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1NC Shell – Obama Good – START Good (1/2)

A. Uniqueness and impact – START ratification likely now – ratification failure triggers a ripple effect collapsing arms control and global security

Rogin, Foreign Policy’s The Cable Blog writer, 7-19-10

(Josh, Foreign Policy The Cable Blog, “What are the consequences if START ratification fails?”,

<http://thecable.foreignpolicy.com/posts/2010/07/19/what_are_the_consequences_if_start_ratification_fails>, accessed 7-19-10)

The conventional wisdom in Washington is that President Obama's strategic arms-control treaty with Russia will be eventually ratified by the Senate, with a smattering of reluctant GOP votes. But what if that doesn't happen?

The possibility of the treaty being rejected or stalled indefinitely is a real one. The center of gravity on the Senate side is around Sens. Jon Kyl, R-AZ, and John McCain, R-AZ, neither of whom has revealed yet which way they will vote. Interested but less-involved senators like Bob Corker, R-TN, are likely to follow their lead.

It's been reported that Kyl is in negotiations now, bargaining for concessions, such as more money for nuclear modernization or guarantees that missile defense won't fall victim to the treaty. But in the end, there's no assurance he will vote yes, and the treaty could be voted down or pulled from consideration. That would be a huge setback for U.S. credibility abroad and the Obama administration's entire arms-control agenda, according to experts, former officials, and foreign diplomats.

"If this were to go down, the ripple effect consequences around the world would be the worst possible outcome we've seen since World War II," said former Sen. Chuck Hagel, the Nebraska Republican who currently co-chair's Obama's Foreign Intelligence Advisory Board. "It would set in motion the disintegration of any confidence in the leadership of the two major nuclear powers to deal with this and it would set in motion a disintegration of any structural boundaries and capacities to deal with this. This would devastating not just for arms control but for security interests worldwide."

While New START is a deal between the U.S. and Russia, which account for approximately 90 percent of the world's nuclear weapons, its defeat would harm international efforts to later bring other nuclear powers into an arms-control regime, according to former Democratic Senator Gary Hart.

"The two of us have the greatest burden, but sooner or later we want to bring in China and our European allies that have nuclear arsenals and see how far we can go," Hart said. "But it must begin with us and the Russians, and if we turn our back... it's a giant step backward and it would set back our diplomacy, foreign policy, and national security in serious ways."

B. Link – accelerating troop withdrawal drains political capital

Hiatt, Washington Post editorial editor, 10

(Fred, Herald-Sun, 4-27-10, “Leaving worthy issues on the table”, Lexis)

To avoid that trap, Obama had to govern with discipline. First, he would have to turn potential negatives into successes. At home, that meant not only engineering a stimulus program to end the recession but also designing financial reform to prevent a recurrence. In Iraq and Afghanistan, it meant charting a path to not just withdrawal but stable outcomes. Since both fronts would take enormous energy and political capital, Obama could not afford to squander whatever remained across an array of worthy electives. So over time he subordinated everything to just two: health-insurance reform and blocking Iran's development of nuclear weapons.

1NC Shell – Obama Good – START Good (2/2)

C. Internal link – Political capital key to START ratification

Sharp, Center for Arms Control and Non-Proliferation military analyst, 9

(Travis, 8-28-9, Bulletin of the Atomic Scientists, “Local priorities vs. national interests in arms control”, <http://www.thebulletin.org/web-edition/features/local-priorities-vs-national-interests-arms-control>, accessed 7-16-10)

While beliefs about national sovereignty and international law matter, when it comes to arms control treaties, ideological considerations rarely trump pork-barrel politics. Would a senator from a state dependent on the nuclear weapons complex oppose an arms control treaty not on the basis of ideology, but because the treaty would mean the loss of jobs or funding in their home state? Absolutely. As such, the Senate could become a stumbling block in President Barack Obama's plans to reduce the U.S. nuclear arsenal and strategic triad of intercontinental ballistic missiles (ICBMs), submarine-launched ballistic missiles (SLBMs), and strategic bombers. While past treaties such as START I and SORT were approved overwhelmingly by the Senate, those agreements didn't alter the triad's fundamental configuration. Warheads and delivery vehicles were retired, but the constellation of bases and supporting defense contractors, though reduced, remained in place. The force posture being considered by the Obama administration, however, challenges the long-standing status quo and therefore, threatens the local interests of many senators. With a two-thirds Senate majority of 67 votes needed for approval, treaties in the 111th Congress must not only attract support from all 60 caucusing Democratic senators, they must also win affirmation from at least seven Republicans. Based on the guidelines laid out by Obama and Russian President Dmitry Medvedev, the upcoming START follow-on shouldn't be hindered by the 67-vote threshold. But what happens after the next round of negotiations, when warhead numbers will really begin to be lowered? Pushing deeper nuclear reductions through the Senate will be extraordinarily difficult and will require a Herculean political effort from the White House.

Uniqueness – START Ratification Now

START ratification has momentum now – growing national security establishment support

Cirincione, Ploughshares Fund President, 7-19-10

(Joe, Huffington Post, “New Consensus on American Security”, <http://www.huffingtonpost.com/joe-cirincione/new-consensus-on-american_b_651450.html>, accessed 7-19-10)

In a hopeful sign of growing bipartisan support for nuclear reductions, former military commanders and national security officials announced their support today for quick approval of the New START treaty.

Admiral William Owens, former vice chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, said he is "totally convinced the provisions of New START are in the best interests of our country." He urged the Senate to "take the bipartisan approach, pass the treaty and show the world the leadership they expect from the United States."

"New START is essential," said Lieutenant General Arlen "Dirk" Jameson, former deputy commander-in-chief of the Strategic Command. "Without it we'd be poorly equipped to monitor Russia's arsenal," Gen. Jameson said, and it "allows the US to lead in pursuing greater cooperation with our allies and others" on stopping nuclear terrorism and the spread of nuclear weapons to other states.

Owens and Jameson joined former senators Gary Hart (D.-CO) and Chuck Hagel (R.-NE) in a press conference launching the new Consensus for American Security.

The Consensus for American Security is a new initiative of the American Security Project that brings together a broad, bipartisan consensus of former military and national security leaders "who know that American security depends on sound and smart nuclear security policies," says the Jim Ludes, executive director of the American Security Project.

START ratification likely now

Agence France Presse, 6-10-10

(“Key US Senate panel to vote on new START treaty by August”, Lexis)

A key US Senate committee will vote on a landmark nuclear arms treaty with Russia before lawmakers leave for their monthlong August break, the panel's top two members said Thursday.

"We plan to hold a vote in the Senate Foreign Relations Committee on the New START Treaty prior to the August recess," said the panel's chairman, Democratic Senator John Kerry.

Kerry said he and Senator Richard Lugar, the committee's top Republican, "are confident that our colleagues from both sides of the aisle will join us in supporting the treaty to strengthen our national security."

Approval by the panel would set the stage for action by the entire US Senate, where 67 votes are needed for ratification, a process US President Barack Obama has said he would like to see completed in 2010.

Obama's Democratic allies and their two independent allies control only 59 votes, meaning the treaty's backers will need to rally at least eight Republicans to approve the pact.

"This timeline for committee consideration is imperative so that we can restart inspections, invigorate our relationship with Russia and continue our leadership in global nonproliferation," said Lugar.

Lugar, widely hailed as a champion of efforts to curb the spread of nuclear weapons and materials, said the panel would address "legitimate and important concerns expressed by senators."

Some Republican senators have indicated they are inclined to back the pact but say they worry about the effects on the US nuclear deterrent and that they want to energize work at national nuclear laboratories to ensure the safety and reliability of the US arsenal.

Uniqueness – START Ratification Now

GOP not coalescing against START now

Ploughshares Fund, 7-14-10

(Morning Joe, “Gates Talks to Senate Republicans About the Merits of NEW START”, <http://www.ploughshares.org/news-analysis/morning-joe/gates-talks-senate-republicans-about-merits-new-start>, accessed 7-15-10)

\* President Obama used Defense Secretary Robert Gates on Tuesday for a stealth attack on Mitt Romney, a leading Republican presidential contender in 2012.

\* Obama dispatched Gates to meet Senate Republicans to discuss a U.S.-Russia nuclear arms treaty and other national security issues.

\* Gates has helped slow GOP opposition from coalescing. So far, Senate Republicans haven’t followed Romney’s call to scrap the treaty. They held their fire after hearing from Gates in a lunchtime meeting off the Senate floor.

\* “We do have some concerns, particularly with missile defense,” said Sen. Roger Wicker (R-Miss.), a Foreign Relations Committee member who is studying the treaty, “but it’s entirely possible a number of Republicans will support it when it’s all said and done."

\* A GOP aide said Kyl has held several meetings with Biden to work out a possible agreement.

National security establishment lobbying and support bolsters chances of START ratification

Cirincione, Ploughshares Fund President, 7-19-10

(Joe, Huffington Post, “New Consensus on American Security”, <http://www.huffingtonpost.com/joe-cirincione/new-consensus-on-american_b_651450.html>, accessed 7-19-10)

The opening statement by of the 33 high-ranking Consensus members says:

The New START Treaty is a critical and essential first-step. The Consensus demonstrates bipartisan support for efforts to SECURE the world's current nuclear stockpiles, PREVENT terrorists from getting access to nuclear technologies, and REDUCE the spread of nuclear weapons worldwide.

The July 19th conference call was the first in a series advancing the group's efforts to raise awareness about these issues and "to rebuild an enduring bipartisan consensus in the United States about our nation's security."

Members include 15 retired general officers from all four military services. In addition to the four on the conference call, the list includes former Secretary of State George Shultz, Chief Negotiator of the first START agreement Ambassador Richard Burt, Lieutenant General John Castellaw USMC (Ret), Lieutenant General Robert Gard Jr. USA (Ret), Vice Admiral Lee Gunn USN (Ret), Lieutenant General Donald Kerrick USA (Ret), Rear Admiral Rose Levitre USN (Ret), Major General Paul Eaton USA (Ret), General Tony McPeak USAF (Ret), Stanford Physicist Sid Drell, Brookings Institution President Strobe Talbott and two dozen other prominent Americans.

The group statement posted on their web site (www.securityconsensus.org) concludes:

The START Treaty represents the US national interest. It is the only option that allows us to invest in the nuclear security priorities necessary to confront the threats of today and tomorrow. Building on the successes of President Reagan, the Treaty allows us to control old weapons while supporting our forces and the development of advanced capabilities. Without this Treaty, we will not be able to move forward with new strategic issues that are vital to protecting America.

The statesmanship demonstrated by the Consensus members today could help break the partisan blockade in the Senate and restore America's leadership on this urgent security challenge.

[Note – “Consensus” = The Consensus for American Security, the membership is described in the evidence]

Uniqueness – START Ratification Now – Lugar

Lugar on board now – and he is key to leveraging GOP votes

Pinkus, National Security Journalist for the Washington Post, 7-6-10

(Walter, “Fine Print: State Department reports play role in START ratification”, Washington post, <http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/content/article/2010/07/05/AR2010070502338.html>, accessed 7-15-10)

More pertinent to today's situation is the review of negotiating records that year preceding the ratification of the Intermediate-Range Nuclear Forces Treaty, which ended with removal of those types of U.S. and Russian missiles from Western Europe. In its report on the treaty, the Foreign Relations Committee said such a review of negotiating records should not become a regular procedure but should be done on a case-by-case basis. "A systematic expectation of Senate perusal of every key treaty's negotiating record" could result in less candor in future negotiations, the panel's report said.

In responding to the GOP letter last week, Kerry said there had already been 10 hearings on the treaty with administration witnesses and then experts representing both political parties who criticized or supported the pact. He said the NIE and the State Department Compliance Reports were available for review.

He also said that a closed committee session to go over the NIE would be held shortly and that another hearing with the directors of the nation's nuclear weapons laboratories would take place in mid-July. The latter were to discuss the administration's plans to maintain the viability of the nation's nuclear stockpile, an issue stressed by Republicans as a requirement for their support.

As for ratification of the treaty, Kerry said: "I look forward to completing this process as soon as possible."

With Democrats needing at least eight Republicans to get the two-thirds Senate vote for ratification, Kerry has to avoid irritating his panel's minority members. But there is one bit of sunlight for him in their letter: The minority member who did not sign it was Sen. Richard Lugar (Ind.), the ranking GOP member and former panel chairman whose vote is needed to draw other Republicans if ratification is to pass.

Endorsement by 30 influential national security leaders bolsters momentum, especially with Lugar

Partnership for a Secure America, 6-24-10

(“30 Top National Security Leaders Come Out in Support of New START Treaty”, <http://blog.psaonline.org/2010/06/24/30-top-national-security-leaders-come-out-in-support-of-new-start-treaty/>, accessed 7-16-10)

This morning, a bipartisan group of 30 top national security leaders issued a statement in support of the new Strategic Arms Reduction Treaty (START). The statement, whose signatory list includes ten former Senators, four former Secretaries of Defense, and four former Secretaries of State, calls START “a necessary and appropriate step toward safeguarding our national security” that “enhances stability, transparency and predictability between the world’s two largest nuclear powers.” Both Sen. Richard Lugar (R-IN) and Sen. Robert Casey (D-PA) read from the statement in today’s Senate Foreign Relations Committee hearing on START. The statement also appeared as an advertisement in today’s Politico.

Uniqueness – START Ratification Now – AT – Spy Scandal Hurts START

No impact – No major political fallout out from spy scandal

Sunday Business Post, 7-4-10

(“Spy games will not affect US-Russian relations”, Lexis)

The modest political impact of the story was underlined by the muted reactions from Barack Obama's

White House administration.

White House press secretary Robert Gibbs told reporters at a briefing that he did ''not believe that this will affect the reset of our relationship with Russia''.

Philip Gordon, assistant secretary of state with responsibility for Russia, struck a similarly pragmatic note, asserting that the US ''would like to get to the point'' where covert agents were not deployed by either side, but added that ''we're apparently not there yet.

I don't think anyone in this room is shocked to have discovered that."

Uniqueness – Obama Strong Now

Obama winning on his agenda now – stimulus, health care, financial reform prove

Feldmann, Christian Science Monitor, 7-16-10

(Linda, Christian Science Monitor, “Financial reform bill another win for Obama, but will the public care?”, <http://www.csmonitor.com/USA/Politics/2010/0716/Financial-reform-bill-another-win-for-Obama-but-will-the-public-care>, accessed 7-16-10)

Passage of financial regulatory reform signals another landmark legislative victory for President Obama, following the Recovery Act and health-care reform.

