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\*\*Obama Good Links\*\*

Links- Afghanistan-Congress

The house just rejected early withdrawal overwhelmingly- plan unpopular

Malone 10 (Jim, staff writer, *VOA News*, 10-Mar, http://www1.voanews.com/english/news/asia/House-Votes-Down-Afghan-Withdrawal-Resolution-87284652.html ) ET

The U.S. House of Representatives on Wednesday overwhelmingly rejected a resolution calling for a quick withdrawal of U.S. troops from Afghanistan. The vote was 356 against and 65 in favor of the resolution. Even though the final tally was not close, the debate in the House gave anti-war lawmakers an opportunity to vent their frustrations about the war. The effort to end U.S. military involvement in Afghanistan was led by a familiar anti-war face in Congress, Democrat Dennis Kucinich of Ohio. Kucinich said the U.S. military effort in Afghanistan was approved shortly after the 2001 terrorist attacks on the United States and that it was time for Congress to reconsider America's commitment there. "To reflect on our responsibility for troop casualties that are now reaching 1000, to look at our responsibilities for the cost of the war, which approaches $250 billion, our responsibility for the civilian casualties and the human costs of the war," said Dennis Kucinich.

Congress will oppose plan- seen as national security threat

Malone 10 (Jim, staff writer, *VOA News*, 10-Mar, http://www1.voanews.com/english/news/asia/House-Votes-Down-Afghan-Withdrawal-Resolution-87284652.html ) ET

 The Ohio representative won the support of only 60 Democrats and five Republicans in the House vote. They are frustrated by the length of the conflict in Afghanistan and they opposed President Barack Obama's decision late last year to send additional troops. The vast majority of Republicans and Democrats opposed the resolution. Florida Representative Ileana Ros-Lehtinen, the top Republican on the House Committee on Foreign Affairs, noted the recent success of a U.S.-led offensive in Afghanistan. "Our brave men and women are making steady progress against the deadly foe and are doing so at great risk to their lives," said Ileana Ros-Lehtinen. "This offensive is already producing dramatic success, including the capture of senior Taliban leaders, the routing of their forces and the stabilization of key areas. A winning strategy should be supported, not undermined." Several Democrats joined Republicans in speaking out against the withdrawal resolution, including Representative Howard Berman of California, the Chairman of the House Committee on Foreign Affairs. "If we withdraw from Afghanistan before the government is capable of providing a basic level of security for its own people, we face the prospect that the Taliban once again will take the reins of power in Kabul and provide a safe haven to al-Qaida," said Howard Berman. "That would be a national security disaster." Even though the House easily rejected the call to pull out U.S. troops from Afghanistan, there were many complaints about the government of Afghan President Hamid Karzai from members on both side of the issue.

And, republican support troop withdrawal- plan popular

Abrams 10 (Jim, AP, U.S. Department of Justice -Counsel for the Solicitor of Labor, *Associated Press,* Mar 10, http://blog.taragana.com/politics/2010/03/10/house-rejects-quick-troop-withdrawal-from-afghanistan-but-anti-war-lawmakers-get-to-vent-22742/ ) ET

The House on Wednesday soundly rejected an effort by anti-war lawmakers to force a withdrawal of all U.S. troops from Afghanistan by the end of the year.The outcome of the vote, 356-65 against the resolution, was never in doubt. But the 3 1/2 hours of debate did give those who oppose President Barack Obama’s war policies a platform to vent their frustrations.Opposing the resolution was easy for almost all Republicans, who have been solidly behind Obama’s decision to increase U.S. troop strength in Afghanistan from 70,000 to 100,000. Only five Republicans supported the measure.

Links- Afghanistan-Controversial

And, withdrawal of troops is controversial

Montopoli June 24th ( Brian, editor of Public eye, *CBS*, http://www.cbsnews.com/8301-503544\_162-20008781-503544.html?utm\_source=feedburner&utm\_medium=feed&utm\_campaign=Feed:+CBSNewsGamecore+(GameCore:+CBSnews.com , June 24-10) ET

There are, of course, political considerations at play - while Republicans like Sens. Lindsey Graham and John McCain have expressed concerns about setting a deadline, liberals (including House Democrats who hold the purse strings for war funding) are increasingly unwilling to continue pouring money into a conflict without a clear and defined endpoint. "We cannot tell the enemy when you are leaving in warfare and expect your strategy to be able to prevail," McCain argues. "That's just a fundamental of warfare." The vagueness of the message coming out of the White House - we have a deadline, only we don't have a deadline, we'll be withdrawing lots of troops, only we might not - is meant to try to placate both sides of the debate as the battle continues.

Links- Afghanistan- Mccain

Mccain opposes troop withdrawal- says would just let enemy re-emerge

Youngman june 27th (Sam, 10, http://thehill.com/homenews/senate/105749-mccain-blasts-afghanistan-withdrawal-date-as-political-decision , *The Hill*) ET

Sen. John McCain blasted President Barack Obama's stated goal of beginning troop withdrawal from Afghanistan in July 2011, saying Obama made a "political decision" not based on military strategy. McCain (R-Ariz.), Obama's opponent in the 2008 presidential election, continued to criticize Obama's decision to include a timetable in his Afghanistan strategy, and he criticized military leaders who signed on to Obama's timetable strategy."It was purely a political decision," McCain said on NBC's "Meet the Press." "Not one based on facts on the ground, not one based on military strategy." McCain, ranking member on the Senate Armed Services Committee, went further, saying that no military advisers proposed to Obama any strategy that included a timetable. But when host David Gregory noted that Obama's military leaders have endorsed the strategy, McCain faulted them for not opposing the commander in chief. "They didn't do it, and they should have because they know better," McCain said. McCain said the president needs "to just come out and say this is conditions-based and conditions-based only." The White House has said repeatedly that July 2011 represents a start date for withdrawal, and that is not a total withdrawal date. But McCain, echoing arguments against a timeline in Iraq, said that when "you tell the enemy you're leaving, they will wait." "I'm against a timetable," McCain said. "In wars you declare when you're leaving after you've succeeded."

Links- Afghanistan- PMCs

And, military contractors spend lots lobbying to ensure troops stay in Afghanistan- they’d hate the plan because of profit

Stein 10 (Sam, Huffington Post staff writer, *The Huffington Post,* 1-21-10, http://www.huffingtonpost.com/2010/01/21/top-defense-contractors-s\_n\_431542.html ) ET

The ten largest defense contractors in the nation spent more than $27 million lobbying the federal government in the last quarter of 2009, according to a review of recently-filed lobbying records. The massive amount of money used to influence the legislative process came as the White House announced it would ramp up military activity in Afghanistan and Congress considered appropriations bills to pay for that buildup. All told, these ten companies, the largest revenue earners in the industry, spent roughly $7.2 million more lobbying in the fourth quarter of 2009 (October through December) than in the three months prior. Such an increase in lobbying expenditures is partly a reflection of just how profitable the business of waging war can be. Each of these companies earned billions of dollars in defense contracts this past year. As the U.S. ramps up its military activities overseas, and the army is stretched thin by other ventures, it stands to reason that the contracts won't dry up any time soon.

Contractor lobbies have huge financial interests in troops- plan unpopular

Markusen 4 (ann, professor, is the director of the Institute's Project on Regional and Industrial Economics, *World Traveler,* May/June, http://www.thirdworldtraveler.com/National\_Security/PriviteNationalSecurity.html) ET

In mid-December, Congress passed a defense appropriations bill that totaled more than $635 billion. Shortly thereafter, the firm Northrop Grumman moved its corporate office to the Washington D.C. region to be closer to the heart of legislative action. Among the issues on which these ten firms lobbied, "appropriations" was the most frequently cited in lobbying forms. "We've built Rome," one longtime good-government official said of the symbiosis between contractors and the government. On a related note, the Congressional Research Service released a report on Thursday, which showed that the number of private security contractors has bulged in the wake of Obama's Afghanistan-surge announcement. Currently, contractors in Afghanistan make up between 22 percent and 30 percent of armed U.S. forces in Afghanistan.

And contractors benefit economically from war in afghan

Ross 9 (Sherwood, executive for a national civil rights organization, as a reporter for the Chicago Daily News, http://www.sodahead.com/united-states/lining-the-pockets-of-pentagon-contractors/blog-134744/ ) ET

"Defense Earnings Continue to Soar," Renae Merle wrote in The Washington Post on July 30, 2007. "Several of Washington’s largest defense contractors said last week that they continue to benefit from a boom in spending on the wars in Iraq and Afghanistan…" Merle added, "Profit reports from Northrop Grumman, General Dynamics and Lockheed Martin showed particularly strong results in operations in the region." More recently, Boeing’s second-quarter earnings this year rose 17 percent, Associated Press reported, in part because of what AP called "robust defense sales."

Links- Afghanistan PMCs

Contractors have huge portfolios invested in Afghanistan- plan unpopular

Jacobs 9 (Karon, Reporter @ Reuters, *Reuters,*Dec 2, http://www.reuters.com/article/idUSN02263720091202 ) ET

defense contractor DynCorp International Inc (DCP.N) said on Wednesday it expects to gain more business in

Afghanistan as U.S. troop levels rise there. "We expect to see relatively steady growth in our business in Afghanistan largely because we have a pretty broad portfolio of services at work in the country today," DynCorp Chief Executive Bill Ballhaus said during a Credit Suisse conference that was broadcast over the Internet. DynCorp, a government services provider to the U.S. Department of Defense and State Department, was chosen earlier this year to support U.S. troops in the southern part of Afghanistan under the Logistics Civil Augmentation Program, or LOGCAP. Ballhaus said his company, which provides police training as well as dining and other logistics services, was well-positioned to support U.S. President Barack Obama's plan to send more troops to Afghanistan.

Jacobs 9 (Karon, Reporter @ Reuters, *Reuters,*Dec 2, http://www.reuters.com/article/idUSN02263720091202 ) ET

Additionally, DynCorp disclosed in a November regulatory filing that certain payments, which it believed totaled about $300,000, had been "made to expedite the issuance of a limited number of visas and licenses from foreign government agencies," potentially violating the U.S. Foreign Corrupt Practices Act. The company added that it brought the payments to the attention of the U.S. Justice Department and Securities and Exchange Commission. Last week, DynCorp disclosed that its executive counsel had been terminated without cause. "Like many companies, we have had a select number of incidents in most cases that we have brought forward as a part of our efforts to be transparent, proactive and accountable," Ballhaus added. DynCorp shares rose 92 cents, or 7 percent, to $14.05 on the New York Stock Exchange late Wednesday afternoon.

Links- Generic- Congress

Questions of troop withdrawals spark intense debate in Congress.

Weisman 7(Jonathan, staff writer for The Washington Post “GOP Looks Beyond War Measure to Fight on Funding” )AQB

There is going to be a real battle some time in March over defunding our troops that are in harm's way or somehow shackling the military's ability to fight," said House Minority Leader John A. Boehner (R-Ohio). When Rep. Heather A. Wilson (R-N.M.) charged that the resolution offers no support for troops not yet deployed to the battlefield, House Majority Leader Steny H. Hoyer (D-Md.) showed just how sensitive Democrats are to the charge. "No one ought to hide behind the troops. No one ought to come to this floor and say that this Congress, 435 of us, will not support whatever soldier or sailor or Marine is deployed to Iraq," Hoyer said angrily. "Whether it is today or tomorrow, they will have our support." Republicans have been less successful at ruffling Democratic feathers over the issue at hand -- the deployment of additional troops. Republican leaders have put up an energetic rapid-response center to try to debunk Democratic arguments against Bush's war plan. Rank-and-file Republicans have met with national security adviser Stephen J. Hadley, as well as representatives from the embassies of Jordan, Egypt and Saudi Arabia. But GOP efforts to hold their lawmakers off the Democratic resolution appeared to falter yesterday. As Bush conducted his news conference, the House floor was turning into a fratricidal showdown in a split-screen visual that even Republicans had to admire. "It was a good strategic move," one GOP lawmaker said.

Military issues are turned into a political minefield in Congress as Democrats and Republicans use support for troops as tool for making political fissures in the other.

Weisman 7(Jonathan, staff writer for The Washington Post “GOP Looks Beyond War Measure to Fight on Funding” )AQB

Even the president conceded yesterday that the House will deliver a bipartisan rebuke tomorrow, when it votes on a resolution opposing the deployment of additional troops to Iraq, while affirming Congress's support for "the members of the United States Armed Forces who are serving or who have served bravely and honorably in Iraq." But, he warned, Congress must not meddle with the funds needed to support those troops. "I think you can be against my decision and support the troops, absolutely. But the proof will be whether or not you provide them the money necessary to do the mission," he said at a White House news conference. Republicans think the funding debate will unite their party and expose deep fissures among the Democrats, some of whom want immediate action to deny funding to the war effort. But Democratic leaders have rallied around a strategy that would fully fund the president's $100 billion request for the wars in Iraq and Afghanistan but would limit his ability to use the money. Rep. John P. Murtha (D-Pa.), chairman of the House Appropriations subcommittee on defense, will formally outline the Democrats' plan today to antiwar groups agitating for binding action against the war. Rep. James P. Moran Jr. (D-Va.), a subcommittee member who helped arrange the Internet event, said the plan is aimed at tamping down calls from the Democrats' liberal wing for Congress to simply end funding for the war.

Links- Generic – Decrease Spending

Republicans are always seeking to increase military spending, plan is perceived as cuts.

The Washington Times 98(Global policy watch, “History shows long pattern of executive branch leadership” Nov 16)AQB

Perhaps the most notable departure from prior Congresses has been the growing reliance on sanctions to bully uncooperative states into complying with American policy. The Congress has been sensitive to the pleas and pressures of special interest groups. [But] there is nothing new here either. Such groups were active through the history of the Republic, most notably when America emerged as a great power at the turn of the 20th century, when competing committees sought to position the United States in support of either Britain or Nazi Germany prior to World War II and particularly in the Cold War era, when ethnic groups became especially influential in matters of foreign policy. . . . The Republican majority successfully added funds to the defense budgets in Fiscal years 1996 through 1998, the largest amount totaling $11.2 billion in Fiscal year 1997. The 1998 bipartisan balanced budget agreement, however, effectively limited the Congress' ability to increase the defense budget "top line" (that is, total funding) in Fiscal Year 1999, allowing for no increases through Fiscal Year 2002. The agreement also represented a real decline in defense spending through Fiscal Year 2002. . . . The final, decisive [Senate] vote in favor of [NATO] enlargement demonstrated the degree to which a clear administration lead could draw upon and coalesce latent support in both parties. . . . By agreeing to work together with [Senate Foreign Relations Committee] Chairman [Jesse] Helms, despite his ideological opposition to much of the administration's agenda, by organizing an effective lobbying group in [the] State [Department], and the NSC [National Security Council], and by working closely with the Senate Observer Group, the administration assured that NATO enlargement, an issue that was never defined in partisan terms to begin with, remained outside the partisan arena.

