marine Corps Air Station (MCAS) Futenma.1 By uniting in mass demonstrations against the construction of a new U.S. base, and by staging a multi-year round the clock demonstration at the proposed site of the new base, Okinawans put pressure squarely on Prime Minister Yukio Hatoyama to keep his campaign pledge to move Futenma air base off the island.2 However, shortly after the sinking of the South Korean warship Cheonan, which South Korea and the U.S. charge was the work of a torpedo launched by a North Korean submarine, Hatoyama reversed his pledge. The Japanese government bowed to U.S. pressure, agreeing to move forward with earlier plans to relocate Futenma within Okinawa to smooth over U.S.-Japan relations.

\_\_\_\*\*Guam Shift – Japan/SoKo

Internal Link – Genocide

**Presence in Guam is genocide**

**Gerson 8** (Joseph, Foreign Policy in Focus, Latin America and Caribbean, director of programs of the American Friends Service Committee, http://www.fpif.org/articles/resisting\_the\_empire)JFS

**Guam** is not home. Located in the North Pacific and conquered by the United States from Spain in 1898, it **has long served as a** U.S. **stepping stone to Asia. Nominally it is not a U.S. colony**, **but** **a**n “unincorporated **territory**” with a nonvoting delegate in Congress. Throughout the Cold War, **U.S.** air and naval **bases occupied the island’s best agricultural lands, water sources and fishing grounds**. **Now the abuses** and usurpations **are** becoming much **worse**. Since the nonviolent 1995 Okinawan uprising, **the Pentagon has been preparing** for the day when it is finally forced **to withdraw** **from** Okinawa and **Japan**. Thus **Guam is being transformed** in **to a military “hub.”** Already large enough to accommodate B-52 and stealth bombers, Andersen Air Force Base is being expanded to serve as “the most significant U.S. Air Force base in the Pacific region for this century.” More submarines are being homeported in its harbor, and the Navy is considering homeporting an aircraft carrier strike force there is well. Then, there are those Marines from Okinawa. Understandably, **Guam’s** tiny Chamorro **population feels besieged.** **In the traditions of U.S.,** Israeli and South African settler **colonialism, it is “cowboys and Indians all over again.” We have a responsibility to prevent this** cultural **genocide**.

Internal Link - Hegemony

**Redeployment to Guam kills hegemony**

**Klingner 9** (Bruce, Heritage Foundation, November 9, is Senior Research Fellow for Northeast Asia in the Asian Studies Center at The Heritage Foundation, http://www.heritage.org/Research/Reports/2009/11/Japans%20Security%20Policy%20Navigating%20the%20Troubled%20Waters%20Ahead)JFS

Washington should also counsel the DPJ about the danger of unintended consequences and make clear that there are ramifications to its statements and policies. **If the DPJ insists on moving** Marine air units **from Okinawa, it would degrade U.S. deterrent and warfighting capabilities,** which are, after all, in place **to defend Japan, maintain peace** and stability **in Asia, and constrain Chinese adventurism.** A senior U.S. defense official warned in October that DPJ **revisions to the existing** U.S. **force realignment agreement could cause** the U.S. Congress to halt funding for the larger **redeployment to Guam** **and** well as **damage the bilateral relationship** of trust.

**Hegemony prevents economic collapse, regional nuclear wars, and nuke war**

**Ferguson 4** (Professor of History at NYU Niall, , “A World Without Power,” Foreign Policy, July 1)JFS

So what is left? Waning empires. Religious revivals. Incipient anarchy. A coming retreat into fortified cities. **These are the** Dark Age experiences that **a world without a hyperpower might quickly find itself reliving.** The trouble is, of course, that this Dark Age would be an altogether more dangerous one than the Dark Age of the ninth century. For the world is much more populous--roughly 20 times more--so friction between the world's disparate "tribes" is bound to be more frequent. Technology has transformed production; now human societies depend not merely on freshwater and the harvest but also on supplies of fossil fuels that are known to be finite. Technology has upgraded destruction, too, so **it is** now **possible not just to sack a city but to obliterate it.** For more than two decades, globalization--the integration of world markets for commodities, labor, and capital--has raised living standards throughout the world, except where countries have shut themselves off from the process through tyranny or civil war. **The reversal of globalization**--which a new Dark Age would produce--**would certainly lead to economic stagnation and even depression.** As the United States sought to protect itself after a second September 11 devastates, say, Houston or Chicago, it would inevitably become a less open society, less hospitable for foreigners seeking to work, visit, or do business. Meanwhile**, as Europe's Muslim enclaves grew, Islamist extremists' infiltration of the EU would become irreversible, increasing trans-Atlantic tensions over the Middle East to the breaking point. An economic meltdown in China would plunge the Communist system into crisis, unleashing the centrifugal forces that undermined previous Chinese empires. Western investors would lose out and conclude that lower returns at home are preferable to the risks of default abroad. The worst effects of the new Dark Age would be felt on the edges of the waning great powers. The wealthiest ports of the global economy--from New York to Rotterdam to Shanghai--would become the targets of plunderers and pirates. With ease, terrorists could disrupt the freedom of the seas,** targeting oil tankers, aircraft carriers, and cruise liners, while Western nations frantically concentrated on making their airports secure. Meanwhile, **limited nuclear wars could devastate numerous regions, beginning in the Korean peninsula and Kashmir, perhaps ending catastrophically in the Middle East.** In Latin America, wretchedly poor citizens would seek solace in Evangelical Christianity imported by U.S. religious orders. **In Africa, the great plagues of AIDS and malaria would continue their deadly work.** The few remaining solvent airlines would simply suspend services to many cities in these continents; who would wish to leave their privately guarded safe havens to go there? **For all these reasons, the prospect of an apolar world should frighten us today** a great deal more than it frightened the heirs of Charlemagne. **If the United States retreats from global hegemony-**-its fragile self-image dented by minor setbacks on the imperial frontier--its critics at home and abroad must not pretend that they are ushering in a new era of multipolar harmony, or even a return to the good old balance of power. Be careful what you wish for. The alternative to unipolarity would not be multipolarity at all. It would be apolarity--a global vacuum of power. **And far more dangerous forces than rival great powers would benefit from such a not-so-new world disorder.**

Internal Link – US/Japan Security Alliance

**Presence in Guam destroys the US-Japan security alliance**

**Talmadge 6/22** (Eric, Associated Press, http://www.wtop.com/?nid=105&sid=1920660)JFS

But **while the alliance is** one of the **strong**est Washington has anywhere in the world, **it has come under intense pressure lately over a plan to** make sweeping reforms that would **pull back** roughly 8,600 **Marines from Okinawa to** the U.S. Pacific territory of **Guam.** The move was conceived in response to opposition on Okinawa to the large U.S. military presence there \_ more than half of the U.S. troops in Japan are on Okinawa, which was one of the bloodiest battlefields of World War II. Though welcomed by many at first, **the relocation plan has led to** renewed Okinawan **protests over the U.S. insistence** it cannot be carried out unless **a new base** is built **on Okinawa** to replace one that has been set for closing for more than a decade. **A widening rift between Washington and Tokyo** over the future of the Futenma Marine Corps Air Station **was a major factor in the resignation of** Prime Minister Yukio **Hatoyama** earlier this month. **It could well plague Kan as well.**

**The US-Japan alliance is critical to stop Chinese aggression against Taiwan**

**Okamoto 2** (Yukio, special advisor to the Japanese Prime Minister’s Task Force on Foreign Relations, WASHINGTON QUARTERLY, Spring, p. 59)JFS

**The U.S.-Japan alliance represents a significant hope for a peaceful resolution of the Taiwan problem. Both Japan and the United States have clearly stated that they oppose reunification by force.** When China conducted provocative missile tests in the waters around Taiwan in 1996, the United States sent two aircraft carrier groups into nearby waters as a sign of its disapproval of China's belligerent act. **Japan seconded the U.S. action, raising in Chinese minds the possibility that Japan might offer logistical and other support to its ally in the event of hostilities. Even though intervention is only a possibility, a strong and close tie between Japanese and U.S. security interests guarantees that the Chinese leadership cannot afford to miscalculate the consequences of an unprovoked attack on Taiwan. The alliance backs up Japan's basic stance that the two sides need to come to a negotiated solution.**

**Taiwan is the most likely scenario for global nuclear escalation**

**Ikegami, ‘8**. Dr. Masako, Professor of Sociology and Peace & Conflict Studies and Director of the Center for Pacific Asia Studies – Stockholm University “Time for Conflict Prevention Across the Taiwan Strait”, China Brief, 8(7), 3-28, http://www.jamestown.org/single/?no\_cache=1&tx\_ttnews[tt\_news]=4822)

Indeed, a **cross-Strait conflict is potentially one of the most dangerous conflicts involving two major nuclear powers, in which the risk of escalation, in the worst case, cannot exclude strategic nuclear exchange**. Thus, it is understandable that many countries make such a statement of “neutrality” or remain bystanders. **The location of Taiwan**, however, **in the midst of** the **vital** sea lines of communications (**SLOCs), any level of armed conflict will inevitably envelop an international affair with global consequences, economically, politically and militarily. By nature, a cross-Strait conflict cannot be a limited theatre of war**. Therefore, it would greatly improve conflict prevention if NATO could at a minimum maintain its own version of “strategic ambiguity” to make Beijing’s calculation of using force more difficult, less optimistic, and thereby more prudent [9]. The recent large-scale naval exercise conducted by the United States, Japanese, Australian, Indian and Singaporean navies in September 2007 might have aimed at such a signalling effect toward China. It will also be constructive if Europe, together with other Western countries, were to make Beijing understand **that any armed attack on Taiwan would lead to worldwide criticism and boycotts of Chinese products.**

Internal Link - Deter NK/Taiwan

**Troops in Okinawa are key to check conflict in North Korea and Taiwan**

**Talmadge 10** (Eric, The Marine Corps Times, http://www.marinecorpstimes.com/news/2010/02/ap\_stalder\_okinawa\_021910/)JFS

**To lighten Okinawa’s load, both sides have agreed the Futenma base should be closed and** about 8,000 Marines **shifted to** the U.S. Pacific territory of **Guam**. But Japan’s new coalition government is divided over calls that a replacement for Futenma should be located off Okinawa or outside of Japan altogether. **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. Stalder, in an interview with The Associated Press, said **the issue should not be looked at as a** local **problem, but should be seen from the regional strategic perspective**. He said the **troops on Okinawa** continue to **serve a key deterrent and stabilizing role**, need to be close **to** potential hot spots like **North Korea and Taiwan and are** now **well positioned to deal with other** humanitarian or **security contingencies in the region**. “You’ve got to have forward-deployed ground forces. In our case, that happens to be the Marines,” he said. “**Okinawa**, if you look at the map, **is strategically** in maybe **the perfect place in the region.** From there, you deter a lot of potentially bad events, and **you can get everywhere you need to get very quickly.”**

**Taiwan is the most likely scenario for global nuclear escalation**

**Ikegami, ‘8**. Dr. Masako, Professor of Sociology and Peace & Conflict Studies and Director of the Center for Pacific Asia Studies – Stockholm University “Time for Conflict Prevention Across the Taiwan Strait”, China Brief, 8(7), 3-28, http://www.jamestown.org/single/?no\_cache=1&tx\_ttnews[tt\_news]=4822)

Indeed, a **cross-Strait conflict is potentially one of the most dangerous conflicts involving two major nuclear powers, in which the risk of escalation, in the worst case, cannot exclude strategic nuclear exchange**. Thus, it is understandable that many countries make such a statement of “neutrality” or remain bystanders. **The location of Taiwan**, however, **in the midst of** the **vital** sea lines of communications (**SLOCs), any level of armed conflict will inevitably envelop an international affair with global consequences, economically, politically and militarily. By nature, a cross-Strait conflict cannot be a limited theatre of war**. Therefore, it would greatly improve conflict prevention if NATO could at a minimum maintain its own version of “strategic ambiguity” to make Beijing’s calculation of using force more difficult, less optimistic, and thereby more prudent [9]. The recent large-scale naval exercise conducted by the United States, Japanese, Australian, Indian and Singaporean navies in September 2007 might have aimed at such a signalling effect toward China. It will also be constructive if Europe, together with other Western countries, were to make Beijing understand **that any armed attack on Taiwan would lead to worldwide criticism and boycotts of Chinese products.**

**North Korean conflict escalates into maximum destruction**

**Chol ‘99**, Executive Director of Center for Korean-American Peace, Kim Myong, “US-DPRK Will End Up in Shotgun Marriage,” Policy Forum Online, October 22, <http://www.nautilus.org/fora/security/9907G_Kim.html>.

**Kim Jong Il,** often called North Korea's David, **did not flinch from standing up to the military muscle of the** world's super-Goliath, the **United States**. Kim Jong Il had already built up a lethal war machine capable of wreaking unprecedented havoc on the American mainland at a minute's notice. Kim Jong Il is sure of the huge capability of his military. **It would take** the Korean People's Army **as few as several minutes to wipe** out **off the world map the whole of South Korea and the entire Japanese archipelago. Significantly absent from the Perry report is a mention of the real threat of any new war in Korea instantly expanding into nuclear war, with 12 operating nuclear reactors in the ROK**, 51 reactors in Japan and 102 in the United States **singled out as prime targets**. However, the Perry report noted that **a new war would be fought on the world's most densely populated and industrialized areas**, unlike the Gulf War and the Yugoslavia war. Resumption of hostilities in Korea would spell an abrupt end to the present unprecedented economic prosperity the Americans are enjoying. It would leave South Korea and Japan smoking in Stone-Age ruins. Forward military bases, AEGIS ships, nuclear-powered aircraft carriers, submarines and cruise missiles would be of little operational value in safeguarding the American mainland from nuclear holocaust**. Moreover,** **dozens,** hundreds of Chernobyls **will inevitably break out in South Korea, Japan and the United States.**

Okinawa Presence Good – East Asian Stability

**Okinawa’s geostrategic location makes it critical for power projection and peace in East Asia**

**Kapoor**, **6/10** (Rajesh Associate Fellow at the Centre for Land Warfare Studies at The Institute for Defence Studies and Analyses, *Eurasia Review*, June 10th, Available Online at http://www.eurasiareview.com/201006102989/the-strategic-relevance-of-okinawa.html)JFS

In the post-Occupation period, US troops and military **bases in Japan** **have been instrumental in ensuring peace and stability** within Japan as well as **in East Asia. The geo-strategic location of Okinawa makes it the preferred site for** hosting US military **bases** both in terms of securing Japan as well as **for** US **force projection in the** Far **East**. **Okinawa**’s distance from the rest of Japan and from other countries of East Asia makes it **an ideal location to host** military **bases and** thus **extend** US **military outreach considerably.** In the case of an eventuality, it is easier for the US marines, who act as first responders to exigencies, to take appropriate action well before the rest of Japan is affected. In addition, **Japan cannot ignore the** potential **threat** it faces **from** **its nuclear neighbours including China, North Korea and Russia.** The Russian and Chinese threats, as of now, can be ruled out. However, **the North Korean threat is very** much **real** and Japan has been building up its Ballistic Missile Defence system in collaboration with the US to cater for it. Okinawa Prefecture includes a chain of hundreds of small islands. The midpoint of this chain is almost equidistance from Taiwan and Japan’s Kyushu Island. During the Vietnam War, the USFJ military bases particularly in Okinawa were among the most important strategic and logistic bases. In addition, strategists in Japan note that despite the country’s three non-nuclear principles, some bases in Okinawa were used for stockpiling nuclear weapons during the Cold War. Even today, US **nuclear-armed submarines** and destroyers **operate in the vicinity of Japan**, **facilitated by a secret deal** between the governments of the US and Japan. Moreover, having military **bases in Japan** also **helps the US to have easy access to the** strategically important **five seas** –the Bering Sea, the Sea of Okhotsk, the Japan Sea, the East China Sea and the South China Sea.1

**And, East Asian instability leads to nuclear war**

**Landy 2k** (Jonathon, National Security and International Correspondent, Knight Ridder, March 10, L/N)

**Few if any experts think China and Taiwan**, North Korea and South Korea, or India and Pakistan **are spoiling to fight. But even a minor miscalculation by any of them could destabilize Asia, jolt the global economy, and even start a nuclear war. India, Pakistan, and China all have nuclear weapons, and North Korea may have a few, too. Asia lacks the kinds of organizations, negotiations, and diplomatic relationships that helped keep an uneasy peace for five decades in Cold War Europe. “Nowhere else on Earth are the stakes as high and relationships so fragile**,” said Bates Gill, director of northeast Asian policy studies at the Brookings Institution, a Washington think tank. “We see the convergence of great power interest overlaid with lingering confrontations with no institutionalized security mechanism in place. **There are elements for potential disaster.** In an effort to cool the region’s tempers, President Clinton, Defense Secretary William S. Cohen and National Security Adviser Samuel R. Berger all will hopscotch Asia’s capitals this month. For America, the stakes could hardly be higher. There are 100,000 U.S. troops in Asia committed to defending Taiwan, Japan and South Korea, and the United States would instantly become embroiled if Beijing moved against Taiwan or North Korea attacked South Korea. While Washington has no defense commitments to either India or Pakistan, a conflict between the two could end the global taboo against using nuclear weapons and demolish the already shaky international nonproliferation regime.

Okinawa Presence Good – Hegemony

**Okinawa is key to US global power projection**

**Kazuhisa ’99** (Ogawa, Analyst of International Ptx, Japan Quarterly, P. 22)

**No country in the** littorals of the **Pacific and Indian Oceans even begins to approach Japan in meeting conditions for a power-projection platform. One year after Japan notifies the U**nited **S**tates **of its intention to terminate the alliance, the U**nited **S**tates **would lose** leverage and with it, most of **its capability to project military power over half the world.** Short of power-projection capability, **the U**nited **S**tates **would be hard-pressed to remain the world’s sole superpower. Despite its colossal economy, diversified nuclear arsenal and** qualitative advantage in **conventional forces**, the United States would be just one among several great powers, **America’s power differential with respect to China, Russia, and other major powers would be much smaller. This has been** generally **acknowledged by U.S. governmental policy advisers** in semi-official meetings. Then, by the way of reports, I convinced the Japanese government leaders of the significance of the American’s agreement.

**Hegemony prevents economic collapse, regional nuclear wars, and nuke war**

**Ferguson 4** (Professor of History at NYU Niall, , “A World Without Power,” Foreign Policy, July 1)JFS

So what is left? Waning empires. Religious revivals. Incipient anarchy. A coming retreat into fortified cities. **These are the** Dark Age experiences that **a world without a hyperpower might quickly find itself reliving.** The trouble is, of course, that this Dark Age would be an altogether more dangerous one than the Dark Age of the ninth century. For the world is much more populous--roughly 20 times more--so friction between the world's disparate "tribes" is bound to be more frequent. Technology has transformed production; now human societies depend not merely on freshwater and the harvest but also on supplies of fossil fuels that are known to be finite. Technology has upgraded destruction, too, so **it is** now **possible not just to sack a city but to obliterate it.** For more than two decades, globalization--the integration of world markets for commodities, labor, and capital--has raised living standards throughout the world, except where countries have shut themselves off from the process through tyranny or civil war. **The reversal of globalization**--which a new Dark Age would produce--**would certainly lead to economic stagnation and even depression.** As the United States sought to protect itself after a second September 11 devastates, say, Houston or Chicago, it would inevitably become a less open society, less hospitable for foreigners seeking to work, visit, or do business. Meanwhile**, as Europe's Muslim enclaves grew, Islamist extremists' infiltration of the EU would become irreversible, increasing trans-Atlantic tensions over the Middle East to the breaking point. An economic meltdown in China would plunge the Communist system into crisis, unleashing the centrifugal forces that undermined previous Chinese empires. Western investors would lose out and conclude that lower returns at home are preferable to the risks of default abroad. The worst effects of the new Dark Age would be felt on the edges of the waning great powers. The wealthiest ports of the global economy--from New York to Rotterdam to Shanghai--would become the targets of plunderers and pirates. With ease, terrorists could disrupt the freedom of the seas,** targeting oil tankers, aircraft carriers, and cruise liners, while Western nations frantically concentrated on making their airports secure. Meanwhile, **limited nuclear wars could devastate numerous regions, beginning in the Korean peninsula and Kashmir, perhaps ending catastrophically in the Middle East.** In Latin America, wretchedly poor citizens would seek solace in Evangelical Christianity imported by U.S. religious orders. **In Africa, the great plagues of AIDS and malaria would continue their deadly work.** The few remaining solvent airlines would simply suspend services to many cities in these continents; who would wish to leave their privately guarded safe havens to go there? **For all these reasons, the prospect of an apolar world should frighten us today** a great deal more than it frightened the heirs of Charlemagne. **If the United States retreats from global hegemony-**-its fragile self-image dented by minor setbacks on the imperial frontier--its critics at home and abroad must not pretend that they are ushering in a new era of multipolar harmony, or even a return to the good old balance of power. Be careful what you wish for. The alternative to unipolarity would not be multipolarity at all. It would be apolarity--a global vacuum of power. **And far more dangerous forces than rival great powers would benefit from such a not-so-new world disorder.**

Okinawa Presence Good – A2: Turns

**No turns – withdrawal from Okinawa is net worse for east asian stability**

**Auslin 10** (Resident Scholar and Director of Japan Studies at the American Enterprise Institute, Wall Street Journal Asia, June 16th, Available Online at http://www.aei.org/article/102196)

**This worst-case scenario would be** a series of simultaneous, grassroots **movements against the U.S. military presence in Japan that could** potentially put fatal stress on the bilateral security alliance and effectively **isolate Japan** militarily in the western Pacific. Given Mr. Hatoyama's fate when he botched this issue, politicians now are more likely to respond to public demands or they will be replaced by those who do. **The result**ing political clash **would** either reaffirm tight ties with Washington or **lead to** endemic **paralysis in Japan's national security** establishment. Given that the U.S. has permanently forward deployed ships and planes only in Japan, **any scenario** like the one sketched out above **could significantly weaken U.S. capability to operate in the western Pacific, and thus call into question U.S. credibility** as the underwriter of regional stability at a time **when a crisis is brewing on the Korean peninsula and China continues to flex its** naval and air **muscle**. Anyone concerned about that scenario, even if unlikely, realizes that **the next half-decade of U.S.-Japan relations will have to go back to basics:** rebuilding trust in the relationship, agreeing on a common set of objectives in Japan's waters and throughout Northeast Asia, and strengthening a commitment to upholding **the alliance's military capabilities.** The good news is that Japan's bureaucrats and military leaders remain more committed than ever to revitalizing the alliance. Whether politicians on both sides of the Pacific are willing to follow them, however, is another matter.

Guam Hates Relocation

**Guam hates relocation – governor statement**

**Dominion Post 9** (Wellington, New Zealand newspaper, December 11, Lexis)JFS

**The governor of** United States- administered **Guam said it would be unable to provide a new home for a US airbase at the centre of a row between Washington and Japan.** As part of a 2006 pact between Tokyo and Washington, **8000 troops will be moved from Japan to Guam** by 2014 but Japan's new government also wants to review the future of the Okinawa island Marine Corps airbase. **Guam Governor** Felix **Camacho said** yesterday **the island did not have the capacity to provide a new home for the Futenma airbase** as well. Camacho said he was confident the stand-off between Washington and Tokyo would be resolved. Japan and the US are at loggerheads over where to relocate the Okinawa airbase, which was due to be moved from a city area to a coastal region under the 2006 agreement.

\_\_\_\_\*\*Japan CP – Aff Answers

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 Version
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Text – The United States Federal Government should consolidate redeployed troops from Iraq to Kandahar.

Troops that leave Iraq are redeployed to Afghanistan

**AP 10** (Associated Press, May 24 2010, http://www.usatoday.com/news/military/2010-05-24-troops-afghanistan\_N.htm)IM

WASHINGTON (AP) — For the first time since the 2003 U.S. invasion of Iraq, there are more U.S. forces serving in Afghanistan than in Iraq. The Pentagon says that as of Saturday, 94,000 U.S. forces were in Afghanistan and 92,000 in Iraq. The figure for Afghanistan will rise to roughly 98,000 later this summer with the Obama administration's commitment of additional forces. The level of U.S. forces in Iraq has fallen from a high of more than 160,000 in 2007, when they were in heavy combat there. All U.S. combat forces are scheduled to leave Iraq by September. In his presidential campaign Barack Obama called for a quick end to the war in Iraq and expansion of the Afghan conflict. Since taking office he has sent more than 40,000 additional U.S. forces from Iraq to Afghanistan.