At a minimum, this latest success demonstrates that Mr. Obama and his team know how to work their big majorities in Congress and get things done. This is part of the spoils of the resounding Democratic sweep of 2008, which handed Obama the White House and large caucuses in the House and Senate.

But big majorities are diverse, and, as the Democrats discovered with health care, getting agreement – and votes – can be like herding cats. Especially in an era of intense polarization, that requires 60 votes in the Senate to pass anything big. The Democrats got three Republican senators to join them Thursday in voting for financial reform, a victory in and of itself, as it passed 60 to 39.

Obama’s success in passing financial regulatory reform, just a few months after health care, also puts the lie to the idea that major legislation can’t pass in an election year. Democrats know that the days are probably numbered for their big majorities, and that they had to act soon if they wanted it to have a shot at passage. Democrats are also hopeful there’s room in the schedule for one more biggie: energy reform.

Links – Troop Withdrawal (1/4)

Troop withdrawal triggers perception of the US cutting and running

Astore, retired Air Force lieutenant colonel and former Air Force Academy instructor, 7-14-10

[William, YES! Magazine, “An End to Constant War” <http://news.yourolivebranch.org/2010/07/14/an-end-to-constant-war/>, Date accessed July 16, 2010.]

If one quality characterizes our wars today, it’s their endurance. They never seem to end. Though war itself may not be an American inevitability, these days many factors combine to make constant war an American near certainty. Put metaphorically, our nation’s pursuit of war taps so many wellsprings of our behavior that a concerted effort to cap it would dwarf BP’s efforts in the Gulf of Mexico. Our political leaders, the media, and the military interpret enduring war as a measure of our national fitness, our global power, our grit in the face of eternal danger, and our seriousness. A desire to de-escalate and withdraw, on the other hand, is invariably seen as cut-and-run appeasement and discounted as weakness. Withdrawal options are, in a pet phrase of Washington elites, invariably “off the table” when global policy is at stake, as was true during the Obama administration’s full-scale reconsideration of the Afghan war in the fall of 2009. Viewed in this light, the president’s ultimate decision to surge in Afghanistan was not only predictable, but the only course considered suitable for an American war leader. Rather than the tough choice, it was the path of least resistance. Why do our elites so readily and regularly give war, not peace, a chance? What exactly are the wellsprings of Washington’s (and America’s) behavior when it comes to war and preparations for more of the same? Consider these seven: 1. We wage war because we think we’re good at it—and because, at a gut level, we’ve come to believe that American wars can bring good to others (hence our feel-good names for them, like Operations Enduring Freedom and Iraqi Freedom). Most Americans are not only convinced we have the best troops, the best training, and the most advanced weapons, but also the purest motives. Unlike the bad guys and the barbarians out there in the global marketplace of death, our warriors and warfighters are seen as gift-givers and freedom-bringers, not as death-dealers and resource-exploiters. Our illusions about the military we “support” serve as catalyst for, and apology for, the persistent war-making we condone. 2. We wage war because we’ve already devoted so many of our resources to it. It’s what we’re most prepared to do. More than half of discretionary federal spending goes to fund our military and its war making or war preparations. The military-industrial complex is a well-oiled, extremely profitable machine and the armed forces, our favorite child, the one we’ve lavished the most resources and praise upon. It’s natural to give your favorite child free rein. 3. We’ve managed to isolate war’s physical and emotional costs, leaving them on the shoulders of a tiny minority of Americans. By eliminating the draft and relying ever more on for-profit private military contractors, we’ve made war a distant abstraction for most Americans, who can choose to consume it as spectacle or simply tune it out as so much background noise. 4. While war and its costs have, to date, been kept at arm’s length, American society has been militarizing fast. Our media outlets, intelligence agencies, politicians, foreign policy establishment, and “homeland security” bureaucracy are so intertwined with military priorities and agendas as to be inseparable from them. In militarized America, griping about soft-hearted tactics or the outspokenness of a certain general may be tolerated, but forceful criticism of our military or our wars is still treated as deviant and “un-American.” 5. Our profligate, high-tech approach to war, including those Predator and Reaper drones armed with Hellfire missiles, has served to limit American casualties—and so has limited the anger over, and harsh questioning of, our wars that might go with them. While the U.S. has had more than 1,000 troops killed in Afghanistan, over a similar period in Vietnam we lost more than 58,000 troops. Improved medical evacuation and trauma care, greater reliance on standoff precision weaponry and similar “force multipliers,” stronger emphasis on “force protection” within American military units: All these and more have helped tamp down concern about the immeasurable and soaring costs of our wars. 6. As we incessantly develop those force-multiplying weapons to give us our “edge” (though never an edge that leads

**CARD CONTINUES, NO TEXT OMITTED**
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**CARD CONTINUED, NO TEXT OMITTED**

to victory), it’s hardly surprising that the United States has come to dominate, if not quite monopolize, the global arms trade. In these years, as American jobs were outsourced or simply disappeared in the Great Recession, armaments have been one of our few growth industries. Endless war has proven endlessly profitable—not perhaps for all of us, but certainly for those in the business of war. 7. And don’t forget the seductive power of beyond-worse-case, doomsday scenarios, of the prophecies of pundits and so-called experts, who regularly tell us that, bad as our wars may be, doing anything to end them would be far worse. A typical scenario goes like this: If we withdraw from Afghanistan, the government of Hamid Karzai will collapse, the Taliban will surge to victory, al-Qaeda will pour into Afghan safe havens, and Pakistan will be further destabilized, its atomic bombs falling into the hands of terrorists out to destroy Peoria and Orlando.

The evidence above is a continuation of this card:

Troop withdrawal triggers perception of the US cutting and running

Astore, retired Air Force lieutenant colonel and former Air Force Academy instructor, 7-14-10

[William, YES! Magazine, “An End to Constant War” <http://news.yourolivebranch.org/2010/07/14/an-end-to-constant-war/>, Date accessed July 16, 2010.]

Any move towards military restraint is a political non-starter

Logan, CATO Foreign Policy Studies Director, 3-23-10

(Justin, “The Domestic Bases of America's Grand Strategy,” <http://www.cato.org/pub_display.php?pub_id=11606>, accessed 7-16-10)

Grand strategy happens to be one of the areas in which the academy has been producing work that could be helpful to the FPE. However, because the debate over grand strategy in the academy is free from the domestic political forces exerting themselves on the FPE, some of the options currently being seriously discussed are political non-starters in Washington. For instance, one of the main competitors in the academic debate on the subject has been "restraint," a strategy formally proposed in 1997 but whose current leading exponent is Barry Posen of MIT. Posen describes restraint as a strategy in which Washington would "conceive its security interests narrowly, use its military power stingily, pursue its enemies quietly but persistently, share responsibilities and costs more equitably, watch and wait more patiently."

It is difficult to describe an approach that resembles actual American strategy less than this one. The reason for this is the role of domestic politics in U.S. grand strategy. Washington is on strategic auto-pilot, and it has been for some time. Serious changes to grand strategy will require either dramatic changes in U.S. domestic politics, or the rise of an external challenge that forces the FPE to think much more carefully about the formation and execution of U.S. grand strategy.

When it comes to the latter scenario, some scholars have stated that the end is already nigh. America has had a good run, but multipolarity is here, and with it, balance-of-power constraints that will cause Washington to start acknowledging tradeoffs and making hard choices. According to these scholars, strategic adjustment is coming. Others counter that the declinists have misread the material balance of power, and that America has a lot of fight left in it. For now, the optimists have had the better of the debate.

As for domestic political changes, as early as 1993, Kenneth Waltz hoped that (.pdf) "America's internal preoccupations will produce not an isolationist policy, which has become impossible, but a forbearance that will give other countries at long last the chance to deal with their own problems and make their own mistakes. But I would not bet on it."

Almost 20 years later, who would?

Links – Troop Withdrawal (3/4)

Plan would be perceived as appeasement, triggering backlash

Kupchan, Georgetown International Affairs professor, 10

(Charles, March/April 2010, “Enemies Into Friends,” Foreign Affairs)

OBAMA'S SECOND main challenge is to manage the domestic backlash that regularly accompanies the accommodation of adversaries--one of the key stumbling blocks in past efforts at rapprochement. Anglo-American rapprochement in the nineteenth century on several occasions almost foundered on the shoals of domestic opposition. The U.S. Senate, for example, rejected a general arbitration treaty with the United Kingdom in 1897. Meanwhile, the British government, fearful of a nationalist revolt against its accommodating stance toward Washington, hid from the public its readiness to cede naval superiority in the western Atlantic to the United States. General Suharto, well aware that accommodation with Malaysia risked provoking Indonesian hard-liners, moved slowly and cautiously--as did General Ernesto Geisel when Brazil opened up to Argentina. As the Nixon administration discovered in the 1970s, these governments were wise to be cautious. Detente between the United States and the Soviet Union stalled in part because the White House failed to lay the groundwork for it at home and ran up against congressional resistance. In 1974, for example, Congress passed the Jackson-Vanik amendment, which imposed trade restrictions in order to pressure the Soviet Union to allow emigration.

Like past leaders who advocated accommodation, Obama faces formidable domestic opposition. When he pledged to pursue engagement with the Iranian government even after its troubled election last year, the Washington Post columnist Charles Krauthammer criticized Obama's policy of "dialogue with a regime that is breaking heads, shooting demonstrators, expelling journalists, arresting activists." "This," he wrote, "from a president who fancies himself the restorer of America's moral standing in the world." After the Obama administration revised its predecessor's missile defense program, John Boehner (R-Ohio), the House minority leader, claimed that "scrapping the U.S. missile defense system in Poland and the Czech Republic does little more than empower Russia and Iran at the expense of our allies in Europe."

An even bigger challenge than parrying these rhetorical blows will be ensuring that the concrete bargains struck in the service of rapprochement pass muster with Congress. If the United States is to ratify a deal on nuclear weapons reductions with Moscow and embrace the Comprehensive Nuclear Test Ban Treaty, two-thirds of the Senate will have to approve. Even without a single defection from the Democratic caucus, the White House will need a healthy measure of support from the Republican Party, which has moved considerably to the right since it last shot down the Comprehensive Nuclear Test Ban Treaty, in 1999. Scaling back sanctions against Cuba, Iran, or Syria would similarly require congressional action, which also would not come easily; Congress would no doubt balk at the prospect of ending the isolation of Havana, Tehran, or Damascus. Jackson-Vanik, after all, is still on the books, even though the Soviet Union is no more and Russia ended its restrictive emigration policies long ago. In the face of such congressional hurdles, Obama should develop a legislative strategy that supports his diplomacy sooner rather than later.

Links – Troop Withdrawal (4/4)

Congress will reflexively oppose military withdrawal---the defense lobby’s too powerful

Dayen, Firedog Lake, 5-17-10

(David, Firedog Lake, “Defense Spending Cuts Face Likely Congressional Override,” online: <http://news.firedoglake.com/2010/05/17/defense-spending-cuts-face-likely-congressional-override/>, accessed 7-16-10)

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

A case in point: our bloated military budget. The Obama Administration has generally tried to cancel out unnecessary defense programs, with meager success in the last budget year. Congress will probably assert themselves in an election year, however.

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

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

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

Last year, after a similarly protracted struggle, Gates succeeded in getting Congress to end funding for the F-22, a plane which tended to malfunction in the rain. Seriously. But Congress did not move on the F-35 engine or the C-17, and they seem similarly positioned this year. Ike Skelton and Carl Levin support the F-35 engine, for example, and included it in their appropriation requests out of the House and Senate Armed Services Committees, which they separately chair.

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

Links – Afghanistan – Withdrawal Costs Political Capital (1/2)

Withdrawal now would be political suicide – Obama would be pegged as weak on defense

Kapur, Raw Story Washington correspondent, 7-5-10

(Sahil, THE WASHINGTON INDEPENDENT, National News in Context “As Afghan War Drags On, Some Democrats Threaten Revolt, Votes Last Week Revealed Democratic Growing Schism.” <http://washingtonindependent.com/90906/as-afghan-war-drags-on-some-democrats-threaten-revolt>, accessed 7-16-10)

“Generally, members of your own party support your foreign policy,” he said. “It’s typical that you have to worry more about the opposition party than your own, and the fact that Democrats are expressing reservations should send a warning sign to the Obama administration.” This deepening fissure could turn into a headache for the president and Democratic leaders. “There’s been a schism in the Democratic Party over all wars since Vietnam. What matters is the intensity of it,” said Eric Alterman, of the liberal Center for American Progress. “[The antiwar coalition is] going to make it more difficult for [Obama] to continue the war, and they’re going to be a faction that has to be negotiated with.” “But they’re not going to cut him off at the knees, they’re not to going to humiliate him, and they’re not going to destroy his presidency over it,” Alterman continued. “It’s not going to be the kind of thing that tears the party apart, as this issue has done in the past, because people have learned those lessons.” O’Hanlon, a self-described Democrat and proponent of the Afghanistan occupation, cautioned that stripping funding now would cause Democrats to get “pilloried by Republicans” for “being weak on defense.” “It would be not only strategically unwise but politically suicidal,” he said. And while skeptical Democrats could play an important role in determining the eventual outcome of the war, they may not wield much influence over the administration’s short-term strategy. “This group has influence in the broader sense because obviously it has put a stake in the ground, and if things continue to go badly in Afghanistan, its influence will grow,” O’Hanlon said. “At some point it may be able to push the United States out of this conflict, but for now it’s not going to have any direct impact on strategy.” Recent weeks and months have enhanced negative perceptions of the war, due to escalating violence, the ousting of Gen. Stanley McChrystal and charges of corruption by the government of Afghan President Hamid Karzai. Polls [suggest](http://voices.washingtonpost.com/behind-the-numbers/2010/05/on_afghanistan_a_negative_shif.html) Americans are growing increasingly dissatisfied with the war. The Obama administration hasn’t flinched in its commitment to the effort, and has even begun to back away from its promise to begin winding America’s involvement in the war next July. “That absolutely has not been decided,”[**said**](http://news.yahoo.com/s/afp/20100620/pl_afp/afghanistanunrestusmilitarypolitics_20100620220132) Defense Secretary Robert Gates on June 20 on Fox News, nothing that withdrawal will be “conditions-based.” Obama[**said**](http://news.yahoo.com/s/ap/obama) on June 28 that there’s “a lot of obsession” about the withdrawal date, which irritated some Democrats who perceived it as a snub. It’s unclear whether Democrats will accept the president’s decision to extend it beyond then, if he chooses to. “I think a year from now all bets are off if we haven’t seen major progress,” O’Hanlon said. “It’s possible to imagine a revolt within the party in a year.