Link- - Generic- Detroit Contractors

and, defense contractors in America would be hurt to- kills detroit’s economy- politically unpopular

halcom 10 (Chad, Detroit business staffwriter, may 2, http://www.crainsdetroit.com/article/20100502/SUB01/100429787# , *Crain’s Detroid Business*) ET

The first Gulf War spurred an initial a bump in orders for local suppliers to defense contractors, and in new hiring at the Detroit Arsenal Tank Plant, while construction equipment exporter Energy International Corp. in Southfield had $2 million in additional construction orders to rebuild Kuwait after the war. But local business growth from the Gulf War was small, outside of some retailers who reported a surge in sales of merchandise with patriotic themes and the Detroit 3 automakers who reported $10 million apiece in post-war vehicle sales to Kuwait.

And the war on terror is key to defense economy in Detroit- plan is unpopular

halcom 10 (Chad, Detroit business staffwriter, may 2, http://www.crainsdetroit.com/article/20100502/SUB01/100429787# , *Crain’s Detroid Business*) ET

Defense growth isn't isolated to Macomb County. The Ann Arbor area has added several hundred new jobs across at least 13 companies that do at least some defense business and didn't yet exist in 1985, according to data from Ann Arbor Spark, the business incubator and economic development organization. These include Advanced Photonix Inc., the electronics company founded in 1996 with more than 100 employees and 2008 revenue of $23.2 million, Adaptive Materials Inc. at 57 employees and nearly $8 million revenue for 2009, and Soar Technology Inc. at 28 employees, founded in 1998. Spark President and CEO Michael Finney estimates 300 to 400 startup companies approach the organization each year about possible assistance with business development, either from the community at large or as commercial spinouts of technology developed at the University of Michigan or Eastern Michigan University. Of these, Finney estimates “There are a fair number of people whose intellectual property and innovations are developed specifically with a homeland security and defense operation,” he said. “Most of the folks we find in automotive are also looking to transition to other industries, including those.”

And Michigan gets huge profit from the war- plan unpopular

halcom 10 (Chad, Detroit business staffwriter, may 2, http://www.crainsdetroit.com/article/20100502/SUB01/100429787# , *Crain’s Detroid Business*) ET

Perhaps nothing escalated business in defense and homeland security for Southeast Michigan like the War on Terror. Businesses across the five-county region of Southeast Michigan saw a total of $5.22 billion in defense contract awards in 2008, more than likely a peak year, compared with just over $1.1 billion worth of contracts in 2000, according to the Web site governmentcontractswon.com. The Tacom Contracting Center, which is based in Warren but awards defense contracts to companies nationwide, also reports contracting grew from $8.2 billion in 2003 to a peak of $30.5 billion in fiscal 2008.

I/L - Defense Contractor Lobbies Key

Defense contractors have massive political clout

AFP 8 [March 25, Agency French Press, http://www.defensenews.com/story.php?i=4005316&c=AME&s=TOP]KLS

WASHINGTON - U.S. President Barack Obama on March 24 renewed his vow to cut spending on costly weapons programs, but acknowledged taking on influential defense contractors would be politically "tough." Obama said that there was wide agreement in both political parties that the way the government purchased weapons was plagued by waste, but that defense firms were influential in Congress and had ensured industry jobs were spread across the country. "I think everybody in this town knows that the politics of changing procurement is tough," Obama said at a news conference. "Because you know, lobbyists are very active in this area. Contractors are very good at dispersing the jobs and plants in the Defense Department widely," Obama said.

Link- Generic- Nuclear Umbrella

Plan is unpopular- US committed to protecting countries under the nuclear umbrella

Schlesinger et al 9 [UJames Schlesinger, Former Secretary of Defense, Chair; General Michael Carns, U.S. Air Force (Retired); Admiral Edmund Giambastiani, U.S. Navy (Retired); Jacques Gansler; Franklin Miller; Christopher Williams, .S. January 10, Department of Defense Office of the Assistant Secretary of Defense (Public Affairs) http://newsblaze.com/story/20090110134305tsop.nb/topstory.html] KLS

Deterrence, as all of you know, is as old as human conflict. What the Israelis are doing at the present time in the Gaza Strip is to re-create a deterrent. Deterrence during the Cold War became identified with nuclear weapons to a large extent, perhaps an excessive extent. But deterrence is quite separate. Nuclear deterrence is different. It is different in two respects. One is the enormous power, destructiveness, of nuclear weapons. The second is that nuclear weapons are basically created in -- in the desire to avoid the actual use of those weapons in combat. It is, therefore, a different kind of deterrent. Conventional forces likely will be used in combat. Nuclear forces, we hope, will not have to be used. And therefore it creates a kind of divergence with respect to the capabilities that one has in one's nuclear force. On the one hand, there is a concept of a second-strike force, that even under attack we'll be able to destroy the designated targets on the other side. But the larger role, and the one that we feel has been neglected to some extent, within the DOD at large as well as previously, with the Air Force, is that role of deterring any use of nuclear weapons against American soil, against American interests, against America's allies. And consequently, the -- this larger purpose of our nuclear forces, our nuclear deterrent, has sometimes been neglected within the Department of Defense as a whole, in the same way that the Air Force came to neglect it, as recounted in the phase one report. The services, as we discovered, have tended to understate the unique aspects of deterrence, and the principal question is to some extent that they have failed to fully recognize the psychological and political consequences of our deterrent forces. This has many illustrations, some of which you will read about when you go through the report; but most of these illustrations reflect a focus on the military aspects rather than on the psychological aspects, remembering that deterrence is in the eye of the beholder. The strength of the American deterrent will be evaluated in Moscow, Beijing, Warsaw, Tokyo and other such places; that is, amongst potential -- potential -- opponents and amongst the allies whom we are committed to protect. I remind you of what we stated in the first report: that the United States is obligated to provide a nuclear umbrella for 30-plus nations, and that number may increase. Thus, those 30 nations must retain confidence in the U.S. nuclear umbrella. If they fail to do so, some five or six of those nations are quite capable of beginning to produce nuclear weapons on their own, and the consequence is to add to proliferation. The strength of the U.S. nuclear umbrella, the credibility of that umbrella, is a principal barrier to proliferation. As I mentioned earlier, some of the problems that we saw in the case of the Air Force are replicated in the DOD at large. There has been a dispersal of office and personnel. There has been a downgrading and dilution of authority. There has been no training and no teaching of the doctrine of deterrence and an absence of an understanding of the unique role that nuclear weapons must play, irrespective of how large their domain happens to be. As you know, since the Cold War, the domain of nuclear weapons has substantially shrunk, but whatever the size of that domain, others must see that the forces that we have are quite capable of carrying out their responsibilities. We emphasize that deterrence must start from the top, that the services, indeed, have picked up clues over the years since the end of the Cold War that the interest in deterrence at the highest levels of DOD has diminished. And if deterrence is in the eye of the beholder, it is a political statement that must come from the very highest offices of the government, not only here in the DOD but from the White House, from the Department of State and the like. We, generally speaking, found one aspect of our deterrent posture to be quite impressive, and that is the Navy. The Navy is a -- SSP within the Navy is isolated and it performs its functions quite well. Admiral Giambastiani, referred to earlier as Admiral G, may have something to say on that subject. But we were quite satisfied, generally, with the Navy's performance. Morale is high, by contrast to some of the indications of lower morale in the Air Force in the nuclear establishment when we visited them earlier. We make some recommendations for change. Within the OSD, we urge the establishment of an assistant secretary of Defense; within the policy shop, an assistant secretary of Defense for deterrence, who will have within him -- within his authorities over other elements in the OSD. We urge that the Nuclear Weapons Council be expanded to cover the full range of nuclear capabilities. To this point, the Nuclear Weapons Council has been focused primarily on the nuclear weapons themselves, in association with the Department of Energy, which has the responsibility for making and maintaining those weapons. We urge that the missions assigned to STRATCOM be reviewed because STRATCOM has multiple and diverse missions, and we believe that STRATCOM is overloaded. We urge that the STRATCOM and JFCC capabilities be reviewed to see that they have adequate resources because the -- I mentioned there has been some downgrading and shrinkage of the resources available in this mission. Repeat, no matter how circumscribed this mission becomes in the postwar -- -Cold War era, there must be adequate resources, so that nobody doubts its capabilities. And finally, we have recommended that the Joint Staff capabilities for oversight and direction, which have eroded, be restored and placed under a general officer. One should bear in mind that we are interested in the future. We are not just interested in what the capabilities are today. We are concerned, as we look out five, 10 years, that to the extent that we need a nuclear deterrent -- and the Commission on Strategic Posture appointed by the Congress states that we will need a nuclear deterrent for the indefinite future -- that there be no doubt in the minds of any observers in foreign capitals as to the strength, the credibility -- indeed, the impressiveness -- of the nuclear deterrent of the United States.

Link- Generic- Nuclear Umbrella

Plan is controversial within Congress- nuclear umbrella commitments prove

M. Kelleher and Warren 9 [Catherine Watson Institute Visiting Fellow, Scott L, October, Arms Control Association, http://www.armscontrol.org/act/2009\_10/Kelleher

The principal issues with the elimination of tactical nuclear weapons are political and conceptual, rather than straightforwardly military, with the single but critical exception of the risk of terrorist seizure. The notion of the U.S. nuclear umbrella, with tactical weapons serving as a real or potential down payment on a security commitment, particularly in Europe, still has significant traction within the Obama administration. Key factions in the Pentagon and perhaps in the Department of State argue that the United States must still provide allies substantial security support, especially with Iran and North Korea deeply engaged in nuclear programs. This is the case despite the indifference of many NATO allies toward technical weapons or, in some cases, direct demands for elimination. Some European countries, especially elites in the newer central and eastern European member states, attach a high symbolic importance to the deployment of tactical nuclear weapons on European soil as evidence of U.S. security guarantees. Turkey also is thought to be particularly concerned about any withdrawal because it faces a more direct threat from Iranian missiles, although it is now included in the new U.S. plans for a European missile defense system.[3]

Links- Generic- Republicans

Republicans support and praise positive movements. The plan would be a sign of defeat in their eyes.

Dinino 3(Stephan, writer for The Washington Post, “GOP to offer resolution for wide support of troops” March 20)AQB

Congressional Republicans are crafting as broad a war resolution as possible to win Democratic backing and show unanimity in support of U.S. troops. Soon after the first F-117A stealth fighters and cruise missiles hit a target near Baghdad last night, that unity began to show. Republicans and Democrats, including some who had vocally opposed President Bush's Iraq policy, offered prayers for the troops and support for Mr. Bush. "I am proud of our president, our troops, and our allies," said House Speaker J. Dennis Hastert, Illinois Republican. "Whether we support the attack or have advocated for continued diplomacy, we, as a country, must unite behind our president and our troops," said House Democratic Caucus Chairman Robert Menendez, New Jersey Democrat. For his part, Senate Minority Leader Tom Daschle, South Dakota Democrat, praised the troops: "We are awed by their sacrifice and their bravery, and we want them and their families to know that they have the profound respect and gratitude of every American." House and Senate Republicans still are working on the final wording of resolutions that support the troops overseas, but they do not intend to broach contentious objectives, such as ousting Iraqi dictator Saddam Hussein. "We're trying to write a bipartisan resolution," House Majority Leader Tom DeLay, Texas Republican, told reporters yesterday. Sen. John W. Warner, Virginia Republican, who as chairman of the Armed Services Committee was writing the Senate's version, said the resolution would be "pretty much straightforward" and resemble the one Congress overwhelmingly passed in 1991 at the beginning of the Persian Gulf war. But Democrats who have been critical of Mr. Bush's diplomacy could find it difficult to vote for language in the 1991 resolution specifically supporting the "leadership of the president as commander-in-chief." Both chambers plan to stop regular floor action as early as today to vote on the resolution. "I suspect we'll have as broad a resolution as possible to get the kind of support to show unanimity," said Senate Republican Conference Committee Chairman Rick Santorum, Pennsylvania Republican.

The GOP ardently resist troop withdrawals or anything that reduces military influence abroad – proven with the outrage when Bush’s surge plan lost in congress.

Hurt 7(Charles, writer for The Washington Times, “Senate resolution called 'disgrace';

Republicans see lack of support for U.S. troops” Feb. 1)AQB

"There's no other way it could come out," Mr. DeMint said of the two resolutions that have been authored. "That is the choice that they're making. That is the decision they're making because we know if we withdraw and leave this to the Iraqis when they're not ready, that we will lose all." The "nonbinding" resolutions rebuke Mr. Bush and his plan for sending an additional 21,000 troops to Iraq. But neither has any force of law that would require troops to come home or cut off funding. One resolution was co-authored by Senate Foreign Affairs Committee Chairman Joseph R. Biden Jr., Delaware Democrat, and Sen. Chuck Hagel, Nebraska Republican. A second was authored by Sens. John W. Warner, Virginia Republican; Ben Nelson, Nebraska Democrat; and Susan Collins, Maine Republican. All five senators voted to go to war in 2002. Sen. John Cornyn, Texas Republican, was not serving in the Senate for the vote authorizing the war but has been an ardent defender of it. He said Congress is sending mixed messages to the troops, to voters and to the world with a "no confidence" vote that carries no force. "We can't claim to support the troops and not support their mission," he said in a floor speech yesterday. "If we don't support the mission, we shouldn't be passing nonbinding resolutions. We should be doing everything in our power to stop it." Instead, Mr. Cornyn said, "we should send them the message that, yes, we believe you can succeed and it's important to our national security that you do." He has been drawing up a resolution to do that. "That's just nonsense," said Sen. Tom Harkin, Iowa Democrat, who voted for the war in 2002. "What undermines the troops is keeping them fighting in a civil war, to keep them fighting for a mistake."

Links- Generic- Republicans

Republicans view troop withdrawals as traitorous and unsupportive of the troops.