The fast withdrawal of the plan will lead to collapse in Iraq

**Martin 10** (Lt Col William Jay, air liason officer @ Fort Riley, Kansas, USAF, June 7 2010, http://www.airpower.maxwell.af.mil/airchronicles/apj/apj10/sum10/07martin.html)IM

The fast withdrawal of the plan will lead to collapse in Iraq

Martin 10 (Lt Col William Jay, air liason officer @ Fort Riley, Kansas, USAF, June 7 2010, http://www.airpower.maxwell.af.mil/airchronicles/apj/apj10/sum10/07martin.html)IM

M a n y f a c t o r s w i l l c o m p e l t h e A i r F o r c e t o m a i n t a i n a s t r o n g p r e s e n c e i n I r a q i F r e e d o m a t l e a s t u n t i l t h e e n d o f D e c e m b e r 2 0 1 1 , w h e n a l l U S f o r c e s a r e s c h e d u l e d t o b e o u t o f I r a q . 2 4 U n t i l t h e n , a i r p o w e r w i l l h a v e t o u p h o l d i t s c u r r e n t r o l e i n c o u n t e r i n s u r g e n c y , d o s o a c r o s s a v a s t b a t t l e s p a c e , a n d c o n d u c t p r o t e c t i v e o v e r w a t c h o f c o n v o y s d u r i n g t h e r e d e p l o y m e n t o f g r o u n d f o r c e s a n d t h e i r e q u i p m e n t to Afghanistan. T h e s e t a s k s w i l l d e m a n d c o o p e r a t i o n a n d e x p e c t a t i o n m a n a g e m e n t b e t w e e n t h e A i r F o r c e a n d t h e A r m y t o e n s u r e a s a f e , o r d e r l y w i t h d r a w a l a n d c o n c l u s i o n t o I r a q i F r e e d o m . W i s e l y , t h e C F A C C h a s a l r e a d y t a k e n s t e p s t o p a c e A i r F o r c e r e d e p l o y m e n t c o r r e c t l y , y e t p l a n n i n g s t a f f s p a r t i c u l a r l y f r o m t h e A i r F o r c e m u s t s t a y t h e c o u r s e a n d r e s i s t t h e u r g e t o s h i f t m a n p o w e r a n d a i r a s s e t s f r o m I r a q t o A f g h a n i s t a n t o o q u i c k l y . T h e A r m y w i l l h a v e t o t a k e a n a c t i v e r o l e i n a i r i n t e g r a t i o n a s w e l l , e s p e c i a l l y w i t h r e g a r d t o J F O s . A s t h e y a t t e m p t t o p r o v i d e a i r s u p p o r t t o g r o u n d u n i t s s p r e a d o u t o v e r g r e a t e r d i s t a n c e s , b o t h s e r v i c e s w i l l s o l v e k e y c h a l l e n g e s w i t h a c o m b i n a t i o n o f t e c h n i c a l s o l u t i o n s , o r g a n i z a t i o n o f T A C P t a s k s , a n d u t i l i z a t i o n o f A r m y J F O s . T h e s e s o l u t i o n s are c r i t i c a l t o m i s s i o n s u c c e s s , w i l l r e d u c e p o t e n t i a l U S c a s u a l t i e s u p o n w i t h d r a w a l . D u r i n g t h e l a s t t w o d e c a d e s , A i r m e n h a v e l e a r n e d t h a t t h e y a r e o f t e n t h e f i r s t i n a n d l a s t o u t o f a n o p e r a t i o n , s o i t s h o u l d c o m e a s n o s u r p r i s e t h a t t h e A i r F o r c e , and supporting troops, m u s t s t a y i n I r a q f o r t h e d u r a t i o n . A i r p o w e r r o l e s a r e i n e x t r i c a b l y l i n k e d t o t h e g r o u n d c o m m a n d e r s n e e d s , a n d f o r t h e m o m e n t i n I r a q i F r e e d o m , a i r i n t e g r a t i o n i n t h e r e a l m s o f C A S , I S R , a n d A E A i s c r i t i c a l t o A m e r i c a s s u c c e s s . A l t h o u g h t h e s h o o t i n g w a r i n A f g h a n i s t a n d e m a n d s m o r e r e s o u r c e s s o m e o f t h e m ( s u c h a s T A C P s ) a l r e a d y i n v e r y s h o r t s u p p l y w e m u s t s h o w r e s t r a i n t . A s K i p l i n g s a i d , w e m u s t h a v e t h e w i l l t o h o l d o n l o n g a f t e r [ o u r t u r n ] a n d b e t h e l a s t t o l e a v e . '\*
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Consolidation in Kandahar is key

**Koring 10** (Paul, Globe and Mail, June 11 2010, http://www.theglobeandmail.com/news/world/afghan-surge-delayed-as-us-general-slows-down-major-offensive/article1600093/)IM

President Barack Obama’s top commander in Afghanistan has delayed the strategically crucial battle for Kandahar, signalling a shift to a slow, gradual effort to sap Taliban support in the war-ravaged province rather than a major military offensive. “It will happen more slowly than we had originally anticipated,” General Stanley McChrystal said. For weeks, senior U.S. officials have been scaling back the ambitious expectations, insisting for instance that no “offensive” was ever planned. With casualties soaring, public support at home slipping, and the surge-and-get-out strategy looking too optimistic, Gen. McChrystal’s cautious warnings came as NATO ministers gathered to assess progress in the Afghan counterinsurgency, on which the alliance has staked its post-Cold-War reason for existence. The President, having made the Afghan conflict his war, tripling the number of U.S. troops there to roughly 100,000, is also caught in a time squeeze. While successful counterinsurgencies usually need more than a decade – and most military analysts believe the past eight years in Afghanistan have been mostly a stop-gap effort – Mr. Obama has also pledged to start pulling American troops out of the war-ravaged country. Trimming expectations, while preparing Americans for the long haul, seems to be the new strategy to bolster public support at home. Polls show American support for the war sagging to its lowest level since Mr. Obama was running for the presidency, when he vowed to pull out of Iraq and escalate the war he said that mattered – in Afghanistan. In the latest poll, 53 per cent said the Afghan war wasn’t worth the costs. That was before a sudden upsurge in combat deaths. In the first 10 days of June, 30 foreign soldiers were killed, most of them American. That’s almost as many – 33 – killed so far this year in Iraq. Audacious Taliban attacks, including two in the recent past on the main NATO bases at Kandahar and Bagram, have demonstrated the Islamic insurgents haven’t been cowed by the arrival of tens of thousands of U.S. troops. The Taliban also shot down a U.S. helicopter earlier this week. And yesterday, the big Chinook helicopter carrying Britain’s new Prime Minister, David Cameron, on his first tour of Afghanistan was diverted from landing at a forward operating base after communications intercepts detected a Taliban attack was being planned. The Taliban also fired missiles at a Kabul peace gathering during President Hamid Karzai’s welcoming address, forcing the beleaguered Afghan leader to retreat to his palace. It’s going to be “a very tough summer” of escalating violence, Mr. Gates predicted. But even as America’s allies – including Canada and the Netherlands – end combat operations and the Taliban insurgency appears to be gaining strength, some military analysts say the long-term strategy to win in Afghanistan is just beginning to gain traction. James Dobbins, director of the International Security and Defense Policy Center at the Rand Corporation, says the emergency counterinsurgency strategy for southern Afghanistan is “very demanding, very intense and will require an extraordinary degree of integration,” not just between U.S. military and civilian agencies but also to include allied military and development teams and the still-nascent Afghan security forces and local governments. A consolidation of forces in the southern province of Kandahar would be the ideal solution – diplomatic pressure without increased military pressure overall. It’s a win-win; Obama keeps his withdrawal agenda, but the fight against the Taliban continues effectively.
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Control of Kandahar is key to win the war in Afghanistan and to defeat the Taliban

**Massoud 10** (Waheedullah, Center for a New American Security, March 31 2010, http://www.cnas.org/node/4290)IM

March 31, 2010 - In an interview with AFP, CNAS President John Nagl echoes Admiral Mullen's assertion that a U.S.-led offensive into Afghanistan's southern province of Kandahar is crucial to turning the tide against the insurgency. "In the last two months we've had a tremendous impact on the major approaches into Kandahar to try to squeeze the Taliban's access," said Nagl. The top US military commander on Wednesday billed operations against the Taliban in their Afghan spiritual capital as the "cornerstone" of the fight to reverse nearly nine years of escalating conflict. Operations to beat back the Taliban in the southern province of Kandahar, heartland of a bitter insurgency against the Western-backed Afghan government, are due to escalate in coming months as thousands more troops deploy. "Kandahar is what we're looking into now. It is a cornerstone in reversing the momentum for the Taliban," Admiral Mike Mullen, chairman of the US Joint Chiefs of Staff, told reporters on a visit to Kabul. "Kandahar is the very heart of the insurgency. The next operations are there," he added. Military planners say operations against the Taliban in the province have already begun and will escalate in coming months as thousands more US and NATO forces deploy to Afghanistan under escalated counter-insurgency tactics. Mullen spoke a day after touring the Marjah region of Helmand province, which neighbours Kandahar, and where a massive US-led offensive is under way in the first major test of the sweeping new couner-insurgency strategy. On Tuesday, he met local leaders from Marjah who complained to him about a lack of security and a failure to deliver on promises of civil services six weeks after the campaing was launched. The Marjah operation has been seen by US defence officials as a dress rehearsal for an even more decisive clash in Kandahar, the third biggest city in Afghanistan, which is likely to begin in June. The number of troops under US and NATO control is set to rise from 126,000 to 150,000 by August, by which time military planners intend to have Kandahar under Afghan government control. The Kandahar offensive promises to be a major test of the US-led efforts to bring a quick end to the war -- and experts believe failure is not an option. "It's impossible to defeat the insurgency without holding Kandahar," said John Nagl, a retired military office now at the Center for A New American Security (CNAS) think tank. "If the Taliban were the Third Reich, this would be Berlin. This is where it began," Nagl said of Kandahar, the Taliban's spiritual heartland.

Overview

In the status quo troops are being phased out of Iraq into Afghanistan – the plan would cause a mass redeployment. The mass redeployment causes increase Taliban control and corruption in Afghanistan because of ineffective supply line policies and the diffusion of troops. Instead we should consolidate the troops redeployed in the status quo to the southern province of Kandahar. This is the crucial step to prevent the Taliban from gaining control and to win the war in Afghanistan.

Redeployment

Troops that are removed from Iraq are redeployed to Afghanistan

**Army News 10** (USArmy, April 5, 2010, www.defencetalk.com/third-army-cg-details-iraq-drawdown-afghanistan-buildup-efforts-25469/)IM

Washington: Third Army Commanding General Lt. Gen. William G. Webster will provide a media update April 2, 2010, at 10:00 EST in the DoD Press Briefing Room. The topics addressed will be the Third Army's role in the responsible drawdown of Iraq, buildup in Afghanistan and the reset of our Army. The Third Army's area of responsibility is an area of more than 4.5-million square miles or 1.5 times the size of the continental U.S. Encompassing 20 countries and four time zones, the area includes 42 ethnic groups speaking 60 languages. To support the redistribution of forces from Iraq to Afghanistan, the Third Army is executing an impressive redeployment plan. Since May 2009, Third Army has begun to retrograde: \* 2.8 million items of organizational and theater provided equipment \* 88,000 shipping containers \* 40,700 pieces of rolling stock \* 85,000 U.S. Forces Third Army has also moved 2,725 tons of ammunition and more than one million items including vehicles, repair parts; general supplies, barrier material, and packaged petroleum products from Iraq to Afghanistan since mid-2009. The Third Army is actively coordinating with several agencies to ensure the right equipment is delivered to Afghanistan at the right time. Some of that equipment is coming from the United States and some will be sourced from Iraq as part of a responsible drawdown. Included are: \* A 30,000 increase in U.S. Forces \* 5,000 additional mine resistant vehicles \* Three additional major distribution centers \* A Door-to-Door program to move priority equipment from Iraq to Afghanistan "This is an enormous task, unprecedented in modern military history," said Lt. Gen. William G. Webster, Commanding General, Third Army. "We have a well thought out plan and the synergy and cooperation of our many teams involved that will ensure we anticipate and are prepared to meet all requirements for U.S. CENTCOM and our Army."

Redeployment

Both withdrawn equipment and troops go to Afghanistan

**Lopez 10** (Toss, Army News Service, Apr. 7 2010 http://www.centcom.mil/news/army-beating-iraq-equipment-drawdown-estimate)IM

Nearly half of the equipment coming out of Iraq has been marked to go to Afghanistan for the buildup there, Webster said. Other equipment will go back to the United States to be reintegrated into the Army, sold to foreign militaries, or disposed of. But much of the equipment the Army will keep, including that for buildup in Afghanistan, needs to be modified before going into the new environment, or repaired, due to excessive wear from use in Iraq. "The equipment we have has been ridden hard," the general said. Equipment is now being reset and repaired in Kuwait, Webster said. If it can't be reset there, it may go back to the United States to be repaired in depots. "We have a large team of experts from Army Materiel Command and the Defense Logistics Agency that looks at all of this equipment in Iraq where it currently sits," he said. "If the equipment is not fully mission-capable, or it doesn't have enough life in it,… they will pass that equipment back to us." If the Army determines the overall cost to repair equipment is more than the operational cost, Webster said, it might be scrapped. While equipment needs to be cleaned up and refurbished before going into Afghanistan, other equipment needs to be modified for the different operational environment there, Webster said. "Some of the equipment we'll get out of Iraq does not have the latest armor on it," he said. "We may also have to change engines, suspensions, transmissions, as well as adding on the latest armor, before we push it forward. We're trying to get it to our troops in the best condition possible before they realize they need it." To move that equipment around in theater, the Army is depending heavily on the Northern Distribution Network set up by the U.S. Transportation Command. About half of supplies are being moved that way, Webster said. "Those northern routes have given us a great deal of relief and additional capacity if any of the routes are blocked by weather or enemy action," he said. The general said through efficiencies he expects the Army can beat its initial time estimates for moving necessary equipment into Afghanistan. "The president told us he wanted to move [into Afghanistan] as quickly as possible," he said. "Initial estimates were that is was going to take as much as 18 months. Through the efficiencies we found and the hard work of the entire [Defense Department] team, and our allies too, with all these other networks we now will be able to move the 5,000-plus vehicles, and corresponding troops, that are needed for the buildup by the end of the summer."

Equipment and troops are redeployed to Afghanistan

**Logistics Today 10** (Logistics Today, Apr. 5 2010, http://logisticstoday.com/operations\_strategy/news/logistics-support-afghan-buildup-ahead-schedule-20100405/)IM

President Barack Obama announced in December 2009 that the U.S. would increase its footprint in Afghanistan by 30,000 troops. Initial estimates suggested that the buildup of troops and equipment would take about 18 months in order to maintain a responsible drawdown of some of the same equipment in Iraq. But after months of putting those plans into action, troops heading to Afghanistan will be able to obtain their equipment sooner than expected, according to Webster. “Through the efficiencies that we’ve found and the hard work of the entire [Defense Department] and our allies, we now will be able to move the 5,000-plus vehicles, and corresponding troops, that are needed for the [Afghanistan] buildup by the end of the summer,” he says. Some of the equipment in Iraq is too worn for deployment to Afghanistan and will be sent stateside for training requirements. Other equipment in Iraq will be left there for the Iraqi military, he says. Much of the U.S. equipment leaving Iraq is being refurbished in Kuwait where 3rd Army’s theater headquarters is located, Webster notes. Afghanistan-bound equipment will be reconfigured to fit that country's terrain and environment. So far, redistribution of vehicles and equipment to the United States and Afghanistan from Iraq has resulted in more than $992 million in defense savings, he claims. The Afghanistan buildup is the largest in terms of equipment since World War II, Webster says. When the drawdown operation in Iraq began in June 2009 about 2.8 million items of equipment, along with 88,000 containers, were identified. As of March 29, 2010, 35% of material and equipment, as well as 21,000 troops, have been redeployed from Iraq to Afghanistan since the president’s announcement. Nearly half of the equipment due out of Iraq has been identified or is being processed for Afghanistan, Webster says. While support of a responsible Iraq drawdown is critical, 3rd Army’s priority is to support the Afghanistan buildup. More than 2,600 reconfigured MRAPs, including the all-terrain version, already have arrived in Afghanistan, the general said. “Our top priority is to support the 30,000 additional troops the president has ordered to Afghanistan,” Webster says, “and getting them the resources they need to execute their mission.”

Redeployment

As troops are removed from Iraq they are sent to Afghanistan

**CNN 10** (May 31 2010, http://politicalticker.blogs.cnn.com/2010/05/31/u-s-on-track-in-iraq-casey-says/?fbid=sIg60Ul51iq#more-106519)IM

Washington (CNN) – The drawdown of U.S. forces in Iraq remains on track, and the military will meet the troop level benchmark laid out by President Obama, according to the Army Chief of Staff. In an interview with CNN Chief National Correspondent John King, Gen. George Casey said the military is slated to reduce troop levels to 50,000 by the end of August. "[I]t's something we've been working on with the leadership in Iraq for more than 18 months. We have been gradually moving the extra equipment and things out. There's a great plan in place and we're executing that plan right now," Casey said on CNN's John King, USA. The U.S. now has more troops in Afghanistan than Iraq for the first time since 2003. When asked about the need for additional resources in Afghanistan - beyond the 30,000 additional troops scheduled to be deployed there - Casey said the number should be sufficient. "I've heard no discussion of additional troops beyond the 30,000. We, the chiefs, looked at that and General [Stanley] McChrystal has looked at that and we all believe that that will be sufficient for him to accomplish him mission."

2NC Politics NB

If Obama receives results, he’ll get political room

Loyd 10 (Anthony May 11 The Australian http://www.theaustralian.com.au/news/world/campaign-to-push-taliban-out-of-kandahar-has-7-months-to-succeed/story-e6frg6so-1225864937589 TBC 7/3/10)

Yet Nato officers know that they have a tough deadline. By the end of the year troop numbers will decline and Dutch forces will withdraw. In November political attention in Washington will be focused on the midterm elections and critics of the war will remind President Obama of his pledge to start pulling out combat troops in 2011. "If there's a change in the game and it looks like we can run the table then Obama will gain some political oxygen," noted a senior Western diplomat involved closely with the Hamkari campaign. "But if we can't deliver by Christmas... people at home will remind the President of the deal (to begin the withdrawal of US combat troops in 2011)."

Results are key to public opinion

De Borchgrave 10 (Arnaud Newsmax 29 Jun http://www.newsmax.com/deBorchgrave/Obama-Taliban-McChrystal-FinancialTimes/2010/06/29/id/363386 TBC 7/3/10)

Perception is all too often reality. Add to the Afghan debacle syndrome that 31 out of 50 U.S. states are seen as insolvent. Some local governments are readying bankruptcy proceedings. State governments can only default; California is on the verge of taking up the option. State and local governments have unfunded retirement obligations of at least $2 trillion. But the United States still spends more on defense (Iraq and Afghanistan included) than the rest of the world put together. Nobel Prize winner in economics Paul Krugman writes, "We are now, I fear, in the early stages of a third depression. It probably will look more like the Long Depression than the much more severe Great Depression. But the cost — to the world economy and, above all, to the millions of lives blighted by the absence of jobs — will nonetheless be immense." Clearly, Obama has to show the country light at the end of the Afghan tunnel before November's midterm elections. Public opinion support has already dropped to less than 50 percent.

\*\*\*Kandahar Redeployment\*\*\*

Solvency Advocate – Zhari Specific

Troop redeployment to the Zhari district is key to solving the Taliban

Schifrin and McGarry 10 (NICK, MATT May 25 ABC News http://abcnews.go.com/International/Afghanistan/battle-kandahar-heart-taliban-country/story?id=10729732&page=1 TBC 7/3/10)

The vast majority of that combat power will go to the districts surrounding Kandahar City. Half of "Greater Kandahar" lives in those areas, which will likely host a long, hot, violent summer. ABC News spent three weeks in the districts of Maiwand and Zhari. Zhari was so feared by the Soviet Army it was dubbed "the heart of darkness." Residents of Zhari consistently said in interviews there was little stopping insurgents from moving around and little to no presence of the Afghan government. The main reason: there has not been enough troops -- American, Canadian, or Afghan -- to protect people from the Taliban. Multiple village leaders were scared to be seen with American soldiers, knowing when they left, insurgents would come to threaten them. "This is the home of the Taliban. This is an area that has provided a lot of the leadership for the Taliban movement, not only local and mid-level leaders, but senior leaders, Mullah Omar himself," said Lt. Col. Jeffry French, the commander of the 2nd battalion of the 5th Stryker Brigade Combat Team, which is currently in charge of western Zhari. Two of the battalion's outposts sit within a few miles of Sangisar, the town where Mullah Omar used to live and where he took the oath from a few dozen men that started the modern Taliban movement in 1994. "This is the staging area for Kandahar City. They have operated with impunity here," French says, although the arrival of a company of his troops in western Zhari just before Christmas has improved security. "I don't think there's any greater effect we could have on the Taliban's ability to pursue the war than establishing persistent security here."

Flooding the area with soldiers is key to solve

SCHIFRIN McGARRY and GUDGELL 10 (NICK, MATT, AND MIKE July 2, ABC http://abcnews.go.com/International/american-troops-afghanistan-brace-tough-fight/story?id=11073850 TBC 7/5/10)

But Ullrich acknowledges that Alpha Company has only been able to manage so much, with few resources. "I can go in and own it for a day or two days, but when I leave, they can move back in," he says with a sigh, referring to the insurgents. "I can't yet push in and get closer to the people and under the Taliban's skin." "I don't have a rifle." Commanders are confident that flooding this area with American soldiers will help change that. But they know there is a chicken and egg problem. The people of Zhari need to help the Americans in order to improve security here. But they seem unwilling to do that -- until they see an improvement in security.

Zhari District key – Troop Numbers

Zhari district is a crucial precondition to overall Kandahar strategy – troop numbers key to rooting out entrenched insurgency

Farmer 2 (Ben, Jul 2010 The Telegraph http://www.telegraph.co.uk/news/worldnews/asia/afghanistan/7868176/Troops-call-it-the-Heart-of-Darkness-the-spiritual-home-of-the-Taliban.html TBC 7/3/10)

American soldiers arriving in Kandahar for this summer's long-awaited operation to secure Afghanistan's second city have found a well-prepared enemy. The Daily Telegraph was the first newspaper to accompany the influx of troops from the 101st Airborne Division into Zhari district, the home of the Taliban movement. Coalition commanders insist the push, named Operation Hamkari or 'cooperation', is a new kind of military offensive. Its objective is governance and jobs rather than gun battles. But it is already clear, a month after the reinforcements arrived, they will need to fight for Zhari first. The area forms a funnel of arms, fighters and supplies from rural Kandahar and Helmand to the provincial capital. Whoever controls Zhari, which sits astride the Highway One nationwide ring road, has a critical hold on the western approach to Kandahar city. The district is also of historic importance to the Taliban movement, which grew up in Zhari's orchards and vineyards. Mullah Mohammad Omar, founder of the movement, taught at a small mosque in the village of Singesar after he and other leaders fought the Soviet army in the 1980s. His militia of religious students, or Taliban, were formed to fight the power of local warlords in 1994. Their brand of strict Islamic law became the antidote to abusive local commanders. Mullah Omar and 30 men were said to have hung a warlord who abducted and raped two teenage girls from the gun barrel of a tank. The 101st Airborne Division and hundreds of Afghan soldiers arrived in May to wrest the Taliban's birthplace from the insurgency's grip. "This is their area we are operating in," explained Lt Col Johnny Davis, commander of the division's first battalion, 502nd infantry regiment. "It's their back yard, this is where their movement began and I am sure they have been told not to lose it." Zhari is a focal point of President Barack Obama's surge. Several thousand American and Afghan troops have replaced a company of little more than 120 Canadians. Their terrain is a wedge around 15 miles long and four miles wide at its thickest. Zhari's population is hemmed in by mountains and deserts around a dense strip of irrigated vineyards and orchards which the locals call the gardens. The Americans instead call it the 'green monster'. Soldiers patrolling this farmland must scrabble over mud walls in 120F heat to avoid the paths seeded with homemade bombs. Visibility among the pomegranate trees is cut to a few yards. The gardens are a patchwork of safe areas and battlegrounds, demarcated by streams, tracks and trees. Platoons can count attacks from almost any group of trees. In the labyrinth of alleys and sun-baked mud houses in Senjaray town, foot patrols have come under grenade attack from fighters no older than boys. Patrols have found bunkers, fighting positions and "bed down positions" where fighters can rest unobserved. "There's no doubt that in large tracts of Zhari, you have got clear evidence that the insurgency is alive and well and has significant freedom of action," said Gen Nick Carter the British officer commanding international troops in southern Afghanistan. "That means the population is oppressed and is not connected to the government." The intelligence reports that the insurgents are now as corrupt and mercenary as the hated warlords, suggests an opportunity exists to import Afghan civil servants to set-up schools and clinics across the rural district. The operation - which must also take harvest time demands into account - is set to stretch far into the autumn. But American commanders are confident that weight of numbers not time will tilt the battle. "We have heard all the names, the Heart of Darkness and so on," said Major Matt Neumeyer "But just by sheer numbers we are going to gain more space and take it from the enemy."

Zhari District key – Kandahar

Significant troop presence in Zhari district is crucial to success in Kandahar

Schifrin and McGarry 10 (NICK, MATT May 25 ABC News http://abcnews.go.com/International/Afghanistan/battle-kandahar-heart-taliban-country/story?id=10729732&page=1 TBC 7/3/10)

"Zhari is like the gateway to Kandahar city," says Mohammed Niyaz Serhadi, who was the Zhari district governor until he recently resigned in order to run for parliament. "Most of attacks are planned in this district. Most of the government opponents are based in this district." Serhadi admits neither he nor the police have very much reach in Zhari. He spoke to ABC News last month in the Zhari district center, which is located inside an American army base because of threats. "The government doesn't even have control of 10 percent of the district," he said. The thousands of troops moving into Zhari and the surrounding districts will try to disrupt Taliban safehavens, just as U.S. troops did around the Iraqi capital as part of the surge there in 2007. "Just like Baghdad, somewhere out in environs, we had enough forces hitting where they were building the IED's, where they're causing most of the problems for the city, where they're coming from," says a separate senior military official. "With enough forces out there [we can] get security well stabilized" in the city. Between the districts and the city center the United States will try to create a "blanket of security" or "an outer ring of security," according to senior military officials. Thirty-seven roads lead in and out of the city, and up until this point, the Afghan police been unable to keep militants from coming in and out.