Links – Afghanistan – Withdrawal Costs Political Capital (2/2)

Withdrawal of troops in Afghanistan would undermine Obama’s leadership, costing him capital

Frost, Foreign Policy Blogs Network, 10

(Patrick, 3-30-10, New York University Political Science and International Relation Master’s Degree, “President Obama in Afghanistan good for the poles and much more”, http://afghanistan.foreignpolicyblogs.com/2010/03/30/president-obama-in-afghanistan-good-for-the-polls-and-much-more/, accessed 7-14-10)

Barack Obama made his first trip to Afghanistan as president a few days ago, and during his 6 hours in the country he met with President Karzai, Gen. McChrystal, and Ambassador Eikenberry. It has been reported that Obama pressed Karzai on clamping down on corruption and that their conversations were very much ‘down to business’.In related news, the US president’s approval rating (WaPo poll) for his management of the Afghanistan situation, unlike other areas such as health care, jobs, and the economy, is on the rise. During the height of his ‘dithering stage’ on choosing an Afghan strategy in October, November of 2009, his ratings had turned upside down, with more disapproving (48%) than approving (45%). This was a long fall from early in 2009 when Obama held strong in the low 60’s. As I argued in late 2009, it wasn’t so much the situation on the ground that was causing Americans to become disenfranchised with our presence and ability to win in Afghanistan, though that certainly was a factor, but a lack of leadership from the nation’s leaders. The only time Obama talked about Afghanistan was about how difficult a situation it was him and the US. Don’t believe me? The American public wanted to see a leadership that had a plan that it believed in. ‘Either we are in to win or let’s get the heck out!’Since the announced Afghan surge strategy at West Point, the Obama administration has enjoyed ever growing levels of support, November 45%, December 52%, January 50%, and the latest from a couple days ago, 53%, with an incredible only 35% disapproving. These numbers come despite the fact that American combat deaths have doubled and injuries tripled from this time last year. The uptick in the poll numbers is good for the president and should show the administration that the American public is willing to give him time to show positive results from McChrystal’s surge strategy. This latest visit by Obama, especially with images like the one below, will only help.Garnering domestic support for a war over seas is a crucial part of any winning war strategy. President Obama must spend political capital on fostering support for the Afghan war effort by reminding the American public the stakes involved and communicate that we have a strategy in place that can bring success. Now that the health care debate is thankfully not dominating his agenda any longer, I expect more public attention to be shown by President Obama about this critical issue to US foreign policy. The poll numbers show he’ll have a somewhat friendly audience.

Links – Afghanistan – Withdrawal Spun Against Obama

The plan’s weakening of US stance in Afghanistan ensures Obama is spun as indecisive

Partridge, Guardian columnist, 7-3-10

(Matthew, Guardian Unlimited, “Lincoln, FDR or Nixon - its Obama's choice”, Lexis)

In contrast to Nixon, both Abraham Lincoln and Franklin Roosevelt used the idea of "unconditional surrender" to increase popular support for continued participation in, respectively, the American civil war and the second world war. Although Lincoln did not come up with an explicit statement along the line of Roosevelt's "The only terms on which we shall deal with an Axis government or any Axis factions are the terms proclaimed at Casablanca: unconditional surrender", most historians agree with James McPherson that Lincoln's two-part Emancipation Proclamation made any settlement short of total victory impossible. Obama can follow them by both ruling out any future negotiations with the Taliban and declaring that American forces will not respect any deal between them and Karzai.

Of course, a completely hardline position may not be possible since some former Taliban hold minor governmental or parliamentary posts. However, formal negotiations with the Taliban, or tolerance of such discussions, risk encouraging insurgents to continue terrorising the wider population and discouraging those who are fighting alongside Nato troops.

Hinting that a negotiated settlement, rather than a free and democratic Afghanistan, is the ultimate goal may also reinforce the growing perception of Obama as an indecisive leader. Ironically, by putting temporary political considerations ahead of fulfilling his promise to win the war in Afghanistan, Obama may fail to achieve either.

Links – Afghanistan – Withdrawal Unpopular with GOP

GOP opposes troop withdrawal – they’d backlash against the plan

CQ Politics, 6-16-10

[“GOP criticizes withdrawal plan as undermining Afghanistan efforts,” <http://news.yahoo.com/s/cq/20100616/pl_cq_politics/politics3684343_1>, accessed 7-16-10]

Senate Republicans on Wednesday attacked President Obama's plan to begin withdrawing U.S. forces from Afghanistan in July of next year, saying that the United States was sending a self-defeating message to its allies in the region. Testifying before the Senate Armed Services Committee, Army Gen. David H. Petraeus, the commander of all U.S. forces in the Middle East and Afghanistan, assured lawmakers that Obama's July 2011 date signaled the beginning of a process of troop withdrawals whose pace would be determined by conditions on the ground. "That is not the day when we look for the door and turn out the lights, but when a process begins," said Petraeus, who resumed his testimony Wednesday. He fainted from dehydration during testimony June 15. "It would be helpful if your sentiments were shared by the president, the vice president and the national security adviser," said Republican John McCain of Arizona, who cited Obama, Vice President Joseph R. Biden Jr., and national security adviser James L. Jones as saying that the July 2011 start of the troop withdrawal was "etched in stone."

Links – Afghanistan – Lugar Opposition

Lugar opposed to troop reductions in Afghanistan

Agence France-Presse, 7-14-10

(“Afghanistan won’t be ready for US withdrawal: Lugar”, <http://rawstory.com/rs/2010/0714/afghanistan-ready-withdrawal-lugar/>, accessed 7-16-10)

There is substantial concern about our course in Afghanistan," said Senator Richard Lugar, the top Republican on the Senate Foreign Relations Committee and one of his party's most respected elder statesmen on international affairs.

US President Barack Obama must make clear what he hopes to achieve, how, and by when, and do more to clarify what will happen by his self-imposed July 2011 deadline for starting a withdrawal of US forces, said Lugar.

"Absent a major realignment on the ground, it is unrealistic to expect that a significant downsizing of US forces could occur at that time without security consequences," the senator warned.

But "the lack of clarity in Afghanistan does not end with the president's timetable. Both civilian and military operations in Afghanistan are proceeding without a clear definition of success," he added.

Links – Afghanistan – Debate

Plan would trigger a partisan debate – country divided on Obama Afghanistan policy

Condon, CBS News 7-13-10

(Stephanie, CBS News, “Poll: Most Want Afghanistan Withdrawal Timeline.” <http://www.cbsnews.com/8301-503544_162-20010459-503544.html>, accessed 7-15-10)

Most Americans -- 54 percent -- think the U.S. should set a timetable for the withdrawal of U.S. troops from Afghanistan. Forty-one percent disagree. There is a partisan divide on the issue: 73 percent of Democrats think the U.S. should set a timetable, while only 32 percent of Republicans say the U.S. should do so. Fifty-four percent of independents want a timetable. Americans are divided over President Obama's handling of Afghanistan: 43 percent say they approve of his handling of the war, while 44 percent say they disapprove.

Despite opposition, Congress has continued to endorse Obama’s current strategy, ensuring plan triggers emotional debate

Agent France-Presse, 7-1-10

(July 1st 2010. “Obama allies demand end to Afghan war” Google News. Access- July 16th 2010. < <http://www.google.com/hostednews/afp/article/ALeqM5iSimG1nAN7O36cGfJUhezqnIfr7Q>, accessed 7-15-10)

A group of US lawmakers allied with the White House called Thursday for an end to the Afghan war, labeling it an unwinnable drain on US "blood and treasure" and comparing it to Vietnam."Every dollar spent and every life wasted in Vietnam was just that: A waste," said Democratic Representative Jerrold Nadler. "Afghanistan is the same. Every dollar we spend, every life we waste is a waste." Some 21 lawmakers have joined the "Out of Afghanistan Caucus" opposing continued combat operations there, according to one of the group's leaders, Democratic Representative John Conyers. The revolt against President Barack Obama's strategy to turn around the faltering campaign came as the House of Representatives was expected to pass a bill to pump another 37 billion dollars into the wars in Iraq and Afghanistan. Recent polls have found the US public deeply pessimistic about the Afghan war, with some surveys finding a majority say it was not worth fighting, and growing numbers backing a US pull-out almost nine years after the October 2001 invasion. The House was also expected to take up an amendment by Democratic Representative Barbara Lee that calls for using the money only "for the safe and orderly withdrawal" of US forces, she told reporters. "This amendment would require the beginning of the end of this, our longest war," she said, stressing that "the costs of this war in blood and treasure are just too great." The House was also expected to vote on another Democratic amendment calling on Obama to provide a withdrawal timetable, though enough Republicans and Democrats support Obama's strategy that both measures were expected to be defeated. "We don't know whether we'll be successful today, but I believe we are standing here to say that we're committed to vote, over and over again, no, no, no," said Democratic Representative Sheila Jackson Lee. The spending bill under consideration also included nearly three billion in aid for Haiti in the wake of the devastating earthquake there, 701 million dollars of increased US-Mexico border security and 304 million dollars for the response to the catastrophic Gulf of Mexico oil spill.

Link – Afghanistan – Public Supports Current Strategy

Afghanistan is turning with General Petraeus and public support is at 63%. Withdraw would destroy this.

Engelhardt, Nation Institute's TomDispatch.com founder and editor, 7-12-10

(Thomas, CBS News Opinion, “Remind Me Again: Why Are We in Afghanistan? Time to Rethink an Increasingly Self-Evident Failure of U.S. Policy in Afghanistan”, <http://www.cbsnews.com/stories/2010/07/12/opinion/main6671452.shtml>, accessed 7-15-10)

Democratic critics of Gen. Petraeus, and of President Obama’s surge strategy, were notably quiet this week as the general toured the capital’s power hotspots from John Podesta’s Center for American Progress to the [American Enterprise Institute](http://voices.washingtonpost.com/right-now/2010/05/petraeus_salutes_team_kagan_at.html), while being feted as the hero of the moment and a potential [presidential candidate](http://firedoglake.com/2010/05/23/petraeus-hearts-irving-kristol-smiles-at-presidential-quip/) in 2016.  As in 2007, when he was appointed to oversee George W. Bush’s surge in Iraq after the critics said it couldn’t be done, the impressive charts the general brought to his congressional testimony once again vividly indicated otherwise.  The situation in Afghanistan has undergone an Iraq-like change since the nadir of July 2010 when critics and proponents alike agreed that the nine-year-old war was foundering, the counterinsurgency strategy failing, and [polling](http://www.newsweek.com/2010/06/25/obama-s-approval-ratings-slump-in-latest-newsweek-poll.html) in the U.S. highlighted the war’s increasing unpopularity. “What a difference a year makes,” said a jubilant senior official at the Pentagon.  In just 12 months, as Gen. Petraeus likes to describe it, he managed to [synchronize](http://www.tomdispatch.com/post/175196/tomgram%3A_our_wars_are_killing_us__/)the Afghan and Washington “clocks” and, in the process, as he had done in Iraq, took the news out of the war and the war out of the news.  The latest Gallup poll indicates that up to 63% of Americans are now “supportive” of the general’s approach to the Afghan War...

Link – Generic – AT – No Perception/No Blame

Salience ensures a link – policies that are salient with the public receive congressional scrutiny

Rosati, University of South Carolina Government and International Studies professor, 04

(Jerel A., THE POLITICS OF UNITED STATES FOREIGN POLICY, 2004, p. 309-11)

The third pattern to consider is that Congress is the ultimate political body within the U.S. government. Members of Congress are “political animals” who are preoccupied with their institutional status and power, their electoral security, and how they are perceived within and beyond the Washington beltway. They tend to be obsessed with reelection and are constantly soliciting funds from private contributors for reelection campaigns. A preoccupation with reelection also makes them overly sensitive to public perceptions, political support, political trends, and their public images. If the public and their constituents are interested in an issue and have staked out a position, members of Congress tend to reflect the dominant public mood. If the public is uninterested, members of Congress have more freedom of action; yet they are constantly pressured by the president, executive agencies, congressional colleagues, special interest groups, and their constituents.

Zero sum nature of politics ensures president is assigned political blame

Fitts, Professor of Law at the University of Pennsylvania Law School, 96

(Michael, “The Paradox of Power in the Modern State,” *University of Pennsylvania Law Review,* January, 144 U. Pa. L. Rev. 827, Lexis, accessed 7-8-09, AB)

To the extent that the modern president is subject to heightened visibility about what he says and does and is led to make increasingly specific statements about who should win and who should lose on an issue, his ability to mediate conflict and control the agenda can be undermined. The modern president is supposed to have a position on such matters as affirmative action, the war in Bosnia, the baseball strike, and the newest EPA regulations, the list is infinite. Perhaps in response to these pressures, each modern president has made more speeches and taken more positions than his predecessors, with Bill Clinton giving three times as many speeches as Reagan during the same period. In such circumstances, the president is far less able to exercise agenda control, refuse to take symbolic stands, or take inconsistent positions. The well-documented tendency of the press to emphasize the strategic implications of politics exacerbates this process by turning issues into zero-sum games.

Presidency is the focal point of politics – president gets the credit or the blame

Rosati, University of South Carolina Government and International Studies professor, 4

(Jerel A., THE POLITICS OF UNITED STATES FOREIGN POLICY, 2004, p. 80)

Given the popular image of presidential power, presidents receive credit when things are perceived as going well and are blamed when things go badly. Unfortunately, American politics and the policy process are incredibly complex and beyond considerable presidential control. With so many complex issues and problems to address – the debt problem, the economy, energy, welfare, education, the environment, foreign policy – this is a very demanding time to be president. As long as presidential promises and public expectations remain high, the president’s job becomes virtually an impossible task. Should success occur, given the lack of presidential power, it is probably not by the president’s own design. Nonetheless, the president – the person perceived to be the leader of the country – will be rewarded in terms of public prestige, greater power, and reelection (for him or his successor). However, if the president is perceived as unsuccessful – a failure – this results not only in a weakened president but one the public wants replaced, creating the opportunity to challenge an incumbent president or his heir as presidential nominee.