Hurt 7(Charles, writer for The Washington Times, “Senate resolution called 'disgrace';

Republicans see lack of support for U.S. troops” Feb. 1)AQB

Republicans said the troops in Iraq want the full support of Congress rather than give up on a mission in which they have lost so many comrades. They pointed to an NBC News clip aired last week that has stormed the Internet. "One thing I don't like is when people back home say they support the troops but not the war," one soldier interviewed said. "If they're going to support us, support us all the way." Spc. Tyler Johnson said, "You're not supporting what they do. They died for you. It don't make sense to me." The clip became one of the most-watched clips on YouTube yesterday with more than 38,000 views. William M. Arkin, a Washingtonpost.com columnist, took offense. "These soldiers should be grateful that the American public .. do still offer their support to them, and their respect," wrote Mr. Arkin. "Through every Abu Ghraib and Haditha, through every rape and murder, the American public has indulged those in uniform, accepting that the incidents were the product of bad apples or even of some administration or command order." The NBC report "is just an ugly reminder of the price we pay for a mercenary oops sorry, volunteer force that thinks it is doing the dirty work," he added. Late last night, leaders of both parties were negotiating the wording and timing of votes for the resolutions. Mr. Warner made changes to his resolution in an effort to win more Democratic backing, picking up support from Sen. Carl Levin, Michigan Democrat. The new resolution vows to protect funding for existing troops while being silent on funding for the troop surge. It keeps Mr. Warner's original language expressing the Senate's opposition to the troop buildup but not calling it contrary to the national interest. Also yesterday, former Secretaries of State Henry Kissinger and Madeleine K. Albright urged Mr. Bush in testimony before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee to develop a regional strategy that goes beyond the Iraq troop surge, including talks with Iran and Syria, and more autonomy for Iraq's rival ethnic and religious factions. Mr. Kissinger defended the addition of 21,000 U.S. troops, though, calling it "the best way to get the maneuvering room to the changes in deployment and strategy that will be required."

Republicans continuously seek support for troops, especially while abroad. Plan is perceived as weakness.

The Washington Times 98(Global policy watch, “History shows long pattern of executive branch leadership” Nov 16)AQB

An examination of recent patterns in defense spending, the deployment of forces overseas, the provision of advice and consent to treaties, and the funding of major defense programs, even the imposition of sanctions relating to concerns about weapons proliferation, indicates that the Congress has tended to conform to the overall policy directives of the executive branch, despite partisan differences over many of those policies. One of the most contentious national defense issues in the 1990s has been the deployment of American land forces in Bosnia. . . . President Clinton's decision to deploy 26,000 ground troops as part of the NATO Implementation Force to support the November 1995 Dayton accords prompted fierce congressional controversy. Nevertheless, the executive branch was consistently able to muster congressional support for funding troop deployments to Bosnia, although Congress was frustrated by the administration's obfuscation about the duration, size and even nomenclature of the deployment. Like its predecessors, the Republican-led Congress placed the highest priority on supporting both the forces in the field and their commander-in-chief, regardless of the party affiliation. The Congress likewise followed the executive branch's lead in ratifying two major treaties: NATO enlargement and the Chemical Weapons Convention. . . . There is no denying that the Congress does not necessarily follow the executive branch's lead on every national security issue. Yet even with respect to sanctions, where the Republican Congress is perceived to have stolen a march on the Democratic administration, there has been considerably more bipartisanship, and indeed commonality, between the two branches of government than is widely recognized. . . . Congressional readiness to initiate sanctions legislation is a function of legislators' perception that the administration is irresolute in matters of foreign and national security policy. . . . In contrast with its behavior [under Democratic leadership] in the past with respect to Vietnam, Central America, Lebanon and Somalia, the [Republican-led] Congress has generally gone along with Clinton administration policies that many members have found distasteful. [The Republican-led] Congress' rationale resembles that of the pre-Vietnam era: when forces are deployed abroad, members support the troops and hesitate to undercut the nation's commander-in-chief.

Links- Generic- Republicans

Republicans will stand firm and resist troop withdrawal plans. One issue they all stand firm on.

Miller 8(S.A., writer for The Washington Times “GOP bucks veto threat on war bill”)AQB

Republicans did stand firmly with their party's leader when blocking a troop-withdrawal timetable and other war policy restrictions, including a prohibition on permanent U.S. bases in Iraq and a time limit on combat deployments. The series of votes came a week after a Republican political stunt allowed the Democratic-led House to pass its package without funding for troops, leaving Congress far from replenishing the Pentagon's coffers that it says will begin running out next week. Senate Majority Leader Harry Reid, Nevada Democrat, was joined by a bipartisan group of the chamber's war veterans - including the measure's lead sponsors, Democratic Sen. Jim Webb of Virginia and Republican Sen. Chuck Hagel of Nebraska - in praising the passage of the new GI bill, which will pay college tuition and a monthly housing allowance for veterans of the wars in Iraq and Afghanistan. "There is no politics in this," said Mr. Webb, the lead sponsor of the new GI bill. "This is taking care of the people who take care of us."

Links- Generic – PMCs

Defense contractors get their money by going overseas now- withdraw would devastate the industry

Weltsch 3 (Jerry, Principal Analyst-Frost Sullivan, *Frost & Sullivan,* jan 24-3, http://www.frost.com/prod/servlet/market-insight-top.pag?docid=4295667 ) ET

Defense contractors in the U.S. have long sought to expand their business by exploring opportunities in foreign markets, not only through foreign military sales or direct sales to foreign governments, but through the support of U.S. forces overseas. Many such contractors are now witnessing, for better or for worse, the beginnings of a great shift in the global focus of U.S. forces from East Asia and Western Europe to Southwest Asia and Eastern Europe. The end of the Cold War and the defense budget reductions of the 1990s benignly began this trend. While base closures across the U.S. were direct result of these actions, U.S. military base closures in foreign locales outside the U.S. (e.g. The Philippines and Panama) were, combined with treaty obligations, also a result of these events. The foreign and defense policies of the current Bush administration have slowly begun to shift the focus of the U.S. foreign military interests, and with it, the loci of the U.S. military presence overseas

And, contractors main focuses are in Japan, south korea, Iraq, afghanistan, and iran- plan angers contractors by losing them money

Weltsch 3 (Jerry, Principal Analyst-Frost Sullivan, *Frost & Sullivan,* jan 24-3, http://www.frost.com/prod/servlet/market-insight-top.pag?docid=4295667 ) ET

Many are speculating that most will remain in the Middle East. For now that means deployment in Iraq, but in the interim, many feel that new bases will be built in the outlying deserts of Kuwait to ensure the maintenance of the fruits of Operation Iraqi Freedom and to deter Iran from trying to politically and militarily influence the development of a new Iraq. In addition, while the U.S. military presence in Afghanistan is rather insignificant in terms of what the U.S. has on the ground in Iraq, the current Bush administration seems to have relegated military operations there to a bare minimum. Today, the few thousand U.S. forces there on the ground are basically there to chase the ghosts of Al-Qaida and the Taliban while helping a multinational force ensure that Kabul remains in the hands of the current government. Thus, many U.S. defense contractors feel that investing in a long-term military presence in Afghanistan could be a waste of time and effort. Others are speculating that not all U.S. forces stationed in Europe and currently deployed in Iraq will return to Europe. However, by the time they do go back, they will not return to Germany. Instead, to ensure that Russia will think twice about westward expansion again, the U.S. will look to establish a military presence in Poland, Hungary, and/or Bulgaria. With an array of forces in Eastern Europe, the current Bush administration may hope to build a wall between Western Europe and Russia to maintain the status quo and keep the two from developing the political and economic cooperation that could rival that of the U.S. For the first time since the end of the Second World War, defense contractors must determine what these trends mean for their overseas business operations. Many companies invested in developing local firms in Germany, Japan, South Korea, and to a lesser extent in The Philippines, that supported U.S. military operations in these countries. They now need to begin rethinking how and where new opportunities for the support of U.S. troops overseas will develop over the next five to ten years. We have seen much rapid change over the last five to ten years in terms of U.S. military presence in foreign lands, and at the rate and direction in which the current Bush administration is taking us, the pace is due to quicken.

Links- Generic- PMCs

And military construction plans benefit congress members- plan unpopular

Byrne 9 (Peter, investigative reporter who specializes in uncovering government and corporate corruption, http://current.com/176ue4c , *Current*, Jan 30) ET

As chairperson and ranking member of the Military Construction Appropriations subcommittee (MILCON) from 2001 through the end of 2005, Feinstein supervised the appropriation of billions of dollars a year for specific military construction projects. Two defense contractors whose interests were largely controlled by her husband, financier Richard C. Blum, benefited from decisions made by Feinstein as leader of this powerful subcommittee. -- There IS no "progressive" wing of the Democratic Party, and there never has been. It's a sham. Let's just do a quick tally of bills that Feinstein and the majority of the Democratic party have supported:

Contractors rake in billions of dollars because of war- plan unpopular

Byrne 9 (Peter, investigative reporter who specializes in uncovering government and corporate corruption, http://current.com/176ue4c , *Current*, Jan 30) ET

Former Halliburton subsidiary KBR, according to author Pratap Chatterjee in his "Halliburton’s Army"(Nation Books), raked in "more than $25 billion since the company won a ten-year contract in late 2001 to supply U.S. troops in combat situations around the world." As all know, President Bush’s Vice President Dick Cheney previously headed Halliburton (1995-2000) and landed in the White House the same year Halliburton got its humungous outsourcing contract. Earlier, as Defense Secretary, (1989-1993) Cheney sparked the revolutionary change to outsourcing military support services to the privateers. Today, Halliburton ranks among the biggest "defense" winners of all. Halliburton’s army "employs enough people to staff one hundred battalions, a total of more than 50,000 personnel who work for KBR, a contract that is now projected to reach $150 billion," Chatterjee writes. "Together with the workers who are rebuilding Iraq’s infrastructure and the private security divisions of companies like Blackwater, Halliburton’s Army now outnumber the uniformed soldiers on the ground in Iraq."Accompanying Pentagon outsourcing, Chatterjee writes, "is the potential for bribery, corruption, and fraud. Dozens of Halliburton/KBR workers and their subcontractors have already been arrested and charged, and several are already serving jail terms for stealing millions of dollars, notably from Camp Arifjan in Kuwait."

And, contractors have huge amounts of clients- lots of money would be lost by plan

Business wire 7 ( *Business Wire*, Mar 12, http://www.allbusiness.com/services/business-services/4307764-1.html )ET

HERNDON, Va. -- Deltek, the leading provider of enterprise management software for project-focused

organizations, today announced that federal services providers, Eagle Support Services Corporation (Eagle) and MacAulay-Brown, Inc. (MacB), have joined Deltek's growing list of more than 11,000 world class customers. Eagle and MacB have separately licensed Deltek Costpoint, Deltek's industry-leading enterprise solution designed specifically for sophisticated project-driven organizations, to manage key defense contracts and support their rapid growth. Costpoint will provide Eagle and MacB with complete enterprise-wide solutions to manage their entire businesses including critical integrated project and financial accounting, billing, purchasing, time and expense, human resources and business performance management functionality. "We needed an enterprise system that would help us to comply with complex government regulations while streamlining key operational processes across all levels of our organization," said Jim Spencer, President and CEO of Eagle, a leading provider of commercial military support and sustainment programs worldwide. "Deltek's software is the only fully integrated solution that can seamlessly report on every aspect of our business, and advance our continued growth over the next several years." "Costpoint will give us the flexibility we need to gather, integrate and evaluate critical project data across our entire company," said Thomas Batty, Vice President of Business Operations for MacB. "Costpoint's intuitive reporting, forecasting and compliance management features will help to support our organic and acquisition growth - keeping us a step ahead of the competition at all times as we aggressively grow and expand

Link Module – Israel Lobby

1. The Israel lobby has a very strong influence on Capitol Hill – Not even Obama will be able to resist.

Kenes 6/28/10(Bulent, The Turkish Press “Will Obama Be Able To Resist ‘The Lobby’?”)AQB

I do not know what the details of the Erdogan-Obama meeting were or what mood dominated it, but after seeing Gordon’s statements to the AP news agency, I do not think we have to focus on this meeting any longer in order to understand what the US administration thinks about Turkey. Gordon’s statements -- which I believe can be considered strange in terms of established diplomatic practice and diplomatic courtesy as they came just before the meeting of the leaders of the two countries -- were, it seems, intended to appease certain groups outside Turkish and US public opinion about the potential course of the meeting. Their message was: “Relax. Obama will talk to Erdogan within this framework.” Who were the groups Gordon was trying to appease? I am sure it was no one but Israel and the powerful and decisive Israeli lobby in the US that Gordon was trying to calm by issuing guarantees to them. Remembering the arguments in the book, “The Israel Lobby and U.S. Foreign Policy” (2008), co-authored by John J. Mearsheimer and Stephen M. Walt, which I luckily re-skimmed recently, I realized that Obama has enough reasons for worrying about the Israeli lobby in the US and for calming it down.

2. The Israel lobby backs US presence in the Middle East – They have many interests in keeping the US there; including placing friendly regimes.

Weber 8(Mark, director of the Institute for Historical Review “Iraq: A War For Israel” March)AQB

The role of the pro-Israel lobby in pressing for war has been carefully examined by two prominent American scholars, John J. Mearsheimer, professor of political science at the University of Chicago, and Stephen M. Walt, professor of international affairs at Harvard University. [15] In an 81-page paper, "The Israel Lobby and U.S. Foreign Policy," they wrote: “Pressure from Israel and the [pro-Israel] Lobby was not the only factor behind the decision to attack Iraq in March 2003, but it was critical. Some Americans believe that this was a war for oil, but there is hardly any direct evidence to support this claim. Instead, the war was motivated in good part by a desire to make Israel more secure… Within the United States, the main driving force behind the Iraq war was a small band of neoconservatives, many with close ties to Israel’s Likud Party. In addition, key leaders of the Lobby’s major organizations lent their voices to the campaign for war.” Important members of the pro-Israel lobby carried out what professors Mearshiemer and Walt call “an unrelenting public relations campaign to win support for invading Iraq. A key part of this campaign was the manipulation of intelligence information, so as to make Saddam look like an imminent threat.” For some Jewish leaders, the Iraq war is part of a long-range effort to install Israel-friendly regimes across the Middle East. Norman Podhoretz, a prominent Jewish writer and an ardent supporter of Israel, has been for years editor of *Commentary*, the influential Zionist monthly. In the Sept. 2002 issue he wrote: “The regimes that richly deserve to be overthrown and replaced are not confined to the three singled-out members of the axis of evil [Iraq, Iran, North Korea]. At a minimum, the axis should extend to Syria and Lebanon and Libya, as well as ‘friends’ of America like the Saudi royal family and Egypt’s Hosni Mubarak, along with the Palestinian Authority, whether headed by Arafat or one of his henchmen.” Patrick J. Buchanan, the well-known writer and commentator, and former White House Communications director, has been blunt in identifying those who pushed for war: [16] “We charge that a cabal of polemicists and public officials seek to ensnare our country in a series of wars that are not in America’s interests. We charge them with colluding with Israel to ignite those wars and destroy the Oslo Accords. We charge them with deliberately damaging US relations with every state in the Arab world that defies Israel or supports the Palestinian people’s right to a homeland of their own. We charge that they have alienated friends and allies all over the Islamic and Western world through their arrogance, hubris, and bellicosity...