Zhari key to Kandahar success

BOWMAN 10 (TOM NPR 6/17 http://www.npr.org/templates/story/story.php?storyId=127770428 TBC 7/5/10)

His tour continuing, Hodges climbed into a helicopter and flew north over the city, toward a narrow strip of green. Orchards and fields hug the river below. In the distance — desert terrain and the district of Zhari in Kandahar province, a hiding place for Taliban fighters. The helicopter landed at Forward Operating Base Wilson, a jumble of tents and newly constructed plywood buildings. Inside the military operations center, Hodges and a few other officers unfolded a map, showing where thousands of American and Afghan soldiers will operate in Zhari. One of the officers, British Maj. Gen. Nick Carter, commander of all U.S. and allied forces in southern Afghanistan, explained that to win in Kandahar, the allies must root out the Taliban from Zhari. "I think it's still the case that the insurgency has a significant amount of freedom of movement in Zhari, and that's inevitable given that we haven't really had much of a presence here for last few years," Carter said. As many as 8,000 U.S. and Afghan troops will replace the 800 American soldiers in Zhari. They'll start patrolling next month, pause in August for the holy month of Ramadan, and then go after the Taliban in September.
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Targeted troop increase in Kandahar is key to success in Afghanistan

Davidson 9 (Steph, National Post, Dec. 2 2009, http://www2.canada.com/calgaryherald/story.html?id=2292743)IM

The key to success in Afghanistan is Kandahar province, according to a report released yesterday. More troops are needed in the province to reverse the Taliban gains in the area and stop the terrorists' campaign of intimidation in Kandahar City, said the report, The Taliban's Campaign for Kandahar. "Kandahar is critical," said Carl Forsberg, author of the 72-page document which outlines the Taliban's campaign to gain control over Kandahar as "centred on projecting intimidation and violence and terror into Kandahar City in order to erode the government." What happens in Kandahar could very well decide the fate of the rest of the country, Mr. Forsberg said. The province was the birthplace of the Taliban and Afghan President Hamid Karzai and his family were also from Kandahar. "To a large extent the power of President Karzai depends upon government control in Kandahar. If the province is lost to the Taliban, that will be a major blow to his government and to his influence as well. I think to some extent for the last 200 years you've seen Afghanistan sort of follow Kandahar," Mr. Forsberg said. "Given both the Taliban and the Karzai family's roots in Kandahar I think you'll see a very similar phenomena this time around." Kandahar is where Canadian troops are operating. Most Canadian troops in Afghanistan operate in Panjwaii and Dand districts with a smaller number in Kandahar City. A U.S. battalion already under Canadian command has been based in Zhari since the summer. Yesterday, it was revealed that Canada is once again set to take command of an area north of Kandahar -- the Arghandab -- that was handed over to U.S. forces only three months ago. However, few if any Canadian troops will actually move back into Arghandab. Rather, new U.S. troops to be put under Canadian command beginning in a few weeks are to take over responsibility for the area from a U.S. army Stryker battalion. The shift in responsibilities is part of a new war strategy, backed by Barack Obama's troop surge. With "Arghandab District, we will control 85 per cent or more of the population of Kandahar," Brig.-Gen. Daniel Menard said. "It will be a huge brigade." Yesterday's report by the Institute for the Study of War said Kandahar was the birthplace of the Quetta Shura Taliban, who see themselves as "the government in exile." "They call themselves the Islamic Emirate of Afghanistan and have national ambitions to retake the entirety of Afghanistan, basically to return to the position they were in before 2001," Mr. Forsberg said. Until now, the report details, Coalition forces have been unable to sufficiently respond to the Taliban's campaign in the province. The report calls for more troops to "reverse the Taliban's momentum, eliminate its sanctuaries around Kandahar City and neutralize its capabilities to attack Kandahar." However, Mr. Forsberg cautioned an additional deployment will only be sufficient if they are sent to strategically important areas. The report concludes, "ISAF [NATO's International Security Assistance Force] failed to block the Taliban's advance because it did not understand the enemy's objectives in Kandahar. "ISAF has been constantly disrupting the Taliban in Kandahar. This approach is flawed, as simply disrupting the Taliban is insufficient for success. "The Taliban have staked their campaign to retake the south on seizing Kandahar City. Destroying the insurgents in Kandahar is a critical and necessary first step for reversing the Taliban's gains across southern Afghanistan and neutralizing their effects on the entire country."

Kandahar is key to winning the war in Afghanistan

**AP 10** (July 6 2010, Associated Press, http://news.yahoo.com/s/ap/as\_afghanistan)IM

KABUL, Afghanistan – Three Afghan policemen and a British soldier were killed by roadside bomb attacks in Afghanistan's volatile south and east, officials said Tuesday. Insurgent attacks have been surging in much of the country as NATO, bolstered this year by some 30,000 more U.S. troops, ramps up a crucial push to bring security to Taliban-dominated areas in the south after nearly nine years of war. The British soldier was on patrol in the south's Helmand province when a roadside blast wounded him in Nahr-i-Saraj district, Britain's Ministry of Defense said in a statement Tuesday. It did not identify him. The soldier, from 1st Battalion of the Mercian Regiment, was evacuated to Britain after Sunday's blast but died Monday in a hospital. At least 15 international troops have been killed in Afghanistan so far in July. Last month was the deadliest of the war for the NATO force trying to stabilize the country since the Taliban's hard-line Islamist regime was toppled by U.S.-backed forces in 2001. According to a tally by The Associated Press, 103 international service members, including 60 Americans, died in June. In eastern Afghanistan, three Afghan police died Tuesday afternoon when their joint convoy with international troops was patrolling in Logar province and a vehicle hit a buried mine in Baraki Barak district, local government chief Mohammad Rahim Amin said. Another police vehicle that came to assist hit a second mine, wounding four Afghans, Amin said, adding that an American helicopter flew to the scene and was hovering over the wreckage before sunset. Logar, the province just south of the capital of Kabul, hosts a major American base and is also a hive of activity for the Haqqani network of insurgents allied with al-Qaida and the Taliban. Insurgent attacks have increased around the country in recent years, prompting the U.S. to send more troops and launch a security operation in the southern province of Kandahar, the spiritual birthplace of the Taliban. Sen. John McCain, the ranking Republican on the U.S. Senate Armed Services Committee, said Monday the Kandahar push is crucial to whether NATO and Afghan troops will prevail in the war. McCain, who visited Afghanistan's largest city in the south on Monday with two other U.S. lawmakers, warned of tough fighting ahead and predicted that casualties would rise in the short-term.
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Winning Kandahar is key to winning the war in Afghanistan

**RFE 10** (Radio Free Europe, July 6 2010, http://www.rferl.org/content/US\_Senator\_McCain\_Says\_Kandahar\_Key\_To\_Winning\_In\_Afghanistan/2092032.html)IM

U.S. Senator John McCain has identified Kandahar as key to the West's efforts to win the war in Afghanistan and predicted an upsurge in casualties as NATO and Taliban forces intensify their struggle for control there. Visiting the southern city on Monday (July 5), McCain -- the ranking Republican on the U.S. Senate's Armed Services Committee -- said the U.S.-led NATO forces would prevail in the overall conflict if they secured Kandahar. "The Taliban know that Kandahar is the key to success or failure, so what happens in this operation will have a great effect on the outcome of this conflict," McCain said. Despite rising casualties among allied forces, McCain expressed confidence that the NATO military operation would succeed. "It's obviously the key area and if we succeed there, we will succeed in the rest of this struggle," McCain said. But he tempered his upbeat message by criticizing President Barack Obama -- who defeated him in the 2008 U.S. presidential election -- for pledging to begin withdrawing troops from Afghanistan in July next year. Although he expected progress to be made by next July, McCain said the withdrawal pledge provided the Taliban with motivation to wait out the NATO presence. "We must not tell the enemy that we will begin leaving when we have not finished the job," he said. McCain's criticisms were rebutted by Vice President Joe Biden, who told MSNBC television during a trip to Iraq that the administration's strategy was aimed at putting responsibility on the government of Afghan President Hamid Karzai to "get in the game" by training its own forces. "You have got to get in the game. We're not here forever," Biden said. "We cannot want the security of your country more than you want it."

Success in the Kandahar mission is crucial to overall Afghan success

Schifrin and McGarry 10 (NICK, MATT May 25 ABC News http://abcnews.go.com/International/Afghanistan/battle-kandahar-heart-taliban-country/story?id=10729732&page=1 TBC 7/3/10)

So U.S. Military Police are training Afghan police inside the city, and those efforts will be redoubled to try to produce a competent, independent police force. "We're pedaling as fast as we can to get them trained," the senior military official says, "but we're not where we need to be yet." The U.S. and the provincial government are also working to improve basic physical security for important buildings in Kandahar City, such as the vulnerable police station that "even Ray Charles could find," in the words of a separate senior military official. In the end, the complex collection of fighting in the districts, checkpoints around the city and training and physical security enhancements inside the city will all have to work at the same time for the U.S. to see the kind of results it needs to quickly. U.S. commanders say they want to see visible improvements by the time Ramadan begins in the middle of August. And much of it will be dependent on whether the local governments can improve -- and provide residents with the confidence that the U.S. and powerful Afghans are fighting to secure the population. "How do you show success in this campaign?" asks a senior civilian official in Kandahar, referring to the new U.S. strategy in Afghanistan. "You stabilize Kandahar."

Success in Kandahar is absolutely critical – Any failure alienates the population

Schifrin and McGarry 10 (NICK, MATT May 25 ABC News http://abcnews.go.com/International/Afghanistan/battle-kandahar-heart-taliban-country/story?id=10729732&page=1 TBC 7/3/10)

"Our intent is to take away from [the Taliban] access to the population where they are traditionally strongest. And that will take away from them some of their credibility as well as recruiting, funding, access to narcotics," McChrystal told ABC News in a March interview. "It won't be decisive. But it's a pretty severe blow to them if they lose what we would consider their most important area." Many have been more blunt. The campaign is the most significant test of the new American counterinsurgency strategy in Afghanistan, and if it fails in any way, risks further alienating a skeptical population that is desperate for security. "We've got a few months," says one senior military official who has helped plan the campaign, "to make a giant difference."
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Kandahar is key to Afghan success

Gearan 10 (ANNE, AP JUNE 10, http://breakingnews.gaeatimes.com/2010/06/10/us-commander-in-afghanistan-says-kandahar-operation-will-take-longer-than-planned-33277/ TBC 7/3/10)

Kandahar is Afghanistan’s second-largest city and a key to the success of President Barack Obama’s revamped war strategy, which focuses on turning local allegiances against the Taliban and toward the U.S.-backed central government in Kabul. Kandahar was always the place where that strategy was most starkly challenged, since the Taliban is a daily presence in neighborhoods and carries a significant level of popular support.

Troop presence in Kandahar is critical to progress

SHANKER and RUBIN 10 THOM and ALISSA 6/28 New York Times http://www.nytimes.com/2010/06/29/world/asia/29military.html?\_r=1 TBC 7/5/10

Despite deepening pessimism back home and disarray in the top American military ranks, officials insist that the buildup of soldiers in Afghanistan is beginning to show results: Commando raids over the last four months have taken scores of insurgent leaders out of action, in a secretive operation aimed partly at pressuring the Taliban to reconcile with the Afghan government. About 130 important insurgent figures have been captured or killed in Afghanistan over the past 120 days, about the time that commanders turned their attention from the fight around Marja to a much more complex campaign around Kandahar, according to NATO military statistics. The targets have included Taliban shadow provincial governors and military commanders, as well as district-level financiers, trainers and bomb makers. At the same time, American military officials say that the greater number of troops, along with more trained Afghan security forces, is allowing NATO forces “to confront the Taliban in places where they had not been confronted in the past,” said Brig. Gen. Josef Blotz, the NATO spokesman here. “This is tough, but we are in” the fight, he said. He predicted that given more time, there would be progress.

Kandahar key to breaking insurgent morale

SCHIFRIN McGARRY and GUDGELL 10 (NICK, MATT, AND MIKE July 2, ABC http://abcnews.go.com/International/american-troops-afghanistan-brace-tough-fight/story?id=11073850 TBC 7/5/10)

"This is one of the most complex nuts to crack in terms of the overall campaign," says French, whose men are being replaced by the second brigade of the 101st Airborne. "It would be a massive psychological blow to the Taliban if … follow-on forces come in here and establish persistent security. I don't think there's any greater effect we could have on the Taliban's ability to pursue the war."

Success in Kandahar is key to forcing the Taliban to reconcile

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

The Taliban's top priority is to control Kandahar, which the Nato-led coalition has been slow to counter up to now, maintaining an under-manned presence in the city. Many experts believe this has been a strategic mistake. "Kandahar means Afghanistan. If we have a peaceful Kandahar, we will have a peaceful Afghanistan," Tooryalai Wesa, governor of Kandahar province, said in an interview. "Kandahar was the centre for Taliban at that time [during their rule]. I'm sure they'll be trying to focus the most here." Yet, until recent months, a combat force of just 1,000 Canadian troops was left to defend the province, allowing the Taliban to control large parts of the region and embark on a step-by-step plan to capture Kandahar city. Districts around the province such as Zhari and Panjwai, have Taliban presences, with shadow courts and other parallel extremist institutions. The Nato troop deployment in Kandahar is being rapidly ramped up and should reach some 6,000 this spring. Some experts believe that the Kandahar offensive would need to be even bigger than the current operation in Helmand. The Taliban is more dispersed in Kandahar and more integrated into the community – unlike Marjah, where the fighters are concentrated in one spot – so the operation will have to be targeted over a much bigger area,. There is likely to be fighting across much of the province and out in extending into the militant hideouts in the neighbouring province of Uruzgan. Thousands more troops are expected to be deployed to begin a major offensive by early summer. "Kandahar [military operation] is imminent," said Khalid Pashtoon, a member of parliament for the city. "If they [Nato] don't come to Kandahar, all the operations mean nothing. "The Taliban are so proud of being from Kandahar. Once you demoralise them there, then automatically the Taliban will be compelled to reconcile."
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Kandahar is strategically key – Opium routes

BURNS 10 (JOHN F. May 21 New York Times http://www.nytimes.com/2010/05/23/weekinreview/23burns.html?pagewanted=1&ref=kandahar TBC 7/6/10)

Though Kabul has been the capital for 250 years, Kandahar has been the main crucible of power in Afghanistan since the mid-18th century, when a Kandahari tribal chief, Ahmad Shah Durrani, unified the country and established himself as the first of the Durrani kings, a dynasty that endured until the last monarch, Zahir Shah, was overthrown in 1973. The Communists who ruled until 1992 regarded their competition with the mujahedeen for support from the Kandahari tribes as crucial to their survival, and the two governments since the 1990s — the Taliban, ousted by the American-led invasion after 9/11, and the current administration of President Hamid Karzai — have had their roots in Kandahar. In a country of perhaps 30 million people, Kandahar’s importance goes beyond numbers. The province is thought to have fewer than two million people, perhaps half in Kandahar city and its outlying districts. Most belong to a cluster of powerful tribes — the Popolzai, Barakzai, Achakzai, Alokozai, Alizai, Ishaqzai, Noorzai and Ghilzai, among others — who are part of a confederacy known as the Pashtun. They are the politically dominant ethnic group who live, mostly, in the lands between the Hindu Kush mountains and the 1,200-mile border with Pakistan. Strategically, Kandahar is critical. It lies at a junction of historic trade routes that served as infiltration routes for the mujahedeen, and now for the Taliban. It is the main entrepot for the opium-and-heroin trafficking that is Afghanistan’s economic mainstay and a source of financing for the Taliban, as well as for corrupt tribal leaders who nominally, at least, support the Kabul government — among them, many Afghan and American officials say, President Karzai’s younger half-brother Ahmed Wali Karzai, president of Kandahar’s provincial council.

Kandahar key to Afghanistan

Hasht-e Sobh 10 (Kabul, in Dari 26 May 10 Afghan paper speculates on politics around Kandahar operation BBC Monitoring South Asia Lexis Nexis TBC 7/6/10)

President Karzai has emphasized many times that military operations alone are not the way out and he is still strongly against NATO's planned military attack on Kandahar. But if Kandahar is to be attacked, even if it is a political move only, a military attack should also be expected. But why is Karzai against a military attack on Kandahar? According to NATO, Kandahar is the political and military heart of the Taleban, but according to Karzai, Kandahar is a treasure. Kandahar is both Karzai's birthplace and his brother's economic and political stronghold. The main problem is that Kandahar is both Karzai's and Mullah Omar's or the Taleban's birthplace. And this is why it is of extreme importance for both sides. Although Kandahar is Karzai's birthplace, tribal and mafia tensions are strong in this province and that is paving the way for militant activities. On the other hand, there are also accusations levelled by the Westerners and the Afghan government institutions (the Afghan Defence Ministry) [as received] against Karzai's brother. Therefore, Kandahar is a treasure for Karzai for many reasons. But it is a treasure which is plagued with tribal tensions and mafia activities. The problem is that Karzai has a distorted view of this treasure [Kandahar Province]. Kandahar is not a treasure but it is the Taleban stronghold and not Karzai's stable political and social base and a secure and safe place under government control. Kandahar is more like a ruined treasure to Pakistan and terrorist groups than to Karzai. Apart from being of political, social, regional and tribal value to the terrorists and Pakistan, Kandahar is also of moral value to them. If Kandahar is considered a treasure to Karzai, it highlights his illegal economic interests managed by his brother. We can say that an attack on Kandahar is needed for strategic reasons, because unfortunately Kandahar is the heart of the Taleban and of extreme strategic value. According to Rasmussen, the attack on Kandahar would be more of a political operation than a military offensive. It is the reality that Taleban members and Taleban ideas have a strong political, economic and social base, in addition to Pakistani sponsorship. And this makes launching a military operation against it impossible. On the other hand, the Taleban's hold in Kandahar is strengthened by tribal complexities. Therefore, an attack on Kandahar will be a test for NATO, the foreign forces in Afghanistan and Barak Obama's new strategy, which makes the attack extremely crucial. Despite his current opposition, Hamed Karzai will accept an attack on Kandahar Province because an attack on Kandahar will be an attack at the heart of the Taleban.

Kandahar key to Afghanistan

Goodspeed 10 (Peter, National Post 'None more important'; The success or failure of Obama's troop surge lies in Kandahar City May 29 Lexis Nexis TBC 7/6/10)

As thousands of Canadian, U.S., British and Afghan troops prepare for a summer offensive in Kandahar -- expected to be the most decisive battle in the Afghan war -- the Taliban are already preparing their battleground, planting mines, hiding weapons and terrifying the local population. Kandahar city may be a ramshackle, mud-brick metropolis of 500,000 people, but it is the spiritual home of the Taliban and has always been the Afghan insurgency's centre of gravity. The insurgents will not give up the city or the area without a fight. "The Taliban are in control in Kandahar and the areas geographically adjacent to Kandahar city. They control it completely," said Hy Rothstein, a retired U.S. Special Forces Colonel who teaches at the U.S. Navy's Postgraduate School in Monterey, California.
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Kandahar key to Afghanistan – History

Graham 8 (Hugh June 18 Toronto Star Staff Writer City of Kandahar is key that unlocks Afghanistan; Conquering armies have taken Kandahar-Kabul route since the time of Alexander the Great Lexis Nexis TBC 7/6/10

History tells us that when Kandahar falls, Kabul will follow. Of course it doesn't happen quite that quickly. But Canadians should keep history in mind after last week's Taliban raid which freed 400 fellow fighters from a Kandahar prison with the remobilized rebels apparently bolstering a Taliban force massing northwest of the city in the Arghandab district. At this moment, Canada's government and military aren't likely to remind us of past precedents for one simple reason: The pattern of Afghan history is not on our side. Canada and NATO have held Kandahar not just with troops but with a series of complex deals with district governors; overnight, that whole structure could become a house of cards. History tells us that if Canada and NATO lose Kandahar, the present stalemate will end and the balance will tip in favour of the Taliban. Then the past will flow back in with a vengeance. To control Afghanistan, you have to control Kandahar and Kabul, the two main cities. That also means possession of the road between them, which has always favoured native resistance. Though NATO appears to dominate the Kandahar-Kabul road (the southeast quarter of the ring road that circles the entire country), it is already one of the least secure and most lethal sections of road in Afghanistan. The region is dominated by the Ghilzai, the Pashtun tribesmen who make up the rank and file of the Taliban; and they don't just mount ambushes on the road, they live along it. Security has been so poor that Tajiks and Uzbeks travelling from Kabul to Kandahar have had to disguise themselves as Pashtuns. It's not only because the road links Kandahar and Kabul that it's important. Much of the present war in Afghanistan is being fought along the country's only real highway, the ring road which runs round the impassable central mountains and acts as the country's lifeline, providing the only practical communication as well as hosting the majority of Afghanistan's population and agriculture. Ever since the ring road was a series of trade routes, over two millennia ago, the Kandahar-Kabul stretch has been the most sensitive. Alexander the Great took that very route from the settlement he founded at Kandahar, right up to Kabul. In the Middle Ages the Kandahar-Kabul trek was the trade route that connected India to Asia. In 1747, the father of modern Afghanistan, Ahmad Shah Durrani, united the Pashtun tribes around Kandahar, seized the city from the Persians and marched north from Kandahar along that same route to take Kabul. In 1839, in the First Afghan War, the British marched north from India, took Kandahar and from Kandahar followed the road to attack Kabul. In the second Afghan war, in 1878, the British in Kandahar marched north to Kabul to relieve British troops trapped there. In both wars, the British lost first one city and then the other. Abdur Rahman, the next Afghan shah, marched from Kabul to Kandahar to defeat a rival claimant. In those days, things were much as they are today: You have to be on good terms with the tribes along the way. As Nancy Hatch Dupree wrote in A Historical Guide to Afghanistan, "nineteenth century travellers approached the land of the Ghilzai between Kalat-i-Ghilzai and Ghazni (on the Kandahar-Kabul road) with fear and trepidation for the 'much dreaded' Ghilzai Pushtun were a large, fiercely independent, aggressively valiant Afghan tribe whose daring exploits fill the pages of Afghan history." When the Soviets invaded in 1979, they seized the entire ring road but could never secure it effectively or control the country beyond it. In the civil war that followed the Soviet withdrawal, the Taliban "bought off" the difficult Kandahar tribes for $1.5 million. In 1995, they fought their way up the same old road to Kabul, taking the capital in 1996 by cutting the city's supply lines. For Canada, there remains an ominous note about the Soviets: They had failed to secure the Panjwaii and Arghandab districts west of Kandahar, the natural springboards for any attack on the city. That's the area Canada has been trying to secure for three years and that's where the Taliban are massing once again. Over the centuries, everyone seems to have taken Afghanistan by taking Kandahar and making the trek to Kabul or vice versa. And if NATO doesn't come up with a new and better strategy, sooner or later, it is bound to happen again.

Kandahar key to Afghanistan

Goodspeed 10 (Peter, National Post 'None more important'; The success or failure of Obama's troop surge lies in Kandahar City May 29 Lexis Nexis TBC 7/6/10)

Turning the tide in Kandahar is critical to NATO's plans to weaken the Taliban and push the war to a point where Afghan insurgents might accept some form of peace talks. Two months ago, when Pentagon planners produced an 80-page unclassified primer on Kandahar, they concluded, "Of all the districts and cities in Afghanistan none is more important to the future of the Afghan government or the Taliban insurgency than Kandahar city." The coming offensive will be a crucial test of the new counterinsurgency strategy unveiled last December, ordering 30,000 more troops to Afghanistan and setting a target date of July 2011 to begin bringing them home. NATO's objective is to target the Taliban insurgency; secure key population centres; restore credible government services and train competent Afghan security forces to police and hold Kandahar. The offensive's "shape, clear, hold, build and transfer" counterinsurgency plan was originally refined in Iraq. It calls for NATO troops to maintain a low profile inside Kandahar city itself by handing control to Afghan army and police units. NATO troops will focus on driving the Taliban out of safe havens on the outskirts of Kandahar, especially in the districts around Arghandab, Zhari and Panjwaii, while moving to stabilize and protect rural areas around the provincial capital.
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Kandahar key to Afghanistan – Model of success

Goodspeed 10 (Peter, National Post 'None more important'; The success or failure of Obama's troop surge lies in Kandahar City May 29 Lexis Nexis TBC 7/6/10)

Experts believe the Taliban's show of force is a statement to the Afghan people before 23,000 NATO troops descend on Kandahar for the upcoming offensive that could start any day. "What's up for grabs here is how we actually define victory or success in Afghanistan," said Brian Katulis of the Center for American Progress in Washington. "It's not simply about gauging progress in Afghanistan -- it's actually defining what progress actually means." Lying at the junction of historic silk trade routes that also served as infiltration routes for mujahedeen who defeated the former Soviet Union, Kandahar was a symbol of Afghan resistance long before Mullah Mohammad Omar organized the Taliban there 16 years ago. Since the Taliban were driven from power in the aftermath of the September 11, 2001 terror attacks on Washington and New York, Kandahar has remained a wild, untamed place with little security, virtually no government and a strong, lingering, Taliban presence.

Kandahar is key to Afghanistan – Now is the time

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)

Some political analysts believe that the attacks carried out by the Taleban in Kandahar is in fact, a response to the preparations which was announced by US official some times back [preparations for a massive military operation in Kandahar]. Some days earlier, the US and NATO commanders in Afghanistan announced that they will soon conduct a massive military operation in Kandahar so that Kandahar province is cleared of Taleban and the government's rule is established. Now it is seen that by carrying out simultaneous attacks in the city of Kandahar, the Taleban wants to prove the point that they can easily enter the city of Kandahar and carry out terror attack in their chosen areas. Taking the casualties of the Kandahar attacks into consideration, it is necessary that the Afghan and foreign forces should also step up their preparations to conduct the massive military operation in Kandahar and they should target their positions before the Taleban resort to any other similar terror attacks there. Taking that issue into consideration that by carrying out organized and coordinated attacks in Kandahar, the Taleban have been able to put a negative impact on the psychological and security conditions there. It is now necessary that the Afghan security officials, should also take some serious measures so that by exerting military pressures on that group [the Taleban]; the Taleban should not be given further opportunity to carry out similar attacks in the other parts of the country. Kandahar was the main stronghold of the Taleban in the past and now as well, this province is of special importance for the Taleban. According to some evaluations which have been conducted in this regard so far, if the Afghan and foreign forces are able to clear Kandahar province of Taleban insurgents, then Taleban's defeat in other parts of the country is also not far from a possibility.

Kandahar Key to Afghanistan

Kandahar is the crucial region to prevent corruption and Taliban take-over

**WSJ 10** (Maria Abi-Habib, Wall Street Journal, June 18 2010, http://online.wsj.com/article/SB10001424052748703438604575314880781384468.html)IM

KABUL—The U.S. said it will roll out and test a new anti-corruption task force in Afghanistan's southern province of Kandahar, where coalition forces plan a surge in operations against the Taliban this summer. A top military official said Kandahar will be something of a proving ground for the anti-corruption group, dubbed Task Force 2010, whose creation was reported Friday in The Wall Street Journal. The task force will use its experience in Kandahar, a Taliban stronghold, to then "zoom out" to the rest of the country, he said. The U.S military announced the creation of the task force as it comes under pressure from Congress to justify the billions of dollars being spent as part of the stepped-up war effort in Afghanistan. The task force, like Congress, will be investigating allegations that some of the money being spent on private contractors to provide security, supplies and reconstruction work for allied forces is ending up with Afghan power brokers. Task Force 2010 will formally start operations in July. The task force's deployment in Kandahar highlights the importance the U.S. is placing on the operation's success: The bulk of new U.S. troops coming into the country this year will be deployed in and around Kandahar city and neighboring Helmand province in an effort to break the back of Taliban resistance. Task Force 2010 cobbles together under one command many law-enforcement and financial-oversight staff already in Afghanistan. Military officials say there also will be an influx of forensic auditors to trace the path of money distributed to private contractors. Investigators aim to trace how money is used as it is distributed to contractors who in turn distribute it to subcontractors. Investigators will try to clamp down on companies that overcharge for poor-quality materials, create ghost employees to pocket salaries or push for unnecessary projects in order to siphon off cash. Coalition officials say they hope better coordination will mean that the money disbursed in Kandahar will go to better use than in previous years. "We're looking to support in every way possible via contracting what NATO is planning to do to help the people of Kandahar," said a senior U.S. military official in Kabul. Many Afghans say that past NATO development efforts using private companies simply lined the pockets of local warlords. Coalition officials also say they worry that aid and development money has fueled the insurgency, as private companies bribed Taliban insurgents to operate safely in particularly dangerous areas. The U.S. spent $14 billion on contracts last year, including money from a common NATO fund. That figure doesn't include money spent on contracts by individual NATO countries, and coalition officials say they have only a vague idea how much has been spent since the beginning of the war effort. "We realize we have a problem, we just don't know the extent of it," the military official said.