Link – Generic – Controversial Policies Spend Political Capital

Controversial policies drain political capital

Burke, University of Vermont political science professor, 9

(John P., Presidential Studies Quarterly 39.3 (Sept 2009), “The Contemporary Presidency: The Obama Presidential Transition: An Early Assessment”, p574(31). Academic One; accessed 7-15-10)

President Obama signaled his intention to make a clean break from the unpopular Bush presidency with his executive orders and early policy and budget proposals. At the same time, he also sought to tamp down public expectations for quick results on the economy. Early--and ambitious--actions were taken, but as he cautioned in his inaugural address, "the challenges we face are real" and they "will not be met easily or in a short span of time." His initial political capital seemed high.

But was the right course of action chosen? The decision was made to embrace a broad range of policy reforms, not just to focus on the economy. Moreover, it was a controversial agenda. His early efforts to gain bipartisan support in Congress--much like those of his predecessors--seem largely for naught and forced the administration to rely on narrow partisan majorities. The question that remains is whether his political capital, both in Congress and with the public, will bring him legislative--and ultimately policy--success. Good transition planning is propitious, but it offers no guarantees. Still, without it, political and policy disaster likely awaits. So far, President Obama seems to reside largely on the positive side of the equation. But what the future might portend remains another matter.

Unpopular action ensures backlash against the president – politicians are emboldened when they smell blood in the water

Stolberg, New York Times, 3

(Sheryl Gay, 9-13-3, New York Times, “Democrats Find Some Traction On Capitol Hill”, p. A1, Lexis)

"A presidential speech, instead of boosting support, is followed by a seven-point drop and suddenly the atmosphere changes," said Thomas Mann, a scholar at the Brookings Institution who follows Congress. "Republicans, who have been reluctant to get off the reservation, now say, 'Wait just one minute.' And Democrats have all the more reason to be unified." Ross K. Baker, a political scientist at Rutgers University, agreed. "Any sign of weakness out of the White House is going to be perceived by the president's allies in Congress as an opportunity to act a little bit more like free spirits, and on the part of the opposition to be more aggressive," Professor Baker said. "It's the blood-in-the-water syndrome."

Link – Generic – AT – No Link – No Debate

Least Amount of Fiat

There’s always a risk of a link to the politics disad. Policymaking is a process of negotiation. There’s always a winner and a loser. Obama has to spend political capital in order to get his bill passed. No matter who the plan is popular with, the opponents of the plan will lose out, ensuring a poisoned negotiating climate for future items on the agenda

Link – Generic – AT – No Link – Plan Passes Unanimously

\_\_\_ Counter-interpretation: Least Amount of Fiat – Fiat means that the aff passes with the least amount of fiat necessary to do the plan, which would be 51 votes in the Senate.

a. Least amount of fiat good. The aff already gets to fiat that a plan passes when it wouldn’t normally pass, and that’s enough to let us have a debate on the plan. Letting the aff fiat that it passes with unanimous support takes away the DA, which is key to neg ground

b. Most real world, rarely do bills pass with a unanimous vote, especially on issues that do not have momentum – like their inherency indicates, this is not likely to happen now. A 51-49 split is more realistic than a unanimous vote, ensuring a link because the plan would trigger debate.

Link – Generic – AT – Our Plan is Popular

Only a risk of a link – There’s always opposition to be overcome

Rosati, University of South Carolina Government and International Studies professor, 04

(Jerel A., THE POLITICS OF UNITED STATES FOREIGN POLICY, 2004, p. 388)

The fragmentation of public ideological and foreign policy beliefs gives a president great opportunities but also creates great risks. Unlike those in the 1950s, presidents now are no longer driven to pursue only an anticommunist containment policy. Yet it is unclear how far a president may go in pursuing any policy before losing public support. Presidents no longer come to office with automatic majorities behind their policies. No matter what the president and his advisers believe, a substantial number of Americans – in the mass public and especially the elite public – disagree, or are open to disagreement, with presidential policy. Hence, the continual presidential search for, and frustration in obtaining, consensus and policy legitimation.

Link – Generic – AT – Winners Win

Winners don’t win if public doesn’t understand the win – financial reform proves

Adams, BBC Diplomatic Correspondent for BBC, 7-15-10

(BBC News, “Sweeping US financial reform passed by Senate: Analysis”, http://www.bbc.co.uk/news/business-10654128, accessed 7-15-10)

After long months of debate, the US Congress has finally given President Obama what he wants - the most sweeping financial reforms since the Great Depression.

After healthcare reform, it represents another significant legislative victory for Mr Obama.

Eyeing the US mid-term elections, the White House said "this will be a vote that Democrats will talk about through November".

But the party in power may struggle to make political capital out of a 2,300 page bill, stuffed with 533 new regulations.

An Ipsos Public Affairs poll found that 38% of Americans had never heard of the bill, while another 33% knew almost nothing about it.

Given this apparent lack of understanding about a bill which one of its authors, Senator Chris Dodd, said would ensure that Americans "never, ever again go through what the nation has been through", the polling suggests the connection between arcane Washington politicking and Main St reality is simply too wide.

Link Magnifier – Military Clout (1/3)

The military controls the spin – they have clout and fear on their side

Goodman, Center for International Policy National Security fellow and former CIA analyst, 7-7-10

(Melvin A., Consortium News, “What Obama can learn from Eisenhower”, <http://www.consortiumnews.com/2010/070510a.html>, accessed 7-15-10)

A central problem for the nation is the increased power and influence of the Pentagon over the foreign and national security policies of the United States. No president since Eisenhower has fully understood the Pentagon’s dominant position in military and security policy. Armed with his knowledge and experience as World War II’s Supreme Allied Commander in Europe, Eisenhower made sure that he could not be outmaneuvered by his military advisers, particularly on such key issues as the Vietnam War and tensions with the Soviet Union. However, his immediate successors thoroughly bungled the decision-making process. President John F. Kennedy never understood that the Pentagon anticipated the failure of the CIA in Cuba in 1961 and expected to use its air power to finish the job. President Lyndon B. Johnson knew that Vietnam was a fool’s errand but failed to challenge the pleas from the Pentagon for more force and additional troops – or the strategic views of the Rostow and Bundy brothers. By contrast, Eisenhower ignored the hysteria of the bomber and missile gaps in the 1950s, claimed by Senators Stuart Symington and Kennedy as well as by such key advisors as Paul Nitze. Nitze had unnecessarily heightened concerns about U.S. security in National Security Council Report 68 (known as NSC-68) in the late 1940s, and he was the chief author of the overwrought Gaither Report, which called for unnecessary increases in the strategic arsenal. Eisenhower ignored these advocates for increased defense spending and even cut the military budget by 20 percent between 1953 and 1955 on the way to balancing the budget by 1956. Eisenhower started no wars and was willing to settle for a stalemate in ending the Korea War. Eisenhower clashed with the military mindset from the very beginning of his presidency. He knew that his generals were wrong in proclaiming “political will” as the major factor in military victory. A five-star general, Eisenhower would have shuddered when four-star General David Petraeus, like so many military commanders of recent decades, proclaimed last week that U.S. political will is the key factor for success in Afghanistan. How Much is Sufficiency? Eisenhower knew that military demands for weaponry and resources were always based on inexplicable notions of “sufficiency,” and he made sure that Pentagon briefings on the Hill were countered by testimony from the national security bureaucracy. Henry A. Kissinger was one of the rare national security advisers and secretaries of state who understood Eisenhower’s point of view. During the ratification process for the SALT I agreement in 1972, Kissinger countered conservative and military opposition to SALT and the Anti-Ballistic Missile Treaty with two questions they could never answer: What is strategic sufficiency? What would we do with strategic sufficiency if we had it? In his Farewell Address in 1961, Eisenhower warned that the United States should not become a “garrison state,” but nearly 50 years later we have developed a garrison mentality with unprecedented military spending; continuous military deployments; hyped fears about “Islamo-terrorism” and now cyberwars; and exaggerated aspirations with regard to counterinsurgency and nation-building. Eisenhower understood that it was the military-industrial complex that fostered an inordinate belief in the omnipotence of American military power. Eisenhower made sure that the Pentagon and the Dulles brothers, who were in command at the State Department and the CIA, respectively, did not over-reach with the U.S. role overseas. Finally, although Eisenhower signed off on some aggressive, even violent, CIA operations, such as in Iran in 1953, Guatemala in 1954, and the Congo in 1960, he did not authorize the more grandiose actions that characterized later presidencies, the likes of Kennedy’s Bay of Pigs; Johnson’s Vietnam; Reagan’s Grenada; Bush II’s Iraq; and now Obama’s Afghanistan. Eisenhower opposed and reversed the British-French-Israeli invasion of Egypt in 1956, and withstood criticism for not assisting the Hungarian uprising weeks later.

**CARD CONTINUES, NO TEXT OMITTED**

Link Magnifier – Military Clout (2/3)

**CARD CONTINUED, NO TEXT OMITTED**

Thirty years after the fact, President Ronald Reagan joined in criticizing Eisenhower’s restraint regarding Hungary. With the possible exception of President Richard Nixon, no recent president has understood the military mindset and was willing to limit the military’s influence. Democrats, such as Kennedy, Johnson and Bill Clinton as well as Republicans such as Reagan, George H.W. Bush and George W. Bush deferred too readily to the military; devoted too many resources to the military; and often resorted to the use of power instead of diplomacy and statecraft. Now President Obama has found himself in a position where the military wields far too much influence on Capitol Hill; controls too much of the depleted U.S. Treasury; and has the leading policy voice on both security and diplomatic issues.

The evidence above is a continuation of this card:

The military controls the spin – they have clout and fear on their side

Goodman, Center for International Policy National Security fellow and former CIA analyst, 7-7-10

(Melvin A., Consortium News, “What Obama can learn from Eisenhower”, <http://www.consortiumnews.com/2010/070510a.html>, accessed 7-15-10)

The military is key to Obama’s national security and foreign policies

Goodman, Center for International Policy National Security fellow and former CIA analyst, 7-7-10

(Melvin A., OpEdNews, “The Military-Industrial Complex's Win”, <http://www.opednews.com/articles/1/The-Military-Industrial-Co-by-Marji-Mendelsohn-100707-848.html>, accessed 7-16-10)

In addition to unprecedented military spending, the Pentagon has gained increased leverage over the $70 billion intelligence community as well as increased influence over the national security and foreign policies of the United States.

With the State Department and the CIA in decline, the Pentagon's role in intelligence, nation building, and Third World assistance grows significantly. Congressional armed services committees have become sounding boards for the Pentagon, and the increased absence of military experience on the part of congressional representatives contributes to less oversight.

Recent presidents also have retreated from the principle of meaningful civilian control over military policy. George W. Bush, for instance, identified the chief lesson from the Vietnam War as the need to avoid interference from politicians in Washington with the military commanders on the ground. As for Obama, while deliberating whether to escalate the war in Afghanistan, he allowed himself to be blindsided by the self-serving leak of Gen. Stanley McChrystal's recommendation for more troops, a policy also pushed by Gen. David Petraeus and one that Obama ultimately bowed to. President Eisenhower's warning about the military-industrial complex and the need for commanders-in-chief who actually understood and knew how to resist the Pentagon's clarion calls have never been more germane.

Link Magnifier – Military Clout (3/3)

Petraeus has clout, can leverage influence fight withdrawal

Chandrasekaran & DeYoung, Washington Post, 6-24-10

(Rajiv & Karen, “Petraeus could provide calming influence after leadership change”, <http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/content/article/2010/06/23/AR2010062303772.html>, accessed 7-15-10)

Petraeus is a frequent visitor to Washington, where he has assiduously developed personal relationships with senior lawmakers and opinion shapers that have served him well. He has been relied upon by the Obama administration to defend its Afghan policy on Capitol Hill, a job he also performed for a different war: He almost single-handedly rebuffed congressional pressure on Bush to scale back the mission in Iraq.

Military has clout – lobby closes ranks when challenged

Gentry, US Army Lieutenant Colonel and former CIA analyst, ’02

(John A., 12-22-2, Parameters, “Doomed to Fail: America's Blind Faith in Military Technology”,)

These reforms are unlikely to occur in the absence of a significant US battlefield defeat. Organizations that agree on little within the Pentagon close ranks when collectively challenged. The military services have significant lobbying clout on Capitol Hill and powerful supporters in reserve and veterans organizations. Policymakers and the citizenry should continue to expect poor military performance and avoid--for a myriad of reasons--policies that run the risk of major war. The best we probably can hope for is a moderate conflict in which the inadequacies of JV 2O2O are obvious but the United States does not suffer disastrous defeat. Hundreds of lives and the associated diplomatic and domestic political ramifications of a defeat will probably be part of this awakening. We can but hope the cost will not be higher.

Link Magnifier – Defense Industry

Defense industry lobby key – control most powerful congressional votes

Priest, Washington Post national security and intelligence writer, 8

(Dana, 11-13-8, Washington Post, “Dana Priest on National Security and Intelligence”, Lexis)

Dana Priest: Well, frankly, some of the biggest ticket items are the least important in this world in which threats come less from states than from non-state organization. And our equipment, generally speaking, so far out-paces any adversary you have to question why were still building so much. So, spending pressures could force the government to further transform the military into the lighter, more agile and, incidentally less expensive, force that it needs to be. That said, the state-by-state lobbying effort to make sure this does not happen (defense contractors and subcontractors are conveniently sprinkled throughout the congressional districts of the most powerful lawmakers) will be huge.

Defense industry lobby has clout

Gorevoi, What the Papers Say, 6

(8-15-6, “A DISARMED DECISION”, Lexis)

But she will have to intervene soon. The sanctions threaten the profits of some major American corporations in the defense sector. The arms-makers have one of the most powerful lobby groups in Congress. What's more, in legal terms, the State Department's ban on cooperation with the Russian companies can only apply to government agencies and companies. The private companies that control the lion's share of the American defense sector are not at all dependent on State Department memos.

Link Magnifier – Interest Groups

Interest groups wield clout in the political process

Rosati, University of South Carolina Government and International Studies professor, 04

(Jerel A., THE POLITICS OF UNITED STATES FOREIGN POLICY, 2004, p. 445)

Interest groups and social movements influence the domestic political environment and the governmental policymaking process in a number of ways. First and most well-known, groups usually “lobby” policymakers involved in the policy process. This is done by providing information and money, as well as mobilizing followers to provide support or cause political trouble. Second, the same techniques are used to influence domestic politics more generally, including the political agenda, public beliefs and behavior, and electoral politics. Third, members of some groups, especially those that are well established and have close relationships with government agencies and personnel, are consulted often by and actually participate with policymakers in the policy process. Fourth, well-established groups also tend to serve as important sources of political recruitment for official positions within government. As was discussed in chapter 5, major presidential appointees usually come from business, law, and academia. Finally, groups that are extremely active internationally, such as multinational corporations, affect U.S. foreign policy and the policymaking process because of their visibility and activities abroad.