Links – Israel Lobby

Israel has plans for the middle east – It will use the Israel Lobby to sabotage Obama if it doesn’t get what it wants.

Escobar 6/9/10(Pepe, The Asia Times, “The method in Israel's madness”)AQB

Let's survey Israel's possible motivations. A key Israeli motive to attack the humanitarian flotilla was to send a "signal" to Turkey about the Brazil and Turkey-mediated Iran nuclear fuel-swap deal - as its success pre-empted Israel's pleas for a military strike on Tehran's nuclear facilities. Israel wants conflict between Washington and Tehran - and that means using the Israel lobby in Washington to sabotage US President Barack Obama's half-hearted attempts at finding any sort of agreement with Tehran over its uranium-enrichment program. Israel wants a weak Turkey - out of the loop both in the Middle East and the European Union (EU). Turkey is an emerging, key regional power now with good, stable relations with its neighbors. Turkey is key for the US: 70% of all supplies for US troops in Iraq go through the Incirlik base in Turkey. Turkey has troops fighting the US war in Afghanistan. Not to mention that Turkey - in Obama's own terms - represents the key bridge between the West and the Muslim world.

The Israeli lobby has already established dominance over Obama.
Sullivan 6/15/10(Andrew, The Australian “Israel not the country I once loved”)AQB

Israel had a choice - to join the new President to try to restart the West's engagement with the Islamic world, or to sour the atmosphere and make Obama's job much harder. In Gaza, Israel chose the latter. Even as the Israeli government knew that its main enemy, Iran, would benefit by Israel's further alienation of the Arab world, it used the last months of George W. Bush's term to make a point. Obama turned the other cheek, as he often does. He simply urged a new start to the peace process, by asking the Israelis to suspend new construction of illegal settlements in the West Bank and East Jerusalem. After Gaza, this seemed like a way to change the atmosphere, and to prove to the world that the US was returning to its pre-Bush role of seeking a two-state solution. No one in Washington openly supported the settlements, let alone their growth. Everyone understood this constant provocation was a source of bitterness and distrust. Getting talks going by temporarily staunching this open wound was a legitimate request by Israel's ally and donor of $US3 billion ($3.5bn) a year in aid. But the new Israeli government refused to play ball. Benjamin Netanyahu, the Prime Minister, brandishing the Israel lobby's enormous sway over the US congress and media, called Obama's bluff - and exulted in his humiliation of the young American presidency. There was no freeze. Au contraire, a visit by Vice-President Joe Biden turned into a fiasco as new construction was approved in East Jerusalem the day he arrived. It was followed by the brazen Mossad assassination in Dubai and then the military raid on a flotilla of ships headed to break the embargo on Gaza. An unarmed US citizen, 19 years old, was killed by four Israeli bullets fired at close range into the head.

Links – Israel Lobby

The Israel lobby will help Israel “thwart” Obama if he risks Israel’s interests in the Middle East.

Mearsheimer 6/30/10(John, professor of political science at the University of Chicago, “The attack on the Gaza relief flotilla jeopardizes Israel itself”)AQB

Israel's troubled trajectory is also causing major headaches for its American supporters. First, there is the matter of choosing between Israel and the United States. This is sometimes referred to as the issue of dual loyalty, but that term is a misnomer. Americans are allowed to have dual citizenship—and in effect, dual loyalty—and this is no problem as long as the interests of the other country are in synch with America's interests. For decades, Israel's supporters have striven to shape public discourse in the United States so that most Americans believe the two countries' interests are identical. That situation is changing, however. Not only is there now open talk about clashing interests, but knowledgeable people are openly asking whether Israel's actions are detrimental to U.S. security. The lobby has been scrambling to discredit this new discourse, either by reasserting the standard argument that Israel's interests are synonymous with America's or by claiming that Israel—to quote a recent statement by Mortimer Zuckerman, a key figure in the lobby—"has been an ally that has paid dividends exceeding its costs." A more sophisticated approach, which is reflected in an AIPAC-sponsored letter that 337 congresspersons sent to Secretary of State Hillary Clinton in March, acknowledges that there will be differences between the two countries, but argues that "such differences are best resolved quietly, in trust and confidence." In other words, keep the differences behind closed doors and away from the American public. It is too late, however, to quell the public debate about whether Israel's actions are damaging U.S. interests. In fact, it is likely to grow louder and more contentious with time. This changing discourse creates a daunting problem for Israel's supporters, because they will have to side either with Israel or the United States when the two countries' interests clash. Thus far, most of the key individuals and institutions in the lobby have sided with Israel when there was a dispute. For example, President Obama and Prime Minister Netanyahu have had two big public fights over settlements. Both times the lobby sided with Netanyahu and helped him thwart Obama. It seems clear that individuals like Abraham Foxman, who heads the Anti-Defamation League, and organizations like AIPAC are primarily concerned about Israel's interests, not America's. This situation is very dangerous for the lobby. The real problem is not dual loyalty but choosing between the two loyalties and ultimately putting the interests of Israel ahead of those of America. The lobby's unstinting commitment to defending Israel, which sometimes means shortchanging U.S. interests, is likely to become more apparent to more Americans in the future, and that could lead to a wicked backlash against Israel's supporters as well as Israel.

Links – Israel Lobby

The Israel lobbies power will remain intact for at least another decade – No politician will risk their job speaking against Israel’s interest in the middle east.

Mearsheimer 6/30/10(John, professor of political science at the University of Chicago, “The attack on the Gaza relief flotilla jeopardizes Israel itself”)AQB

Israel is facing a bleak future, yet there is no reason to think that it will change course anytime soon. The political center of gravity in Israel has shifted sharply to the right and there is no sizable pro-peace political party or movement. Moreover, it remains firmly committed to the belief that what cannot be solved by force can be solved with greater force, and many Israelis view the Palestinians with contempt if not hatred. Neither the Palestinians nor any of Israel's immediate neighbors are powerful enough to deter it, and the lobby will remain influential enough over the next decade to protect Israel from meaningful U.S. pressure. Remarkably, the lobby is helping Israel commit national suicide while also doing serious damage to American security interests. Voices challenging this tragic situation have grown slightly more numerous in recent years, but the majority of political commentators and virtually all U.S. politicians seem blissfully ignorant of where this is headed, or unwilling to risk their careers by speaking out.

Links- Iraq- PMCs

And defense contractors profits went up 231% because of Iraq- withdrawing would be massively unpopular

Ross 9 (Sherwood, executive for a national civil rights organization, as a reporter for the Chicago Daily News, http://www.sodahead.com/united-states/lining-the-pockets-of-pentagon-contractors/blog-134744/ ) ET

Quite a few oil company CEO’s and "defense" industry executives, however, do have a pretty good idea of why that war is being fought. As Michael Cherkasky, president of Kroll Inc., said a year after the Iraq invasion boosted his security firm’s profits 231 percent: "It’s the Gold Rush." What follows is a brief look at some of the outfits that cashed in, and at the multitudes that got took.

Defense companies benefit economically from the Iraq war- oppose plan

Ross 9 (Sherwood, executive for a national civil rights organization, as a reporter for the Chicago Daily News, http://www.sodahead.com/united-states/lining-the-pockets-of-pentagon-contractors/blog-134744/ ) ET

Since the Iraq War began," Matthew Rothschild, editor of The Progressive wrote, "aerospace and defense industry stocks have more than doubled. General Dynamics did even better than that. Its stock has tripled." An Associated Press account published July 23rd observed: "With the military fighting two wars and Pentagon budgets on a steady upward rise, defense companies regularly posted huge gains in profits and rosier earnings forecasts during recent quarters. Even as the rest of the economy tumbled last fall, military contractors, with the federal government as their primary customer, were a relative safe haven." Among the big winners are top Pentagon contractors, as ranked by WashingtonTechnology.com as of 2008. Halliburton spun off KBR in 2007 and their operations are covered later. Data was selected for typical years 2007-09.

And, Iraq is a growing investment place for contractors

Jacobs 9 (Karon, Reporter @ Reuters, *Reuters,*Dec 2, http://www.reuters.com/article/idUSN02263720091202 ) ET

At the same time, he added that DynCorp expected increased business in Iraq as it expands into new services, even as troop levels decline there. The company, which works with subcontractors in providing services abroad, also said it was bolstering its compliance procedures. "The ability to perform, ensure compliance and ensure employee conduct is right at the center of the radar screen for our customers because they are increasingly under tremendous oversight and scrutiny," Ballhaus said. Shares of DynCorp came under pressure last month after a Kuwaiti food supplier that was a subcontractor to the company was indicted on allegations that it overcharged the United States. The case deals with issues prior to DynCorp's relationship with the supplier.

<READ PMC”S KEY>

Links- Iraq- PMCs

And, announce of withdrawal in Iraq would cause a huge loss of profit for contractors

Ross 7 (Daveed, American counter-terrorism expert and attorney living in Washington D.C, *Counterterrorism blog*, http://counterterrorismblog.org/2007/05/kuwait\_american\_contractors\_on.php ) ET

The prevailing attitude among the contractors I spoke with was that there will indeed be a large exodus of workers if a timetable is set (they thought the number leaving could be as high as 50,000), but that the numbers leaving will level off over time because some people will want to stay to make money. Also, as contractors leave, the salary that can be earned in Iraq will correspondingly rise. But this isn't a simple case of diminishing supply and steady demand: there will still be a demand for contractors in Iraq as U.S. troops draw down, but demand won't stay even because a deteriorating security situation may cause some projects that otherwise may have been completed to shut down. Overall, the contractors' view was that the timetable would strike a major blow to reconstruction efforts.

And, contractors would also see loss in the local economy- plan unpopular

Ross 7 (Daveed, American counter-terrorism expert and attorney living in Washington D.C, *Counterterrorism blog*, http://counterterrorismblog.org/2007/05/kuwait\_american\_contractors\_on.php ) ET

This gives rise to another concern beyond the reconstruction efforts. There will likely be a ripple effect on the Iraqi economy as projects are shut down. The contractors provided a couple of examples. One involved a village from which they hire a lot of Iraqi workers -- a village that lacks a freshwater source. Reconstruction efforts haven't yet reached the water supply for that village, and as U.S. troops draw down it's highly unlikely that such a project will be started. The contractors have also heard that a hospital in Baquba may not be completed because of the deteriorating security situation there. They felt that a withdrawal timetable would cause an increase in these kinds of stories. These economic effects would in turn result in a lack of employment and the kind of frustration that can help tilt people toward militancy.

And, contractors hate troop withdrawal- bad card

Ross 7 (Daveed, American counter-terrorism expert and attorney living in Washington D.C, *Counterterrorism blog*, http://counterterrorismblog.org/2007/05/kuwait\_american\_contractors\_on.php ) ET

It's worth noting that the contractors were also frustrated at an increase in bureaucracy that makes it more difficult for them to work in Iraq. They weren't sure who was responsible for some of the newer rules that they see as ridiculous, but commented that "it's like somebody doesn’t want us here." One example is that during their current stint, they were ordered into Kuwait a number of days before flying into Iraq. Although they're supposed to be compensated for their extra time in Kuwait, the Kuwaiti government is apparently unwilling to verify their hours. They also were under some restrictions that limited their ability to eat and spend time in the Kuwait City airport that seemed rooted not in legitimate security concerns, but more of a desire to control their movements solely for the sake of control.

<READ PMCS KEY>

Links- Japan- Bipartisan

Congress has bipartisan support for sustained Japanese presence

Bandow 6/18 [Doug, Doug Bandow is a senior fellow at the Cato Institute. A former special assistant to President Reagan, 210, http://www.nationalinterest.org/Article.aspx?id=23592] KLS

Yet what is most curious about the issue is the dogged insistence of American officials in maintaining the Japanese protectorate. The world in which the security treaty was signed has disappeared. Admits Kent E. Calder of SAIS, “the international political-economic context of the alliance and the domestic context in both nations have changed profoundly.” There is no reason to assume that a relationship created for one purpose in one context makes sense for another purpose in another context. The one-sided alliance—the United States agrees to defend Japan, Japan agrees to be defended—made sense in the aftermath of World War II. But sixty-five years later Japan possesses the second-largest economy on earth and has the potential to defend itself and help safeguard its region. “All of my Marines on Okinawa are willing to die if it is necessary for the security of Japan,” Lieutenant General Keith Stalder, the Pacific commander of the Marine Corps, observed in February. Yet “Japan does not have a reciprocal obligation to defend the United States.” How does that make sense for America today? Washington officials naturally want to believe that their role is essential. Countries which prefer to rely on America are happy to maintain the pretense. However, keeping the United States as guarantor of the security of Japan—and virtually every other populous, prosperous industrial state in the world—is not in the interest of the American people.

Sustained presence in Japan bipartisan- McCain, Obama prove

Schmitt 9[Gary J, Resident Scholar and Director of Advanced Strategic Studies, October, American Enterprise Institute for Public Policy Research, http://www.aei.org/outlook/100075] KLS

Candidate Obama's approach to the East Asia region as a whole was to reiterate the need for America's presence to be "enduring."[4] It is the sustained presence of the United States that has played the key role in preserving peace in Asia, and it is that peace, in turn, which has been the foundation upon which the region's remarkable economic development has taken place. And while the American alliance structure remains crucial to maintaining that peace, Obama, the candidate, noted that new ideas were afoot in the region and he intended to augment these bilateral relations. He supported "forg[ing] a more effective framework in Asia that goes beyond bilateral agreements, occasional summits, and ad hoc arrangements, such as the Six Party Talks."[5] Breaking down then-Senator Obama's policies for specific countries, Obama noted that the Japanese alliance plays a "vital" role in helping the U.S. maintain regional security.[6] Here, Obama was a bit less forward leaning than his opponent, Senator John McCain. McCain not only emphasized Japan's "key" role both in keeping the peace in the past, but also his expectations that Japan might play an even greater role in the future.[7] Accordingly, McCain supported the Japanese government's efforts to win a permanent seat on the UN Security Council.