Kandahar Key to Taliban

Kandahar is key to achieve reconciliation with the Taliban

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

The Taliban's top priority is to control Kandahar, which the Nato-led coalition has been slow to counter up to now, maintaining an under-manned presence in the city. Many experts believe this has been a strategic mistake. "Kandahar means Afghanistan. If we have a peaceful Kandahar, we will have a peaceful Afghanistan," Tooryalai Wesa, governor of Kandahar province, said in an interview. "Kandahar was the centre for Taliban at that time [during their rule]. I'm sure they'll be trying to focus the most here." Yet, until recent months, a combat force of just 1,000 Canadian troops was left to defend the province, allowing the Taliban to control large parts of the region and embark on a step-by-step plan to capture Kandahar city. Districts around the province such as Zhari and Panjwai, have Taliban presences, with shadow courts and other parallel extremist institutions. The Nato troop deployment in Kandahar is being rapidly ramped up and should reach some 6,000 this spring. Some experts believe that the Kandahar offensive would need to be even bigger than the current operation in Helmand. The Taliban is more dispersed in Kandahar and more integrated into the community – unlike Marjah, where the fighters are concentrated in one spot – so the operation will have to be targeted over a much bigger area,. There is likely to be fighting across much of the province and out in extending into the militant hideouts in the neighbouring province of Uruzgan. Thousands more troops are expected to be deployed to begin a major offensive by early summer. "Kandahar [military operation] is imminent," said Khalid Pashtoon, a member of parliament for the city. "If they [Nato] don't come to Kandahar, all the operations mean nothing. "The Taliban are so proud of being from Kandahar. Once you demoralise them there, then automatically the Taliban will be compelled to reconcile."

Kandahar key to Karzai

Success with local population is key to Karzai credibility

Riechmann 10 (Deb, AP June 13th, http://blog.taragana.com/politics/2010/06/13/afghan-president-karzai-seeks-support-for-kandahar-security-operation-43057/ TBC 7/6/10)

Karzai spokesman Waheed Omar said the president was expected to announce a few development projects for Kandahar in a move to gain public support for his government. NATO and Afghan officials have taken pains to avoid describing the Kandahar operation as a military offensive, a term that has made the half million residents wary about what was to come. Omar said Karzai would call the campaign a "process of stabilization" to bring better governance, services and new development to the area. He said Karzai also would discuss results of this month's national conference, or peace jirga, which endorsed his efforts to reach out to the Taliban. Karzai was also expected to reiterate his call to the opposition to lay down their weapons, renounce violence, accept the Afghan constitution and break ties with al-Qaida and other terrorist networks. "This is Karzai's only second visit to Kandahar in the last couple of years," said Tony White, spokesman for the chief NATO civilian official. "This process of reaching out to Kandahar can only be led by the president. It can't be led by us. It's important for him to address the senior leadership — tribal and religious — and show his support for the effort."

Karzai staking his credibility on Kandahar operation

FILKINS 10 (DEXTER June 13 New York Times http://www.nytimes.com/2010/06/14/world/asia/14afghan.html?ref=kandahar TBC 7/6/10)

President Hamid Karzai flew to this restive city on Sunday and told a gathering of local leaders to prepare themselves for sustained operations to rid the area of Taliban insurgents — and for the pain those operations would exact. “This operation requires sacrifice, and without sacrifice you cannot restore peace to Kandahar,” Mr. Karzai told the gathering of about 400 leaders from around the province. “Will you help me?” Mr. Karzai asked. And many, if not most, stood up and declared they would. The speech by Mr. Karzai was his most demonstrative effort to date to sell the people of Kandahar on the police and military operations planned for the area over the coming months. Securing Kandahar, the most important city in southern Afghanistan, and the surrounding area is considered vital in reversing Taliban dominance and forcing the group to consider making peace. But starting the Kandahar operation has proved to be the most difficult task NATO and the Afghan leaders have faced in many months. Weary of fighting, many Kandahar leaders oppose military operations. American and NATO commanders say they are determined to press ahead. Until Sunday, Mr. Karzai himself appeared ambivalent. At a similar gathering in April, he told local leaders that he would start no operation if they opposed one. The president’s lack of enthusiasm drew criticism from at least one member of his own government, who accused Mr. Karzai of giving up. American commanders themselves stopped using the word “operation” to describe the activities they had planned for the area. And they agreed to slow it down. Gen. Stanley A. McChrystal, commander of American and NATO forces, said this past week that the operation would take longer than he had originally planned, perhaps many months. The Sunday trip to Kandahar by Mr. Karzai appeared to be a show of resolve on the part of NATO and the Afghan government — and on the part of Mr. Karzai himself. In his previous trip to the city, Mr. Karzai drew many negative responses from local leaders. This time, he kept the feedback to a minimum. Like it or not, he suggested, the operation is coming.

Kandahar key to Karzai

Trust in Karzai is at stake in Kandahar

Hasht-e Sobh 10 (Kabul, in Dari 5 Apr Afghan paper sees Karzai visit heralding Kandahar military push BBC Monitoring South Asia Lexis Nexis TBC 7/6/10

First, Kandahar was the centre of the [Taleban's] Islamic Emirate of Taleban in the past and the city where Taleban leader Mullah Mohammad Omar lived. American forces are based in this province now. Kandahar city has special strategic importance for both the Taleban and international forces. By remaining influential in Kandahar, the Taleban intend to control the neighbouring Zabol, Urozgan and Helmand provinces. International forces understand this and are trying to change the situation in this province in their favour by launching military operations in June. Keeping that fact in mind, Kandahar has been changed into a battlefield between the two sides. The Taleban have had control over some districts in this province. Daman, Maywand and Zari districts are believed to be the most volatile districts of Kandahar. Some Western media report that the Taleban wander freely even in Kandahar city. The Taleban have shown the extent of their power through a series of attacks in Kandahar and other sensitive areas. The second point is that Kandahar has been transformed into a stage for the interference of foreign countries. Kandahar is located on the border with Pakistan, and Spin Boldak is believed to be the entry door for Pakistan's interference in this province. Iran has also been accused of sending arms shipments to Kandahar via neighbouring provinces. Exactly one week ago, US Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff Mike Mullen said that large caches of Iranian arms were being sent to this province. Yesterday, some media reported new shipments arriving in this province from Iran, coinciding with Karzai's trip to Kandahar. The third issue that has brought Kandahar to prominence is the presence of controversial authorities in this province. Some Western media consider Karzai's brother [Ahmad Wali Karzai] as the head of the provincial council in Kandahar to be an obstacle to peace and stability in this province. Amid all these objections, Karzai's brother remains in power with full authority. Alongside all these problems, a major military operation called "Omid" [Hope] is scheduled to be launched in Kandahar in June. This operation has caused fear and hope among the residents of this province. Even though international forces say these operations will be led by Afghans, the Marja operations [in Helmand] indicated how problematic and defective fighting in an area can be. So, Karzai's trip to Kandahar is probably aimed at justifying these operations to most of the elders in the region. And that is what the commanders of American and NATO forces need. Once more, Karzai was able to gain local people's cooperation in supporting the government at the meeting with elders from the four southern provinces [Kandahar, Helmand , Nimroz and Zabol]. Now we should wait and see what message it will bring for the people tired of fighting and violence in this province.

Impact – Afghanistan Success

Failure in Afghanistan leads to nuclear war

**Wesley 10** (Michael, Exec. Director of the Lowy Institute for Int. Policy. Professor of Int. Relt’s @ Griffith U, Feb. 25 2010 http://www.lowyinterpreter.org/post/2010/02/25/A-stable-Afghanistan-Why-we-should-care.aspx)IM

We do have an interest in the future of domestic stability within Afghanistan, but we need to think much more clearly about which countries build and guarantee that stability. An Afghan state built just by the US and its allies will be inherently unstable because, as we demonstrated after the Soviet Union withdrew, we have little stomach for any continued strategic involvement in the region. Pakistan, India and China, on the other hand, have deep and enduring strategic interests there, and their competition would soon undermine anything ISAF and NATO leave behind. Understanding the dynamics of strategic competition among Asia's rising behemoths has to be the first step in trying to figure out how to mitigate it. Great power competition in the twenty-first century will be different because of the depth and extent of the dependence of national economies on the global economy. National economies are now less self-sufficient and more vulnerable to the disruption of trading and investment relations than at any time in history. What stops great power confrontations getting out of hand these days is not so much the fear of nuclear annihilation as the fear of global economic ruin – and the resulting national ruin.The danger is that in the heat of the competition, the great powers will lose sight of this fact. This is why instability and weakness in Afghanistan is so dangerous – because in the fog of proxy war, intensely jealous great powers will assume their rivals have the upper hand and redouble their own efforts to exert influence and control, leading to a vast, very likely nuclear, conflict. To avoid the worst possible outcome, all three rivals must be engaged in the process of building a stable Afghanistan – and collectively guaranteeing it. The most realistic route is to actively involve the SCO in the future of Afghanistan while broadening that organisation to include India and Pakistan. This solution ties the stability of the northern and southern tiers of Central Asia to each other, thereby broadening the stakes of those involved. The one hope and one fear that bind China and Russia together are also remarkably relevant to the SCO's proposed new members.

Afghan stability is key to prevent instability in Pakistan and nuclear conflict

**Indian Express 9** (Oct 27 2009, http://www.indianexpress.com/news/afghan-instability-increases-risk-of-conflag/533860/)IM

Asserting that the Al Qaeda leader Osama bin Laden and his deputies are in Northwest Pakistan, a top American Senator has said that instability in Afghanistan is too dangerous for nuclear-armed Pakistan as the world cannot afford turbulence there. "While stabilising Afghanistan is not going to solve all of our problems in Afghanistan, I understand that instability in Afghanistan only increases the risk of conflagration where the world can least afford it, next door in Pakistan," Senator John Kerry said in a speech at the Council on Foreign Relations, a Washington-based think-tank. "That's why, regardless of what happens in Afghanistan, and especially if we want to reduce the needs for additional boots on the ground over the long-haul, it is vitally important that we support, that we intensify even, our support and improve our cooperation with Pakistan," said Kerry, who is chairman of the powerful Senate Foreign Relations Committee. Kerry, who has just returned from Afghanistan and Pakistan, said the decisions made and actions taken in the weeks and months ahead will be what really gives meaning to that moment and definition to the future of both the countries. Observing that what happens inside Afghanistan is important to US's strategic interests, Kerry said: "our goals and our mission do not end at Afghanistan's borders. No front is more important in our fight against international terrorism than nuclear-armed Pakistan, and the chaos next door in Afghanistan would have enormous repercussions there." Emphasising that bringing stability in Afghanistan and Pakistan is not the job of the United States alone, Kerry said: "The United States cannot do it alone. We want all nations to trade and invest in Afghanistan but we also want all nations to help with stabilising the country, including the cooperation of President Karzai."

Impact – Afghanistan Success

Failure in Afghanistan leads to nuclear conflicts

**Starr** **1** (S. Frederick, U.S. Senate Committee on Foreign Relations. Dec 13 2001, http://www.cacianalyst.org/Publications/Starr\_Testimony.htm)IM

There exists a fundamental misunderstanding about the relationship of Central Asian states (and Russia, for that matter) to the war on terrorism. We hear about their cooperation with the US, as if they are doing us a favor that should be rewarded. Nothing could be further from the truth. For a decade, the Central Asian states have faced the threat of Islamic radicalism, terrorism, and drug trafficking, with which the first two are closely linked. All of the Central Asian states have identified these issues as their main security threat, and Afghanistan as the locus of that threat. So has Russia, which has used the issue to justify the stationing of troops in four of the five countries of the region. To address this threat, Central Asian governments have arrested countless suspects, abrogating the civil rights of many who are doubtless innocent. All of the countries have resorted to the same primitive policies, the differences among them being only of degree, not of kind. Some commentators have argued that these measures are largely responsible for the growth of terrorism in the first place. There is some truth in this, but we must be careful in levying this charge. When we demand that Messers, Musharraf, Arafat, or Mubarrak crack down hard on jihhadist groups, Palestinian terrorists, or Muslim brotherhoods, are we not asking them to do exactly what we criticize Central Asian governments for doing? Americans bridle when our critics abroad blame September 11 on the US actions, yet we come close to doing the same thing with respect to the Central Asians. Both the Central Asians and the Russians, who have claimed a special role in the region, have been notably unsuccessful in their campaigns against terrorism. But now the situation is changing, thanks to the United States. We are risking American soldiers lives and expending billions of our citizens resources to address a threat that hangs over their countries as much as ours. The fact that we have our own interests at heart in no way qualifies this truth. Early signs of progress in the war on terrorism already exceed what has been accomplished locally in a decade. And so let us cease all talk of some payment owed Central Asians (or Russians) for their cooperation. If anything, it is they who should thank us. However, this does not mean that US actions are without risk to the Central Asian states. Quite the contrary. For a decade they have faced not only the dangers arising from Afghanistan but also the constant threat posed by certain groups in Russia, notably the military and security forces, who are not yet reconciled to the loss of empire. This imperial hangover is not unique to Russia. France exhibited the same tendencies in Algeria, the Spanish in Cuba and Chile, and the British when they burned the White House in 1812. This imperial hangover will eventually pass, but for the time being it remains a threat. It means that the Central Asians, after cooperating with the US, will inevitably face redoubled pressure from Russia if we leave abruptly and without attending to the long-term security needs of the region. That we have looked kindly into Mr. Putin’s soul does not change this reality. The Central Asians face a similar danger with respect to our efforts in Afghanistan. Some Americans hold that we should destroy Bin Laden, Al Queda, and the Taliban and then leave the post-war stabilization and reconstruction to others. Such a course runs the danger of condemning all Central Asia to further waves of instability from the South. But in the next round it will not only be Russia that is tempted to throw its weight around in the region but possibly China, or even Iran or India. All have as much right to claim Central Asia as their backyard as Russia has had until now. Central Asia may be a distant region but when these nuclear powers begin bumping heads there it will create terrifying threats to world peace that the U.S. cannot ignore

Impact – Regional Stability

Promoting long-term stability in Afghanistan defeats extremist forces and prevents instability in the region

**Speedie 9** (David, Carnegie Council – The Voice for Ethics in International Affairs, Aug. 17 2009, http://www.cceia.org/resources/articles\_papers\_reports/0028.html)IM

The United States/NATO and Russia have(has) clear and urgent common interests in promoting long-term stability in Afghanistan. These include containing and defeating "radical extremist" forces, reversing the noxious effects of the opium trade from that country, and preventing instability in Afghanistan from impacting an extended region. Despite these shared interests, cooperation between Russia and the West is "episodic," rather than strategic or systematic. Afghanistan must be seen, not in isolation, but in a broader regional (Central Asian) context. This is true both in terms of the importance of the region (strategic location, energy resources) and of the formidable challenges (instability, economic reversals). Russia and the West both see advantages and interests to be protected (thus the recent competition for a military presence in the otherwise marginal Kyrgyzstan), but should avoid a new "Great Game" of promoting self-interest over shared concerns. Afghanistan is now, as one paper writer states, "Obama's War." From campaign pledge to return to the "right" war, the President has: appointed new military and diplomatic leadership in Kabul, including a special envoy; invested in an enhanced troop presence; and made strenuous, if incomplete, efforts to drum up international support for the military and reconstruction effort in Afghanistan.

An unstable Afghanistan leads to central Asian instability, war and terrorism

**Kalburov 9** (Ivan, Move One, Nov. 25 2009, http://www.moveoneinc.com/blog/asia/instability-may-spread-from-afghanistan-to-central-asia/)IM

Analysts forecast instability can spread from Afghanistan to other states in central Asia. The landlocked war-torn Afghanistan heavily depends on deliveries through its neighbors for all kinds of supplies. We already wrote about the difficulties in transporting goods in the country, but if the insurgents stretch beyond its borders, it will become even more difficult for logistics companies to supply Afghanistan with products and equipment. As the long-lasting post-Soviet crisis is being further fueled by the current economic one, social problems are starting to create fertile ground for radical religious movements such as the one in Afghanistan. Afghanistan’s Taliban may seek to establish a foothold in ex-Soviet Central Asia to recruit supporters and disrupt supplies for U.S. troops in Afghanistan, regional security officials said Tuesday. Former Soviet republics Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan, Tajikistan and Uzbekistan act as transit nations for U.S. Afghan supplies and all but Kazakhstan have reported armed clashes with Islamists this year. In the past year, the Taliban insurgency has spread to parts of northern Afghanistan that had long been relatively peaceful, even as violence raged in the south and east of the country. ‘The deteriorating situation in northern Afghanistan enables the Taliban to spread their influence in that region, giving international terrorists more opportunities to infiltrate the territory of Central Asian states,’ Mikhail Melikhov, a senior official at the Common Security Treaty Organization (CSTO), told a conference in the Kyrgyz capital Bishkek. CSTO, dominated by Russia, is a defense bloc of ex-Soviet republics. Marat Imankulov, the head of the anti-terrorist center of the Commonwealth of Independent States (CIS), another post-Soviet bloc that focuses on economic and political ties, said security risks were compounded by the economic downturn. ‘Frankly speaking, the economic crisis in the CIS countries is turning into a social one,’ he told the conference. ‘We cannot avoid talking about the growing risks of extremist and terrorist activities.’ Imankulov said some security analysts expected the Taliban to try destabilizing Central Asian states ‘to disrupt equipment and food supply channels for coalition forces.

Impact – Corruption

Corruption in Afghanistan collapses rule of law – that leads to instability and a Taliban takeover

Nelson 9 (Soraya, National Public Radio, http://www.npr.org/templates/story/story.php?storyId=121825564)IM

Ask people in Afghanistan about justice and they'll most likely tell you there isn't any.

Laws in Afghanistan are often not enforced, especially if the offender is rich or powerful. The courts are a confusing maze in which justice is dispensed at a glacial pace. Often, the outcomes are determined by bribes. The U.S. and its allies have pledged to rebuild Afghanistan. But the coalition has lagged in its efforts to develop the rule of law — and ignoring the lack of justice is proving a costly mistake. … Afghan Supreme Court Justice Abdul Malik Kamawi is not surprised by such allegations. He says his government and its Western allies need to work a lot harder on tackling corruption in the justice sector, training court officers and paying judges livable wages. "If we don't improve justice, especially when it comes to property issues, the result will be chaos and insecurity that could ultimately lead to anarchy," he says. The Taliban has certainly used the lack of rule of law to strengthen its standing with Afghans in a growing number of districts. Militants who are trained in Islamic law hold mobile courts in homes, mosques and gardens. Reached by phone, a Taliban spokesman who goes by the name Qari Yousef Ahmadi says Afghans prefer his group's brand of Islamic justice because they don't trust the Karzai government to do anything but fill its pockets.

Kandahar key to Successful Review

Kandahar has been billed as the lynchpin to Afghanistan it’s crucial to Obama’s review

Reuters 10 (11 Jun, http://www.dawn.com/wps/wcm/connect/dawn-content-library/dawn/news/world/35-obamas-timetable-looms-as-kandahar-pace-slows TBC 7/3/10)

Obama has ordered a review of US strategy in December and had been counting on progress in Kandahar, the Taliban's birthplace, to show momentum is shifting and troops can start to pull out in July 2011 as planned. But the top US and Nato commander in Afghanistan, General Stanley McChrystal, said on Thursday that after lessons learned in neighboring Helmand province, he wanted more time to shore up Afghan support for the Kandahar operation and to build up local governance and capacity to get the job done. McChrystal said he expected there would be progress by year-end but warned of “very, very difficult days” ahead and that the pace would be slower in Kandahar than expected. The balance between military priorities and political agenda will become harder to manage as pressure mounts on the US government to stick to its July 2011 pullout deadline. Obama needs to show progress by December to bolster his case for a continued US commitment and ask for more time to consolidate gains, said Lisa Curtis, an expert on Afghanistan at the Heritage Foundation, a conservative thinktank. “But if the situation seems unchanged and there is still a stalemate then it will be much more difficult. The withdrawal date will them loom much more heavily,” added Curtis. Kandahar had been billed as the linchpin to turn around war in Afghanistan but US officials say it has been tough to win local support and show the public the Afghan government is not corrupt and can be trusted to deliver services.

Now is the critical time for Kandahar – must be improved before Obama’s review

DeYoung and Whitlock 10 (Karen and Craig Washington Post Staff Writers March 31, http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/content/article/2010/03/30/AR2010033004090.html TBC 7/3/10)

Senior administration officials in Washington said overall transition to stability and vastly improved governance in Kandahar must be completed by December, when Obama has asked Gen. Stanley A. McChrystal, the top U.S. and NATO commander in Afghanistan, for an overall review of how the new strategy he announced last fall is faring. The strategy calls for U.S. military withdrawals to begin in July 2011. "We really don't have much time," said a senior military official on McChrystal's staff of the Kandahar operation.

Kandahar key to December policy review

Kornblut and Jaffe 10 (Anne E. Greg February 27 U.S. begins to lay groundwork for Kandahar drive; OPERATION IS 'CENTERPIECE' Marja offensive has been prelude, officials say Lexis Nexis TBC 7/6/10)

"Bringing comprehensive population security to Kandahar City is really the centerpiece of operations this year, and, therefore, Marja is the prelude. It's sort of a preparatory action," said one senior official, speaking on the condition of anonymity. U.S. officials telegraphed the Marja offensive for many weeks before it began, and they appear to be laying the same kind of groundwork before moving into Kandahar, Afghanistan's second largest city and the original base of Taliban leader Mohammad Omar. The drives into Marja and Kandahar come as part of the administration's decision to deploy 30,000 additional troops in the country, a final push to secure major population centers almost nine years after the Sept. 11 attacks. Any military operation to drive the Taliban from Kandahar will probably play out very differently than the battle taking place in Marja, which is a tenth the size. About 11,000 U.S. and Afghan troops pushed into Marja and within the first 13 days of the operation raised the Afghan flag over the district's government center. Afghan officials also quickly selected a new district governor to oversee reconstruction efforts. In Kandahar, U.S. forces are unlikely to move into the city in large numbers and instead will probably attempt to drive Taliban fighters from towns and villages surrounding the main city, military officials said. Local politics in Kandahar, where the Taliban movement first secured its foothold in Afghanistan, are also far more tangled than in Marja. The success or failure of U.S. operations in Kandahar will probably dominate the administration's next review of war policy in December. In the interim, President Obama is conducting monthly video conferences with leaders on the ground and receiving lengthy written assessments.

Review Important

The December review is a key test of Afghan strategy

SMITH AND DIMASCIO 10 (BEN JEN Politico.com June 25 Ouster puts spotlight on Afghanistan TBC 7/6/10)

President Barack Obama's decision to replace his insubordinate Afghan commander has refocused the attention of an anxious nation and a divided Congress on the war in Afghanistan and on a series of crucial moments expected over the next two years of a long, messy conflict that, thanks to American politics, is on a very tight schedule. What happens in Afghanistan will be dictated by factors only partly under Obama's control. And elements of his war plan, an offensive in Marja that has been far more difficult than expected and a promise to retake Kandahar, have grown more complicated as Taliban resistance has stiffened and the government of Afghan President Hamid Karzai has been slow to crack down on corruption. But the domestic politics of the Afghan war are on a clearer schedule than the complications of Afghan politics allow, and the clock is ticking more loudly than supporters of the war would like. Here are the dates that are on their minds: June-July 2010: Gen. David Petraeus, Stanley McChrystal's replacement, represents continuity in Afghanistan, his appointment being the most seamless way to continue U.S. policy on the ground. And his confirmation hearings, which could come as soon as next week, appear likely to give Obama a political boost. They will be a rare time of bipartisanship on Capitol Hill, and the expected Petraeus lovefest should give administration policy a bit of breathing room. November 2010: The McChrystal fracas has refocused American attention on the dismal situation on the ground. Administration officials - and not just McChrystal - were revealed to be deeply at odds with one another and with Karzai. These conditions will face their first political judgment in the midterm elections, and the White House will want to tout some measure of progress - cities secured, new Afghan troops or falling U.S. casualties. The Petraeus appointment, however, cools the sense that the war will be a significant factor on Nov. 2. December 2010: When Obama ordered 30,000 more troops to Afghanistan last year after an extensive policy review, his administration promised to revisit the strategy this December - and held out the possibility of pulling the plug if it didn't work.

December review is key to avoiding negative perception of the US deadline

Barnes 10 (Julian E. Debate grows over Afghan drawdown plan June 16 Lexis Nexis TBC 7/6/10)

The deadline makes it appear that the U.S. is more interested in "leaving than succeeding," he said. "I continue to worry a great deal about the message we are sending in the region," McCain said. The administration is planning a major assessment of the war in December, another key deadline. After the 2007 troop buildup in Iraq, the military used its first major assessment to buy time from Congress, showing that violence had begun to abate. With Afghanistan, however, some military officials worry that the December assessment deadline doesn't give them enough time to show that their strategy is working. Military leaders had hoped to have two successes to put before the White House in that review: Kandahar and Marja.

McCain Likes the Counterplan

McCain likes the counterplan

ANI 10 (June 6th http://breakingnews.gaeatimes.com/2010/07/06/kandahar-key-to-success-in-afghan-war-say-top-us-lawmaker-37903/ TBC 7/6/10)

The US led allied forces' success in Afghanistan would largely depend on the foreign troops ability to secure Kandahar, the Taliban's stronghold, top Republican Senator John McCain has said. McCain, who recently visited the largest city in South Afghanistan, warned of a tough fight ahead for the international troops and predicted that casualties would also rise. "The Taliban know that Kandahar is the key to success or failure," Express.co.uk quoted McCain, as saying. "So what happens in this operation will have a great effect on the outcome of this conflict. But I am convinced we can succeed and will succeed, and Kandahar is obviously the key area. And if succeed there, we will succeed in the rest of this struggle," he added.