Public cynicism ensures vocal interest groups strongly influence policy-making

Rosati, University of South Carolina Government and International Studies professor, 04

(Jerel A., THE POLITICS OF UNITED STATES FOREIGN POLICY, 2004, p. 441-2)

Second, current political campaigning and electioneering methods are losing the interest of the American public. Many observers attribute the low voter turnouts to such things as difficult registration requirements, the demands of everyday life, and even general satisfaction with public policy. There is some truth to these explanations, but the tremendous drop in public trust of government officials and decline in citizen political efficacy since the 1960s also suggest that there are too many elections, too much politicking and manipulation, and too few concrete results for people’s lives. In other words, the public has acquired a high degree of cynicism about the nature of American politics, including party and electoral politics. If low voter turnout is explained by factors other than public satisfaction, it raises serious questions about the democratic nature of a political system in which only a minority of the citizenry participates in electoral politics. This general perception of the declining relevance of political parties and low participation in electoral politics also contributes to the growing importance of social movements and interest groups in the politics of U.S. foreign policy, the subject of the next chapter.

Internal Links – Political Capital (1/3)

Policymaking requires horse trading – President must use political capital to secure agenda

Ryan, Political scientist & University of the West Indies University Director of the Institute of Social and Economic Studies, 9

(Selwyn, 1-18-9, Trinidad Express, "Obama and political capital," Trinidad Express, <http://www.trinidadexpress.com/index.pl/article_opinion?id=161426968>, accessed 7-15-10)

One of the "realities" that Obama has to face is that American politics is not a winner-take-all system. It is pluralistic vertically and horizontally, and getting anything done politically, even when the President and the Congress are controlled by the same party, requires groups to negotiate, bargain and engage in serious horse trading. No one takes orders from the President who can only use moral or political suasion and promises of future support for policies or projects. The system was in fact deliberately engineered to prevent overbearing majorities from conspiring to tyrannise minorities. The system is not only institutionally diverse and plural, but socially and geographically so. As James Madison put it in Federalist No 10, one of the foundation documents of republicanism in America, basic institutions check other basic institutions, classes and interests check other classes and interests, and regions do the same. All are grounded in their own power bases which they use to fend off challengers. The coalitions change from issue to issue, and there is no such thing as party discipline which translated, means you do what I the leader say you do.

Political capital determines success of the President’s agenda

Light, Brookings Center for Public Service founding director, 99

(Paul Charles, New York University Professor of Public Service, The President’s Agenda: Domestic Policy Choice from Kennedy to Clinton, p. 25-26, Google Books, <http://books.google.com/books?id=vuWJHWdgstsC&printsec=frontcover&dq=the+Presidents+Agenda&hl=en&ei=X2FATOLRFIWKlwflvLHxDQ&sa=X&oi=book_result&ct=result&resnum=1&ved=0CCwQ6AEwAA#v=onepage&q=the%20Presidents%20Agenda&f=false>, accessed 7-15-10)

In chapter 2, I will consider just how capital affects the basic parameters of the domestic agenda. Though the internal resources are important contributors to timing and size, capital remains the cirtical factor. That conclusion will become essential in understanding the domestic agenda. Whatever the President’s personal expertise, character, or skills, capital is the most important resource. In the past, presidential scholars have focused on individual factors in discussing White House decisions, personality being the dominant factor. Yet, given low levels in presidential capital, even the most positive and most active executive could make little impact. A president can be skilled, charming, charismatic, a veritable legislative wizard, but if he does not have the basic congressional strength, his domestic agenda will be severely restricted – capital affects both the number and the content of the President’s priorities. Thus, it is capital that determines whether the President will have the opportunity to offer a detailed domestic program, whether he will be restricted to a series of limited initiatives and vetoes. Capital sets the basic parameters of the agenda, determining the size of the agenda and guiding the criteria for choice. Regardless of the President’s personality, capital is the central force behind the domestic agenda.

Political support key to agenda – collapse of support crushes agenda

Ornstein, American Enterprise Institute fellow and political analyst, 3

(Norman J., Roll Call, 9-10-3, “As Issues Pile Up,; Bush Needs New; Approach With Hill”, Lexis)

When a president operates with sky-high approval and a reputation as a winner no matter what the odds, he has immense leverage with Members of Congress who fear his wrath and assume he will prevail. When he stumbles, the assumptions change, and the ability to exercise power attenuates.

Internal Links – Political Capital (2/3)

The President has a limited capability to pass his agenda. Passing items like the plan take away from his ability to pass other legislation

Feehery, former House Speaker Hastert staffer and Feehery Group president, 9

(John, Feehery Group is a Washington-based advocacy firm, 7-21-9, CNN, “Commentary: Obama enters 'The Matrix'” [www.cnn.com/2009/POLITICS/07/21/feehery.obama.matrix/index.html](http://www.cnn.com/2009/POLITICS/07/21/feehery.obama.matrix/index.html), accessed 7-16-10)

And, indeed, the Congress has its own rules that make quick legislative action, no matter how popular with the American people, hard to achieve. The Obama agenda is breathtaking in its scope and eye-popping in its cost. He seeks to completely recast the health care, energy, financial services and automobile sectors of this country, as he seeks to make the tax code more progressive, retirement programs more sustainable, and the immigration system more welcoming to immigrants. And he also wants to stimulate the economy and get us out of what some people are calling the "Great Recession." But can it all get done, and in a form that makes his political base happy? The president insists that he can get this all done, and his chief of staff, Rahm Emanuel, has implied that the financial crisis has actually given the White House more momentum to get it all done. But history tells a different story. Congress has its own code, and cracking that code usually means taking into account five different factors. These five factors are: Money: It may seem trite, but the biggest factor in determining the size and scope of a legislative agenda is how much money -- and more importantly, the perception of how much money -- is available for the government to use. Bill Clinton's legislative agenda was necessarily limited because his budget constraints made it difficult to spend money on big things. George Bush, who inherited a fairly large budget surplus, had money to burn, which allowed him to pass a prescription drug benefit. President Obama has no money, which means that if he wants to pass a big new entitlement like a health care public option, he will have to make the Congress take the painful step of raising a lot of taxes. Time: The legislative calendar is simply not that long. A new administration has a little less than a year to pass its big-ticket items, mostly because it is very hard to get major initiatives done in an election year. Take away the three months it takes to hire key staff, a couple of months for the various congressional recesses, and you have about six months to really legislate. Since Congress is supposed to use some time to pass its annual spending bills (there are 12 that need to be passed each year, not counting supplemental spending bills), time for big initiatives is actually very limited. Each day the president takes time to travel overseas or to throw out the first pitch at an All Star game, he is taking time away from making contacts with legislators whose support is crucial for the president's agenda. Time is not a limitless resource on Capitol Hill. Political capital: A president enters office with the highest popularity ratings he will ever get (barring a war or some other calamity that brings the country together), which is why most presidents try to pass as much as possible as early as possible in their administrations. The most famous example of that was Franklin Roosevelt's Hundred Days. But there are other examples. Ronald Reagan moved his agenda very early in his administration, George Bush passed his tax proposals and the No Child Left Behind law very early in his White House. They understood the principle that it is important to strike while the iron is hot. President Bush famously misunderstood this principle when he said that he was going to use the "political capital" gained in his re-election to pass Social Security reform. What he failed to understand was that as soon as he won re-election, he was a lame duck in the eyes of the Congress, and he had no political capital. President Obama believes he has a lot of political capital, and perhaps he does. But each day he is in office, his political capital reserve is declining. And each time he goes to the well to pass things like "cap and trade" makes it more difficult for him to pass his more important priorities like health care. Focus: Congress can walk and chew gum at the same time. But focus is essential to achieving results. Presidential focus quite often moves off the domestic agenda and into the wider world of diplomacy. But that can spell greater political danger for a president and his party. George H.W. Bush spent most of his presidency winning a war against Iraq and successfully concluded the Cold War conflict with the Soviet Union. But neither of those foreign policy successes helped him win re-election. His son, George W. Bush, understood that he had to keep a tight focus on the economy and one big domestic policy item (education), and

**CARD CONTINUES, NO TEXT OMITTED**

Internal Links – Political Capital (3/3)

**CARD CONTINUED, NO TEXT OMITTED**

while the war on terror did end up dominating his presidency, Bush never forgot to focus on his domestic achievements. The biggest danger to President Obama is not just foreign entanglements, it is also competing domestic priorities that threaten to undermine his ability to get big things done. For example, the House vote on cap and trade has made it very hard for conservative and moderate Democrats to join with Speaker Nancy Pelosi on a more important health care bill.

The evidence above is a continuation of this card:

The President has a limited capability to pass his agenda. Passing items like the plan take away from his ability to pass other legislation

Feehery, former House Speaker Hastert staffer and Feehery Group president, 9

(John, Feehery Group is a Washington-based advocacy firm, 7-21-9, CNN, “Commentary: Obama enters 'The Matrix'” [www.cnn.com/2009/POLITICS/07/21/feehery.obama.matrix/index.html](http://www.cnn.com/2009/POLITICS/07/21/feehery.obama.matrix/index.html), accessed 7-16-10)

Policymaking requires compromise

Barrett & Eshbaugh-Soha, University of North Texas, 07

[Andrew W. & Matthew, March, Political Research Quarterly, Vol. 60, No. 1, “Presidential Success on the Substance of Legislation”, pp. 100-112, Stable URL: http://www.jstor.org/stable/4623810, Accessed: 7-15-10)

Congress as an institution depends upon the willingness of its members to compromise to produce legislation (Elving 1995). The lawmaking process is protracted and complicated with dozens of opportuni- ties for unsatisfied legislators to kill legislation, including simple inaction by committee chairs or party leaders. With more than five hundred individu- als divided into two legislative bodies, little can be accomplished without building majority coalitions through bargaining and compromise.

Presidents, however, are only one among several cues that legislators use to decide how to vote (Kingdon 1981), with much coalition building taking place independent of presidential involvement (Arnold 1990). Moreover, presidents must overcome several obstacles unique to their office when attempting to build congressional coalitions (Edwards 2000). These include, but are not limited to, the president's limited tenure in office as well as a different electoral clock and constituency than members of Congress. Each of these provides different incentives for presi- dents and legislators to bargain, compromise, and ultimately agree on legislative language. The hierarchical nature of the executive, in contrast to the more decentralized legislature, also exacerbates presidential responsibility and accountability while obscuring that of Congress. Given the difficulty of the lawmaking process itself and the unique obstacles facing the president in building congressional coalitions, presidents will likely be forced to make concessions on most bills they support, as they bargain with legisla- tors to secure their passage. Therefore, we hypothesize that presidents will need to compromise on the substance of legislation before they sign most bills into law.

Internal Links – Political Capital Key to START

Capital key to START ratification

Podvig, Stanford University International Security and Cooperation Research Associate, 9

[Pavel, 4-3-9, "Reaction to the Obama-Medvedev joint statement on arms control," http://www.thebulletin.org/web-edition/columnists/pavel-podvig/reaction-to-the-obama-medvedev-joint-statement-arms-control, accessed 7-5-10]

To begin with, the timeline is tight. As everyone knows, the treaty would have to be ready by December, when START expires. Diplomats I've talked to are publicly optimistic about reaching this goal, but privately admit that the schedule isn't realistic. I also wouldn't underestimate the problems that the new agreement will face domestically. While Obama and Medvedev can probably convince the Senate and Duma to ratify the new treaty without much delay, they may find that they will have to spend substantial amounts of political capital to do so.

START requires capital – focus on other military policy will erode support

Kitfield, Global Security Newswire, 9

[James, 10-9-9, “Wars, Political Battles Complicate Obama Effort to Prevent Spread of Nuclear Weapons, http://www.globalsecuritynewswire.org/gsn/nw\_20091009\_8675.php, accessed 7-16-10]

By launching the nonproliferation initiative while Obama's popularity and stock of political capital remain relatively high, the administration seems to have absorbed the lesson of 1999. "But I see both risk as well as opportunity in the administration's very ambitious strategy," Talbott said. "They obviously hope to get some points on the board with negotiation and ratification of a new START, building a sense of momentum that will translate into Senate ratification of the test-ban treaty. That has a familiar ring, however, because this administration similarly hoped to score some early points with their domestic agenda and then get on a roll where victory begot victory. Then they ran into trouble on health care, which will translate into trouble on other domestic issues. The same thing could happen on their nonproliferation agenda." Indeed, Obama is facing a pivotal decision on whether to surge as many as 40,000 additional U.S. troops to salvage an unpopular war in Afghanistan. Influential Democrats in Congress are already mobilizing to oppose a surge. Such an expansion of the war effort there would likely force the administration to seek Republican support for a supplemental war-funding bill, even as Obama tries to hold his own fractious caucus together behind the nonproliferation agenda. Peter Feaver served in the White House on the National Security Council staff during the Bush administration's surge of forces to Iraq in 2007. If Obama decides to repeat that tactic in Afghanistan, Feaver said, the administration is about to learn some tough lessons about the limits of a president's personal and political capital, and Washington's ability to simultaneously digest major, contentious policy proposals. "The most precious White House resource is a president's actual time and attention, because there are only so many hours in a day and you can't let the president get burned out. The fact that Obama has only spoken to his top commander in Afghanistan a couple of times suggests to me that his staff has conserved that resource for other priorities, and that is about to change if he backs a surge in Afghanistan," Feaver told National Journal. "There is also a limited amount of congressional bandwidth, meaning you can only jam so many major issues into the pipeline before they are traded off against each other." As an example, Feaver notes that if the administration angers Republicans on missile defense but needs their help on an Afghan supplemental, then it may be forced to give on the test-ban treaty or perhaps cap-and-trade. "The deals become more complicated," he said, "and lawmakers have fresh memories of when the administration rolled them and when it conceded to their demands." In the end, Bush pushed through a divisive invasion of Iraq in 2003; won re-election in 2004; and even after the war turned unpopular, mustered enough political backing to surge troops to Iraq in 2007. But major domestic priorities such as immigration and Social Security reform became casualties of war. "I think Obama is in a similar place as Bush in 2002," Feaver said. "Though he's starting to get a lot of push-back, Obama probably has the political capital to ram through health care and get what he wants on Afghanistan and possibly even arms control, but he'll pay a price."