Links- Japan- Bipartisan

Bipartisan support for sustained Japanese military presence

McCormack 3/8 [Gavan, coordinator of The Asia-Pacific Journal – Japan Focus, 2010, http://japanfocus.org/-Gavan-McCormack/3317] KLS

For a country in which ultra-nationalism was for so long a problem, the weakness of nationalism in contemporary Japan is puzzling. Six and a half decades after the war ended, Japan still clings to the apron of its former conqueror. Government and opinion leaders want Japan to remain occupied, and are determined at all costs to avoid offence to the occupiers. US forces still occupy lands they then took by force, especially in Okinawa, while the Government of Japan insists they stay and pays them generously to do so. Furthermore, despite successive revelations of the deception and lies (the secret agreements) that have characterized the Ampo relationship, one does not hear any public voice calling for a public inquiry into it. [2] Instead, on all sides one hears only talk of “deepening” it. In particular, the US insists the Futenma Marine Air Station on Okinawa must be replaced by a new military complex at Henoko, and with few exceptions politicians and pundits throughout the country nod their heads

Links- Japan- Controversial

US defense of Japan is controversial- growing cost, security fears

Preble 91 [Christopher A. Defense analyst, March 14, CATO Institute, http://www.cato.org/pubs/fpbriefs/fpb-007.html] KLS

A prerequisite to a shift in the current U.S.-Japanese strategic relationship is a change in attitude on the U.S. side. In spite of growing public sentiment demanding that Japan contribute more to its own defense and the defense of Western interests generally, some U.S. policymakers have been extremely reluctant to allow the Japanese to assume a more significant role in world affairs. In March 1990, Maj. Gen. Henry C. Stackpole, commander of Marine Corps bases in Japan stated: "No one wants a rearmed, resurgent Japan . . . so we are the cap in the bottle, if you will. . . . If we were to pull out of the U.S.-Japan Security Treaty, it would definitely be a destabilizing factor in Asia."(5) As long as America's policy toward Japan is based on such irrational and anachronistic assessments of Japanese intentions and abilities, no productive changes can take place. Simply put, Americans must overcome their latent fears of Japan, and American leaders must appreciate the degree to which U.S. opposition to greater Japanese military power unnecessarily increases America's own security burdens. Equally important, such reflexive obstructionism threatens to do irreparable harm to the relationship of trust and cooperation so carefully cultivated since the end of World War II.

Links- Japan- Democrats

Democrats support continued presence in Japan- McCain proves- plan unpopular

Japan Times 8 [October 22, Lexis]

As for the Republicans, setting aside Sarah Palin's talk of America's divine mission in the war on terror, it is inconceivable that John McCain believes that a U.S. presence is sustainable in Iraq into the indefinite future. To be fair, McCain never suggested that U.S. troops will wage 100 years of war, as some of his critics claim. What McCain was referring to was a peaceable presence of U.S. forces in the country for a long period, rather like their continued presence in Japan since 1945.

Links- Japan- Flip Flop

A. Obama has refused to reduce troops at Okinawa- plan is a flip flop

Bandow 6/18 [Doug, Doug Bandow is a senior fellow at the Cato Institute. A former special assistant to President Reagan, 210, http://www.nationalinterest.org/Article.aspx?id=23592] KLS

Candidate Barack Obama may have charmed foreign peoples, but President Barack Obama unashamedly cold shoulders foreign leaders he doesn’t like. One of them was Japanese Prime Minister Yukio Hatoyama, who sought to reduce the number of U.S. bases on the island of Okinawa. The Obama administration worked diligently to frustrate Hatoyama’s efforts, which helped force his resignation barely eight months into his term. It was an impressive performance in raw political power. But it likely was a Pyrrhic victory. When World War II ended, the U.S. occupied Japan and effectively colonized the island of Okinawa, seized in a bitter battle shortly before Tokyo surrendered. The U.S. loaded Okinawa with bases and only returned it to Japanese sovereignty in 1972. Four decades later nearly 20 percent of the island remains occupied by American military facilities. The U.S. military likes Okinawa because it is centrally located. Most Japanese like Okinawa because it is the most distant prefecture. Concentrating military facilities on the island—half of U.S. personnel and three-quarters of U.S. bases (by area) in Japan are located in a territory making up just .6 percent of the country—is convenient for everyone except the people who live there. Okinawans have been protesting against the bases for years. In 1995 the rape of a teenage girl set off vigorous demonstrations and led to various proposals to lighten the island’s burden. In 2006 the Japanese government agreed to help pay for some Marines to move to Guam while relocating the Futenma facility to the less populated Okinawan community of Henoko. But residents wanted the base moved off of the island and the government delayed implementation of the agreement. During last year’s parliamentary election the opposition Democratic Party of Japan (DPJ) promised to move the installation elsewhere. Prime Minister Hatoyama later said: “It must never happen that we accept the existing plan.” However, the Obama administration refused to reconsider and threatened the U.S.-Japanese relationship. That unsettled a public which had voted the DPJ into power primarily for economic reasons. Prime Minister Hatoyama wanted to turn the unbalanced alliance into a more equal partnership but the Japanese people weren’t ready. Said Hatoyama as he left office: “Someday, the time will come when Japan’s peace will have to be ensured by the Japanese people themselves.”

B. Flip-flopping crushes political capital – Presidents must take consistent positions

Fitts 96 [Michael A., Professor of Law, University of Pennsylvania Law School University of Pennsylvania Law Review, January, 144 U. Pa. L. Rev. 827, Lexis] KLS

While the president's singularity may give him the formal ability to exercise agenda control, which public choice scholars see as an advantage of presidential power, his visibility and the influence of the media may also make it more difficult for him to exercise it. When public scrutiny is brought to bear on the White House, surrounding such issues as gays in the military or affirmative action, the president must often take a position and act. 128 This can deprive him of the ability to choose when or whether to address issues. Finally, the unitary president may be less able to rely on preexisting congressional or agency processes to resolve disputes. At least in theory, true unitariness means that he has the authority to reverse the decisions or non-decisions of others - the buck stops [\*866] with the president. 129 In this environment, "no politician can endure opposition from a wide range of opponents in numerous contests without alienating a significant proportion of voters." 130 Two types of tactics illustrate this phenomenon. First, presidents in recent years have often sought to deemphasize - at least politically - their unitariness by allocating responsibility for different agencies to different political constituencies. President Clinton, for example, reportedly "gave" the Department of Justice to the liberal wing of the Democratic party and the Department of the Treasury and the OMB to the conservatives. 131 Presidents Bush and Reagan tried a similar technique of giving control over different agencies to different political constituencies. 132Second, by invoking vague abstract principles or "talking out of both sides of their mouth," presidents have attempted to create the division within their person. Eisenhower is widely reported to be the best exemplar of this "bumbling" technique. 133 Reagan's widely publicized verbal "incoherence" and detachment from government affairs probably served a similar function. 134Unfortunately, the visibility and singularity of the modern presidency can undermine both informal techniques. 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 [\*867] on such matters as affirmative action, the war in Bosnia, the baseballstrike, and the newest EPA regulations - the list is infinite. Perhapsin 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. 135 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. 136 Thus, in contrast to Congress, the modern president's attempt to avoid or mediate issues can often undermine him personally and politically.

Links- Japan- Okinawa

And, plan unpopular- base at Okinawa provided the support of bombings in the Vietnam war- we won’t give it up

Ross 9 (Sherwood, feb 2, *LA Progressive*, http://www.laprogressive.com/war-and-peace/time-to-set-okinawa-free/ ) ET

Although the New York Times editorial page claimed “American military behavior in Japan has generally been good since the occupation in 1945,” between 1972 and 1995 U.S. service personnel were implicated in 4,716 crimes. At one point up to a third of the Third Marine Division was infected with venereal disease, prompting author Chalmers Johnson in “Blowback”(Henry Holt) to crack “one has to ask what the New York Times might consider bad behavior.” What’s more, Newsweek noted that when Okinawa poet Ben Takara surveyed girls at Futenma senior high, one-third to one-half of them said they had “scary experiences with U.S. soldiers on their way to school or back home.” Approximately 75% of all U.S. forces in Japan (why, fellow taxpayers, do we keep any forces in Japan, why?) are concentrated on Okinawa, having less than one percent of Japan’s total land area, which “amounts to a permanent collusion of the United States and Japan against Okinawa,” Chalmers observes. The answer is found in Tim Weiner’s “Legacy of Ashes”(Anchor Books), who recalls Okinawa was “a crucial staging ground for the bombing of Vietnam and a storehouse of American nuclear weapons.” Weiner notes that when opposition politicians in 1968 “threatened to force the United States off the island” the CIA funneled big bucks into Japan to defeat them at the polls. In short, Japan can conveniently dump the military burden of its U.S. defense pact on the backs of their captive Okinawans, with 14 military bases jammed onto its 70-mile-long expanse. (Japan itself has just eight U.S. bases.) This saddles Okinawa with the constant hullabaloo of jet warplane noise. (The Futenma base alone has 52,000 takeoffs and landings a year.) Yoshida Kensei, former professor at Obirin University in Japan, and Asian Studies Lecturer Rumi Sakamoto of Auckland University, New Zealand, write that Okinawa is nothing more than a U.S. “military colony.” They want to rid the island of all “war cooperation” and reallocate its land to “agriculture, fisheries, and trade,” high tech, medicine and tourism. And they wouldn’t mind seeing Okinawans make some real cash by converting the U.S. bases into remunerative housing areas, commercial and industrial properties, and educational or research parks. Author Johnson quotes editor Koji Taira of the Ryukyuanist as writing, “the incomes generated directly or indirectly by the bases are only 5 percent of the gross domestic product of Okinawa. This is far too small a contribution for an establishment sitting on 20 percent of Okinawa’s land…In effect, the U.S. and Japan are forcing on Okinawa’s economy a deadweight loss of 15 percent of its GDP every year.”

Links- Japan- public

The American public strongly supports US presence in Japan- plan unpopular

Jitsuro 6/15 [Terashima president of the Mitsui Global Strategic Studies Institute and professor at Waseda University's Graduate School of Asia-Pacific Studies, 210 http://www.japanfocus.org/articles/print\_article/3321] KLS

Given this, let us explore whether the US-Japan Security Treaty would come into play and whether the US would take action if China, in a hypothetical scenario, were to forcibly occupy the disputed Senkaku (Diaoyu) Islands. In the Japanese view, since the Senkakus were under US administration until the moment Okinawa reverted to Japan, there is no question about Japanese possession of the islands. But in recent years, as seen in the statements of US diplomats that the US does not want to get involved in territorial disputes between China and Japan, the US stance is ambivalent. Probably, in a balanced view, the US government would heed American public opinion, and if it concluded that it was appropriate to take action, it might defend the Senkaku Islands. Engaging in speculation of this sort leads to the conclusion that the threats that Japan and the US must face jointly have changed dramatically and are not always clearly defined. From the Japanese side, neither excessive expectations nor excessive dependence are reasonable. Rather, the most realistic view is what might be called a “strategic ambiguity,” that the US presence in the US-Japan alliance serves as a vague symbol of leverage in a time of crisis, and stands as a guarantee to the world that Japan does not stand alone.

Public dislikes the plan- sees Japan military presence as key to containing China and Asian stability

Kendall 3/11 [Paul, Graduate, American University in Washington, 2010, http://www.rherald.com/news/2010-03-11/Columns/col01.html] KLS

Such actions would be a dramatic departure from our historic posture in the region. The arguments for doing so would be, first, that such a shift is ultimately inevitable; and second, that globalization, with its related trade, cultural, and institutional arrangements, would act as a powerful restraining force against any further territorial ambitions of China in Mongolia, Siberia, Vietnam, and India. These arguments would be made more tenable if the American withdrawal were paired with a strengthened regional alliance among the other Asian nations and with the retention of the U.S. military presence in Japan, the Mariana Islands, and the Philippines. Any President who proposed abandoning the U.S. commitment to an independent Taiwan or removing our naval power from the China Seas, however, would be immediately attacked politically, perhaps being drummed out of office and risking the loss of his party’s control of Congress. No President since Woodrow Wilson has ever proposed such a dramatic reduction in U.S. global dominance, and he went down in flames along with his League of Nations idea. So the real key to avoiding future armed conflict with China is our own domestic politics. When the time comes for the U.S. to step back from East Asia, as England did in the Caribbean, will the American public be ready to accept such a withdrawal, or will it react again with red-blooded, patriotic rage, insist upon a change of leadership, and help precipitate what would be an unwinable war? Let us hope that this time things can indeed be different.

Links- Japan- public

Public supports Japanese military presence- fear of Chinese aggression and Asian stability

Bandow 6/18 [Doug, Doug Bandow is a senior fellow at the Cato Institute. A former special assistant to President Reagan, 210, http://www.nationalinterest.org/Article.aspx?id=23592] KLS

Moreover, China’s power is growing. So far Beijing has been assertive rather than aggressive, but increasingly seems willing to contest islands claimed by both nations. The best way to keep the competition peaceful is for Tokyo to be able to protect itself. Of course, several of Japan’s neighbors, along with some Americans, remain nervous about any Japanese military activity given the Tokyo’s wartime depredations. However, the Japanese people do not have a double dose of original sin. Everyone who planned and most everyone who carried out those aggressions are dead. A country which goes through political convulsions before it will send unarmed peacekeepers abroad is not likely to engage in a new round of conquest. Anyway, the best way to assuage regional concerns is to construct cooperative agreements and structures between Japan and its neighbors. Democratic countries from South Korea to Australia to India have an interest in working with Tokyo to ensure that the Asia-Pacific remains peaceful and prosperous. Japan has much at stake and could contribute much. Tokyo could still choose to do little. But it shouldn’t expect America to fill any defense gap. The claim is oft-made that the presence of American forces also help promote regional stability beyond Japan. How never seems to be explained. Bruce Klingner of the Heritage Foundation contends: “the Marines on Okinawa are an indispensable and irreplaceable element of any U.S. response to an Asian crisis.” But the 3rd Marine Expeditionary Force (MEF), while packing a potent military punch, actually has little to do. The MEF isn’t necessary to support manpower-rich South Korea, which is capable of deterring a North Korean attack. The Marines wouldn’t be useful in a war against China, unless the Pentagon is planning a surprise landing in Tiananmen Square to seize Mao Zedong’s mausoleum. If conflict breaks out over Taiwan or various contested islands, America would rely on air and naval units. Where real instability might arise on the ground, only a fool would introduce U.S. troops—insurgency in Indonesia, civil strife in the Solomon Islands or Fiji, border skirmishes between Thailand and Burma or Cambodia. General Ronald Fogleman, a former Air Force Chief of Staff, argued that the Marines “serve no military function. They don’t need to be in Okinawa to meet any time line in any war plan. I’d bring them back to California. The reason they don’t want to bring them back to California is that everyone would look at them and say, ‘Why do you need these twenty thousand?’” Do U.S. bases in Okinawa help dampen regional arms spending? That’s another point more often asserted than proven. Even if so, however, that isn’t necessarily to Washington’s benefit. The best way to ensure a responsible Chinese foreign and military policy is for Beijing’s neighbors to be well-armed and willing to cooperate among themselves. Then local or regional conflicts would be much less likely to end up in Washington. None of this means that the Japanese and American peoples should not be linked economically and culturally, or that the two governments should not cooperate on security issues. But there no longer is any reason for America to guarantee Japan’s security or permanently station forces on Japanese soil. The Obama administration’s foreign policy looks an awful lot like the Bush administration’s foreign policy. The U.S. insists on dominating the globe and imposing its will on its allies.