US Perception of Kandahar is key to Domestic Support

US perception of success in Kandahar is crucial to domestic support for the war

Fitzgerald and Gould 10 (Paul and Elizabeth 27 May 2010 Journalists who have been writing about Afghanistan for almost 30 years http://www.boilingfrogspost.com/2010/05/27/thinking-the-unthinkable-in-the-aftermath-of-kandahar/ TBC 7/3/10)

 The upcoming campaign for the Taliban stronghold of Kandahar will be the crucial test for the United States’ military and the Obama administration’s AfPak strategy. It will clearly be an epic military battle and a test of the intellectual movement for counterinsurgency within the military known as COIN. But, like the battle for Marja in February, will the battle for Kandahar be more about the “perceptions” of American victory than about real success? That battle featured what General Stanley McChrystal described as “government in a box,” a kind of franchisable, political “happy meal” for Afghanistan with a pre-selected government administration, mayor and police force, ready to go the minute the shooting stopped. In the end, General McChrystal’s government in a box turned out to be more like a government in a coffin. Dead on arrival. Authors Thomas H. Johnson and M. Chris Mason likened U.S. policy in Afghanistan to nothing less than British literature’s most famous pipe dream, Alice in Wonderland. “Lewis Carroll’s ironically opium-inspired tale of a rational person caught up inside a mad world with its own bizarre but consistent internal (il)logic has now surpassed Vietnam as the best paradigm to understand the war in Afghanistan.” Johnson and Mason described Marja as nothing more than a massive exercise in public relations, with one intention only; “to shore up dwindling domestic support for the war by creating the illusion of progress,” while the media gulped down the bottle labeled “drink me,” and shrank into insignificance.

Afghanistan k to PC

Winning in Afghanistan is key to Obama’s political capital

KHINDARIA 10 (BRIJ, INTERNATIONAL COLUMNIST IN BREAKING NEWS, INTERNATIONAL, POLITICS, WAR. JUN 25TH http://themoderatevoice.com/77844/obama%E2%80%99s-risky-gamble-in-firing-mcchrystal/ TBC 7/6/10)

Obama and his civilian advisors have a reasonable construct. The President has staked much political capital on using mainly US troops to run Taliban insurgents out of town and pushing the Afghan government and its military and police towards good governance after that. But neither has happened or seems very likely to happen with sufficient clarity before the August 2011 withdrawal schedule for US troops. In local Af-Pak eyes, McChrystal, an expert navigator of US bureaucracy, did not make a careless mistake in giving the Rolling Stone interviews. He and his advisors willfully revealed the shortcomings of Obama’s policies to shake up the civilians taking America deeper into an unwinnable war. If this war were about killing, McChrystal’s removal would be no great hurdle. Any general of an overwhelmingly superior military power knows how to rain death. But Obama turned winning hearts and minds of mostly rural Afghans into the main metric of victory instead of simply crushing the enemies. American leaders may find this combination of war, development and nation building laudable. But it is puzzling to the fanatical Islamists and semi-literate foot soldiers shooting at US and NATO troops. To them, the top commander’s unceremonious dismissal looks like a desperate move to assert control over dissension about a war with nebulous goals. Some 12 months before Obama’s deadline for withdrawing from Afghanistan, that dissension is seeping through the White House’s heavy lid of secrecy. One reason is the Afghan and Pakistani Taliban’s success so far in preventing American troops from sustainably securing territory in the most unruly regions. This has already caused enough stress in the White House to provoke McChrystal’s removal for offences that would get little attention elsewhere. Coming months may be even more stressful.

Apparent victory is key to a withdrawal where Obama retains political capital

Dyer 10 (Gwynne June 27 New Vision Online London-based independent journalist http://www.newvision.co.ug/D/8/20/724023 TBC 7/6/10)

Then the American troops could go home with the appearance of victory, leaving the Afghans to sort themselves out. No matter who is running Afghanistan two or three years later – and it would not necessarily be the Taliban – it is highly unlikely that hordes of Afghans would “follow the Americans home” and blow them up. If Obama and friends understand this, then they will have realised that the best way to end the Afghan war is simply (as they used to say about Vietnam) to “declare a victory and leave.” But they cannot say this out loud in the US, where most of the population believes the mantra that says the “war on terror” must be won in the hills of Afghanistan. It would take more time and political capital than Obama has to persuade the US public that this is arrant nonsense (though it is). So if he really wants to extract American troops from an unwinnable and unnecessary war, then he is condemned to do so by subterfuge. He must engineer an apparent but temporary military success in Afghanistan, do a quick hand-over to Karzai & Co., and get out while the going’s good.

Afghanistan k to Reelection

Success in Afghanistan key to Obama reelection

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: We now have the extraordinary case of two US presidents in a row going to David Petraeus to try to salvage a deteriorating situation. This president is even more dependent upon Petraeus turning this around than Bush was. By the time he turned to Petraeus, Bush was in his second term and had no hopes for re-election. Obama is in his first term and very much hopes he can be re-elected. But to do that, he now needs to succeed in Afghanistan.

Karzai key to Counter Terrorism

Karzai credibility is key to Counter-Terrorism

Goodspeed 10 (Peter, National Post 'None more important'; The success or failure of Obama's troop surge lies in Kandahar City May 29 Lexis Nexis TBC 7/6/10)

"What is putting wind in the Taliban's sail is the utterly corrupt and inept Karzai regime," said Mr. Rothstein, who just visited Afghanistan. "The complete utter, illegitimate, corrupt and dysfunctional nature of the Karzai government has given the Taliban something to rally forces around." The Afghan government's inability to deliver even the most basic services to its citizens may be the weakest link in the Kandahar counterinsurgency. When NATO troops seized control of Marjah in February, they had hoped to offer residents a "government in a box," by rapidly transitioning from combat to development with teams of Afghan officials brought in to administer a wide range of economic development and security programs. It hasn't worked out that way. Combat operations ended in February, but the government in Kabul has failed to dispatch enough administrators or trained police and the Taliban are waging a new campaign of terror and intimidation against anyone who collaborates with NATO.

Consolidation Good

Pressure by consolidation is key to squeeze out the Taliban and win the war

**AP 10** (Anne Gearan, Associated Press, May 29 2010, http://blog.taragana.com/politics/2010/05/29/challenge-for-us-in-crucial-afghan-city-of-kandahar-how-to-keep-battle-from-looking-like-war-40006/)IM

WASHINGTON — In the make-or-break struggle for Kandahar, birthplace of Afghanistan’s Taliban insurgency, U.S. commanders must try to pull off the military equivalent of brain surgery: defeating the militants with minimal use of force. The goal of U.S.-led NATO forces will be to avoid inspiring support for the Taliban even as the coalition tries to root them out when the Kandahar operation begins in earnest next month. The ancient silk road city — a dust-covered, impoverished jumble of one- and two-story concrete and mud brick — may not look like much of a prize. But Kandahar, with a population of more than a million, was once the Taliban’s informal capital and an al-Qaida stronghold. It has served for centuries as a smuggler’s crossroads and trading hub linking southern Afghanistan to the Indian subcontinent. President Barack Obama’s counterinsurgency strategy focuses on protecting population centers such as Kandahar from Taliban predation, with the hope of building support for the center government in Kabul. The Taliban are deeply embedded in the local population, raising the risk of civilian casualties in major clashes. Neither are the Taliban regarded as an alien force. For many in Kandahar, they are neighbors, friends and relatives. Haji Raaz Mohammad, a 48-year-old farmer from Kandahar, said he has never understood why the U.S. is trying to drive out the militants. “I don’t know why they are doing it,” he said. “The Taliban are not outsiders. They are our own people.” Because the task in Kandahar is so delicate, U.S. commanders talk about squeezing rather than driving out the Taliban. The military has struggled to come up with a description of the upcoming fight, avoiding terms like campaign, operation and battle because” because those words and others have annoyed Afghan President Hamid Karzai. So the U.S. is calling it “Hamkari Baraye Kandahar,” which translates as “Cooperation for Kandahar.” Karzai simply calls it a “process.” Whatever it’s called, U.S. military leaders say that unless it succeeds, the rest of the plan for pacifying Afghanistan is hollow. Kandahar is not under direct Taliban control, but there is partial and ever-shifting Taliban influence. The insurgents’ authority overlaps with that of local criminal gangs, warlords, shakedown artists and drug operators. Gen. Stanley McChrystal, the commander of NATO and U.S. forces in Afghanistan, said that a traditional offensive in Kandahar inevitably would cause civilian casualties and damage property, winning propaganda points for the insurgents. A vast consolidation of U.S. troops into Kandahar instead of across the whole country would focus the fight against the Taliban into one crucial area and pressure them out. “This is not Fallujah,” Secretary of State Hillary Rodham Clinton has said. That’s a reference to the city in western Iraq, which in 2004 saw the most intense and controversial urban combat undertaken by the U.S. military since Vietnam. American troops won the battle, but many Iraqis viewed the devastated city as evidence U.S. forces were brutal occupiers. “Lessons have been learned since Iraq, a lot of lessons,” Clinton said. Whatever the U.S. and NATO are planning for Kandahar, the Taliban seem likely to put up stiff resistance. In the past two weeks, insurgents have launched two bold assaults on the largest U.S. and NATO military bases in Afghanistan, including the sprawling, fortified Kandahar airfield. Both attacks were quickly repelled, but demonstrated the militants can strike even foreign military bastions at will. The push to tame Kandahar is expected to begin in earnest shortly after an Afghan peace conference, or jirga, scheduled for the coming week. Karzai has convened the meeting of politicians and powerbrokers as a prelude to eventual negotiations with Taliban leaders. U.S. military commanders say that only when the Taliban realize they can’t win the war will they come to the peace table. U.S. forces and Afghan troops are already patrolling the orchards just outside the city, trying to cut off insurgent supply lines and eliminate hideouts. In the weeks ahead, plans call for ringing Kandahar with a mix of U.S., NATO and Afghan soldiers and police. British Maj. Gen. Nick Carter told reporters at the Pentagon this past week that foreign forces will play the smallest role in the city center. They’ll be far more visible in surrounding districts such as Arghandab, Zhari and Panjwai, where the insurgents who have gained strong footholds.

Consolidation Good

Widely dispersed troops give the perception of defeat – the perception of victory caused by consolidation is key to solve

**Fitzgerald and Gould 10** (Paul and Elizabeth, Authors; Invisible History, June 7 2010, http://www.huffingtonpost.com/elizabeth-gould/thinking-the-unthinkable\_b\_602828.html)IM

The upcoming campaign for the Taliban stronghold of Kandahar will be the crucial test for the United States' military and the Obama administration's AfPak strategy. It will clearly be an epic military battle and a test of the intellectual movement for counterinsurgency within the military known as COIN. But, like the battle for Marja in February, the battle for Kandahar will be more about the "perceptions" of American victory than about real success. The focus of troops in one region reduces the risk of perceived defeat. That battle featured what General Stanley McChrystal described as "government in a box,"a kind of franchisable, political "happy meal" for Afghanistan with a pre-selected government administration, mayor and police force, ready to go the minute the shooting stopped. In the end, General McChrystal's government in a box turned out to be more like a government in a coffin. Dead on arrival. Authors Thomas H. Johnson and M. Chris Mason likened U.S. policy in Afghanistan to nothing less than British literature's most famous pipe dream, Alice in Wonderland. "Lewis Carroll's ironically opium-inspired tale of a rational person caught up inside a mad world with its own bizarre but consistent internal (il)logic has now surpassed Vietnam as the best paradigm to understand the war in Afghanistan." Johnson and Mason described Marja as nothing more than a massive exercise in public relations, with one intention only; "to shore up dwindling domestic support for the war by creating the illusion of progress," while the media gulped down the bottle labeled "drink me," and shrank into insignificance. But what can the world expect of American policy in the aftermath of what promises to be an even larger opium-inspired tea party in Kandahar? And the U.S. would fail if they achieve a military victory, but fail to address the gaping political vacuum necessary to keep the Taliban from returning.

Consolidation Good

Brute military force in Kandahar will fail – consolidation is key to prevent Taliban take-over

**Barrett 10** (Richard, Coordinator, United Nations Analytical Support and Sanctions Implementation Monitoring Team, June 25 2010, http://www.globalexpertfinder.org/comment-analysis/why-the-afghan-end-game-is-so-hard-to-play)IM

Barack Obama, the US president, has said that American troops will start to withdraw from Afghanistan in a year from now; eventually Nato forces will leave and at some point dialogue with the Taliban will begin. So Nato is now planning the end-game, aiming to weaken the Taliban before negotiations start by first driving them from Kandahar. But it is far from clear how the end-game will unfold. With concern rising about the low level of Afghan civilian support, the Kandahar operation may not even start before autumn, despite increasing impatience in Nato capitals. Coalition forces went into Afghanistan in 2001 to attack al-Qaeda, destroy its safe-haven and prevent further terrorist attacks. This is still the stated objective of the Afghan campaign even though al-Qaeda is no longer in Afghanistan; its capacity to organise another 9/11 is, to all intents and purposes, non-existent; and its Taliban sponsors have repeatedly said that when they return to power they will neither interfere themselves in the affairs of any other state, nor allow anyone else to do so from Afghan territory. But after nine years of fighting, what will “victory” look like? To quote a senior Russian official, winning in Afghanistan is not like planting a flag on top of the Reichstag. Success will be more a matter of perception than of fact. Afghan security officials calculate that the Taliban has about 170 key leaders and a further 2,200 regional commanders. The rest of its 30,000-40,000 fighters are foot soldiers who may as readily work in the fields as pick up a gun. Against these numbers, coalition forces stand at around 160,000, coincidentally the number of troops that the Soviet Union deployed in its ill-fated campaign to control Afghanistan in the 1980s, and the Afghan army has grown to about 125,000. But despite the disparity in equipment, training and numbers, it is debatable who is winning. General Stanley McChrystal, the commander of Nato forces in Afghanistan, is widely seen as the smartest soldier around; but even he has run into difficulties. The Taliban will not be defeated militarily, its supply of new fighters is seemingly inexhaustible and it is not deterred by losses; but while Gen McChrystal knows it will take effective, long-term political action to undermine support for the Taliban, the resources at his disposal are military and his time frame is limited both by the US desire to withdraw from combat and by the ebbing confidence of Hamid Karzai, Afghan president, in Nato’s ability to win the war. Gen McChrystal wants to land a decisive blow against the Taliban before Nato forces pull back, and he has identified Kandahar as a crucial objective because of its symbolic and strategic importance to the Taliban. However Mr Karzai has insisted that before any action, local elders must give their support. He wants the balance of action to shift from the military to the political, and from his allies to the Afghans themselves. The US and allies also want to see this shift in emphasis so they can claim success and begin to leave, but the Afghan government is far from ready to take the lead. After 30 years of war, Afghanistan has a dearth of good administrators, and not just in the security sector. Afghan officials themselves admit that the Taliban does a better job than the government in providing security, justice and a corruption-free bureaucracy in areas under its control. Driving the Taliban from Kandahar and keeping its fighters out will be hard enough, given that they are indistinguishable from the rest of the population, but without effective Afghan participation and follow-up, any success will be short-lived. To gain the support and action of Afghans in Kandahar the U.S. must make moves toward consolidating forces in Kandahar. Action by the Obama Administration on this front would send a signal of withdrawal while ensuring stability in the volatile and crucial southern provinces. If the Kandahar operation is seen to have failed, it will strengthen the hand of the Taliban immensely in any negotiation over power-sharing.

Consolidation Good

Consolidation of troops in Kandahar would cause effective governance and prevent the Taliban from gaining power

**Bowman 10** (Tom Bowman, NPR, National Public Radio, June 24 2010, http://www.npr.org/templates/story/story.php?storyId=128058825&ft=1&f=1001)IM

The Taliban insurgency is just one of the major problems in Kandahar, the southern Afghan province where U.S. troops are mounting a new mission this summer and fall. Fueling the insurgency is the fact that Afghans lack everything from clean water and electricity to schools and health clinics. A crucial part of the upcoming U.S. military operation in Kandahar is how Afghans and their American partners hope to get government working again for the people. One of the main challenges facing Kandahar's governor, Tooryalai Wesa, is a shortage of staff for local governments. Some districts in the province have only one or two officials. Here, Wesa talks with local officials at the end of a conference in Kandahar, on Monday. One of the main challenges facing Kandahar's governor, Tooryalai Wesa, is a shortage of staff for local governments. Some districts in the province have only one or two officials. Here, Wesa talks with local officials at the end of a conference in Kandahar, on Monday. As thousands of American troops fan out across Kandahar this summer, Afghan officials are hoping for just a few hundred bureaucrats to run the government here. Earlier this week, more than 100 American officials, Afghan government officials and tribal leaders gathered to talk about the upcoming military operation at a conference held in Kandahar. The discussion shifted from troops to government workers. Currently, some government offices in the province barely have a skeleton staff. Some districts have only a governor and a police chief, said Kandahar Gov. Tooryalai Wesa. Wesa's modest plan for the next couple of months is to make sure each district has at least an attorney, a prosecutor and a judge, and a financial officer. Jelani Popol, a Cabinet minister in Kabul, is in charge of working with local governments. The problem is that there aren't many local officials to work with. "The major obstacle for recruiting the bureaucrats is the security, because they are not sure about the security," Popol says. Movement of U.S. forces to Kandahar, would go a long way towards removing this barrier to effective governance. There is good reason not to be sure. Just last week, a car bomb killed a district leader in downtown Kandahar. Even low-level government workers such as police are being targeted for assassination by militants. Popol is trying to sweeten job offers with hardship pay — extra money to work in dangerous areas. "We will provide additional incentives and allowances for the people to attract more qualified people to this job," he says. Kandahar isn't the only dangerous area in Afghanistan where it's hard to recruit government workers. Just to the west in Helmand province, U.S. Marines are still clearing Taliban areas after a major offensive in February. And Popol is still short nearly half the bureaucrats he needs. "Things are improving, but still we have to deal with some issues, like restoring the full confidence of the people that the government is staying — not leaving them again to the Taliban, this kind of thing," Popol says. The lack of government workers is a significant reason the insurgency is so strong, notes Ambassador Mark Sedwill, the top NATO civilian representative in Afghanistan. "Can their kids get to school? Is the school open? Can their wife go in the streets without fear? Is a policeman a reassuring presence or not? If they have a dispute with a neighbor, can they get that dispute resolved without paying a bribe? All those issues are the ones that in the end will determine success," he says. That success can come only from a responsive government, Sedwill says. Local governance is one of the key measures of whether the war is going well. "That of course will show people that in the end, this isn't endless, that there is a strategy that enables us to hand responsibility to the Afghans, which is what they want, too," he says.

Consolidation Good

The time for pure military efforts is passed – unification of civilian and military goals is key

**RFE 10** (Radio Free Europe, July 7 2010, http://www.rferl.org/content/Petraeus\_Calls\_For\_Unity\_In\_Afghanistan\_/2089724.html)IM

The new U.S. and NATO commander in Afghanistan called today for unity between the civilian and military efforts in the Afghan war. General David Petraeus told a crowd of about 1,700 Afghan, American, and international guests at the U.S. Embassy in Kabul that cooperation between the military and civilian sides "is not optional." "This is a tough mission; there is nothing easy about it," he said. "But working together, we can achieve progress and we can achieve our mutual objectives." Focusing military efforts in a few key regions, such as Kandahar and Kunduz, would easily integrate civilian efforts with military goals. and Petraeus spoke as he made his first public appearance since arriving in the Afghan capital on July 2. He landed a day after his appointment was confirmed by the U.S. Senate and just hours after the U.S. House of Representatives approved $33 billion in funding for a troop surge he hopes will turn the tide of the war. An amendment demanding an exit timetable from Afghanistan failed, but got 162 votes -- the biggest antiwar vote in the House on Afghanistan to date. He is taking over from the dismissed U.S. General Stanley McChrystal, who publicly disparaged the level of cooperation between U.S. civilian and military leaders in Afghanistan in interviews printed in an American magazine. A formal change-of-command ceremony will be held on July 4. The Taliban showed on July 2 just how capable they are of operating outside their traditional strongholds by launching a daring commando-style raid on the office of an American company that provides logistical support for U.S. government aid in relatively peaceful Kunduz, in the north. A Briton, German, Filipino, and two Afghans were killed in the pre-dawn attack, provincial officials said, as well as the six insurgents who mounted the raid. Also on July 2, the NATO-led International Security Assistance Force (ISAF) that Petraeus now commands said two service members had died after separate insurgent attacks in the south and east.

Engagement in Afghanistan shouldn’t include broad troop commitment – consolidation is key

**ABC News 10** (Byron Wolf, July 2 2010, http://www.abcnews.com/thenote/2010/07/gops-steele-doubts-afghan-troop-surge-calls-conflict-a-war-of-obamas-choosing.html)IM

RNC Chairman Michael Steele, in comments that will put him at odds with the rest of his party and historical fact, calls American military involvement in Afghanistan “a war of Obama’s choosing” and questions direct U.S. military involvement there. Steele later says of the President: “Well if he’s such a student of history, has he not understood that that’s the one thing you don’t do is engage in a land war in Afghanistan. Alright? Because everyone who has tried over a thousand years of history, has failed. And there are reasons for that. There are other ways to engage in Afghanistan without committing more troops across the entire country – the new strategy should focus on crucial regions in the country.” Steele says the US should be playing an advisory, "background" role in Afghanistan. “It was one of those areas in the total board of foreign policy in the Middle East, that we would be in the background, sort of shaping the changes that were necessary in Afghanistan, as opposed to directly engaging troops.” Steele's comments can be viewed in amateur video, apparently shot at a fund raiser in Connecticut and posted on YouTube, Steele says that the American military is currently involved in Afghanistan because President Obama was “trying to be cute by half” during the 2008 election.

Consolidation Good

A broad troop surge to Afghanistan is dangerously unpopular in Congress

**The Hill 9** (Mike Soraghan and Jared Allen, Nov 28 2009, http://thehill.com/homenews/house/690631-afghanistan-action-could-test-alliance-between-obama-pelosi)IM

If President Barack Obama announces next week he is sending more than 30,000 more troops to Afghanistan, as he's expected to do, most members of Congress will have plenty to say about it. Most of it will be(is) critical. But they won't be able to do much about it. Obama's change in military strategy doesn't require a vote of Congress. And many of the critics will have little appetite to use the one powerful tool that lawmakers have: cutting off funding. Still, the conflicting views could test the strong alliance between Obama and House Speaker Nancy Pelosi (D-Calif.). Obama will travel to the U.S. Military Academy at West Point for the announcement Tuesday. But his prime-time address will come just as lawmakers return from a week-long recess, so lawmakers will be able to quickly weigh in with support or criticism. Republicans are likely to fault Obama for arriving at a number 6,000 troops short of the 40,000 sought by the top U.S. commander in Afghanistan, Gen. Stanley McChrystal. Liberal Democrats, many of whom supported Obama precisely because he was an early opponent of the Iraq war, will likely lambaste him for escalating another far-flung conflict. Liberals say Obama should lean more on diplomacy and economic development since trying to control Afghanistan with force has proven futile throughout history. "Additional troops would be totally unacceptable," said Rep. Barbara Lee (D-Calif.). "It's fueling the fires of terrorism." Lee is chairwoman of the Congressional Black Caucus. But she was also a co-founder of the Out-of-Iraq Caucus, the only member to vote against invading Afghanistan in 2001, and an early supporter of Obama. Before he departs for West Point, Obama is expected to meet with top Democratic and Republican leaders in Congress. But those leaders probably couldn't call off criticism by their rank-and-file if they wanted to. Leaders wouldn't have much time to sell the plan to their rank-and-file before the speech ends. Rep. Jim McGovern (D-Mass.) has introduced a bill demanding an exit strategy. A similar measure proposed as an amendment in June got 138 votes, but hasn't gotten out of committee. Lee has a bill calling for a troop freeze in Afghanistan, but only 23 other lawmakers have signed on since she introduced it Oct. 1, putting little pressure on Pelosi to bring it to the floor. "I hope to continue building momentum for that," Lee said. "We have to talk with leadership." In addition, House Appropriations Chairman David Obey (D-Wis.), House Defense Appropriatons Chairman John Murtha (D-Pa.) and Caucus Chairman John Larson (D-Conn.) have pushed for a "war tax" on the wealthy to help pay the immense cost of the war. Liberals requested a meeting on Afghanistan in a Nov. 17 letter, but that has not happened yet. Rep. Raul Grijalva (D-Ariz.), co-chair of the Congressional Progressive Caucus, said a resolution of disapproval would be the "next logical step." The House passed such a resolution in 2007 objecting to President Bush's "surge" plan for Afghanistan, with 17 Republicans supporting it. "The drill is the same," Grijalva said. "But there's a Catch-22 -- it's a different administration, a Democratic administration." Pelosi has made it clear that a buildup of troops would not be well-received – she said in September “I don't think there's much support for sending more troops to Afghanistan in the country or in Congress. "If he goes with a lower number than McChrystal," said a Republican aide, "he leaves open the possibility that Republicans would vote with progressives on such a resolution." Republicans have played their cards closer to the vest than liberal war opponents in recent weeks when it comes to Afghanistan. Obama's expected position is more in line with their thinking than it is with most of his fellow Democrats. That's why Republicans would likely not go so far as to cut off funding for the troops Obama does plan to send. When Democrats tried to cut spending on Iraq to force a timeline for withdrawal, Republicans leveled charges that their opponents were not "supporting the troops" to considerable political effect. "It’s pretty tough for our guys to oppose troops in the field," the Republican aide said. But Democrats could try to add a timetable or exit strategy to a war funding bill, presenting a more complex scenario. The Obama administration would probably fight it, trying to preserve the president's authority. And it could forge the same alliance between Republicans against limiting the fight and liberals trying to stop the escalation. The U.S. has 68,000 troops in Afghanistan. Obama is reportedly considering several options that involve different troops levels. McChrystal, the commander of U.S. and NATO troops in Afghanistan, has reportedly requested that an additional 40,000 troops be sent, but Obama is choosing between options that range from 10,000 troops to 80,000 troops. Obama's decision will be one of the most momentous in his first year in office. After arguing during the presidential campaign about the importance of winning the fight in Afghanistan, Obama has clearly been torn over whether to send more troops to the country that hosted al-Qaeda in the years before the terrorist attacks of Sept. 11, 2001.

A2: Troops Don’t Solve

Zhari needs troops – infantry war

SCHIFRIN McGARRY and GUDGELL 10 (NICK, MATT, AND MIKE July 2, ABC http://abcnews.go.com/International/american-troops-afghanistan-brace-tough-fight/story?id=11073850 TBC 7/5/10)

 Today, in Zhari and neighboring Panjway districts, the Taliban maintain massive influence over the area and the people, handing out justice, setting up daytime checkpoients and generally filling a vacuum created by the void of local government, according to local residents. Insurgents also use the area as a supply line and staging ground for attacks in Kandahar City, American military officers say. Which is why, over the next few months, the two districts will become target number one for thousands of American troops pouring into this region trying to secure Kandahar, the Taliban's physical and spiritual heartland. "Please don't use my name," says one local residents just a mile from this base when one of the soldiers is asking him questions. "The Taliban will slit my throat." But making Zhari and Panjway districts secure for the local residents -- and maintaining that security -- will not be easy. Unlike in Kandahar City, where the United States will try to reduce violence primarily with police action, Zhari and Panjway will look more like a traditional infantry fight. The battles will be made more difficult by a weak and still relatively small Afghan Army presence, and because of the historic shortage of American troops: soldiers here simply do not have the knowledge of the local community it needs to wage a counterinsurgency fight -- and the community does not have faith in the Army.