Internal Link – Lugar Key to START

Lugar key to passage

Pinkus, National Security Journalist for the Washington Post, 7-6-10

(Walter, “Fine Print: State Department reports play role in START ratification”, Washington post, <http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/content/article/2010/07/05/AR2010070502338.html>, accessed 7-15-10)

As for ratification of the treaty, Kerry said: "I look forward to completing this process as soon as possible."

With Democrats needing at least eight Republicans to get the two-thirds Senate vote for ratification, Kerry has to avoid irritating his panel's minority members. But there is one bit of sunlight for him in their letter: The minority member who did not sign it was Sen. Richard Lugar (Ind.), the ranking GOP member and former panel chairman whose vote is needed to draw other Republicans if ratification is to pass.

Internal Link – Public Popularity Key to Agenda

The president’s agenda lives and dies by the polls – public approval is crucial

Gregg, Clarion political science professor, 97

(Gary, THE PRESIDENTIAL REPUBLIC, 1997, p. 143-44)

But if presidential power thrives by the polls, it might also die by the polls. While popular presidents tend to get much of what they want and are willing to fight for, unpopular presidents are trapped and constrained by the polls. As a senior aide to President Carter mused about that president's problems with Congress controlled by his own party, "When the President is low in public opinion polls, the members of Congress see little hazard in bucking him...They read the polls and from that they feel secure in turning their backs on the President with political impunity." Unquestionably, the success of the President’s policies bear a tremendous relationship to his popularity in the polls. Without effective public relations, modern presidents and their programs whither on the vine of public opinion.

Public opinion has a strong influence on the passage of legislation

Barrett & Eshbaugh-Soha, University of North Texas, 07

[Andrew W. & Matthew, March, Political Research Quarterly, Vol. 60, No. 1, “Presidential Success on the Substance of Legislation”, pp. 100-112, Stable URL: http://www.jstor.org/stable/4623810, Accessed: 7-15-10)

Public attitudes also should influence the presi- dent's bargaining position. Despite evidence to the contrary (Bond and Fleisher 1990; Collier and Sullivan 1995), presidents, White House staff, and legislators believe that public approval is important to the president's success in Congress (Edwards 1997; Neustadt 1960; Rivers and Rose 1985). Theoretically, public support will improve the president's bargain- ing position as members of Congress will not want to risk alienating their constituents by opposing a popu- lar president's policy preferences. Therefore, we hypothesize that the higher his level of approval, the more a final statute will reflect the president's policy preferences.

Public opinion polls influence presidential agenda

Sparrow, University of Texas at Austin government professor, 8

(Bartholomew H., “Who Speaks for the People? The President, the Press, and Public Opinion in the United States”, 10-13-8, Presidential Studies Quarterly, Volume 38, Issue 4, Pages 578-592, Wiley InterScience, accessed 7-8-9)

Public opinion serves as a metric of presidential leadership with respect to presidential approval ratings. Presidents and their advisors use public opinion not as an absolute guide, but rather for tactical purposes, and instrumentally, for reaching particular political ends (Jacobs and Shapiro 2000). In general, political analysts conceive of public opinion as a channel or guide for policy makers, boundaries beyond which they cannot go but which also offer leeway in terms of the exact path policy makers take. Public opinion serves as a "permissive limit" for policy makers (Almond 1950; Key 1961; Sobel 2001).

Theory Neg – AT – Miscellaneous Theory Arguments

AT – No Link – Bottom of the Docket

\_\_\_ Not real world; presidential priorities change all the time, there’s no such thing as a “docket” that the president has. It’s an archaic concept

\_\_\_ Dejustifies the plan – If their plan is not a priority then there is no reason to vote affirmative, you can always wait and see if the status quo will do the aff plan. The affirmative has not justified that they are resolved that the US should reduce its presence, which assumes now.

\_\_\_ Theoretically illegitimate. Fiat assumes immediate plan passage. The argument severs out of the immediacy of the plan. Justifies affirmatives to spike out of links to all disads by saying the plan will pass “later”. Voting issue because it kills neg ground, which key to fairness

AT – Fiat Solves the Link

\_\_\_ Least amount of fiat is best for debate. The aff can already fiat that the plan gets passed, letting them fiat that there’s no opposition to the plan is too much. They can fiat the outcome, not the process. Fiat is not a magic wand – granting us some reaction from Congress is key to check aff side bias and maintain fairness.

\_\_\_ No link to their should/would argument. We’re not contesting whether the plan passes or not, just the implications of plan passage – whether it “should”. When the plan is introduced, even if some politicians are happy, the real world means there would also be political opposition – the opponents who do not want the plan are enough to trigger a debate, ensuring a link.

Theory Neg – AT – Miscellaneous Theory Arguments

AT – No Spillover

\_\_\_ Nonresponsive: Obama needs to use political capital on the plan, political capital is finite, that’s the tradeoff – our internal link evidence from \_\_\_\_\_\_\_ proves the spillover between the link to the plan and the impact

AT – Intrinsicness

\_\_\_ Logically incorrect. Our link indicates that passing the plan will be supported by Congress. Our internal link indicates that he needs the support Congress gives in order to pass \_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_ Theoretically illegitimate and should be rejected for reasons of ground and fairness – Intrinsicness can be extended to all DAs, the US can “do the plan and do x to prevent the DA” at the same time. Generic DAs are key to neg ground and fairness, ensuring the aff doesn’t automatically win every debate

Impact – START Good – Arms Control & Russian Relations (1/2)

START ratification failure collapses arms control agenda and tanks US-Russian relations

Rogin, Foreign Policy’s The Cable Blog writer, 7-19-10

(Josh, Foreign Policy The Cable Blog, “What are the consequences if START ratification fails?”,

<http://thecable.foreignpolicy.com/posts/2010/07/19/what_are_the_consequences_if_start_ratification_fails>, accessed 7-19-10)

Arms-control advocates are concerned that the basic agreement that was struck between nuclear and non-nuclear countries in the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty (NPT) -- that the "have nots" would forgo building nukes if the "haves" promised to move toward eliminating their stockpiles -- is in jeopardy.

Some, like treaty supporter Sen. Richard Lugar, R-IN, argue that the basic idea of getting to zero nuclear weapons is so controversial, it shouldn't even be part of the START sales pitch.

"I don't fault ... President Obama for talking about a world without nuclear weapons, but neither do I think it is a particularly good idea to express the process in that way," Lugar said. "Talk of ‘no nukes' also invites opposition from those who see it as a sign of weakness in those who lack the backbone to face the world as it is. I don't think that criticism is fair, but it's out there."

A failure to ratify New START would not only risk the NPT and the goal of eliminating nukes, advocates of passage say, it would also spell trouble for the rest of the Obama administration's arms-control agenda, including the president's promise to seek ratification of the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty (CTBT) and then pursue a Fissile Material Cutoff Treaty, which would seek to end the production of weapons grade nuclear material.

When the Senate last voted on CTBT in 1999, which was also the last time the Senate had a contentious debate over arms control, its defeat was a huge blow for the Clinton administration and no arms-control debates have been see on the Senate floor since.

"The alternative [to ratification] is no START treaty, no verification, a clear setback to U.S.-Russian relations and widespread questioning of U.S. ability to carry forth international agreements if we can't get this treaty through," said John Isaacs, executive director of the Council for a Livable World.

Impact – START Good – Arms Control & Russian Relations (2/2)

START prevents US-Russian nuclear war

Isaacs, Executive Director of the Center for Arms Control and Non-Proliferation, 9

12/4/2009

[John, 12-4-9, “The Center for Arms Control and Nonproliferation, “Rebuttals to Arguments Against New START,”<http://www.armscontrolcenter.org/policy/nuclearweapons/articles/rebuttals_to_arguments_against_new_start/>, accessed 7-16-10]

Response: First, it is not necessarily the case that Russia will reduce its nuclear forces without a new arms control agreement. Nor is it true that Russia needs or wants a new arms control agreement far more than the U.S. does. Without limits on the size of U.S. and Russian nuclear forces, Russia would have less confidence in its ability to maintain a stable strategic nuclear relationship with the United States. This could give the upper-hand to hardliners in Moscow who want to slow or even halt plans to reduce the number of deployed warheads and delivery vehicles and invest in additional strategic modernization programs.

Second, the Strategic Posture Commission found that “the sizing of U.S. forces remains overwhelmingly driven by Russia.” If the Russians are reducing nuclear weapons, it is appropriate for the U.S. to do so.

Third, the fact the some Russian reductions might happen in any event is beside the point. If START I is allowed to expire without a new arms control agreement to replace it, so too would the limits on and the means of verifying the two countries’ still enormous nuclear stockpiles and delivery systems. These limits and verification provisions greatly enhance U.S. security by (1) bringing predictability and stability to U.S.-Russian nuclear relations, (2) giving each side confidence than neither side is attempting to retain a significant strategic advantage, and (3) reducing the chances for misunderstanding and worst-case scenario planning. Though the Cold War ended two decades ago, the risks of an accidental or mistaken U.S.-Russian nuclear exchange still exist. A new arms control treaty will reduce this risk.

US-Russia war outweighs – fastest timeframe because lack of ratification creates a short-term brink for relations destabilization. Greatest magnitude because of arsenal size – this is the only scenario for extinction

Bostrom, Oxford philosophy faculty, 2

[Nick, March “Existential Risks Analyzing Human Extinction Scenarios and Related Hazards,” Published in the Journal of Evolution and Technology, Vol. 9, , <http://www.nickbostrom.com/existential/risks.html>, ]

A much greater existential risk emerged with the build-up of nuclear arsenals in the US and the USSR. An all-out nuclear war was a possibility with both a substantial probability and with consequences that might have been persistent enough to qualify as global and terminal. There was a real worry among those best acquainted with the information available at the time that a nuclear Armageddon would occur and that it might annihilate our species or permanently destroy human civilization.[4] Russia and the US retain large nuclear arsenals that could be used in a future confrontation, either accidentally or deliberately. There is also a risk that other states may one day build up large nuclear arsenals. Note however that a smaller nuclear exchange, between India and Pakistan for instance, is not an existential risk, since it would not destroy or thwart humankind’s potential permanently.

Aff Uniqueness – Obama Weak Now

Obama clout low – he’s lost his base and his mojo

Simon, Politico chief political columnist, 7-14-10

(Roger, former Poynter Media Fellow at Yale University, a Hoover Media Fellow at Stanford University, and Kennedy School of Government Institute of Politics Fellow at Harvard University, inducted into the Chicago Journalism Hall of Fame, Politico, “Can Obama get his mojo back?”, <http://www.politico.com/news/stories/0710/39700.html#ixzz0tfRA3Yfl>, accessed 7-15-10)

The Republicans are riding the tiger. It is the tea party tiger, and to a large extent, it is a tiger of anger, intolerance and a fair amount of looniness. (Just 41 percent of tea partiers believe President Barack Obama was born in the United States.)

Tigers run very fast and very well, but if you fall off the tiger — if, for instance, you make the mistake of saying that BP, not the federal government, is the villain in the Gulf oil spill — then the tiger will consume you in a few quick bites.

The Democrats do not have a tiger at the moment, but they want one. The Democrats want the energy, the spirit, the enthusiasm, the mojo that they had after Obama’s victory in 2008.

That spirit is gone, stolen by the tea partiers who wave their “Don’t Tread on Me” flags, wear tri-cornered hats and carry side arms with a sense of giddy delight.

Who would have thought just months ago that the Republicans would be the party of enthusiasm? The Republicans were the party of tired, old white men, thrashed by the magnetic and mesmerizing Obama, whose words flowed like silver from his lips.

Then, a terrible thing happened: Obama began to do things. He saved the economy from disaster. He provided new medical coverage for children. He passed historic health care reform for the entire nation.

But who turned on him? Liberal Democrats. Eric Alterman, a liberal author and columnist for The Nation, wrote recently: “Few progressives would take issue with the argument that, significant accomplishments notwithstanding, the Obama presidency has been a big disappointment.”

I admit, I did not read the remaining 17,000 words of the article — I am saving it for my next coma — and that is because I had trouble grappling with the phrase “significant accomplishments notwithstanding.” If you toss significant accomplishments out the window, how would Franklin D. Roosevelt, Abraham Lincoln or George Washington do by that standard?

Aren’t significant accomplishments what presidents are supposed to accomplish? And isn’t it more than a little unfair to toss those accomplishments aside and then judge those presidents?

No. Not if you judge them by the loss of their mojo. Which is how some liberals are now judging Obama.

Fear not, however, the pooh-bahs of the Democratic establishment have a plan: They are going to get Obama’s mojo back by inventing their own tea party.

Aff Uniqueness – Obama Weak Now

Obama political capital low – and he’ll spend it on energy bill

Wolf, USA Today, 7-14-10

(Richard, USA Today; http://www.usatoday.com/news/washington/2010-07-13-energy-bill\_N.htm; accessed 7-15-10)

The energy bill likely to emerge in the Senate won't look like the one Obama has sought since taking office. He wants to charge utilities and other companies for a portion of their greenhouse gas emissions as a way to reduce pollution and pay for clean energy alternatives.

"I'm not sure the votes are there to do that in this Congress," says Sen. Jeff Bingaman, D-N.M., chairman of the Senate Energy and Natural Resources Committee. "You need to do whatever you're able to do when you're able to do it."

Revising the bill

Instead, the Senate bill is likely to include renewable energy standards and tax credits, tougher fuel-efficiency requirements, incentives for electric vehicles and new oil drilling regulations. The House of Representatives passed a more comprehensive bill, including a price on carbon pollution, last year.

White House spokesman Robert Gibbs said Tuesday that when the Senate takes up the bill, "I expect that the president will be active in that debate."

Since April's Gulf oil spill highlighted the nation's dependence on foreign oil and the dangers of domestic exploration, Obama has sought a deal on taxing carbon pollution — something environmentalists say is essential but most industry officials oppose.

Obama told a bipartisan group of senators involved in energy policy late last month to aim high — but not so high that they don't hit something, according to Democratic Sen. Tom Carper of Delaware, one of the participants.

The problem for Obama: victories on economic stimulus, financial regulation, health care and education have eaten up much of his mandate, leaving him less able to dictate terms. "There's only so much political capital to go around," says Jack Gerard, president of the American Petroleum Institute. "Every major battle consumes a certain amount."

"There's a little bit of legislative fatigue with expansive, huge bills," says Bruce Josten of the U.S. Chamber of Commerce.