Links- Japan- republicans

A. Japanese demilitarization would cost BILLIONS

Cogan 6/18 [Doloris, Editor, University of Hawaii Press, http://www.dmzhawaii.org/?tag=hawaii] KLS

What I’m concerned about is the $20 billion being spent on moving 8,600 Marines and their 9,000 dependents on Okinawa to Guam. At least 18,000 Filipinos and other Pacific islanders are going to be imported under contract to build the necessary housing and other public works.

B. Republicans oppose ANY spending

Ferraro 9 [Thomas, Staff Writer, March 15, Reuters, http://www.reuters.com/article/latestCrisis/idUSN13456635]

Republicans are not the only ones in the U.S. Congress squawking about President Barack Obama's record $3.55 trillion budget plan. Some of the president's fellow top Democrats also are upset with certain provisions -- including ones dealing with farm subsidies, tax deductions and industrial emissions -- setting up hurdles within his own party that Obama must overcome. "Everyone is starting to wake up to the fact that the all-Democratic controlled Washington doesn't mean pure liberalism. It means more centrist, more moderate," said Ethan Siegal of The Washington Exchange, a private firm that tracks the federal government for institutional investors.Republicans see Obama's proposed record spending, much of it aimed at helping to lift the U.S. economy out of a deepening recession, as too costly.Opposition from Democrats and Republicans is likely to grab headlines again in the weeks ahead as committees get down to complete their work in drafting details. Democrats, who expanded their hold on Congress in the November election that brought Obama to power, are proving to be a contentious bunch. "Democrats also have more moderate and more conservatives in their ranks and more issues that will divide them," said Andrew Taylor, a political science professor at North Carolina State University. "It's the cost of doing business." The budget proposal Obama put forward last month outlines a bold governing agenda, which includes expanding healthcare, upgrading education, moving the U.S. toward energy independence and combating global warming. It projects a deficit for this fiscal year of $1.75 trillion, falling to $1.17 trillion next year, prompting Republican complaints about Obama's proposed spending and worrying members from both parties who say there should be more deficit reduction.

Links- Japan- republicans

Republicans oppose the plan-

A. Military presence in Japan supports the War on Terror

McCormack 3/8 [Gavan, coordinator of The Asia-Pacific Journal – Japan Focus, 2010, http://japanfocus.org/-Gavan-McCormack/3317] KLS

But that era ended, and instead of gradually reducing the US military footprint in Japan and Okinawa as the “enemy” vanished, the US decided to ramp it up. It pressed Japan’s Self Defence Forces to cease being “boy scouts” (as Donald Rumsfeld once contemptuously called them) and to become a “normal” army, able to fight alongside and if necessary instead of, US forces and at US direction, in the “war on terror,” specifically in support of US wars in Iraq, Afghanistan and Pakistan. It wanted Japanese forces to be integrated under US command, and it wanted greater access to Japan’s capital, markets and technology. “Client State” status required heavier burdens and much increased costs than during the Cold War, but it offered greatly reduced benefits. Ever since the Hatoyama team first showed signs of being likely to assume government, and talked of “equality” and of renegotiating the relationship, Washington has maintained a ceaseless flow of advice, demand and intimidation to push it into the kind of subservience that had become the norm. The same “Japan experts” and “Japan-handlers” that in LDP times offered a steady stream of advice to “show the flag,” “put boots on the ground” in Iraq, and send the MSDF to the Indian Ocean, now send a steady drumbeat of: Obey! Obey! Obey! Implement the Guam Treaty! Build the new base at Henoko!

B. Republicans dedicated to absolute commitment to the War on Terror

Harmon 6/18 [Gary, The Daily Sentential, 2010, http://www.gjsentinel.com/news/articles/war-on-terror-a-common-theme-of-republican-congressional-candidates] KLS

Two Colorado Republicans are invoking the War on Terror as they carry on their campaigns for Congress. One, Senate candidate Jane Norton, has come under fire from Democrats for a web video in which she criticizes President Obama’s “retreatist tactics” in the War on Terror. House candidate Bob McConnell doesn’t come under fire for his web ad on the Second Amendment. But he does open fire, literally, blasting away at the grinning mugshot of Osama bin Laden with a Heckler Koch .45 caliber handgun. Colorado Democrats called Norton’s ad “deeply offensive” and said they would circulate a petition calling on her to drop the video and return any contributions she gets because of it. Norton, who boasted Friday of her endorsement by Sandra Dahl, wife of United Airlines Flight 93 pilot Jason Dahl, said she would do no such thing. “Joe Rice and the other Democratic veterans deserve thanks for their service, but on this one they’re just wrong,” she said in a statement. “Too many liberals in Washington have forgotten, and the advertisement is not coming down.” McConnell, who is running for the party nomination to oppose incumbent 3rd District Rep. John Salazar, D-Colo., has garnered more than 21,000 views of his Second Amendment video. “I’m going to fight every effort to take our firearms away from us because I’m an American,” McConnell says in the video, in between shooting sessions at the bin Laden poster.

Links- Japan- republicans

Republicans oppose the plan- see Turkish presence as essential to winning the War on Terror

Babbin 7 [Jed, former United States Deputy Undersecretary of Defense, October 15, http://www.humanevents.com/article.php?id=22840] KLS

House Republican leaders are very concerned about the effects the Democrats’ resolution could have. House Minority Leader John Boehner told me, “If the Turks cut off our ability to use Incirlik, there’s no question that this could jeopardize our troops on the ground in Iraq. And frankly, if this is just the latest in the Democrats’ string of back-door attempts to force a retreat from the war against al Qaeda, it’s certainly the most dangerous.”

Republicans oppose the plan, use of base at Incirlik decreases cost, helps wage war in Iraq

Bolme 7 [Selin M. SETA Ankara & Ankara University, July http://findarticles.com/p/articles/mi\_7057/is\_3\_9/ai\_n28498510/pg\_6/?tag=content;col1] KLS

The real issue here is the extent to which the US government intends to support Turkey in her fight against the PKK, and the degree of significance it attributes to the Armenian resolution. President George W. Bush and his government had made it clear that the good relation with Turkey is more important for the US. On 17 October 2006, the Press Secretary at the US Defense Department stated that the restriction on the use of Incirlik base would increase the financial burden of the war in Iraq and cause delays as regards the timeline. This suggests that the US military would side with Turkey in the above matters. At the same press meeting, the Defense Press Secretary suggested that U.S. take Turkey's warning on Armenian Genocide Resolution seriously and the House should consider the importance of Turkey's airspace for US interests and Iraq mission. (28)

Links- Kuwait- PMCs

1. Kuwait contractors make lots of money- plan would enrage them

Chaterjee 10 (Pratap, SR editor of corpwatch, http://civiliancontractors.wordpress.com/2010/02/03/kuwaiti-pentagon-contractor-faces-fraud-charges/ Feb 2) ET

Agility, a Kuwait-based multi-billion-dollar logistics company spawned by the U.S. invasion of Iraq, is scheduled to be arraigned on Feb. 8 on criminal charges of overbilling U.S. taxpayers for food supply contracts in the Iraq war zone that were worth more than $8.5 billion. If the lawsuit is successful, the company could owe the U.S. government as much as $1 billion. Originally known as Public Warehousing Corporation (PWC), Agility boasts that it once supplied one million meals a day to U.S. soldiers and contractors in the Middle East. The company’s Mercedes trucks hauled delicacies, from ice cream to lobster tails, to feed soldiers living on military bases scattered throughout Kuwait. Today, it has new contracts to provide food to the U.S. Agency for International Development (USAID) in Djibouti in the Horn of Africa and – until about a month ago – was supposed to ramp up food delivery to the troops newly posted in southern Afghanistan.

1. This plan has powerful military backing as well- huge backlashes

Chaterjee 10 (Pratap, SR editor of corpwatch, http://civiliancontractors.wordpress.com/2010/02/03/kuwaiti-pentagon-contractor-faces-fraud-charges/ Feb 2) ET

The company has powerful supporters in the U.S. military. Its brochures quote Gen. David Petraeus, now the head of U.S. Central Command: “Agility has performed a miracle across Iraq.” Some see less a miracle and more profiteering. Rory Mayberry, a Halliburton/KBR food production manager for a dining facility at Camp Anaconda, testified before Congress in June 2005: “For example, tomatoes cost about $5 a box locally, but the PWC price was $13 to $15 per box. The local price for a 15-pound box of bacon was $12, compared to PWC’s price of $80 per box.” “PWC charged a lot for transportation because they brought the food from Philadelphia,” he said. “They get options, privileges, that no one else can get, because they used to be part of the [Kuwaiti] government,” says Saad Salem al-Qattan, a Kuwaiti businessman who owns al-Rakeb Company Petroleum Electricity & Construction Services (RAPICO), which is involved in a land dispute with PWC/Agility.

Links - Kuwait -PMCs

And, contractors are making extreme amounts of money in Kuwait through military funding- plan unpopular

Turse 9 (Nick, associate editor, *The Huffington Post,* Nov. 22, http://www.huffingtonpost.com/nick-turse/as-washington-talks-iraq\_b\_366999.html ) ET

The price tag for living the big-box-base lifestyle in Kuwait has, however, been steep. From 2003 to 2009, the U.S. Army spent in excess of $502 million on contracts for construction projects in the small, oil-rich nation, while the Air Force added almost $55 million and the Navy another $7 million. Total military spending there has been more massive still. Over the same span, according to U.S. government data, the Pentagon has spent nearly $20 billion in Kuwait, buying huge quantities of Kuwaiti oil and purchasing logistical support from various contractors for its facilities there (and elsewhere), among other expenditures. In 2006, for example, the international construction firm Archirodon was awarded $10 million to upgrade airfield lighting at Al-Salem and Al-Jaber, two Kuwaiti air bases used by American forces. Recently, there has also been a major scaling up of work at Camp Arifjan. In September, for example, the Pentagon awarded CH2M Hill Contractors a nearly $26 million deal to build a new communications facility on the base. Just days later, defense contractor ITT received an almost $87 million contract for maintenance and support services there.

And, contractors invest millions in kuwait- plan unpopular

AME 8 ( *AME- Middle East News,* May 6-8, http://www.ameinfo.com/155774.html) ET

The Fund is focused on investing in private equity opportunities in Kuwait and is approved by the National Offset Company ("NOC") as a vehicle for foreign contractors to fulfill their Offset obligations. The investment strategy of the Fund is to focus on private equity investments in high-growth sectors such as education, healthcare, manufacturing, and technology within the State of Kuwait. The Fund will mainly invest in growth capital but will also participate in specific early-stage opportunities that offer a favourable risk/return profile. In addition, the Fund will actively pursue opportunities that will further the NOC's objective to cultivate social, economic, and technological developments for the State of Kuwait. The Fund will enable foreign contractors to transfer the burden of arranging their offset obligations to NBK Capital, relieving them of the requirement to invest resources in identifying, analysing, operating, monitoring and eventually exiting offset business ventures. NBK Capital has assembled a highly professional team skilled in the structuring of complex financial transactions with in-depth knowledge of the legal, administrative and market specifics of Kuwait. Amjad Ahmad, Chief Executive - Investment & Merchant Banking, NBK Capital, said: "This is one of the first National Offset Company (NOC) approved funds in Kuwait and we are delighted to be involved in the development of strategic sectors in Kuwait through a proactive investment approach." "Our aim is to invest alongside solid partners and actively help them achieve their strategic and operating goals to build sustainable companies. The expertise of the Fund's management team, supported by the full services of NBK Capital is a key asset and differentiator that will contribute to the success of each portfolio company within the Fund." Faisal Al-Hamad will be leading the Fund's management team supported by a strong professional team with extensive local experience. He added, "Kuwait has benefited from strong economic growth in recent years as a result of the surge in oil prices and reinvestment of petrodollars and this, coupled with a substantial increase in government spending and an appealing demographic profile, has resulted in significant investment opportunities in Kuwait's economy. NBK Capital is ideally positioned to partner with the NOC and advise foreign contractors in the Offset program that will in turn contribute to the development of Kuwait's economy."

And, defense contractors make bank in kuwait – plan would lose them lots of money

UPI 10 (May 28-10, *UPI*, http://www.upi.com/Business\_News/Security-Industry/2010/05/28/LM-to-provide-Kuwait-with-KC-130Js/UPI-47501275057392/ ) ET

Martin has received an order to deliver three of its aerial refueling tanker aircraft to Kuwait to support the country's F-18 aircraft program. U.S. defense company Lockheed Martin received the foreign military sales contract to provide the Kuwait air force with three of the company's KC-130J turboprop aircraft variant. "We are proud to add yet another country to the growing worldwide C-130J community," Jim Grant, Lockheed Martin vice president for C-130 business development, said in a statement. The KC-130J will support the Kuwait air force fleet of F-18 fighter aircraft with aerial refueling that includes 57,500 pounds of fuel offload capabilities. The order will be managed by U.S. Navy with aircraft deliveries expected to begin in late 2013.

Links- Kuwait- PMCs

And, announcing of a time table would cause contractors to lose their job- angers them

Ross 7 (Daveed, American counter-terrorism expert and attorney living in Washington D.C, *Counterterrorism blog*, http://counterterrorismblog.org/2007/05/kuwait\_american\_contractors\_on.php ) ET

When I touched down in Kuwait on the morning of May 17, I was greeted by severe sandstorms. From the air, the sandstorm looked like a cloud covering -- except we touched down on the runway a few seconds after the plane entered the sand. The weather conditions kept me in Kuwait for the day, mainly recovering from jet lag. But I also had the opportunity to speak with some American contractors who were working on reconstruction efforts in the Shia south. Since one of the main things I’m interested in during this trip is the effect that a timetable for the withdrawal of U.S. troops will have on Iraq, I wanted to get the contractors' perspective. They reported that a number of contractors are already leaving in anticipation of a timetable for withdrawal being set. The prevalent thinking among those who have chosen to leave is that there will be a mass exodus when a timetable is announced, and it’s better to return to the U.S. now. That way, those who leave can get good jobs back home before 20,000 or more contractors return to the States looking for work.