A2: Non-Unique

Not enough troops now – assumes new surge

SCHIFRIN McGARRY and GUDGELL 10 (NICK, MATT, AND MIKE July 2, ABC http://abcnews.go.com/International/american-troops-afghanistan-brace-tough-fight/story?id=11073850 TBC 7/5/10)

American commanders acknowledge there will be bloody fighting here through the fall and into the early winter. McComie's battalion commander, Lt. Col. Jeffry French, predicted in May that the troops who are now arriving in Zhari would "walk into a buzzsaw" without a major operation led by Alpha Company -- and that operation was cancelled at the last minute.

A2: Stuck in Afghanistan

2011 drawdown is inevitable

Reid 9 (Chip Dec. 2 CBS News' chief White House correspondent http://www.cbsnews.com/8301-503544\_162-5868282-503544.html TBC 7/4/10)

During the Senate Armed Services hearing today, Defense Secretary Robert Gates was pressed by Sen. Lindsey Graham, R-S.C. on whether the July 2011 date for beginning to withdrawal troops is "locked in." Gates seemed to suggest there was some flexibility, that "it was a clear statement of his strong intent" and that "the president always has the freedom to re-evaluate his decisions." After the hearing Graham said he took that to mean the date is "not locked in" and will depend on conditions on the ground. It was a point of contention at the White House briefing today – I asked White House spokesman Robert Gibbs if senators were incorrect calling the date a "target." After the briefing, Gibbs went to the president for clarification. Gibbs then called me to his office to relate what the president said. The president told him it IS locked in – there is no flexibility. Troops WILL start coming home in July 2011. Period. It's etched in stone. Gibbs said he even had the chisel.

Azerbaijan Stuff

Azerbaijan basing angers russia

Chicky 10 (Jon June 19 US Military Expert AZ interview http://www.news.az/articles/17714 TBC 7/6/10)

Beyond the hypothetical scenario I described above, (logistical support to ISAF) it is difficult to see the possibility of a NATO facility in Azerbaijan or any other CIS country. First and foremost, the European allies are slashing defense budgets because of the Eurozone debt crisis and therefore are not interested in increasing defense commitments but rather in decreasing them. Second is the Russia factor. Russia does not want NATO installations in it what it describes as its zone of "privileged interests." While the U.S. and NATO shouldn't accept an implicit Russian veto on a military presence on the soil of any Eurasian state that consents to such a presence, the matter of Russian assumed opposition to U.S. or NATO military facilities in Eurasia will require careful political and diplomatic consideration.

The US doesn’t base in Azerbaijan because of overstretch in Afghanistan

Chicky 10 (Jon June 19 US Military Expert AZ interview http://www.news.az/articles/17714 TBC 7/6/10)

The ultimate decision to have a foreign military base or presence on Azerbaijani soil is to be decided by the government of Azerbaijan who in turn represents the Azerbaijani people. The concept of a nation providing its consent in having foreign troops on its soil is a vital aspect of a nation's sovereignty and has been a guiding principle of the European security sphere (to which Azerbaijan belongs) for the past 20 years. As to whether the United States would ever have a military presence in Azerbaijan that would depend on many variables. I do not see, at this time, the possibility of a major U.S. military presence in Azerbaijan. The U.S. is heavily committed in the Middle East and Afghanistan and coupled with the ongoing financial and economic troubles the U.S. military is seeking ways to decrease its overseas commitments rather than increase them. That being said, there could be a possibility of some sort of a small, temporary presence in order to support the logistical sustainment of American and NATO forces in Afghanistan. The current situation in Kyrgyzstan and the brazen attacks on NATO convoys in Pakistan illustrate quite clearly the complexity and risks entailed in sustaining NATO counter insurgency operations in Afghanistan. Azerbaijan's geographic location offers the potential to position U.S./NATO logistical efforts in the country to support NATO's International Security Assistance Force (ISAF) in Afghanistan if Azerbaijan, the U.S. and/or NATO would agree to such a hypothetical arrangement. That being said, one could envisage a small number of logistics personnel rather combat troops being involved at this facility.

We’d leave through Azerbaijan – we transport tons of materials through there now

GEARAN 10 (ANNE, AP MONDAY, JUNE 7 http://breakingnews.gaeatimes.com/2010/06/07/obama-stresses-importance-of-azerbaijan-to-afghan-war-effort-moves-to-improve-relations-32548/ TBC 7/6/10)

Tens of thousands of war-related flights have crossed over Azerbaijan since the Afghan war began in 2001, and last year alone about 100,000 U.S. and allied personnel passed through the country. Azerbaijan also is part of an overland supply chain that is a critical alternative to the primary land route through Pakistan. About one-quarter of all war goods come through the oil-rich Caspian Sea nation.

\_\_\_\*\*Afghanistan/Iraq – Aff Answers

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.

\_\_\_\*\*SoKo

SoKo – 1NC S

Relocation is the most effective option for South Korea – the MND can get it done

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>.

Continued protests and physical occupation of the firing range by residents and activists prolonged the suspension of USFK training exercises. South Korean officials found themselves in a diplomatic bind. According to South Korean defense officials, residents did not understand the complex issues that required keeping Kooni Range operable.14 The South Korean Ministry of National Defense (MND) proposed two options to resolve growing tensions, which essentially boiled down to relocating either the training site or the residents. The MND initially preferred relocating residents, but due to budget constraints and opposition from residents, the MND abandoned this idea. After several weeks of negotiation between U.S. and South Korean officials, in August 2000, the MND announced several partial measures including relocating the range 1.5 km off the coast toward a tidal flat near Nong Island and discontinuing the use of live ammunition. Citing limitations to USFK training requirements, in 2004, USFK closed Kooni Firing Range, and in 2005 relocated training operations to Chik-do Island.15

Relocation is a key part of base alignment and consolidation

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>.

Anti-base protests resumed in 2004, coming on the heels of the 2002-03 candlelight vigils for two junior high school girls run over and killed by a U.S. armored vehicle, and demonstrations against the dispatch of South Korean troops to Iraq. Amidst USFK transformation and base realignment and consolidation in South Korea, local residents and activists once again joined forces to oppose the expansion of Camp Humphreys in Pyeongtaek. Figure 1 below indicates which bases were slated for closure and consolidation, emphasizing the closure of bases in and around Seoul and the opening of new bases in the far south. The expansion included relocating USFK headquarters from Yongsan Garrison in Seoul to Pyeongtaek, as well as the consolidation of the 2nd Infantry Division to the Osan-Pyeongtaek area.16 USFK relocation plans called for tripling the size of Camp Humphreys.17 Local residents in Daechuri and Dodori, the two villages most affected by base expansion, were particularly alarmed. Not only was their livelihood as rice farmers threatened, but for the elderly, USFK base expansion meant being uprooted from their homes for a second or third time as a result of foreign base expansion (following the Japanese colonial era and the Korean War). Additionally, activists cited the lack of transparency and democratic process during negotiations between Seoul and Washington.

SoKo – 2NC S

Japan provides empirical precedent – the CP fits perfectly into theatre policy-making

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>.

The U.S. plans to eventually relocate 8,000 Marines to Guam, as outlined in the 2009 “Guam International Agreement,” However, this is contingent on the DPJ following through on the U.S.-Japan plan to relocate Futenma air base to a newly built facility at Henoko.33 As argued above, recent tensions on the Korean Peninsula have bolstered U.S. and host government claims to maintain forces in the Asia-Pacific. U.S. bases are not independent units, but part of a network woven together by alliance ties in an effort to maintain U.S. regional hegemony. Recognizing that this strategic web affects base relocation from one locality to another (i.e. Okinawa to Guam), anti-base activists in Asia have moved to support local anti-base initiatives throughout the region.34 While it may be far-fetched to envisage elimination of all U.S. bases in the region anytime soon, anti-base resistance against Futenma is very much alive. Even though the DPJ aims to move forward with the Henoko plan, the past fifteen years of anti-base resistance in Okinawa suggests that the fate of Futenma’s relocation still remains open-ended. Henoko residents, with the support of Okinawan and Japanese activists, continue to resist. Okinawans continue to voice their opposition to base relocation in Okinawa. Strong protests on Tokunoshima Island in Kagoshima Prefecture amidst earlier rumors that Futenma would locate to this island also attest to the widespread opposition to U.S. bases by local actors in many communities. The lessons of South Korean anti-base movements speak directly to ongoing movements in Okinawa and Guam. Base relocation to Guam entails additional live-fire training sites as in Maehyangri. The possibility of a missile defense system for Guam resonates with the potential inclusion of Aegis destroyers on Jeju Island’s future naval base. The expansion of Camp Schwab in Henoko, while extending into the sea rather than taking additional land, parallels the expansion of Camp Humphreys in South Korea.35 The links between military base issues in the Asia-Pacific, and the corresponding cross-national ties formed between anti-base actors are poignantly summarized in a September 2009 letter to President Obama following the Second East Asia International Symposium on Environmental Problems Caused by U.S. Military Bases. The executive committee of the symposium writes: U.S. troops stationed near our dwellings are operating combat training in the name of the security of the Pacific-Asia region… Recently U.S. troops are expanding their bases and building new facilities under the cloak of "relocation." If the new base constructions in Pyeongtaek, Henoko, Takae, and Iwakuni [and Guam] are completed, they will again take away our land, which provides our livelihood, and destroy our environment. As overseas US military bases are promoting new construction projects, we are about to lose our dwellings and even our seas.36 The anti-base center of gravity in the Asia-Pacific shifts as current events unfold. In the early 1990s, the Philippines commanded much attention. In the mid-1990s, Okinawa rose to the fore. In the post-9/11 period, U.S. global force realignment brought significant attention to South Korea, Japan, Okinawa, and Guam. As the U.S. continues to reshuffle its military presence within and outside the Asia-Pacific region, scholars, activists, and policymakers will need to turn to comparative analyses to understand the full scale and scope of overseas base issues and anti-base movements.

SoKo – 2NC S

When troops were removed in the past, they were sent farther south as part of a larger military strategy

Grace 3 (Francie, CBS Newswriter, http://www.cbsnews.com/stories/2003/06/09/world/main557628.shtml¸date accessed: 7/3/2010) AJK

The United States and South Korea agreed Thursday to withdraw U.S. troops from the tense Demilitarized Zone separating South Korea from communist North Korea. The troops will be moved farther south, a joint statement said after two days of talks. The redeployment will remove U.S. military bases from the Korean front line for the first time since the end of the 1950-53 Korean War. The statement gave no timetable for the withdrawal. Even after the redeployment, U.S. troops will continue to train north of Seoul and close to the DMZ, it said. In April, Defense Secretary Donald H. Rumsfeld said U.S. troops stationed near the Korean DMZ could be shifted south, moved to other countries in the region or even brought home under a global realignment of U.S. troops. Pentagon officials have characterized the proposed moves as part of a wide-ranging review of American military posture that aims to match deployments with current, rather than past, threats. Postings in Europe that have been maintained since World War II are also being evaluated.

When troops were removed in the past, they were sent farther south as part of a larger military strategy

BBC News 4 (http://news.bbc.co.uk/2/hi/asia-pacific/3970979.stm, date accessed: 7/3/2010) AJK

The plan is that 5,000 US troops will leave South Korea this year, 3,000 next year, 2,000 in 2006, and 2,500 in 2007 and 2008. That will leave a total of about 24,500 troops in the country. The US and South Korea also agreed earlier this year to relocate all of the US troops based in the South Korean capital, Seoul, to a new base further south. The US has said it will move the 8,000 troops to Pyongtaek, 80km (50 miles) to the south, by December 2008, freeing up money from its prime real estate location.

Troops are relocated to the south of South Korea

Nam 6 (Chang- hee, “Relocating the U.S. Forces in South Korea: Strained Alliance, Emerging Partnership in the Changing Defense Posture, p 615-631, Asian Survey, UC Press, date accessed: 7/5/2010) AJK

In July 2004, South Korea (ROK) and the United States laid down a blueprint for realigning the United States Forces Korea (USFK) through a consultative body called the “Future of the ROK-US Alliance Policy Initiative” (FOTA). The two sides announced that they agreed to merge the Second Infantry Division (2nd ID) bases around Camps Casey and Red Cloud and then relocate them south of the Han River within a few years. The Han River runs along the northern part of Seoul, where the center of strategic gravity is located for South Korea’s security. Washington further notified Seoul that about 12,500 soldiers of the U.S. ground forces will leave Korea permanently by the end of 2008.

SoKo – Guam 1NC NB\*\*

Troops would go from South Korea to Guam

Kan and Niksch 2010 (Shirley and Larry, Specialist in Asian Security Affairs and Specialist in Asian Affairs, Congressional Research Service, http://www.fas.org/sgp/crs/row/RS22570.pdf, date accessed: 7/3/2010) AJK

Since 2000, the U.S. military has been building up forward-deployed forces on the U.S. territory of Guam to increase deterrence and power projection for possible responses to crises and disasters, counter-terrorism, and contingencies in support of South Korea, Japan, the Philippines, Taiwan, or elsewhere in Asia. The defense buildup on Guam has been moderate. Nonetheless, China has concerns about the defense buildup, suspecting it to be directed against China. Guam’s role has increased with plans to withdraw some U.S. forces from Japan and South Korea. In 2006, the United States and Japan agreed on a “Roadmap” to strengthen their alliance, including a buildup on Guam to cost $10.3 billion, with Japan contributing 60%. The goals are to start the related construction on Guam by 2010 and to complete relocation of 8,000 marines and their 9,000 dependents from Okinawa to Guam by 2014. On February 17, 2009, Secretary of State Hillary Clinton visited Tokyo and signed the bilateral “Agreement Between the Government of the United States of America and the Government of Japan Concerning the Implementation of the Relocation of the III Marine Expeditionary Force Personnel and Their Dependents From Okinawa to Guam” that reaffirmed the “Roadmap” of May 1, 2006. The two governments agreed that of the estimated $10.27 billion cost of the facilities and infrastructure development for the relocation, Japan will provide $6.09 billion, including up to $2.8 billion in direct cash contributions (in FY2008 dollars). The United States committed to fund $3.18 billion plus about $1 billion for a road. However, on September 16, 2009, Yukio Hatoyama of the Democratic Party of Japan became Prime Minister. This political change raised a question about whether Japan would seek to renegotiate the agreement, even while the United States seeks its implementation. This dispute has implications for the relocation of marines from Okinawa to Guam.

We’ve empirically moved troops from South Korea to Guam

Glantz 6 (Aaron, staff writer for Inter Press Service, http://ipsnorthamerica.net/news.php?idnews=563, date accessed: 7/6/2010) AJK

Bevacqua noted that the Pentagon's decision to redeploy to Guam comes after large-scale protests against the United States military presence in South Korea and the Japanese island of Okinawa. In both countries, the U.S. military operates under rules negotiated between governments called a "Status of Forces Agreement", or SOFA. But because Guam is a U.S. territory, no SOFA is required. Indeed, the Japanese government is so keen to have the Marines leave Okinawa -- where a number of U.S. servicemen have made headlines by raping local women -- that Tokyo is underwriting most of the estimated 10-billion-dollar cost of the redeployment. "Japan and South Korea make noises, the people there antagonise the U.S. military, so the U.S. responds," Bevacqua told IPS. "They say you don't want us there, we'll go to a place where people have no say over what we do, and that place is Guam."

SoKo – US-ROK NB

Withdrawing troops from South Korea seems like abandonment

Brooke (James, NYT staff write, http://theseoultimes.com/ST/?url=/ST/db/read.php?idx=611&PHPSESSID=afe70fcbe49b445b8029b60df0311643, date accessed: 7/5/2010) AJK

A senior Pentagon official in Seoul described the plan, which would remove 12,500 American troops from South Korea, as a "concept proposal" that could still be revised, although South Korean officials indicated they had little doubt the withdrawal would move ahead. The reduction of the American force, in place for decades to deter attack from North Korea, would be the first since 1992, when about 7,000 troops were withdrawn. The move would include the previously announced transfer of a brigade of about 3,600 soldiers to Iraq this summer, Pentagon and South Korean officials said. Those troops, from the Second Infantry Division, are not scheduled to return to South Korea after their tour in Iraq. The proposed cutback is sparking debate in South Korea about whether Washington is turning its back on a long and close alliance with the country, especially as new disclosures about North Korea's program to build nuclear weapons have increased concerns about the intentions of that closed society. This week, American and South Korean security officials are conducting regularly planned talks on the future of the alliance.

Leaving South Korea spreads panic over abandonment and future conflict

Nam 6 (Chang- hee, “Relocating the U.S. Forces in South Korea: Strained Alliance, Emerging Partnership in the Changing Defense Posture, p 615-631, Asian Survey, UC Press, date accessed: 7/5/2010) AJK

Conservative and pro-alliance political forces in Seoul have expressed concerns that the North Korean military may misinterpret the veracity of the U.S. security commitment to South Korea in light of this unprecedented, planned reduction and relocation of the U.S. forces on the peninsula. The Roh government has had to explain to a worried public that the massive repositioning had nothing to do with growing friction between the two allies over their perceptions about the nature of the North Korean regime. In accordance with a directive from the South Korean National Security Council, during his discussions with Washington Korean negotiators tried to get the second phase of relocation postponed. The chief negotiator, Lt. Gen. Young-koo Cha, reportedly tried to extend the relocation schedule by having the second phase postponed until the end of the North Korean nuclear crisis. This caused fears of “abandonment” to spread among some Koreans who correlated the pullout of U.S. forces in 1949 with the onset of the Korean War in 1950. The Pentagon’s announcement that it intended to withdraw one military brigade from Korea further exacerbated such worries. Yet, the proposed early redeployment of 12,500 U.S. troops from Korea was delayed after the South Korean government decided to send about 3,500 soldiers to join the coalition efforts in Iraq. Similarly, the U.S. FOTA representative seemed to have considered South Korea’s demands more favorably in negotiating the cost sharing arrangement and relocation schedule- after South Korea decided to join the Iraq mission. The joint statement emanating from the tenth FOTA, in fact, included an acknowledgement from the U.S. stating, “The U.S. welcomed the ROK government’s steadfast commitment to deploy ROK armed forces to assist peace and reconstruction efforts on behalf of the Iraqi people.

SoKo – Iraq 1NC

**Troops have empirically gone to Iraq when withdrawn from South Korea**

**Kan and Niksch 2010** (Shirley and Larry, Specialist in Asian Security Affairs and Specialist in Asian Affairs, Congressional Research Service, http://www.fas.org/sgp/crs/row/RS22570.pdf, date accessed: 7/3/2010) AJK

In May 2006, the United States and Japan signed a detailed “roadmap” agreement to broaden military cooperation, mostly dealing with changes and additions to U.S. forces in Japan. It provides for the relocation of the headquarters of the III Marine Expeditionary Force and 8,000 U.S. marines from Okinawa to Guam by 2014. Approximately 7,000 marines will remain on Okinawa. The cost of the relocation is estimated at $10.27 billion. Of this amount, Japan pledged to contribute $6.09 billion, including direct financing of facilities and infrastructure on Guam.7 Visiting South Korea in June 2008, **Defense Secretary Robert Gates announced that U.S. troops there would remain at about 28,000**, instead of carrying out the plan of 2004 to restructure U.S. forces by reducing troop strength from 37,000 to 25,000 by September 2008. U.S. officials indicated that **further withdrawals of Army forces would be possible, primarily to support the requirements of the Army and Marine Corps in the active theaters of Iraq and Afghanistan**.

**Specifically, troops would fill combat missions**

**Brookes 4** (Peter, Senior Fellow at the Heritage Foundation, http://www.heritage.org/Research/Commentary/2004/06/Defending-South-Korea, date accessed: 7/6/2010) AJK

First, the number of troops does not completely determine military capability. In fact, **despite the decrease in American soldiers in Korea, U.S. firepower will actually increase** due to expected changes in force structure over the next several years. Although technology cannot replace soldiers in some missions, **today's hi-tech equipment can provide significant firepower advantages** over the common foot soldier. Therefore, **the U.S. can withdraw some of its Korean-based troops for other soldier-intensive missions, such as Iraq, Afghanistan and the war on terrorism,** while actually improving the lethality and deterrence of its forces in Korea.

SoKo – Afghanistan 1NC

**Troops have empirically gone to Afghanistan when withdrawn from South Korea**

**Kan and Niksch 2010** (Shirley and Larry, Specialist in Asian Security Affairs and Specialist in Asian Affairs, Congressional Research Service, http://www.fas.org/sgp/crs/row/RS22570.pdf, date accessed: 7/3/2010) AJK

In May 2006, the United States and Japan signed a detailed “roadmap” agreement to broaden military cooperation, mostly dealing with changes and additions to U.S. forces in Japan. It provides for the relocation of the headquarters of the III Marine Expeditionary Force and 8,000 U.S. marines from Okinawa to Guam by 2014. Approximately 7,000 marines will remain on Okinawa. The cost of the relocation is estimated at $10.27 billion. Of this amount, Japan pledged to contribute $6.09 billion, including direct financing of facilities and infrastructure on Guam.7 Visiting South Korea in June 2008, **Defense Secretary Robert Gates announced that U.S. troops there would remain at about 28,000**, instead of carrying out the plan of 2004 to restructure U.S. forces by reducing troop strength from 37,000 to 25,000 by September 2008. U.S. officials indicated that **further withdrawals of Army forces would be possible, primarily to support the requirements of the Army and Marine Corps in the active theaters of Iraq and Afghanistan**.

**Specifically, troops would fill combat missions**

**Brookes 4** (Peter, Senior Fellow at the Heritage Foundation, http://www.heritage.org/Research/Commentary/2004/06/Defending-South-Korea, date accessed: 7/6/2010) AJK

First, the number of troops does not completely determine military capability. In fact, **despite the decrease in American soldiers in Korea, U.S. firepower will actually increase** due to expected changes in force structure over the next several years. Although technology cannot replace soldiers in some missions, **today's hi-tech equipment can provide significant firepower advantages** over the common foot soldier. Therefore, **the U.S. can withdraw some of its Korean-based troops for other soldier-intensive missions, such as Iraq, Afghanistan and the war on terrorism,** while actually improving the lethality and deterrence of its forces in Korea.

SoKo – Guam 2NC XT

Troops stationed in South Korea are sent to Guam

Faiola and Graham 4 (Anthony and Bradley, Washington Post writer, <http://articles.sfgate.com/2004-06-08/news/17428861_1_south-korea-uri-party-korean-peninsula>, date accessed: 7/6/2010) AJK

Moreover, the pullout from Korea could end up being largely offset by a buildup of U.S. forces elsewhere in the Pacific -- notably in Guam, where Pentagon officials envision stationing more aircraft and submarines, and in Hawaii, where an aircraft carrier may be moved from the mainland United States. The withdrawal would be the first major troop cut on the Korean Peninsula since the early 1990s, when 7,000 U.S. troops left. Kim said officials at the South Korean National Security Council, Defense Ministry and Foreign Ministry would review the proposal before giving a response. "We'll formulate a position and then notify the United States," he said.

SoKo – AT: Protestors

Protestors won’t make any difference in South Korea – throw out older ev

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>.

A pro-U.S. security consensus still ingrained in the national security perceptions of South Korean and Japanese elites continues to dominate strategic thinking in Seoul and Tokyo. Heightened tension with North Korea under the conservative Lee Myung-Bak regime has dampened the political climate for anti-base opposition and shaped Asian leaders’ perceptions of U.S. force posture and base realignment in South Korea. Although many South Koreans rebuked President Lee for his harsh response towards the North, the Cheonan incident has nevertheless reinforced this dominant security consensus.25 In South Korea, escalating tensions with North Korea even before the Cheonan incident had strengthened South Korean support for continued U.S. military presence on the Korean Peninsula. In this environment, opposition to U.S. military initiatives ring hollow to the broader public compared to previous campaigns. For example, the emerging anti-base movement on Jeju Island earlier this year against the construction of a South Korean naval base capable of hosting two Aegis destroyers has been isolated primarily to Gangjeong village.26 Although the appeal of Gangjeong village’s mayor and residents have received significant attention from global anti-base activists in Okinawa, Japan, Guam, Europe, and the U.S., the movement has garnered relatively little attention in South Korea.

Anti-base activists are all focused on the FTA

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 anti-base protests continued, by June 2006, various umbrella coalition groups, particularly labor and farmer groups, had shifted away from the anti-base movement to prepare for protests against the upcoming U.S.-South Korea Free Trade Agreement (FTA) negotiations. The government again sent 15,000 riot police on September 13 to destroy empty homes where activists and a handful of residents were residing.20 In October 2006, workers began leveling the land for construction as the government continued negotiating with residents. The South Korean government and Daechuri residents finally signed an agreement on February 13, 2007, with the residents agreeing to move out by March 31 to a nearby village. While the village residents’ decision was made independent of the broader anti-base coalition, activists issued a statement stating that they would respect the agreement.21

SoKo – AT: Lee DA

The plan isn’t a key issue in South Korea politics

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>.

While Okinawa’s anti-base tradition is well-known and documented among activists and scholars, South Korea’s anti-base movements have received little attention.5 Whereas anti-base opposition is embedded deep within Okinawan political history, anti-base sentiments in South Korea linger at the fringe of politics, only on occasion moving to the center, as in the 2002 presidential elections.

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

Turkish Offsets 1NC (1/2)

Text: The United States federal government should pull all troops out of the Incirlik air base and redeploy them along the Turkey-Iraq border.

I. Solvency:

Military presence key to being able to combat the PKK

Press TV 6/21 (http://www.presstv.ir/detail.aspx?id=131360&sectionid=351020204) GAT

Top Turkish military commander has called for patience in Turkey's "long-term effort" against the separatist Kurdistan Workers' Party (PKK) militants. "We are absolutely determined to fight the terrorist organization until it is entirely annihilated. This struggle is a long-term one and requires patience," AFP quoted Army Chief General Ilker Basbug said on Monday. Speaking at a conference in the northwestern city of Canakkale, Ilker said the campaign against PKK militants should include different strategies including economic and socio-cultural incentives to integrate the country's large Kurdish community. The general, however, did not rule out a military option against the PKK, listed by the majority of international community as a terrorist organization. "It would be a mistake to think that terror will be eradicated only by taking the required measures in the economic and socio-cultural fields as long as the terrorist organization continues to keep armed elements," the general noted. He made the speech after a surge over the weekend in cross-border attacks against the PKK forces holed up in the mountainous north Iraq, during which 12 Turkish troops were also killed. The Kurd militants launched an armed struggle against the Turkish government in 1984 in a bid to create an independent homeland in the country's Kurdish majority southeast. The bloody conflict has so far claimed the lives of around 45, 000 people.