Aff Uniqueness Answer – No START Ratification Now

START ratification chances weakening now – spy scandal hurts case

Sunday Business Post, 7-4-10

(“Spy games will not affect US-Russian relations”, Lexis)

Still, not everyone is willing to minimise the fallout.

The START nuclear arms reduction treaty, agreed last April, is cited as evidence of concrete progress by some in Washington, but others are more sceptical.

The agreement still needs to be ratified by the US Senate.

Republicans, suspicious of the Russians and almost united in their opposition to Obama's

agenda, may now have another reason to withhold support.

One senior Republican senator, Kit Bond of Missouri, told the New York Times last week that the alleged spy affair ''ought to reset our rosy view of Russia, and remind us that Russia is not a trustworthy ally''.

No ratification coming

Knigge, Deutsche Welle, 7-14-10

(Michael, DW-WORLD.DE, “Start arms reduction treaty faces rocky road in US Congress”

<http://www.dw-world.de/dw/article/0,,5792528,00.html>, accessed 7-16-10)

President Barack Obama with his Russian counterpart Dmitry Medvedev after signing the new Start treaty

A leading US Republican has called the new Start treaty Barack Obama's worst foreign policy mistake and urged Congress not to pass it. While that doesn't scupper the treaty, it shows that ratification won't come soon.

Mitt Romney, generally considered to be a leading Republican contender for the 2012 US presidential election, chose an op-ed in the Washington Post last week to pour scorn on the so-called new Start arms reduction treaty negotiated by the Obama administration with Russia.

Under the headline "Obama's worst foreign policy mistake," Romney, who lost the Republican nomination for the 2008 presidential election to John McCain, didn't mince words. Arguing that the treaty was badly negotiated by the Obama administration and that it puts US security at stake, he called it a non-starter that must not be ratified.

Romney's rebuke accomplishes three things: One, it brandishes his credentials - his official platform is called Free & Strong America Political Action Committee - as a foreign policy hawk within the Republican Party and the wider conservative spectrum of US politics. Two, it serves as a rallying cry for Republicans, many of whom had voiced their unease at the treaty before to come together and examine the deal in Congress. And three, it has made it clear that the treaty which requires a two-thirds majority in the Senate, i.e. eight Republican votes, won't sail through Congress easily.

No ratification now – missile defense is a deal-breaker

Heinrichs, Foundation for Defense of Democracies adjunct fellow, 6-17-10

(Rebeccah, The Hill, “Hearing on what START treaty means for missile defense”, <http://thehill.com/blogs/congress-blog/homeland-security/103951-hearing-on-what-start-treaty-means-for-missile-defense>, accessed 7-5-10)

Yesterday’s hearing did nothing to dispel the concerns of Senators who see restrictions on missile defense as a deal breaker for ratifying the New START Treaty. Interestingly, several Senators, including Jim DeMint (R-SC) and John Thune (R-SD), have asked to see the negotiation records related to the agreement. They’re on to something.

Aff Link Uniqueness Answer – Afghanistan Draining Capital Now (1/2)

Obama Afghanistan policy losing support from crucial Senate leadership now

Associated Press, 7-15-10

(Today Online, “Key US senators doubt Afghan war progress; US envoy sees no 'definitive turning point,” <http://www.todayonline.com/BreakingNews/EDC100715-0000043/Key-US-senators-doubt-Afghan-war-progress-US-envoy-sees-no-definitive-turning-point>, accessed 7-15-10)

WASHINGTON (AP) - Two of the Senate's leading foreign policy experts have expressed doubts about the course of the war in Afghanistan, further complicating the Obama administration's effort to maintain support for the nearly 9-year-old conflict. Sen. John Kerry, a Democrat and chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, said it is not clear that the administration has a solid strategy for prevailing. The panel's top Republican, Richard Lugar, decried "a lack of clarity" about U.S. war goals. Their complaints were aired at Wednesday's hearing in which the administration's special envoy for Afghanistan and Pakistan, Richard Holbrooke, acknowledged the way ahead remains in doubt. Holbrooke said there were "significant elements of movement forward in many areas" but he did not see a "definitive turning point in either direction."

Non-unique - Afghanistan has been draining Obama’s political capital since election

Baker, New York Times, 9

(Peter, 8-22-9, New York Times, “Could Afghanistan Become Obama’s Vietnam?”, <http://www.nytimes.com/2009/08/23/weekinreview/23baker.html?_r=1&scp=1&sq>, accessed 7-14-10)

WASHINGTON — President Obama had not even taken office before supporters were etching his likeness onto Mount Rushmore as another Abraham Lincoln or the second coming of Franklin D. Roosevelt. Yet what if they got the wrong predecessor? What if Mr. Obama is fated to be another Lyndon B. Johnson instead? To be sure, such historical analogies are overly simplistic and fatally flawed, if only because each presidency is distinct in its own way. But the L.B.J. model — a president who aspired to reshape America at home while fighting a losing war abroad — is one that haunts Mr. Obama’s White House as it seeks to salvage Afghanistan while enacting an expansive domestic program. In this summer of discontent for Mr. Obama, as the heady early days give way to the grinding battle for elusive goals, he looks ahead to an uncertain future not only for his legislative agenda but for what has indisputably become his war. Last week’s elections in Afghanistan played out at the same time as the debate over health care heated  up in Washington, producing one of those split-screen moments that could not help but remind some of Mr. Johnson’s struggles to build a Great Society while fighting in Vietnam. “The analogy of Lyndon Johnson suggests itself very profoundly,” said David M. Kennedy, the Stanford University historian. Mr. Obama, he said, must avoid letting Afghanistan shadow his presidency as Vietnam did Mr. Johnson’s. “He needs to worry about the outcome of that intervention and policy and how it could spill over into everything else he wants to accomplish.” By several accounts, that risk weighs on Mr. Obama these days. Mr. Kennedy was among a group of historians who had dinner with Mr. Obama at the White House earlier this summer where the president expressed concern that Afghanistan could yet hijack his presidency. Although Mr. Kennedy said he could not discuss the off-the-record conversation, others in the room said Mr. Obama acknowledged the L.B.J. risk. “He said he has a problem,” said one person who attended that dinner at the end of June, insisting on anonymity to share private discussions. “This is not just something he can turn his back on and walk away from. But it’s an issue he understands could be a danger to his administration.” Another person there was Robert Caro, the L.B.J. biographer who was struck that Mr. Johnson made some of his most fateful decisions about Vietnam in the same dining room. “All I could think of when I was sitting there and this subject came up was the setting,” he said. “You had such an

**CARD CONTINUES, NO TEXT OMITTED**

Aff Link Uniqueness Answer – Afghanistan Draining Capital Now (2/2)

**CARD CONTINUED, NO TEXT OMITTED**

understanding of history — would have to be very aware of what happened in another war to derail a great domestic agenda,” he said. Afghanistan, of course, is not exactly Vietnam. At its peak, the United States had about 500,000 troops in Vietnam, compared with about 68,000 now set for Afghanistan, and most of those fighting in the 1960s were draftees as opposed to volunteer soldiers. Vietnam, therefore, reached deeper into American society, touching more homes and involving more unwilling participants. But the politics of the two seem to evoke comparisons. Just as Mr. Johnson believed he had no choice but to fight in Vietnam to contain communism, Mr. Obama last week portrayed Afghanistan as the bulwark against international terrorism. “This is not a war of choice,” he told the Veterans of Foreign Wars at their convention in Phoenix. “This is a war of necessity. Those who attacked America on 9/11 are plotting to do so again. If left unchecked, the Taliban insurgency will mean an even larger safe haven from which Al Qaeda would plot to kill more Americans.” But while many Americans once shared that view, polls suggest that conviction is fading nearly eight years into the war. The share of Americans who said the war in Afghanistan was worth fighting slipped below 50 percent in a survey released last week by The Washington Post and ABC News. A July poll by the New York Times and CBS News showed that 57 percent of Americans think things are going badly for the United States in Afghanistan, compared with 33 percent who think they are going well. That growing disenchantment in the countryside is increasingly mirrored in Washington, where liberals in Congress are speaking out more vocally against the Afghan war and newspapers are filled with more columns questioning America’s involvement. The cover of the latest Economist is headlined “Afghanistan: The Growing Threat of Failure.” Richard N. Haass, a former Bush administration official turned critic, wrote in The New York Times last week that what he once considered a war of necessity has become a war of choice. While he still supports it, he argued that there are now alternatives to a large-scale troop presence, like drone attacks on suspected terrorists, more development aid and expanded training of Afghan police and soldiers. His former boss, George W. Bush, learned first-hand how political capital can slip away when an overseas war loses popular backing. With Iraq in flames, Mr. Bush found little support for his second-term domestic agenda of overhauling Social Security and liberalizing immigration laws. L.B.J. managed to create Medicare and enact landmark civil rights legislation but some historians have argued that the Great Society ultimately stalled because of Vietnam. Mr. Obama has launched a new strategy intended to turn Afghanistan around, sending an additional 21,000 troops, installing a new commander, promising more civilian reconstruction help, shifting to more protection of the population and building up Afghan security forces. It is a strategy that some who study Afghanistan believe could make a difference. But even some who agree worry that time is running out at home, particularly if the strategy does not produce results quickly. Success is so hard to imagine that Richard Holbrooke, Mr. Obama’s special representative for Afghanistan, this month came up with this definition: “We’ll know it when we see it.”  The consequences of failure go beyond just Afghanistan. Next door is its volatile neighbor Pakistan, armed with nuclear weapons and already seething with radical anti-American elements. “It could all go belly up and we could run out of public support,” said Ronald E. Neumann, a former ambassador to Afghanistan and now president of the American Academy of Diplomacy. “The immediate danger is we don’t explain to Americans how long things take. I certainly get questions like, ‘Is the new strategy turning things around? Is the civilian surge working?’ We’re not going to even get all of those people on the ground for months.” Others are not so sure that the new strategy will make a difference regardless of how much time it is given. No matter who is eventually declared the winner of last week’s election in Afghanistan, the government there remains so plagued by corruption and inefficiency that it has limited legitimacy with the Afghan public. Just as America was frustrated with successive South Vietnamese governments, it has grown sour on Afghanistan’s leaders with little obvious recourse. Lt. Col. Douglas A. Ollivant, a retired Army officer who worked on Iraq on the National Security Council staff first for Mr. Bush and then for Mr. Obama, said Afghanistan may be “several orders of magnitude” harder. It has none of the infrastructure, education and natural resources of Iraq, he noted, nor is the political leadership as aligned in its goals with those of America’s leadership. “We’re in a place where we don’t have good options and that’s what everyone is struggling with,” Colonel Ollivant said. “Sticking it out seems to be a 10-year project and I’m not sure we have the political capital and financial capital to do that. Yet withdrawing, the cost of that seems awfully high as well. So we have the wolf by the ear.” And as L.B.J. discovered, the wolf has sharp teeth.

Aff Link Turn – Winners Win (1/2)

Winners win – political leadership in tough fights builds capital

Singer, My Direct Democracy editor, 9

(Jonathan, My Direct Democracy, “By Expending Capital, Obama Grows His Capital”, 3-3-9, <http://www.mydd.com/story/2009/3/3/191825/0428>, accessed 7-8-9, AFB)

From the latest NBC News-Wall Street Journal survey:

Despite the country's struggling economy and vocal opposition to some of his policies, President Obama's favorability rating is at an all-time high. Two-thirds feel hopeful about his leadership and six in 10 approve of the job he's doing in the White House.

"What is amazing here is how much political capital Obama has spent in the first six weeks," said Democratic pollster Peter D. Hart, who conducted this survey with Republican pollster Bill McInturff. "And against that, he stands at the end of this six weeks with as much or more capital in the bank."

Peter Hart gets at a key point. Some believe that political capital is finite, that it can be used up. To an extent that's true. But it's important to note, too, that political capital can be regenerated -- and, specifically, that when a President expends a great deal of capital on a measure that was difficult to enact and then succeeds, he can build up more capital. Indeed, that appears to be what is happening with Barack Obama, who went to the mat to pass the stimulus package out of the gate, got it passed despite near-unanimous opposition of the Republicans on Capitol Hill, and is being rewarded by the American public as a result.

Take a look at the numbers. President Obama now has a 68 percent favorable rating in the NBC-WSJ poll, his highest ever showing in the survey. Nearly half of those surveyed (47 percent) view him very positively. Obama's Democratic Party earns a respectable 49 percent favorable rating. The Republican Party, however, is in the toilet, with its worst ever showing in the history of the NBC-WSJ poll, 26 percent favorable. On the question of blame for the partisanship in Washington, 56 percent place the onus on the Bush administration and another 41 percent place it on Congressional Republicans. Yet just 24 percent blame Congressional Democrats, and a mere 11 percent blame the Obama administration.

So at this point, with President Obama seemingly benefiting from his ambitious actions and the Republicans sinking further and further as a result of their knee-jerked opposition to that agenda, there appears to be no reason not to push forward on anything from universal healthcare to energy reform to ending the war in Iraq.

Victory begets more victories – politicians won’t cross a winner

Ornstein, American Enterprise Institute fellow and political analyst, 1

(Norman J., Roll Call, 9-10-1, “High Stakes and an Overloaded Agenda”, Lexis)

Those victories came at a crucial time, psychologically, for the White House. Imagine if the Democrats' preferred patients' rights legislation had passed by a wide margin in the House (as it has in the past) and if the President had been rebuffed on drilling in ANWR. He would have spent the month of August as the target of news stories declaring him weak and on the defensive, and arrived back in Washington in September with no momentum and limited leverage in the legislative battles of the fall. Instead, by showing that he can win even when he's expected to lose, and even on high-stakes issues, Bush left lawmakers with reason to pause before writing him off when key votes loom.

Aff Link Turn – Winners Win (2/2)

Winners win – plan is a win for Obama because he overcomes opposition

Ornstein, American Enterprise Institute fellow and political analyst, 1993

(Norman J., Roll Call, “Clinton Can Still Emerge a Winner; Here's What to Do”, May 27, p. Online)

2. Winning comes to those who look like winners. This only sounds redundant or cliche-ish. If power is the ability to make people do something they otherwise would not do, real power is having people do things they otherwise wouldn't do without anybody making them - when they act in anticipation of what they think somebody would want them to do.

If a president develops a reputation as a winner, somebody who will pull out victories in Congress even when he is behind, somebody who can say, "Do this!" and have it done, then Members of Congress will behave accordingly.