And, contractors see the gulf as vital to their economic growth- plan unpopular

Defense News Staff 9 (*Defense News,* http://www.defensenews.com/story.php?i=4369142 , Nov 10-9) ET

Major American and European defense companies, facing potentially tighter spending at home, see the Middle East market as increasingly important and are planning for a major presence at the Dubai Air Show. Boeing will have a broad focus at the show, covering air mobility and integrated air and missile defense, said Jeff Johnson, vice president of business development for the Middle East for Boeing IDS. It will bring the 737 airborne early warning and control (AEW&C) aircraft it's building for Australia's Project Wedgetail. The United Arab Emirates Land Force's Apache Longbow helicopter, built by Boeing, will be on display, as will Boeing's AH-6 light attack/reconnaissance helicopter and the F/A-18E Super Hornet, Johnson said. The U.S. Air Force will perform daily demonstrations of Boeing's F-15E Strike Eagle, and Boeing also will be demonstrating the Vigilare air defense command-and-control system with a simulator. The company also sees the Middle East as a market for its C-17 cargo airplane and Chinook helicopters. "The last three years, with some of the oil prices going up and the modernization in the gulf and in the region, the large U.S. production lines like Chinook, Apache, C-17 offered great capabilities to customers that are looking at smaller fleet numbers," Johnson said. "The sustainment road map is there, so they are taking advantage of the U.S. production lines and investments as part of their reset."

Links - Kuwait- Military Leaders

And, forced withdrawal from Kuwait angers military leaders- strategic region

Frost 3 (Paul- MA rep, *Edmund A.Walsh School of Foreign Service | Georgetown University*, Spring 3, http://www12.georgetown.edu/sfs/isd/military.pdf ) ET

 Practically speaking, one participant stressed that the natural tendency of the American military is to expand from the location in which it already maintains a presence. In addition, commanders prefer to be forward based, particularly in the Army and Air Force. When the first Gulf War came to an end, the U.S. had established forwarddeployed forces involving ongoing operations in Oman,Kuwait, Bahrain and Saudi Arabia. In 1997 military planners had begun to steps to expand their presence into Qatar, United Arab Emirates, Djibouti and Central Asia. By 2000 the U.S. had concluded formal basing agreements with all of the Gulf Cooperation Council (G.C.C.) states except Saudi Arabia. CENTCOM’s force structure prior to the Iraqi Freedom buildup included approximately 11,000 troops on land and 5,000 to 10,000 at sea in the Gulf area for a total of 16,000 to 21,000. These numbers gave the U.S. the capacity to pursue a policy of dual containment of Iraq and Iran for over a decade, undertake Operation Enduring Freedom in late 2001 in order to defeat the Taliban and root out al Qaeda terrorist networks, and to successfully contain (and later defeat) Iraq. In the new environment of postconflict Iraq, military leaders will inevitably seek to keep significant numbers of troops and facilities in this strategically salient and volatile region.

Links- Kuwait- Petraeus

And, Kuwait has key bases that Petraeus want- plan causes backlash

Turse 9 (Nick, editor at the nations institute Tom dispatch, http://www.corpwatch.org/article.php?id=15479 , *Corp watch*, nov 22) ET

Appearing before the Senate Armed Services Committee early this year, General David Petraeus, head of the U.S. Central Command (CENTCOM), stated: "The Arabian Peninsula commands significant U.S. attention and focus because of its importance to our interests and the potential for insecurity." He continued: "[T]he countries of the Arabian Peninsula are key partners... CENTCOM ground, air, maritime, and special operations forces participate in numerous operations and training events, bilateral and multilateral, with our partners from the Peninsula. We help develop indigenous capabilities for counter terrorism; border, maritime, and critical infrastructure security; and deterring Iranian aggression. As a part of all this, our FMS [Foreign Military Sales] and FMF [Foreign Military Financing] programs are helping to improve the capabilities and interoperability of our partners' forces. We are also working toward an integrated air and missile defense network for the Gulf. All of these cooperative efforts are facilitated by the critical base and port facilities that Bahrain, Kuwait, Qatar, the UAE [United Arab Emirates], and others provide for US forces."

Links- PMCs control Congress

And, over half of congress receives millions from defense contractors, while 25% has over 200 million personally invented- plan causes massive personal loss and would be unpopular

Wahington post 9 ( Oct 31, http://blogs.myspace.com/index.cfm?fuseaction=blog.view&friendId=77408645&blogId=516596493, *Washington Post*) ET

Yesterday, the Washington Post reported that nearly half of the members of the House Sub-Committee for Pentagon Spending have received millions of dollars from Defense Contract Lobbyist Firm, PMA, in exchange for awarding over $200 million to PMA and its defense contractor clients he bigger story however, was reported in 2006; more than 25% (151 members) of Congress has nearly $200 million personally invested in companies that receive major defense contracts (over $5 million). In 2006 alone, Congress awarded more than $275 billion to companies they were personally invested in. How sweet would it be, to be in the unique position to ensure the profitability of YOUR personal investments by first awarding trillions of dollars, that are not your own (OUR money) to companies that you are personally invested in and then be able to keep those companies in business by passing and maintaining legislation that will keep those companies busy for many years to come?

And, senators have personal finances tied up in contractors- plan would be unpopular

Leonnig 9 (carol d- American investigative journalist and a prominent Washington Post Staff Writer, *Washington Post,* Oct 30, http://www.cbsnews.com/stories/2009/10/30/politics/washingtonpost/main5463082.shtml) ET

Together, the seven legislators have personally steered more than $200 million in earmarks to clients of the PMA Group in the past two years, and received more than $6.2 million in campaign contributions from PMA and its clients in the past decade, according to an analysis by Congressional Quarterly and Taxpayers for Common Sense. The Post reviewed earmark and campaign records and found that the seven had each supported funding for PMA clients and also received donations. Young has recently received very little from PMA.

Links- PMCs control congress

And, congressman are tied to the contractors- their political support depends upon it

Leonnig 9 (carol d- American investigative journalist and a prominent Washington Post Staff Writer, *Washington Post,* Oct 30, http://www.cbsnews.com/stories/2009/10/30/politics/washingtonpost/main5463082.shtml) ET

The document also indicates that the House ethics committee's staff recently interviewed the staff of Rep. Devin Nunes (R-Calif.) about his allegation that a PMA lobbyist threatened him in 2007 when he resisted steering federal funds to a PMA client. The lobbyist told a Nunes staffer that if the lawmaker didn't help, the defense contractor would move out of Nunes's district and take dozens of jobs with him.

And, the FBI found evidence that house members accept contributions for earmarking contractors funds, they won’t cut them

Leonnig 9 (carol d- American investigative journalist and a prominent Washington Post Staff Writer, *Washington Post,* Oct 30, http://www.cbsnews.com/stories/2009/10/30/politics/washingtonpost/main5463082.shtml) ET

The document obtained by The Post offers the most detailed picture yet of a widening inquiry into the relationships between lawmakers and PMA, a lobbying firm founded by Paul Magliocchetti that has been under criminal investigation by the Justice Department. A year ago, the FBI raided PMA's offices and carted away boxes of records dealing with its political donations and the firm's efforts to win congressionally directed funds, known as "earmarks," for clients. The document shows that both the ethics committee and the Office of Congressional Ethics are looking into the matter. The OCE investigates and makes recommendations to the House ethics committee, which has the power to subpoena and sanction lawmakers. Internal ethics investigations of members of Congress are normally confidential, but The Post learned details of their work through the document, which became available on a file-sharing network. Under the description of the OCE inquiry, the document says investigators are looking at House members who may have been "accepting contributions or other items of value from PMA's PAC in exchange for an official act." A Hill source cautioned that the ethics committee has not gathered a significant amount of material and has not zeroed in on specific lawmakers.

And the contractors threaten congressmen’s elections

Leonnig 9 (carol d- American investigative journalist and a prominent Washington Post Staff Writer, *Washington Post,* Oct 30, http://www.cbsnews.com/stories/2009/10/30/politics/washingtonpost/main5463082.shtml) ET

As the ethics committee began gathering evidence this summer about PMA's operating methods on Capitol Hill, it contacted the office of Nunes, who had earlier complained to the committee about a lobbyist's aggressiveness in seeking an earmark. Nunes agreed to comment on the incident when The Post asked him about detailed information it had obtained about his complaint. n"I didn't appreciate being threatened," Nunes said. "To me, it was a symptom of the disease we have in Congress, where a lot of members have simply gotten addicted to contributions from companies that are getting their earmarks."

The lobby leader admits

Leonnig 9 (carol d- American investigative journalist and a prominent Washington Post Staff Writer, *Washington Post,* Oct 30, http://www.cbsnews.com/stories/2009/10/30/politics/washingtonpost/main5463082.shtml) ET

Don Fleming, the PMA lobbyist who allegedly threatened Nunes, is now at Flagship Government Relations, a firm started by several departed PMA lobbyists. Fleming did not confirm the encounter, but he said in a statement Thursday that "an important responsibility of any government relations professional is to communicate to policymakers the impact that their decisions have on our clients." He added that he has "always adhered to the strictest code of professional ethics."

Links- PMCs control Congress

And, congressmens holdings in contractors corporation makes a conflict of interest- plan is unpopular

Flaherty 8(ann- staff writer @ AP, *Associated Press*, 4.2.8, http://www.greenchange.org/article.php?id=2440 ) ET

Members of Congress have as much as $196 million collectively invested in companies doing business with the Defense Department, earning millions since the onset of the Iraq war, according to a study by a nonpartisan research group. Not all the companies in which lawmakers invested are typical defense contractors. Corporations such as PepsiCo, IBM, Microsoft and Johnson & Johnson have at one point received defense-related contracts, notes the report by the Washington-based Center for Responsive Politics. The center's review of lawmakers' 2006 financial disclosure statements suggests that members' holdings could pose a conflict of interest as they decide the fate of Iraq war spending. Several members earning money from these contractors have plum committee or leadership assignments, including Democratic Sen. John Kerry, independent Sen. Joseph Lieberman and House Republican Whip Roy Blunt.

And, over half of congress receives millions from defense contractors, while 25% has over 200 million personally invented- plan causes massive personal loss and would be unpopular

Wahington post 9 ( Oct 31, http://blogs.myspace.com/index.cfm?fuseaction=blog.view&friendId=77408645&blogId=516596493, *Washington Post*) ET

Yesterday, the Washington Post reported that nearly half of the members of the House Sub-Committee for Pentagon Spending have received millions of dollars from Defense Contract Lobbyist Firm, PMA, in exchange for awarding over $200 million to PMA and its defense contractor clients he bigger story however, was reported in 2006; more than 25% (151 members) of Congress has nearly $200 million personally invested in companies that receive major defense contracts (over $5 million). In 2006 alone, Congress awarded more than $275 billion to companies they were personally invested in. How sweet would it be, to be in the unique position to ensure the profitability of YOUR personal investments by first awarding trillions of dollars, that are not your own (OUR money) to companies that you are personally invested in and then be able to keep those companies in business by passing and maintaining legislation that will keep those companies busy for many years to come?

Democrats are the most invested- they would all oppose the plan

Flaherty 8(ann- staff writer @ AP, *Associated Press*, 4.2.8, http://www.greenchange.org/article.php?id=2440 ) ET

The study found that more Republicans than Democrats hold stock in defense companies, but that the Democrats who are invested had significantly more money at stake. In 2006, for example, Democrats held at least $3.7 million in military-related investments, compared to Republican investments of $577,500. Overall, 151 members hold investments worth $78.7 million to $195.5 million in companies that receive defense contracts that are worth at least $5 million. These investments earned them anywhere between $15.8 million and $62 million between 2004 and 2006, the center concludes. It is unclear how many members still hold these investments and exactly how much money has been made. Disclosure reports for 2007 aren't due until this May. Also, members are required to report only a general range of their holdings.

And, both democrats and republicans have invested in defense contractors- plan would be unpopular on both parties

Wahington post 9 ( Oct 31, http://blogs.myspace.com/index.cfm?fuseaction=blog.view&friendId=77408645&blogId=516596493, *Washington Post*) ET

Here is a list of those “lawmakers” with the most money invested in companies that were awarded Department of Defense contracts. Sen. John Kerry (D-Mass), with up to $38,209,020 Rep. Rodney Frelinghuysen (R-NJ), with $49,140,000 Rep. Robin Hayes (R-NC), with $37,105,000 Rep. James Sensenbrenner Jr. (R-Wis), with $7,612,653 Rep. Jane Harman (D-Calif), with $6,260,000 Rep. Fred Upton (R-Mich), with $8,360,000 Sen. Jay Rockefeller (D-WVa), with $2,000,002 Rep. Tom Petri (R-Wis), with $5,800,000 Rep. Kenny Ewell Marchant (R-Texas), with $1,163,231 Rep. John Carter (R-Texas), with up to $5,000,000.

Links- PMC Lobbies Powerful

And, military contractors are a powerful lobby- empirically have used their lobbying power to keep costly, outdated systems

Markusen 4 (ann, professor, is the director of the Institute's Project on Regional and Industrial Economics, *World Traveler,* May/June, http://www.thirdworldtraveler.com/National\_Security/PriviteNationalSecurity.html) ET

Beyond efficiency and performance concerns, the increasing reliance on for-profit firms for national defense creates deeper political and institutional problems-namely, the capture of public decision-making by private military interests. Through lobbying, advertising, and heavy campaign contributions, the private defense sector calls for weapons systems and defense initiatives that generate lucrative contracts. Since the end of the Cold War, private military contractors have formed a powerful lobby to protect obsolete Cold War weapons systems. For example, during the Reagan years, strenuous lobbying overcame even the highly mobilized and scientifically well-informed opposition to the B-1 bomber and the Star Wars program, two of the most costly weapons programs in the postwar period. In the 1990s, lobbyists undermined important initiatives to control the export of conventional arms, and recently the aerospace industry-led by Lockheed Martin-pushed hard to bring Poland, Hungary, and the Czech Republic into NATO in the expectation that these countries would then upgrade their militaries with costly new hardware. In general, the defense industry's leverage in Congress makes it difficult for the nation to shift resources toward peacekeeping missions, negotiated settlements, and the use of economic development in place of regional warfare.