**Turkish Offsets 1NC (2/2)**

**II. Net Benefit:**

**Either the US begins to put serious pressure on the PKK or the whole Middle East will erupt into an escalatory global conflict**

Uysal 7/2 (Ahmet, assoc. prof. at Eskişehir Osmangazi University, http://www.todayszaman.com/tz-web/news-214854-109-centerkurdish-separatism-is-a-threat-to-the-future-of-the-middle-east-bribyi-brahmet-uysalcenter.html) GAT

 Not distancing themselves from violence also limits the BDP’s popularity even among Kurds as it won about 15 percent of the Kurdish vote since most Kurds still vote for the AK Party. In other words, the Kurdish region is the main battleground for the separatist PKK and the pro-integration AK Party. While the former wants a further division in the already divided Middle East, the latter seeks integration within the country and with its neighbors, including Syria, Jordan and Lebanon. Iraq and its Kurdish region are considered for such regional integration. The separatist Kurds, not all of them of course, want to dismantle the current Turkish, Iranian, Syrian and Iraqi territories and establish a communist Kurdish state in their place. The foundation of a Kurdish state is an impossible project, but it is sufficient to create problems in the region. Such a state has no chance of survival, as Kurdish leaders of northern Iraq (e.g., Massoud Barzani and Jalal Talabani) have realized, but they continue to play the PKK card for an increased role in Iraq. In recent months their relations with Turkey have improved significantly, but they have to put more pressure on the PKK that is stationed in northern Iraq. Frequent terrorist attacks help hard-liners and make a peaceful solution impossible in addition to poisoning relations with neighbors. Because of the escalation of terrorism in Turkey, Erdoğan’s AK Party may lose its majority in the upcoming elections next year. The sole alternative would be a coalition between the conservative nationalist MHP and the secular nationalist CHP. Their nationalist policies may alienate the moderate Kurds and even escalate ethnic tension, spreading to Iraq and destabilizing the whole region. Because the PKK is positioned in the mountainous north, the rise of terrorist attacks can force Turkey to turn to Iraq. The escalation of terrorism and ethnic conflict in Turkey would create a big mess in the conflict-torn Middle East. The West must put more pressure on radical Kurdish activists operating in European cities by cutting the financial and human support they provide to the PKK. Similarly, the US must put more pressure on Kurdish leaders Barzani and Talabani not to allow the PKK unhindered operation in northern Iraq. Like the Egyptian president who convinced al-Assad not to host the PKK leader in 1999, Arab governments can help Turkey overcome this terrorism by standing by the people of Turkey. Otherwise, the peaceful and rational Turkish experience led by the AK Party in the region will leave the ground for a nationalist government that might destabilize Iraq and damage relations with Kurds, Arabs and the West. Conflicts all around the greater Middle East can hurt and damage even the most stable countries in the globalized world.

Middle East war causes extinction

Nassar 2 (Bahig, Arab Coordinating Centre of Non-Governmental Organizations, paper for Cordoba Dialogue on Peace and Human Rights in Europe and the Middle East) GAT

Wars in the Middle East are of a new type. Formerly, the possession of nuclear weapons by the United States and the Soviet Union had prevented them, under the balance of the nuclear terror, from launching war against each other. In the Middle East, the possession of nuclear weapons and other weapons of mass destruction leads to military clashes and wars. Instead of eliminating weapons of mass destruction, the United States and Israel are using military force to prevent others from acquiring them, while they insist on maintaining their own weapons to pose deadly threats to other nations. But the production, proliferation and threat or use of weapons of mass destruction (nuclear chemical and biological) are among the major global problems which could lead, if left unchecked, to the extinction of life on earth. Different from the limited character of former wars, the current wars in the Middle East manipulate global problems and escalate their dangers instead of solving them.

Incirlik Bad

**Incirlik is the symbolic threat to Turkey’s national security and independence**

PA 5 (Political Affairs, http://www.politicalaffairs.net/article/view/982/1/89/) GAT

Incirlik Base has been a trouble for Turkey. This base has been a jumping board for both NATO and the USA. This base has also been a center for the anti-popular character and missions of the rule of capital in Turkey. Only the capitalist class can ask a foreign country to bring and deploy its nuclear weapons to be used against the people in its own country if necessary. Like any other weapons, nuclear weapons in Incirlik are kept ready not only to attack the peoples of Middle East, but also the workers in Turkey. Working class of Turkey, its party TKP (Communist Party of Turkey), is demanding the disarmament of Incirlik. In this sense, the problem cannot be reduced to the "supervision by Turkish officers" or "permission by the Turkish government. What are the Turkish officers going to supervise? How can an organization, whose primary concern has been getting top positions in the NATO projects and USA's plans for a long time, defend the country's interests? Again, it is none of our concern that the government of capitalists wants to check on the acts of the USA. In the formulas developed by Prime Minister Erdogan and his friends, it is possible to see some points, which aim to soften possible reactions. However, that the USA notifies Turkish government and military authorities doesn't have a practical reality. This is all cheating. After all, saying "let the parliament to discuss that" doesn't mean anything but supporting CHP's, the opposition party's, attempt to be part of the game. In summary, the legal status of Incirlik doesn't bear importance anymore. Working class of Turkey, its party TKP demands that Incirlik shall be closed at once. Of course, the problem doesn't consist of Incirlik. Today, there is not a single military base, which is not open to NATO and the USA. The demand for Incirlik to be closed doesn't mean the acceptance of this situation. On the contrary, the closing of Incirlik would be a challenge by the working class of Turkey against the treason and collaboration of capitalists and against imperialism. The revolution in Turkey will also be the process of purification of our country from imperialism. Working class of Turkey, its party TKP, is struggling for the purification of Incirlik from imperialism. The response to usual accusations like that the closing of a military base will endanger the "country's security" is clear. Whose security? The security of local and foreign monopolies, which possess the most important institutions of our country? The security of a handful of people, who live in extravagance through the poverty of tens of millions? The security of gangs, murderers and drug dealers? The security of IMF collectors? Whose security? If these are not the country's security, and they are obviously not, then Incirlik is clearly threatening the country's security. Incirlik not only threatens our people's security, but also the security of Palestinians, Iraqis and Iranians. Working class of Turkey, its party TKP, want to hinder Incirlik from being an element of threat. Sooner or later, working class of Turkey will take the power. And then, if it is necessary for the defense of an honorable and independent country, the revolutionary power, its revolutionary armed forces will turn Incirlik once again into a military base. But now, on our agenda is the closing of a base, which symbolizes the dependency of Turkey. Incirlik must be closed.

Solvency – Troops Key to Comabt PKK

A firm approach is key to keeping the PKK from causing instability

Cihan 6 (Cihan News Agency, http://www.middleeastinfo.org/forum/index.php?s=365ac380b8efee18000238c5c0f5a39c&showtopic=11289&mode=threaded) GAT

The American Washington Post daily cited the Kurdistan Workers Party (PKK) terrorist organization as one of the severe threats to stability in the Middle East. An editorial written by Lenore G. Martin said that the PKK, which is operating from havens in northern Iraq, was a threat to Turkey and to stability in the Middle East. The daily said that Turkey was determined to prevent a repetition of the 1984-1999 terrorist activities with the separatist PKK, in which it suffered more than 30,000 deaths. Martin underlined that the U.S. should take much firmer action to stop the PKK's terrorist activities from undermining its Middle East policy. The U.S. administration recently appointed a special envoy to coordinate the war against PKK terrorism. Retired General Joseph Ralston recently paid a visit to Turkey to discuss the measures to battle against PKK terrorism. The Washington Post claimed that a Turkish cross-border operation into northern Iraq would create chaos in that part of Iraq and potentially destabilize the region. The daily added that the U.S. would face a more chaotic situation in Iraq and the loss of a long-term relationship with the Iraqi Kurds, who are Washington's best hope for obtaining rights for U.S. bases in the future. "If Washington opposes the invasion, it risks further estrangement from Turkey, a state positioned to play a critical strategic role in a region where Iran increasingly challenges the United States for dominance." The daily advised the Iraqi Kurdish leaders to deny the PKK havens in northern Iraq and prevent PKK leadership from traveling freely throughout the country. The editorial recommended Turkey to grant more cultural and social rights to the Kurdish citizens of Turkey to allow their integration into the Turkish republic. "The U.S. must throw its full weight behind efforts to eject the PKK from northern Iraq. Furthermore the United States needs to pressure Europe more energetically to block the transfer of funds to the PKK, which it has classified as a terrorist organization. It cannot rely on a tripartite commission to stop the next guerrilla war in the Middle East," the Washington Post added.

Solvency – US is Ready

The US has been sharing intelligence with Turkey, but now it’s ready offer more assistance

KÜÇÜKKOŞUM 6/20 (Sevil, Ankara correspondent for Daily News, http://www.hurriyetdailynews.com/n.php?n=us-says-ready-to-offer-more-assistance-against-pkk-2010-06-20) GAT

The United States is ready to offer more assistance to Turkey in the fight against terrorism, an embassy spokeswoman said Sunday, denying allegations of a drop in actionable intelligence in response to Turkey’s stance on Iran. “We stand ready to review urgently any new request from the Turkish military or government,” Deborah Guido, a spokeswoman for the U.S. Embassy in Ankara told the Hürriyet Daily News & Economic Review on Sunday. Allegations that Washington has slowed its sharing of actionable intelligence with the Turkish military following Turkey’s U.N. Security Council vote against new sanctions on Iran were brought back to the country’s agenda with the weekend’s deadly attacks, which killed a total of 12 Turkish soldiers. The Turkish press had speculated that the attacks by the outlawed Kurdistan Workers’ Party, or PKK, were carried out by a group of around 250 terrorists whose crossing of the border would surely have been noted by American intelligence. Chief of General Staff Gen. İlker Başbuğ corrected the news reports Sunday, saying the attacks were committed by 57 terrorists. Guido made clear there has been no change in the level of intelligence sharing with Turkey, and noted that American troops have been facing similar attacks. “Despite our best intelligence efforts in Iraq and Afghanistan in support of our forces there, we experienced similar attacks conducted against Turkish forces [Saturday],” she said, adding that the U.S. shares Turkey’s grief over the deaths. Foreign Ministry sources told the Daily News on Sunday that they had not seen “any signal of a breakdown with the U.S. either in political or military terms.” Military officials publicly confirmed Friday that the cooperation with the United States remained the same. A tripartite mechanism between Turkey, the U.S. and Iraq has been established in recent years with the aim of addressing the security issues in northern Iraq. A joint command center in the northern Iraqi province of Arbil was also formed to facilitate intelligence sharing for operational purposes against the PKK. Diplomatic sources drew attention to the problems experienced in this sharing process, saying Turkish officials had complained several times to their American counterparts about long delays in delivering real-time intelligence regarding movements in the region and had requested more assistance. Retired Gen. Necati Özgen said the recent tension with Israel and the U.S. could have played a part in the latest terrorist attacks. “Did the U.S. provide intelligence on this incident? No. It did not give the intelligence about this big group of terrorists,” the former corps commander said Saturday in an interview with NTV.

Solvency – Troops K2 Solve Brink

Turkish troops are being redeployed to the border – but they need more help from the US to solve the brink

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. Helicopter gunships struck suspected PKK mountain positions in the provinces of Hakkari and Sirnak, security sources said. "A review of intelligence and the structure of personnel in the region was discussed," a statement from Gul's office said after the security summit. In late 2007, a similarly deadly PKK attack on a military unit in Hakkari was followed in early 2008 by a cross-border Turkish land offensive against rebel targets in northern Iraq. Erdogan, who has said Kurdish militants would "drown in their own blood", faces mounting criticism for his government's failure to stop the escalation in violence. Images of soldiers' coffins, draped in red-and-white Turkish flags, have raised tensions in Turkey, with relatives of dead soldiers chanting slogans against the government at funerals. More than 40,000 people, mainly Kurds, have been killed since the PKK took up arms in 1984 seeking an ethnic homeland. Erdogan has granted more political and cultural rights to minority Kurds in an effort to end separatist violence. But his "Kurdish initiative" floundered after it was poorly received in the rest of the country and following a decision by the Constitutional Court late last year to ban the largest Kurdish political party in parliament for its links to the PKK. SABOTAGE CHARGE Turkey, which relies partly on its NATO ally the United States for intelligence sharing on PKK movement in northern Iraq, struck a critical tone following a cabinet meeting. "We expect more support from countries with which we have friendly relations," said Deputy Prime Minister Cemil Cicek. Intelligence-sharing with the United States, which brands the PKK a terrorist group, has helped Turkey target rebels in northern Iraq, both in the past and since Saturday's attack. "The PKK is a common enemy of Turkey and of the United States," James Jeffrey, the U.S. ambassador to Turkey, said in a statement. "There is no change to the level of our intelligence- sharing with Turkey regarding PKK activities in northern Iraq." Erdogan has said the latest wave of attacks was an attempt to sabotage efforts by his ruling AK Party to end the 25-year conflict. He faces an election before July 2011. Kemal Kilicdaroglu, leader of the opposition People's Republican Party, has said political decisions have weakened the struggle against the PKK. Devlet Bahceli, leader of the right-wing Nationalist Movement Party, has called for early elections and the return of emergency rule in the southeast. The PKK said this month it had scrapped a year-old unilateral ceasefire and resumed attacks against Turkish forces because of military operations against it. Violence often rises in southeast Turkey in the spring, when warm weather makes it easier for guerrillas to cross the mountain border from Iraq

Solvency – Pressure on US

Pressure is coming from multiple sides for the US to expands its assistance against the PKK

Today’s Zaman 7/2 (7/2/10, http://www.todayszaman.com/tz-web/news-214883-100-turkish-us-iraqi-generals-meet-on-pkk-terror.html) GAT

Turkish, US and Iraqi military officials met this week to discuss joint measures against the outlawed Kurdistan Workers’ Party (PKK), which has recently stepped up attacks against Turkish troops near the Iraqi border and in other parts of Turkey. The meeting, part of a trilateral mechanism instituted among the three countries to coordinate actions against the PKK, involved commanders in charge of border security from Turkey and Iraq and a commander from the Baghdad headquarters of the US forces in Iraq. It took place in the Turkish border town of Silopi on Tuesday, according to a US military statement released in Baghdad on Wednesday. “This was the first time that the Iraqi borders commander and the Turkish corps commander responsible for the Turkey-Iraq border have met. Both sides agreed to meet regularly,” the statement said. “The meeting included visits to both Turkish and Iraqi border outposts as well as establishing dates for future meetings to discuss secondary border crossing points to enhance trade and sharing of border security information.” Reports in the Turkish media said the participants were generals, but there was no further information on their identity. The meeting came days after Turkish calls for further cooperation from the US and Iraq, where the PKK camps are based. In remarks at the weekend, Prime Minister Recep Tayyip Erdoğan said Turkey expected the trilateral mechanism to do more than intelligence sharing, but did not elaborate further.

Solvency – Empirical Redeployment

The US has responded to the PKK before by moving troops around Turkey

Feldman 6/23 (Helen, writer for Top Buzz, http://www.topbuzznews.net/888/turkey-kurdish-rebels-escalating-its-attacks/) GAT

An explosion has killed three soldiers and a teenager Tuesday in a suburb of Istanbul. Turkey plunged into a new cycle of violence and the list of “martyrs” lengthens by the day. Tuesday morning in the outskirts of Istanbul, a bomb, remotely operated, exploded at the passage of an army bus. Four soldiers and a 17 year old girl were killed, twelve injured. The attack was claimed by the TAK, the Freedom Falcons of Kurdistan, a group active in urban and affiliated to the PKK (Kurdistan Workers Party), according to Turkish authorities. The Kurdish separatist movement, declared terrorist by Ankara and the European Union, had threatened last Friday to carry out violent actions in Turkish cities. The attack in the city succeeds in an already very heavy for the military this weekend: Twelve soldiers died, mostly in a PKK attack against a military outpost in Hakkari province, near Iraq. Faced with popular anger and already campaigning for elections in 2011, the Turkish Prime Minister Recep Tayyip Erdogan has promised to “drown in their blood,” the perpetrators of this attack. Traditionally, melting snow causes an upsurge in fighting in the spring. But this year is particularly deadly: since the month of March, at least two hundred people, mainly Kurds in the ranks, have been identified by staff. The end of a cease-fire by the PKK announced a unilateral June 4 was accompanied by an upsurge in clashes. The Kurdish organization, however, seems divided. News releases – filtered by the Turkish state – of Abdullah Ocalan, the PKK leader who was jailed for life on the island of Imrali, and those of the military command of Kurdish organization, entrenched in the Qandil Mountains in Iraqi Kurdistan, reveal differences. And the rebellion can not control ensures certain small groups, such as TAK. To try to prevent PKK incursions into Turkish territory, army commandos deployed on Monday along the border with Iraq, is an elite helicopter units, and last week sent troops twice to Iraqi territory. Meanwhile, the Turks putting more pressure on their neighbors to tighten the noose on PKK. In Turkey, in early June, Massoud Barzani, the president of Iraqi Kurdistan, which is engaged in a closer political and economic ties with Ankara, has promised to provide “every effort” to weaken the rebels on its territory. Tuesday, James Jeffrey, the U.S. ambassador to Turkey, provided that the U.S. was also willing to “consider urgently” any request for assistance from Ankara to fight against their “common enemy”. The Americans provide information on troop movements of the PKK since 2007. His statement was intended to dispel any accusations that followed the attack on military outpost in Hakkari: the media were surprised that the rebel movements were not detected in time. Some columnists have suggested that Washington had deliberately withheld information, a way to send a warning to Turkey, whose diplomacy in the Middle East currently opposes U.S. interests.

Solvency – Empirical Redeployment

Empirically, when the PKK gets out of hand, troops will be redeployed to the borders around Northern Iraq to combat the problem

NPR 6 (National Public Radio, interview between Liane Hansen and Ivan Watson, http://www.npr.org/templates/story/story.php?storyId=5389304) GAT

In Iraq today, three car bombs exploded in Northern Baghdad, and a fourth blast hit the Shiite Holy City of Karbala. The Associated Press reported that at least 17 people died in the Baghdad blasts, and five people died in Karbala. As the insurgency in Iraq has persisted, over the past month Iran and Turkey have deployed large numbers of additional troops along their borders with northern Iraq. The two countries appear to be coordinating their efforts to battle Kurdish separatist rebels who maintain bases in the remote mountains of Northern Iraq. In the past several weeks, the Iraqi government has expressed concern after it accused Iran of shelling some of these bases. NPR's Ivan Watson is in Sulamenia(ph), in Northern Iraq. He explains who the Kurdish separatists are. IVAN WATSON reporting: They're the Kurdistan Workers Party. They're better known as the PKK, and they're actually a mix of ethnic Kurds from the Kurdish minority populations in Turkey, Iran, Syria and Iraq. They started as a movement in the early '80s that was fighting against the state in Turkey, where ethnic Kurds have long been oppressed. And they're actually trying to carve out a greater Kurdistan in this region. That guerilla war it's going on to this day, it claimed the lives of more than 30,000 people, and today the PKK is considered a terrorist organization by Turkey, the U.S., even the European Union. And over the years, this group, they've established some enclaves just along the mountains in the border area of Northern Iraq, along the borders with Iran and Turkey. And they continue to operate there to this day, out of the control of any government, really. HANSEN: So why are Turkey and Iran putting the pressure on them now? WATSON: Well, about two years ago, a wing of the PKK began attacking security forces in neighboring Iran. Meanwhile, clashes between the PKK and Turkish security forces have really intensified, especially over the past several months. So that prompted Turkey to deploy tens of thousands of additional troops along the border with Northern Iraq and to actually begin some cross border operations against the PKK. Iran, meanwhile, it began shelling across the border last month for the first time in years, hitting some of those PKK enclaves. And it has a couple of incentives for this. One of them is that its crackdown on the PKK has been hugely popular in Turkey. It's been applauded in the Turkish press, and as we know, Iran needs all the international support it can get right now as it faces off with the U.S. over its nuclear program. HANSEN: Now, if these border tensions are taking place in territory under the control of Iraqi Kurds, what do they have to say about the Turkish and the Iranian military operations? WATSON: Well, the Iraqi Kurdish leadership and the government in Baghdad, where the Iraq Kurds are fairly well represented, they have expressed concern about this, but this concern has been somewhat muted. The fact is, is that the Iraqi Kurds, in the past, they've clashed with the PKK. They're not really close to this other Kurdish faction. At the same time, they can't really be seen to be joining with the Turks and the Iranians against their fellow Kurdish brothers, because the PKK does enjoy some popular support here in northern Iraq among ordinary Iraqi Kurds. HANSEN: Are you hearing anything from Washington about these border tensions? WATSON: Well, Washington has urged Turkey not to conduct cross-border operations, saying that's not good for stability in the region. And it has urged Turkey to work together with the government in Baghdad and with the Americans to try to resolve this issue. The Turks, meanwhile, have said they have the right to conduct missions that are hot pursuit of PKK rebels across the border into Northern Iraq. The top PKK leaders, just in the past couple of days, have announced that they will intensify their attacks against both Iran and Turkey if those countries continue to attack their bases. So we're likely to see more pressure on the PKK in the coming weeks and months. HANSEN: NPR's Ivan Watson in Sulamenia, in Northern Iraq. Ivan, thank you very much. WATSON: You're welcome, Liane.

Solvency - Geography

Troops will most likely be stationed at the Ibrahim-Khalil complex at the border – this is the only vehicle crossing along the border and is thus crucial to maintaining stability between Kurds and Turks

Butters 7 (Andrew L., writer for Time Magazine, http://www.time.com/time/world/article/0,8599,1680827,00.html) GAT

Even on a normal day, Ibrahim Khalil, the complex straddling Turkey and Kurdish-controlled northern Iraq, is a rather unusual international border crossing. Although it is an entry point into Iraq, there are no Iraqi soldiers, no Iraqi flags, and seemingly no Iraqi federal officials. Instead, the Iraqi side is controlled by the Kurdistan Regional Government, which enforces its own customs and immigration policies, enforced at checkpoints manned by Kurdish peshmerga fighters under the flag of Kurdistan — a red, white, and green tricolor with a golden sun. Viewed from Turkey, these trappings of autonomy are a worrying prelude to an independent Kurdish state, a prospect to which Turkey — with its own restive Kurdish minority — is implacably hostile. Turkish soldiers often harass Kurds crossing at Ibrahim Khalil, according to Iraqi Kurdish border security officials. They confiscate books or documents that use the word "Kurdistan", deny passage to women called Kurdistan — a common female first name — and to Kurds of foreign nationality whose passports list "Kurdistan" as a place of birth. Turkey's latent hostility towards Iraqi Kurdistan has grown more active following last month's killings of about 40 Turks, mostly soldiers, by fighters of the Kurdish Workers Party, or PKK, a militant group of Turkish Kurds at war with the Turkish state (and branded a terrorist organization by the U.S. and EU). Turkey accuses Iraqi Kurdish leaders of allowing the PKK to maintain bases in northern Iraq as part of a greater Kurdish national agenda. (Iraqi Kurds say they are helpless against a hardened guerilla group that Turkey itself has failed to defeat in over 20 years of war — Turkey rejects these claims of helplessness, pointing out that the Iraqi Kurdish authorities have not even acted to cut off supply lines to the guerrilla movement's camps.) Amid rising tension, the Turks have threatened cross-border military action against the PKK, and also to close their side of the Ibrahim Kalil border crossing as punishment.

Solvency - Geography

Troops would also be deployed to the mountainous areas of the border, since that’s a key part of PKK culture and strategy

Kutschera 5 (Chris, writer for Bnet, http://findarticles.com/p/articles/mi\_m2742/is\_358/ai\_n25112722/pg\_3/?tag=content;col1) GAT

With 14 other cadres and about 30 fighters, the three left the PKK headquarters at Qandil, for the mountains of Iraqi Kurdistan, where they found asylum and protection in the area controlled by ]alal Talabani's PUK. And on 21 October 2004, they founded the new party, at Said Saddik, near Suleimania. All three savagely condemn Abdullah Ocalan, who they accuse of having given up the historical goal of his party after his capture in February 1999--the independence of Kurdistan. "Abdullah Ocalan now says the Kurds are members of the Turkish nation. He openly claims he is a Kemalist, and that the Turkish state can rely on him," says an angry Nizamettin Tas. "Before, he blamed the Kurds of Turkey for being 'assimilated', for suffering an 'illness of personality'." These dissidents also blame Abdullah Ocalan for his policy of confrontation with the Iraqi Kurdish political parties, Massoud Barzani's KDP and Jalal Talabani's PUK. "He calls South Kurdistan (Iraqi Kurdistan) a second Israel," says Nizamettin Tas, "but he wants to make the Kurds servants of Turkish policy." "I went to the mountains to liberate my country and for the independence of Kurdistan, but realised it was not possible to fight against Turkish colonialism in this organisation," says Shahnaz Altun. "One man decides everything; nobody else can say what they think." Osman Ocalan, the brother of Apo, was a member of the executive committee of the party and virtually second in command of the PKK in the early 1990s. He was also arrested, jailed and tried. "In June 1993, they removed all my powers," Osman Ocalan told The Middle East during an exclusive interview. "I was isolated in a cell for three months and interrogated for 52 days before being tried in February 1995. The trial lasted only one day before I was warned that if I continued to defend my ideas, I would be executed. If not, I would be pardoned. A lawyer? Out of the question. The trial was conducted under the law of the mountain!" One wonders why all these activists who claim to have been victims of Ocalan's despotism for more than 10 or 15 years did not leave the PKK earlier? The pursuit of patriotism, is their answer. "PKK was an undemocratic Marxist-Leninist organisation," admits Botan, but it was waging a war of liberation for Kurdistan. For this reason we did not want to criticise the party; we did not want to impede the war effort. After the collapse of the Soviet Union, we had to find an alternative to armed struggle and we began to criticise, in secret, the despotic way Apo was running the war. Some of us were punished for that. It was not until after Apo's capture, we started organising ourselves openly. "In 2003, the leadership of the party split and, since it was impossible to reform the party from inside, we quit with 18 former members of the central committee of the PKK." Shahnaz Altun and Nizamettin Tas explain why many members of the PKK dare not leave the party: "When we are in the mountains, we have no relations with the outside world. And since the PKK decided to kill those who want to go, fear prevents people from leaving," says Botan. "To become a member of the PKK is like joining a religion," adds Sekine. "It feeds an ideological dependence, and even in Turkey, some people still consider Apo a prophet. "It is easy to join PKK but difficult to leave." It is all the more difficult for PKK members to quit the party and come down from the mountains if they are also leaving friends they have fought alongside for years. And it is a struggle for them to re-adapt to civil life; most of them took to the mountains when they were aged 18-20, they have no training, no job skills, nothing to equip them for any other form of life. "I was myself in this situation ... I could see no way of leaving the mountain.