They will want to cut their deals with the president early, getting on the winning team when it looks the best and means the most. They will avoid cutting deals with the opposition.

Stories that show weakness, indecisiveness, or incompetence in the White House - and there are always lots of them - will go unreported or will be played down because they will be seen as the exception that proves the rule of strength and competence.

Coalition building using leadership bolsters agenda

Ornstein, American Enterprise Institute fellow and political analyst, 93

(Norman J., Roll Call, “Clinton Can Still Emerge a Winner; Here's What to Do”, May 27, p. Online)

1. A president's power is defined by his relations with Congress. A president must exercise power in many arenas, persuading many audiences at home and abroad. But the key test for a president's clout or success is how he is judged in dealing with Congress: Does he master them, or do they master him?

The successful president, I suggested in these pages in March, comes across like animal tamer Gunther Gebel-Williams: He gets into the ring with the Congressional lions and tigers, cracks the whip, and, although they growl and roar, they still get up on their tiny little stools and perform. But if a president looks like Gulliver, a pitiful, helpless giant dominated by Congressional Lilliputians, then watch out.

Winning in this regard does not mean forcing sweeping proposals, in toto, down the throats of lawmakers. It means compromising, cutting back, and ceding ground to build majorities, but doing so in ways that make it clear that you are in control.

Perception of successful policy boosts president’s power to control agenda

Rosati, University of South Carolina Government and International Studies professor, 04

(Jerel A., THE POLITICS OF UNITED STATES FOREIGN POLICY, 2004, p. 98)

It was the sense of national emergency associated with the cold war during the fifties and sixties, after all, that was the ultimate source of presidential power and American global leadership following World War II. This means that the fragmented and pluralist political environment that has prevailed since Vietnam will likely continue in the post-cold war future, posing greater foreign policy opportunities and political risks for presidents and American leadership abroad. And as the American public focuses its concern increasingly on “intermestic” (and especially economic) issues, presidents who are perceived as dealing successfully with those issues are likely to enjoy an increase in their popularity and ability to govern in foreign policy and in general. But much will depend on the image that Americans have of a president’s policies and of their relative success, at home and abroad – a function of the turn of events and the strength of presidential leadership.

Aff Link Turn – Afghanistan – Public Popularity

The public thinks that it is impossible to win in Afghanistan and wants a timetable for withdrawal. The war is draining his popularity

Press TV, 7-14-10

(“Poll: US is no-win Afghan scenario,” <http://www.presstv.ir/detail.aspx?id=134710&sectionid=3510203>, accessed 7-14-10)

The results of an opinion poll conducted in the US show that 62 percent of Americans believe in no-win scenario in Afghanistan for US President Barack Obama. According to the new CBS news poll, this is while only 49 percent of Americans were discontent with the US military presence in Afghanistan in May. The poll also indicated that over half of all Americans (54 percent) want a timetable for withdrawal from Afghanistan, nine years into the US-led war there. Americans are divided over President Obama's handling of Afghanistan: 43 percent say they approve of his handling of the Afghan war, while 44 percent disapprove. Just 31 percent maintain the war in Afghanistan is going well. There is also a partisan rift on the issue: 73 percent of Democrats think the US should set a timetable, while only 32 percent of Republicans say the US should do so. Fifty-four percent of independents want a timetable. The prolonged presence of US military personnel in Afghanistan, increasing casualties, and failure of Washington in the war-torn country have resulted in President Obama further losing his popularity.

Aff Link Turn – Afghanistan – Withdrawal Popular with Democrats

**Plan would be popular with the base – polls prove overwhelming Democratic support**

**Binckes, Huffington Post politics intern, 6-29-10**

(Jeremy, Huffington Post, “Most Americans Support Afghanistan Withdrawal Plan (POLL)”, <http://www.huffingtonpost.com/2010/06/29/most-americans-support-af_n_629396.html>, accessed 7-14-10)

A majority of Americans support President Obama's plan for withdrawing from Afghanistan starting in July 2011, according to a USA Today/Gallup poll released Tuesday.

Fifty-eight percent of Americans said they agreed with the plan, while 38 percent opposed it. Most of the opposition was to having a deadline at all -- 29 percent of respondents did not think that that U.S. should set a timetable.

Self-identified Democrats overwhelmingly responded that they favored Obama's withdrawal plan. Independents favored the plan 57 percent to 36 percent, while Republicans opposed the plan 65 percent to 31 percent.

On Tuesday, Gen. David Patraeus said that any reduction in American forces in Afghanistan would be "conditions-based." He added that Americans will provide assistance and support in Afghanistan for years to come.

Gallup interviewed 1,044 adults in all 50 states between June 25 and June 26.

War for Afghanistan is becoming increasingly unpopular – Democrats turning on Obama

Daily Times 7-3-10

(Daily Times, Daily Times = Pakistani daily newspaper, “US House approves money for Afghan troop surge,” <http://www.dailytimes.com.pk/default.asp?page=2010\07\03\story_3-7-2010_pg1_6>, accessed 7-15-10)

An amendment demanding an exit timetable from Afghanistan failed, but got 162 votes, the biggest anti-war vote in the House on Afghanistan to date. All but nine of the supporters were Democrats, and included House Speaker Nancy Pelosi. House leaders added billions of dollars in non-military spending before passing the war funds, so the measure must now return to the Senate, which is not in session again until July 12. Pentagon chief Robert Gates said recently the money for 30,000 additional troops to Afghanistan should be approved by July 4 to avoid the Pentagon having to juggle accounts and possibly lay off civilians while continuing war operations. Still it seemed a wonder the new money for the unpopular war got through the lower house at all, after long arguments among Democratic lawmakers over whether and how to do it. They set up a complicated series of votes in which the non-military spending passed 239-182, while the part containing the war funding passed 215-210.

Aff Internal Link Answer – Party Power (1/2)

[Read with Democrats Turn]

Base support is the crux of all political capital

Light, Brookings Center for Public Service founding director, 99

(Paul Charles, New York University Professor of Public Service, The President’s Agenda: Domestic Policy Choice from Kennedy to Clinton, p. 25-26, Google Books, <http://books.google.com/books?id=vuWJHWdgstsC&printsec=frontcover&dq=the+Presidents+Agenda&hl=en&ei=X2FATOLRFIWKlwflvLHxDQ&sa=X&oi=book_result&ct=result&resnum=1&ved=0CCwQ6AEwAA#v=onepage&q=the%20Presidents%20Agenda&f=false>, accessed 7-15-10)

Call it push, pull, punch, juice, power, or clout— they all mean the same thing. The most basic and most important of all presidential resources is capital. Though the National internal resources time, information, expertise, and energy all have an impact on the domestic agenda, the President is severely limited without capital. And capital is directly linked to the congressional parties. While there is little question that bargaining skills can affect both the composition and the success of the domestic agenda, without the necessary party support, no amount of expertise or charm can make a difference. Though bargaining is an important tool of presidential power, it does not take place in a neutral environment. Presidents bring certain advantages and disadvantages to the table. Perhaps the best way to illustrate the impact of capital is to compare Kennedy's early legislative failures with Johnson's eventual victories. According to the Congressional Quarterly Almanac, Johnson secured passage of 60 percent of his legislative proposals in 1965, while Kennedy secured passage of only 27 percent of his in 1963. Was Johnson's success due to some change in the President's prerogatives? Was it due to his abilities as a legislative broker? The answer to both questions is no. Neither institutional prerogatives nor bargaining skills explain Johnson's dramatic success. Johnson's higher degree of success paralleled the increase in his political resources following the 1964 election. Johnson's greater impact was the result of the massive increase in House Democrats, particularly from Northern liberal districts. Johnson went from 263 Democrats in the Eighty-seventh Congress to 294 in the Eighty-eighth. Moreover, the Northern Democratic bloc, Johnson's base of support, grew from 152 seats in 1964 to 194 in 1965. Finally, whereas Kennedy was elected to office by 49.7 percent of the vote, Johnson returned to office in 1965 following a landslide. The increases in both electoral margin and congressional support assured a greater degree of success for Lyndon Johnson. Hence, Johnson's success stemmed from dramatic shifts in presidential capital. Though Johnson's skills might have stretched his scarce resources, the basic explanation for the change lies in his increased external resources, in his political "capital." Though power may remain undefined in the presidential literature, among the presidential staffs it is generally understood to be equal to the President's party support in Congress. For most White House aides, capital is defined as the number of votes the President can generate in Congress at any one time on any given issue. As such, capital responds to the President's public approval and electoral margin. However, the base of presidential capital is always the number of party seats the President has in Congress. Throughout the following discussion, it should be remembered that capital is only a word—some aides used it frequently; others used a variety of other terms. Its attractiveness rests on the image of a fixed amount of influence expended over time. It should be remembered that this definition is restricted to the domestic agenda— a restriction with heavy legislative content; the definition would certainly change in foreign affairs.

Aff Internal Link Answer – Party Power (1/2)

[Read with Democrats Turn]

Party discipline is key to passage of legislation

Barrett & Eshbaugh-Soha, University of North Texas, 07

[Andrew W. & Matthew, March, Political Research Quarterly, Vol. 60, No. 1, “Presidential Success on the Substance of Legislation”, pp. 100-112, Stable URL: http://www.jstor.org/stable/4623810, Accessed: 7-15-10)

Fluctuations in the legislative and public environ- ment, including party control of Congress, conditions of gridlock, the point in a president's tenure, and pres- idential popularity should affect the president's bar- gaining position and, therefore, his degree of legislative success. Party control in Congress is by far the most important factor affecting presidential suc- cess in the legislative arena (Edwards 1989; Bond and Fleisher 1990). This is not surprising because legisla- tors and presidents of the same party share similar ide- ological beliefs and usually agree on which policy solutions are appropriate for social problems and public concerns. Political goals further link legislators and presidents of the same political party, as they invariably attempt to win reelection on similar policy records. For these reasons, presidents will likely have to bargain less with legislators of their political party and will receive more of what they want on legislation when their party controls Congress. Thus, unified gov- ernment will increase the degree of presidential suc- cess on the substance of legislation

Aff Internal Link Answer – Popularity/Political Capital Not Key to Agenda

No internal link – popularity and political capital are not key to agenda

Rockman, Purdue University Political Science professor, 9

(Bert A., October 2009, Presidential Studies Quarterly, “Does the revolution in presidential studies mean "off with the president's head"?”, volume 39, issue 4, Academic OneFile. accessed 7-15-10)

Although Neustadt shunned theory as such, his ideas could be made testable by scholars of a more scientific bent. George Edwards (e.g., 1980, 1989, 1990, 2003) and others (e.g., Bond and Fleisher 1990) have tested Neustadt's ideas about skill and prestige translating into leverage with other actors. In this, Neustadt's ideas turned out to be wrong and insufficiently specified. We know from the work of empirical scientists that public approval (prestige) by itself does little to advance a president's agenda and that the effects of approval are most keenly felt--where they are at all--among a president's support base. We know now, too, that a president's purported skills at schmoozing, twisting arms, and congressional lobbying add virtually nothing to getting what he (or she) wants from Congress. That was a lot more than we knew prior to the publication of Presidential Power. Neustadt gave us the ideas to work with, and a newer (and now older) generation of political scientists, reared on Neustadt but armed with the tools of scientific inquiry, could put some of his propositions to an empirical test. That the empirical tests demonstrate that several of these propositions are wrong comes with the territory. That is how science progresses. But the reality is that there was almost nothing of a propositional nature prior to Neustadt.

Aff START Impact Answers– Impact Internal Link Non-Unique

Arms control credibility internal link non-unique – START delays undermine credibility now

Rogin, Foreign Policy’s The Cable Blog writer, 7-19-10

(Josh, Foreign Policy The Cable Blog, “What are the consequences if START ratification fails?”,

<http://thecable.foreignpolicy.com/posts/2010/07/19/what_are_the_consequences_if_start_ratification_fails>, accessed 7-19-10)

Meanwhile, European allies are growing frustrated with the slow pace of the Obama administration's arms-control agenda. Several European diplomats have told The Cable they are aware of the difficulties of Senate ratification but nevertheless feel they were given assurances by the administration and are looking to Obama to get it done.

"From the European point of view, nobody can understand why the START treaty has not been ratified," said France's Ambassador to Washington Pierre Vimont, "When we send cables back home saying that START might not be ratified, they ask us ‘What have you been drinking?'"

Aff START Impact Answer – Not Key to Russian Relations

START won’t solve US-Russian relations

Brookes, Heritage Foundation National Security Affairs & Policy Studies fellow, 10

(Peter, 1-20-10, “O's Year of Foreign-Policy Fumbles,” <http://www.heritage.org/Press/Commentary/ed012510f.cfm>, accessed 7-16-10)

Russia: Washington-Moscow ties are increasingly cold, despite White House affections. Sensing weakness, Russia is now holding America's European, anti-Iran missile-defense system hostage to strategic-arms-control reduction talks -- an Obama priority. Worse, Washington cuddles with Moscow despite Russia's occupation of Georgia's South Ossetia and Abkhazia; we've even put Georgia's (and Ukraine's) NATO membership on ice to appease the Bear. Obama's Russia policy has left other former Soviet states nervous, too. Skipping ceremonies on the 20th anniversary of the Berlin Wall's fall only bolstered the sense of indifference New Europe now feels from the New World.

Aff – Miscellaneous Theory Arguments

\*\*\*\*DO NOT READ ALL OF THESE ANALYTICS IN A ROW – DOING SO IS UNFLOWABLE AND WILL LIKELY RESULT IN AUTOMATIC LOSS OF SPEAKER POINTS – INTERSPERSE THESE AMONG CARDED ANSWERS\*\*\*\*

\_\_\_ No link – Lower on the docket – Normal means ensures the plan doesn’t jump to the front of the line – it would not be ahead of the agenda item on the docket, so it won’t affect passage of the agenda.

\_\_\_ No link – No capital loss – If the plan really was political suicide, Obama wouldn’t push it.

\_\_\_ No link – Fiat solves link – The magic wand interpretation of fiat, which means the plan is just magically exists as a result of fiat, is better for debate. The debate should be about the outcome of the plan, not plan passage.

\_\_\_ No internal link- No spillover – External policies like the plan and Obama’s popularity are irrelevant to the passage of their impact.

\_\_\_ No necessary internal link – a logical policymaker could choose to do the plan and enact Obama’s agenda – there is not a necessary causal relationship - the impact isn’t a necessary direct result of the plan, only a possible one. Getting hit by a car is not a necessary direct result of crossing the street, it is only a possible, improbable outcome.