Solvency – CMR Net Ben

Gates wants to provide a new form of assistance against the PKK – pulling out would hurt CMR

Pessin 10 (Al, writer for VOA News, http://www1.voanews.com/english/news/middle-east/US-Defense-Secretary-Offers-Turkey-More-Help-on-PKK.html) GAT

U.S. Defense Secretary Robert Gates told Turkish officials in Ankara Saturday he will look for additional ways the United States can help Turkey deal with Kurdish guerrillas along its border with Iraq. Secretary Gates says the United States has been helping Turkey since 2007, when Turkish troops moved into Northern Iraq to chase Kurdish PKK guerrillas based there. To avoid further such incidents, then-President George W. Bush, authorized Secretary Gates to begin providing intelligence to Turkish troops to help in their fights against the PKK. Now, Secretary Gates says he is prepared to try to do more, in part as a follow-up to talks here recently by the U.S. military commander in Iraq, General Ray Odierno. "I offered, during my visit here, to, when I return to Washington, to see if there are more capabilities we can share with Turkey, in terms of taking on this threat," he said. "And when General Odierno was here, there was discussion of an action plan going forward. So I think what we're seeing is a further intensification of the cooperation in an effort to deal with this threat." But Gates also said military action is not the only way to deal with the Kurdish separatists. He said he is working with the Kurdish Regional Government in northern Iraq to try to convince leaders there to put pressure on the PKK to stop its attacks on Turkey. He also said that, as in any counterinsurgency, killing all the guerrillas is not necessarily the way to win, and he welcomed the effort to determine whether it might be possible to convince some PKK fighters to lay down their weapons. "Trying to identify those in the PKK who are prepared to rejoin society and abandon violence, and to reach out to them is a very positive thing," said Gates. "And it helps to try to separate those who are willing to abandon violence and become part of society from the hard core who will not abandon violence and have to be dealt with in other ways." That is what the United States has done in Iraq and is trying to do in Afghanistan.

Solvency – CMR Net Ben

Gates is committed to combating the PKK –the CP would be supported by the military

Trend 6/2 (Trend News, http://en.trend.az/regions/world/usa/1634243.html) GAT

 U.S. Secretary of Defense Robert Gates said Saturday that his country had not requested Turkey to send any new troops to Afghanistan, the semi-official Anatolia news agency reported. Following his meeting with Chief of Turkish General Staff Ilker Basbug in the Turkish capital of Ankara, Gates was quoted as saying that the United States was almost completely devoted to the issues of Afghanistan and the outlawed Kurdish Workers' Party (PKK), Xinhua reported. He said, "we are pleased with the partnership between Turkey and the United States in Afghanistan." "We are extremely pleased with Turkey's contributions in Afghanistan. We have received a promise from "allies and partners" for the deployment of 10,000 additional personnel. We pay high importance to personnel that can train individuals (Afghans) in the areas of military and security," Gates said. Gates also said, "we carry a will to further develop cooperation with Turkey against the terrorist organization PKK as was set forth by former U.S. President George W. Bush back in 2007. " Cooperation between Turkey and the U.S. in fighting against the PKK is getting more intense, Gates said. Washington has been providing intelligence for Turkey in Ankara 's bid to destroy PKK rebels who stage terrorist attacks in Turkey from their bases in northern Iraq, according to Anatolia report. Established in 1978, the PKK took up arms in 1984 to create an ethnic homeland in southeastern Turkey. Its separatist campaign has fuelled conflicts that have killed over 40,000 people in the country. It is estimated that there are a total of 5,000 PKK militants, the majority of whom are holed up in northern Iraq where the PKK headquarters is situated

Impact – Turkey-US Relations (1/3)

The US needs to act against the PKK now or risk more pressure being applied to Turkey-US relations

Bozkurt 6/28 (Abdullah, writer for the Turkish Press, http://www.turkishpress.com/news.asp?id=353364) GAT

The PKK terrorist campaign is once again on the rise in Turkey, but this time is an act of desperation stemming from the fear of losing support among Kurds as well as from the fear of international isolation. Despite the government-launched initiative to secure broader rights for Kurds in Turkey, the violence the PKK is engaged in aims to bring chaos back to the region as seen in the `80s and `90s, during which the heavy-handed approach of the Turkish state made the situation worse than ever. This time the government seem to be acting with a much cooler head, staying away from the trap of a vicious circle of violence. That doesn`t mean the growing public outrage will subside anytime soon, however. Moreover, the opposition parties are poised to take advantage of the bitter news of the soldiers who were killed during last weekend`s PKK raids. A prime example was the leader of the nationalist party calling for early elections and emergency rule in the southeast after the deaths of 12 soldiers. The ruling Justice and Development Party (AK Party) isn`t the only one who will be hurt during this process. There is possibly an international cause for the PKK`s reign of terror as well. Just as on the day following the deadly attack in Semdinli, we saw numerous reports in the Turkish press pointing the finger at allies, including the US, European Union, and Israel. Though Turkish officials dismiss reports of international involvement from close allies in PKK terrorism, conspiracy theories have already started to take a toll on the popularity of these countries in the eyes of Turks on the street. I believe the PKK is trying to score multiple points with the increased violence, both on the domestic front and abroad. Our allies should come out stronger than ever in condemning these attacks and offer substantive support in stemming the violence. They ought to use all available avenues to corner the PKK and its affiliates into giving up their terrorist methods. Complacency and the unwillingness to act on the PKK network will add credibility to these unsubstantiated reports. Alarmingly, these news stories appear not only in fringe sites but also in mainstream media. The US, whose popularity is low in Turkey, is a prime target, of course. These groups have capitalized on news of the last-minute cancellation of a June 16 meeting between Turkish and American officials on terrorism. We`ve recently seen reports that real-time actionable intelligence-sharing doesn`t really help the Turkish military fight terrorists due to the time delay and the filtering mechanism. After the PKK attack on Sunday, some experts accused the US of not sharing information with Turkey on groups gathering around the border to prepare for raids. Whether these accounts are true or not, they send the image that the US is somehow involved in supporting PKK terror in Turkey. The only way to counter these claims is to speak out on these issues and offer credible details on the cooperative framework. I remember interviewing Shari Villarosa, deputy coordinator for regional affairs in the State Department`s Counterterrorism Office back in March at the residence of Douglas Silliman, the deputy chief of mission at the US Embassy in Ankara. She provided an account of how the US had played a key role in a recent wave of arrests targeting PKK-affiliated businesses in France, Belgium, Italy and Germany. Villarosa acknowledged that the US strongly urged Europeans to take action against the 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. Her comments on putting the PKK out of business like Al Capone made headlines in Turkey at the time. US officials should organize more information-sharing events like these. Israel is, of course, the usual suspect. Stories about secret Mossad involvement have already resurfaced in some media outlets. The timing could not be worse as it coincided with soured relations with Israel over the flotilla raid that killed nine Turks in international waters. Although the Turkish Army dismissed speculation on Friday about possible Israeli involvement in the PKK attacks and the stories lacked credible evidence, the rumor machine continues to run, making damage control by Israeli PR officials even more difficult. News of a malfunction in Israeli-made unmanned spy drones and the withdrawal of Israeli trainers from Turkey added fuel to this speculation. I think Israel should act in haste in patching up relations with Turkey over the flotilla crisis before speculation over aiding and abetting PKK terrorism starts eating away at the core of relations as well. The EU may also be a cause of the increased PKK violence. It`s no secret that some people in Turkey strongly believe that the EU wants to dismember Turkey, starting with the Kurdish south. These rumors are being spread by the anti-EU movement, which is gaining ground at the expense of pro-EU circles. The EU recognized the PKK as a terrorist organization in 2002 after 20 years of bloody attacks against Turkey. Only recently have we seen European countries taking steps against PKK-funded organizations in Europe. These operations are not as in depth as Turkey would like them to be, and they do not aim to completely eradicate the PKK from the countries that shield them. They were aimed at neutralizing the threat the PKK poses to internal security in these countries after the EU realized that the PKK isn`t only a terrorist group but also one that smuggles drugs, people and weapons and sows instability in their own countries as well. If our allies value the image and perception of themselves in Turkey, this is the time to speak up and act against the PKK and its affiliates. Doing so will significantly help reduce the impact of unsubstantiated rumors on Turk.

**Impact – Turkey-US Relations (2/3)**

Failing relations between Turkey and US leads to massive complications and tensions in the Middle East over Israel relations, Iran prolif, etc

Cook 6/1 (Steven A., Senior Fellow for MidEast Studies at Council on Foreign Relations, http://www.foreignpolicy.com/articles/2010/06/01/how\_do\_you\_say\_frenemy\_in\_Turkish?page=0,0) GAT

Recently, my colleague and good friend, Charles Kupchan, published a book called How Enemies Become Friends. In it, he argues that diplomatic engagement is decisive in transforming relations between adversaries. It is an interesting read, and the book has received some terrific reviews. Charlie might want to follow up with a new book called How Friends Become Frenemies. He can use the United States and Turkey as his primary case study. It is hard to admit, but after six decades of strategic cooperation, Turkey and the United States are becoming strategic competitors -- especially in the Middle East. This is the logical result of profound shifts in Turkish foreign and domestic politics and changes in the international system. This reality has been driven home by Turkey's angry response to Israel's interdiction of the Istanbul-organized flotilla of ships that tried Monday to break the Israeli blockade of Gaza. After Israel's attempts to halt the vessels resulted in the deaths of at least nine activists, Turkish Foreign Minister Ahmet Davutoglu referred to Israel's actions as "murder conducted by a state." The Turkish government also spearheaded efforts at the U.N. Security Council to issue a harsh rebuke of Israel. Monday's events might prove a wake-up call for the U.S. foreign-policy establishment. Among the small group of Turkey watchers inside the Beltway, nostalgia rules the day. U.S. officialdom yearns to return to a brief moment in history when Washington and Ankara's security interests were aligned, due to the shared threat posed by the Soviet Union. Returning to the halcyon days of the U.S.-Turkish relationship, however, is increasingly untenable. This revelation comes despite the hopes of U.S. President Barack Obama, whose inauguration was greeted with a sigh of relief along both the Potomac and the Bosphorus. Officials in both countries hoped that the Obama administration's international approach, which emphasized diplomatic engagement, multilateralism, and regional stability, would mesh nicely with that of Turkey's ruling Justice and Development Party. The White House made it clear from the beginning that Turkey was a priority for Obama, who raised the idea of a "model partnership" between the two countries. Turkey, the theory went, had a set of attributes and assets that it could bring to bear to help the United States achieve its interests in the Middle East, Central Asia, and the Caucasus. Naturally, as a longtime U.S. ally, Turkey was thought to share America's interests in these regions. That was the thinking, anyway. A little more than a year after Obama addressed the Turkish Grand National Assembly, Washington seems caught between its attempts to advance this model partnership, and recognition of the reality that Ankara has moved on. This desire to restore close relations with Turkey is partially based on a rose-tinted view of the alliance's glory days; even then, the relationship was often quite difficult, buffeted by Turkey's troubled relations with Greece, Ankara's invasion of Cyprus, and the Armenian-American community's calls for recognition of the 1915 massacres as genocide. Back then, Turkey was a fractious junior partner in the global chess game with the Soviets. Today, Turkey is all grown up, sporting the 16th largest economy in the world, and is coming into its own diplomatically. Nowhere is Turkey asserting itself more than in the Middle East, where it has gone from a tepid observer to an influential player in eight short years. In the abstract, Washington and Ankara do share the same goals: peace between Israel and the Palestinians; a stable, unified Iraq; an Iran without nuclear weapons; stability in Afghanistan; and a Western-oriented Syria. When you get down to details, however, Washington and Ankara are on the opposite ends of virtually all these issues. For the first time in its history, Ankara has chosen sides in the Israeli-Palestinian conflict, demanding that Israel take steps to ease the blockade of Gaza or risk unspecified "consequences." Well before the recent crisis, the Turks had positioned themselves as thinly veiled advocates for Hamas, which has long been on the U.S. State Department's list of terrorist organizations. In public statements, Turkish Prime Minister Recep Tayyip Erdogan has compared Turkey's Islamists and Hamas. Implicit in these declarations is a parallel to Erdogan's own Justice and Development Party, whose predecessors were repeatedly banned from politics. This parallel is rather odd. Turkey's Islamists always sought to process their grievances peacefully, while the Islamic Resistance Movement -- Hamas's actual name -- has a history of violence. Ankara's warm embrace of Hamas has not only angered the Israelis, but other U.S. regional allies including Egypt, the Palestinian Authority, and Saudi Arabia. Even in Afghanistan, there's less to Turkey's vaunted cooperation than meets the eye. Turkey was the first ally to offer troops to U.S. efforts there in 2001, and more recently, it has doubled its contingent of soldiers to almost 1,700. However, Ankara has consistently -- like other NATO allies -- refused to throw these forces into the fight, even after the Obama administration's entreaties to do more as part of the Afghan "surge." Ankara also took a lot of heat from George W. Bush's administration for its good relations with the Syrian regime, though the United States eventually reconciled itself to the logic of Turkey's interests in its southern neighbor. Turkey sees its ties with Syria as a hedge against Kurdish nationalism, believing that brisk cross-border trade will make everyone -- Turks, Kurds, and Syrians -- richer, happier, and less suspicious of one another. The close diplomatic ties have an added benefit for Washington: They give Syrian President Bashar al-Assad someone to talk to other than Iranian President Mahmoud Ahmadinejad and Hezbollah Secretary-General Hassan Nasrallah. That's the theory, anyway. But Ankara and Washington may well end up on opposite sides when it comes to the Assad regime. The Turks have been noticeably quiet about U.S. and Israeli allegations that Syria has either transferred Scud missiles to Hezbollah or trained Hezbollah fighters to use them in Syria. What will the Turks do if Israel launches a preventive strike against those missiles, now believed to be on the Syrian side of the border near the Bekaa Valley -- or if the Israel Defense Forces take the fight to Lebanon, where there are 367 Turkish soldiers serving in the U.N. peacekeeping force in South Lebanon? Whatever the exact scenario, conflict along Israel's northern border seems increasingly likely. In that event, Washington will no doubt endorse Israel's right to self-defense -- and Ankara will not. Perhaps the biggest issue separating the United States and Turkey is Iran. There is a full-blown controversy brewing over exactly what the Obama administration communicated to Erdogan and Brazilian President Luiz Inacio Lula da Silva before the two leaders traveled to Tehran in May. There, Lula and Erdogan hammered out a deal that would shift 1,200 kilograms of

<CARD CONTINUES ON NEXT PAGE.>

**Impact – Turkey-US Relations (2/3)**

<CARD CONTINUED>

Iran's low-enriched uranium to Turkey in exchange for fuel for the Tehran Research Reactor (TRR). So far, Washington's explanation of what it did and did not tell Ankara and Brasilia is rather weak -- a perplexing lapse of communication and coordination for an administration that puts a premium on these virtues. Regardless of the Obama administration's mistakes, the Turkish-Brazilian deal demonstrates just how far apart Washington and Ankara are on Iran. The Obama administration sees the TRR agreement as yet another Iranian effort to split Washington, its allies in Europe, the Chinese, and the Russians, thereby forestalling a new round of U.N.-mandated sanctions, all while the Iranians continue to enrich uranium. The Turks think the deal is a promising start to the painstaking task of moving Washington and Tehran toward broader negotiations. The easy temptation is to blame creeping Islamization for Turkey's foreign-policy shift. There is no denying that there is an ideological component to much of Erdogan's rhetoric, especially when it comes to Israel. However, the prime minister is not the architect of Ankara's foreign policy; Foreign Minister Davutoglu is the man responsible for the country's new international activism. Bookish, soft-spoken and extremely smart, Davutoglu is not an Islamist. Rather, he correctly perceived the role Turkey can play in a much-changed world. The structural changes resulting from the end of the Cold War, Europe's continuing rebuff of Turkey, and the economic opportunities to the country's south, east, and north have driven Davutoglu's thinking, not the Quran. Moreover, despite the bitter political battle being played out in Turkey over the country's political trajectory, there is general agreement across the political spectrum on the direction of Turkish foreign policy. Other Turkish governments might have been more cautious about the TRR deal, but they certainly would be seeking to maintain good relations with Iran, Iraq, and Syria, not to mention Russia. The Obama administration has yet to grapple with the ways the structural changes in the international system have affected U.S.-Turkey relations. All the talk about strategic cooperation, model partnership, and strategic importance cannot mask the fundamental shift at hand. The stark reality is that while Turkey and the United States are not enemies in the Middle East, they are fast becoming competitors. Whereas the United States seeks to remain the predominant power in the region and, as such, wants to maintain a political order that makes it easier for Washington to achieve its goals, Turkey clearly sees things differently. The Turks are willing to bend the regional rules of the game to serve Ankara's own interests. If the resulting policies serve U.S. goals at the same time, good. If not, so be it. Moreover, Ankara's approach has proved enormously popular in Turkey and among average Arabs. This is why Erdogan seems all too willing to discuss Turkey's newly influential role in the Middle East at even the most mundane ribbon-cutting events, from Istanbul to the Armenian border. Indeed, it is abundantly clear that Erdogan and his party believe they benefit domestically from the position Turkey has staked out in the Middle East. Yet, it is lost on Washington that the demands of domestic Turkish politics now trump the need to maintain good relations with the United States. Given the mythology that surrounds the relationship, the divergence between Washington and Ankara has proved difficult to accept. Once policymakers recognize what is really happening, Washington and Ankara can get on with the job of managing the decline in ties with the least possible damage. Obama's goal should be to develop relations with Turkey along the same lines the United States has with Brazil or Thailand or Malaysia. Those relations are strong in some areas, but fall short of strategic alliances. "Frenemy" might be too harsh a term for such an arrangement, but surely "model partnership" is a vast overstatement. It's time to recognize reality.

Middle Eastern conflict involving Israel goes nuclear

Steinbach 2 (John, Hiroshima/Nagasaki Peace Committee, March 2002, http://www.wagingpeace.org/articles/02.03/0331steinbachisraeli.htm) GAT

Meanwhile, the existence of an arsenal of mass destruction in such an unstable region in turn has serious implications for future arms control and disarmament negotiations, and even the threat of nuclear war. Seymour Hersh warns, "Should war break out in the Middle East again,... or should any Arab nation fire missiles against Israel, as the Iraqis did, a nuclear escalation, once unthinkable except as a last resort, would now be a strong probability."(41) and Ezar Weissman, Israel's current President said "The nuclear issue is gaining momentum (and the) next war will not be conventional."(42) Russia and before it the Soviet Union has long been a major (if not the major) target of Israeli nukes. It is widely reported that the principal purpose of Jonathan Pollard's spying for Israel was to furnish satellite images of Soviet targets and other super sensitive data relating to U.S. nuclear targeting strategy. (43) (Since launching its own satellite in 1988, Israel no longer needs U.S. spy secrets.) Israeli nukes aimed at the Russian heartland seriously complicate disarmament and arms control negotiations and, at the very least, the unilateral possession of nuclear weapons by Israel is enormously destabilizing, and dramatically lowers the threshold for their actual use, if not for all out nuclear war. In the words of Mark Gaffney, "... if the familar pattern(Israel refining its weapons of mass destruction with U.S. complicity) is not reversed soon - for whatever reason - the deepening Middle East conflict could trigger a world conflagration." (44)

Impact – Turkey-US Relations (3/3)

Even without escalation, Middle East nuclear war guarantees extinction

Hoffman 6 (Ian, Staff Writer, December 12, 2006, “Nuclear Winter Looms, experts say”, MediaNews Group, Inc. and ANG Newspapers) GAT

SAN FRANCISCO -- With superpower nuclear arsenals plummeting to a third of 1980s levels and slated to drop by another third, the nightmarish visions of nuclear winter offered by scientists during the Cold War have receded. But they haven't gone away. Researchers at the American Geophysical Union's annual meeting warned Monday that even a small regional nuclear war could burn enough cities to shroud the globe in black smoky shadow and usher in the manmade equivalent of the Little Ice Age. "Nuclear weapons represent the greatest single human threat to the planet, much more so than global warming," said Rutgers University atmospheric scientist Alan Robock. By dropping imaginary Hiroshima-sized bombs into some of the world's biggest cities, now swelled to tens of millions in population, University of Colorado researcher O. Brian Toon and colleagues found they could generate 100 times the fatalities and 100 times the climate-chilling smoke per kiloton of explosive power as all-out nuclear war between the United States and former Soviet Union. For most modern nuclear-war scenarios, the global impact isn't nuclear winter, the notion of smoke from incinerated cities blotting out the sun for years and starving most of the Earth's people. It's not even nuclear autumn, but rather an instant nuclear chill over most of the planet, accompanied by massive ozone loss and warming at the poles. That's what scientists' computer simulations suggest would happen if nuclear war broke out in a hot spot such as the Middle East, the North Korean peninsula or, the most modeled case, in Southeast Asia. Unlike in the Cold War, when the United States and Russia mostly targeted each other's nuclear, military and strategic industrial sites, young nuclear-armed nations have fewer weapons and might go for maximum effect by using them on cities, as the United States did in 1945. "We're at a perilous crossroads," Toon said. The spread of nuclear weapons worldwide combined with global migration into dense megacities form what he called "perhaps the greatest danger to the stability of society since the dawn of humanity." More than 20 years ago, researchers imagined a U.S.-Soviet nuclear holocaust would wreak havoc on the planet's climate. They showed the problem was potentially worse than feared: Massive urban fires would flush hundreds of millions of tons of black soot skyward, where -- heated by sunlight -- it would soar higher into the stratosphere and begin cooking off the protective ozone layer around the Earth. Huge losses of ozone would open the planet and its inhabitants to damaging radiation, while the warm soot would spread a pall sufficient to plunge the Earth into freezing year-round. The hundreds of millions who would starve exceeded those who would die in the initial blasts and radiation. Popularized by astronomer Carl Sagan and Nobel prize winners, the idea of nuclear winter captured the public imagination, though nuclear-weapons scientists found nuclear winter was virtually impossible to achieve in their own computer models without dropping H-bombs on nearly every major city. Scientists on Monday say nuclear winter still is possible, by detonating every nation's entire nuclear arsenals. The effects are striking and last five times or longer than the cooling effects of the biggest volcanic eruptions in recent history, according to Rutgers' Robock.

**Ext – PKK --> Middle East Instability**

The PKK is a threat to stability in the Middle East

Cihan 6 (Cihan News Agency, http://www.middleeastinfo.org/forum/index.php?s=365ac380b8efee18000238c5c0f5a39c&showtopic=11289&mode=threaded) GAT

The American Washington Post daily cited the Kurdistan Workers Party (PKK) terrorist organization as one of the severe threats to stability in the Middle East. An editorial written by Lenore G. Martin said that the PKK, which is operating from havens in northern Iraq, was a threat to Turkey and to stability in the Middle East. The daily said that Turkey was determined to prevent a repetition of the 1984-1999 terrorist activities with the separatist PKK, in which it suffered more than 30,000 deaths. Martin underlined that the U.S. should take much firmer action to stop the PKK's terrorist activities from undermining its Middle East policy. The U.S. administration recently appointed a special envoy to coordinate the war against PKK terrorism. Retired General Joseph Ralston recently paid a visit to Turkey to discuss the measures to battle against PKK terrorism. The Washington Post claimed that a Turkish cross-border operation into northern Iraq would create chaos in that part of Iraq and potentially destabilize the region. The daily added that the U.S. would face a more chaotic situation in Iraq and the loss of a long-term relationship with the Iraqi Kurds, who are Washington's best hope for obtaining rights for U.S. bases in the future. "If Washington opposes the invasion, it risks further estrangement from Turkey, a state positioned to play a critical strategic role in a region where Iran increasingly challenges the United States for dominance." The daily advised the Iraqi Kurdish leaders to deny the PKK havens in northern Iraq and prevent PKK leadership from traveling freely throughout the country. The editorial recommended Turkey to grant more cultural and social rights to the Kurdish citizens of Turkey to allow their integration into the Turkish republic. "The U.S. must throw its full weight behind efforts to eject the PKK from northern Iraq. Furthermore the United States needs to pressure Europe more energetically to block the transfer of funds to the PKK, which it has classified as a terrorist organization. It cannot rely on a tripartite commission to stop the next guerrilla war in the Middle East," the Washington Post added.

**Ext – PKK Hurts Turkey-US Relations**

**If the US does not begin to make an active stand against PKK activities, Turkey-US relations will go out the window**

Cakan 7/6 (Seyhmus, writer for Reuters, http://www.reuters.com/article/idUSTRE6653EE20100706) GAT

Turkey's military and civilian leaders signaled growing frustration with the United States and Iraq Tuesday over their role in the fight against Kurdish rebels after a new attack on a Turkish base killed 15. More than 80 Turkish soldiers have been killed in fighting so far this year, exceeding the death toll in 2009, most of them after Kurdistan Workers Party (PKK) separatist guerrillas ended a 14-month ceasefire at the start of June. Turkish Prime Minister Tayyip Erdogan's government, under pressure to contain escalating violence that threatens to hurt its popularity in a general vote set by July 2011, has repeatedly called for greater support from Iraq and the U.S. to combat the PKK, which has bases in northern Iraq. In the latest fighting, PKK rebels attacked an army outpost in southeast Turkey overnight, triggering a clash in which 12 rebels and three soldiers were killed, security sources said. "These terror camps within the borders of Iraq, in northern Iraq, are unacceptable. We have demanded this from Iraq and the United States. The time for words is over. It is time for action now," Interior Minister Besir Atalay told a news conference. Striking a similar note, the head of the Turkish armed forces warned that the PKK presence in Iraq could harm ties with its neighbor and with the United States if action is not taken to curb the militants' activities in northern Iraq. "The time has come and is passing for those responsible -- the people, institutions, states and formations in northern Iraq -- to do what is right," General Ilker Basbug was reported as saying in an interview with Star TV. "The presence of the PKK in northern Iraq will have a negative impact on Turkish-Iraqi relations in the coming period. In a sense, it will negatively affect Turkish-U.S. relations." Washington provides intelligence on PKK movements to Ankara.

\_\_\_\*\*Turkey CP – Aff Answers

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.
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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.
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**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.