Contractor lobbies fall under the radar, allowing them to co-opt politics sneakily

Markusen 4 (ann, professor, is the director of the Institute's Project on Regional and Industrial Economics, *World Traveler,* May/June, http://www.thirdworldtraveler.com/National\_Security/PriviteNationalSecurity.html) ET

In any contractual relationship between government and private business, a key question becomes who is representing the broader public interests. Unless there are sturdy provisions to prevent it-and even if all parties are immune to corruption-the natural outcome is an alliance between private-sector suppliers and government officials at the taxpayers' expense. Less visible than the congressional lobbyists and trade groups, but just as significant, contractors employ their superior technical expertise to sell Pentagon procurement managers and top military leaders on pricey and risky new projects. Sitting on Pentagon advisory committees helps, as does the firms' insulation from public scrutiny. The quickening pace of privatization in research and development has left the government without the expertise to assess and monitor contractors' proposals.

And, thought defense contractors aren’t perceived, they hold huge lobbying power

Koogler 7 ( Jeb, former Research Fellow at the New America Foundation, Aug 18, *Foreign Policy Watch,* http://fpwatch.blogspot.com/2007/08/pervasive-and-ugly-influence-of-arms.html) ET

When most people talk about powerful American lobbies, they might list the NRA or AIPAC. The arms industry, however, is rarely mentioned. Yet its ability to sway events in Washington and pass legislation favorable to its interests is...well, frightening.

And, defense contractors have huge influence over legislation- never debated

Koogler 7 ( Jeb, former Research Fellow at the New America Foundation, Aug 18, *Foreign Policy Watch,* http://fpwatch.blogspot.com/2007/08/pervasive-and-ugly-influence-of-arms.html) ET

Matt Dupuis, who also does non-proliferation work at the Center for Strategic and International Studies, explained this to me more clearly in a recent email. He notes that the industry's influence can be seen in the speed with which arms agreements are often passed through Congress. Rarely do arms deals receive extensive debate and they are frequently passed with barely a public word of complaint from our elected officials. This is not exactly the first time we've heard of this. Eisenhower, many decades ago, warned of the dangers of the military-industrial complex. Despite his warning, the arms industry has been able to contribute tens of thousands of dollars to political candidates (George Bush and John Kerry received $766,355 and $399,000 respectively in the 2004 election) and it has been highly effective in getting support for key legislation. The industry's success in passing legislation is due, in large part, to one idea that is repeated over and over again: that arms production is a critical job catalyst. By pushing this notion, they effectively discourage any Congressmen from voting against any proposed arms deals. In his email, Matt explained further:

Links- PMC Lobbies Powerful

PMC lobbyists are so powerful congress doesn’t even weigh whether or not the policy is good- empirics

Koogler 7 ( Jeb, former Research Fellow at the New America Foundation, Aug 18, *Foreign Policy Watch,* http://fpwatch.blogspot.com/2007/08/pervasive-and-ugly-influence-of-arms.html) ET

Unfortunately, Congress has been all too willing to fall into step in support of arms agreements. Courted by numerous contractor arms lobbyists, Congressmen regularly bow to the requests of the weapons industry. Critical questions about whether arms deals might be a bad policy decision are often forgotten under a slough of lobbyist pressure. Here's one example: back in 1995, Congress passed an arms export loan program that made US taxpayers responsible for up to $15 billion if countries like Indonesia and Romania defaulted on their loans. The bill, although clearly detrimental to the American taxpayer, passed quickly.

Links- Turkey- Arms Lobbies

A. US military presence in Turkey gives massive revenues to the arms industry

Urbina 1 [Ian, Staff Writer, New York Times, October 25, http://www.thenation.com/article/us-bows-turkey] KLS

Despite its abysmal human rights record, Turkey is one of the largest recipients of US arms, which average more than $800 million annually. This number is sure to grow now that Washington plans to pay for Turkish support with increased weapons transfers. Soon after George W. Bush announced that he would ease restrictions, Turkish military officials called an emergency meeting to speed up negotiations on a range of major purchases, including a $4.5 billion deal to buy 145 King Cobra attack helicopters from US defense contractor Bell Textron. The deal had been blocked by a dispute over whether a portion of the source code for the helicopters' mission computers could be withheld for security reasons. Since US officials have not ruled out an invasion of Iraq as part of its antiterrorist campaign, Incirlik's value is at a premium. "Now more than ever, no one needs to mention the base by name," remarked Kate Kaufer, analyst for the Arms Trade Oversight Project. "It forms the backdrop to all these military transactions."

B. Arms lobbies key to the agenda- massive contributions

Rothenburger 99 [Aaron, Political Analyst, August, MoJO News Wire, http://www.thirdworldtraveler.com/Weapons/ArmsMakers\_cozy.html] KLS

Samuel Colt was not only America's first major arms exporter, but also its first arms lobbyist. In the mid-19th century Colt (manufacturer of the .45-caliber "peacemaker") gained lucrative contracts by giving ornately engraved firearms to U.S. Gens. Zachary Taylor and Franklin Pierce. Later, Presidents Taylor and Pierce each remembered Colt's gifts when it came time to award military contracts. Today the arms industry gives cash to politicians' war chests and fills the halls of government with lobbyists who are often former Pentagon employees. During the Clinton administration there's been heavy action on the federal campaign front: The political action committees (PACs) of the biggest defense companies gave $14.2 million directly to federal candidates since Clinton's first presidential bid, according to the Center for Responsive Politics (CRP). And the recent frenzy of defense-industry mergers may increase the firepower of these corporate PACs because, as Jen Schechter of the CRP says, "Merging companies is merging clout." The arms makers give money indirectly, too. In 1997 alone the defense industry spent $49.5 million to lobby the nation's decision-makers -- nearly 10 times what they handed out for campaign contributions in the last congressional elections. It's money well spent. During the Clinton years this cash flow has helped arms exporters win tax breaks, guaranteed loans for arms-importing countries, ended the ban on arms exports to Latin America, expanded NATO to include former Warsaw Pact enemies, and defeated bills that would have conditioned arms exports on buyers' human-rights records. While the arms industry successfully uses traditional methods like lobbyists and campaign contributions, it may wield the most influence through elite units within the government. For example, the Defense Trade Advisory Group (DTAG) is a semiofficial body appointed by the State Department to advise on arms exports. Its 40 current members represent the most powerful arms exporters and industry trade groups in the U.S.: Boeing, United Technologies, Lockheed Martin, Hughes, Allied Signal, Litton Industries, Raytheon, General Dynamics, Loral Space Systems, the Electronic Industries Association, and the Aerospace Industries Association.

Links- Turkey- Arms Lobbies

Arms lobbies have massive input in Congress-

Rothenburger 99 [Aaron, Political Analyst, August, MoJO News Wire, http://www.thirdworldtraveler.com/Weapons/ArmsMakers\_cozy.html] KLS

Another government group that advises the Pentagon on overseas arms sales took up the tax-break cry. In 1998. The Defense Policy Advisory Committee on Trade (like DTAG, an organization comprised mostly of executives for major arms exporters) asked the Clinton administration to lobby Congress to change this "unfair" taxation. In fact, bills were introduced in the House and Senate in 1998 to give the defense industry the break it sought; according to Defense News, the reprieve would have amounted to $340 million over the next five years. The bills' sponsors, Sen. Orrin Hatch (R-Utah) and Rep. Amory Houghton (R-N.Y.), are longtime recipients of campaign contributions from arms exporters. Neither bill made it out of committee in the House or Senate -- a rare defeat for the defense industry. The lower exemptions for military equipment could have gone the way of the "recoupment fees," which had allowed the federal government to reclaim taxpayer-funded costs of developing new weapons. Congress effectively ended that policy in 1995 after industry representatives lobbied the government. In effect, Congress rewarded arms exporters with a new $200 million tax break every year -- at the expense of taxpaying citizens. But the arms lobby's greatest victory in the Clinton years was its battle for government-backed loans to countries importing U.S. weapons -- in other words, the government would start guaranteeing sales to fiscally unsound nations. In 1995 Congress established the Defense Export Loan Guarantee program to the tune of $15 billion. The bill's sponsor, Sen. Dirk Kempthorne (R-Idaho), is a former vice president for governmental affairs for FMC Corp. (now part of United Defense, a leading exporter of armored vehicles). The Pentagon-administered loan program charges buyers an administrative fee up front and an exposure fee (reflecting the risk of default) at the time the loan is made; the Pentagon has approved $4.5 billion in potential loans since DELG's inception. The problem is that DELG's most likely borrowers are nations that are high credit risks, such as former Warsaw Pact countries with shaky, newborn market economies and poor credit histories.

**Links- Turkey- Bipartisanship**

Bipartisan dislike for plan- stopped pursuing Genocide resolution because they found US presence in Turkey vital

Today’s Zaman 7 [March 16, http://www.todayszaman.com/tz-web/detaylar.do?load=detay&link=105610] KLS

A senior US State Department official warned Congress yesterday against passing a resolution supporting Armenian claims of genocide, saying the move could result in Turkey closing the İncirlik air base that is used by the US military. Daniel Fried, the assistant secretary of state for European and Eurasian affairs, told a hearing of a House Foreign Affairs subcommittee on Europe that Turkish officials have informed the US that approval of the resolution could lead to a shutdown of the base or a restriction on US overflight privileges granted by Turkey. He also said the US has been informed that Ankara would respond with "extreme emotion" if the Armenian resolution were approved. He added that such a step would undercut voices in Turkey calling for a "truthful exploration of these events in pursuit of Turkey's reconciliation with its own past and with Armenia." In what appears to be one of the strongest appeals to the Congress from the administration against passage of the resolution, Fried also said it runs counter to the views of the 60,000 to 70,000-strong Turkish-Armenian community, which has been warning that the measure would "raise popular emotions so dramatically as to threaten their personal security." He added the US fear was that "passage of any such resolution would close minds and harden hearts." Last week, Secretary of State Condoleezza Rice and Defense Secretary Robert Gates sent identical letters to the speaker of the House of Representatives and two other senior House members. They contended in the letters that the security of the US was at risk from proposed legislation in the House of Representatives that would declare up to 1.5 million Armenians victims of genocide on Turkish soil almost a century ago. In the letters, dated March 7, Rice and Gates also said the resolution could inflict significant damage on US efforts to reconcile the long-standing dispute between Ankara and Yerevan, The Associated Press reported on Wednesday. The appeals went to Democratic House Speaker Nancy Pelosi and representatives John Boehner, leader of the House's Republican minority, and Tom Lantos, the Democrat who chairs the House Committee on Foreign Affairs. A Democratic aide said Pelosi, who controls the House agenda, has no immediate plan to bring the proposal before the House.

Links- Turkey- GOP Dislike

A. Strong military presence decreases Turkish ties with Russia

Barkey 6/24 [Henri, professor at Lehigh University and visiting scholar at the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, World Politics http://www.worldpoliticsreview.com/blog] KLS

WPR: What is driving Turkey's renewed interest in nuclear energy? Henri Barkey: There are three reasons. First, the Iran debate has highlighted how far behind Turkey is on nuclear energy, as there are no installations in Turkey. Second, this also underlines the absence of a critical set of skills for one of the world's largest economies. Turkey is missing out on a whole lot of potential economic feedback loops that would come from a nuclear energy industry. Third, there is a real need in Turkey for energy, as well as for reducing long-term reliance on hydrocarbons and foreign sources of energy. WPR: What regional impact might Turkey's civil nuclear ambitions have? Barkey: Technically, it should not matter to the proliferation debates. Turkey is unique, in that it does not need nuclear weapons because it enjoys the NATO and American nuclear umbrella that includes some 90 tactical nuclear weapons deployed in Turkey proper. A Turkish nuclear energy program would, on the other hand, help reduce dependence on imported gas and oil. But even here, one nuclear plant would not make much of a difference, given the growing Turkish economy and the corresponding increase in its energy needs. WPR: What are the implications of Turkey's increasing energy ties -- including nuclear cooperation -- with Russia? Barkey: Russia is no longer an enemy. In fact, it has become a close friend and Turkey's No. 2 trade partner. So it is natural that ties with Russia will expand. Where it matters for the U.S. and Europe is whether the Russians are benefiting from preferential treatment in this regard. Are they getting contracts that they would not deserve under competitive bidding processes? There is no evidence to that effect, but it is a concern for the West. Even Turks are somewhat worried about their dependence for energy on Russia. No country likes to make itself vulnerable to anyone, including a friend.

Links- Turkey- GOP

Republicans like the plan-

A. Turkish military presence key to checking Russian hegemony

Friedman 8 [George, founder and Chief Intelligence Officer of Stratfor , September 30, http://www.unc.edu/depts/diplomat/item/2008/0709/comm/friedman\_elec.html] KLS

In the same way, the United States will have to address its relationship with Turkey. A long-term ally, Turkey has participated logistically in the Iraq occupation, but has not been enthusiastic. Turkey’s economy is booming, its military is substantial and Turkish regional influence is growing. Turkey is extremely wary of being caught in a new Cold War between Russia and the United States, but this will be difficult to avoid. Turkey’s interests are very threatened by a Russian resurgence, and Turkey is the U.S. ally with the most tools for countering Russia. Both sides will pressure Ankara mercilessly. More than Israel, Turkey will be critical both in the Islamic world and with the Russians. The new president will have to address U.S.-Turkish relations both in context and independent of Russia fairly quickly.

B. Republicans opposed to Russian primacy

Srivastava 1/28 [Amit, Coordinator of India Resource Center, 2010, http://amits123.wordpress.com/2010/01/] KLS

Obama could not have offered Russia olive branch should Bush had not taken aggressive stand on NMD and on Russia and Russia had not reacted by invading Georgia. These offers takes away Russia’s military ability to somewhat contain the US and when the Republicans take away control of the White House after Democrats terms, each time Russia would have lesser capability to challenge American hegemony. At this stage, the aim is to divide Europe, to confuse China rendering it an ideology-less country and to contain Russia. But this bipolarity has time-limit and it would end sooner than the cold war. After this the issue of race, color, ethnicity and nationality will be more highlighted. It will be beginning of a multi-polar cold war.

C. GOP support insures agenda success

White House Bulletin 7 [February 6, Lexis]

The success of Senate Republicans in temporarily blocking debate yesterday on resolutions criticizing President Bush's policy in Iraq has heartened GOP insiders and White House advisers. They say it shows that Bush and his GOP allies can still have a big impact in shaping policy if they stick together, even though the Democrats now control the House and Senate. "Bush is still central to the Republicans," says a GOP strategist who is close to the Republican National Committee. The problem is that it's unclear how much longer -- and on what issues -- the Republicans will rally around the unpopular president and stay unified. Much of the discussion in GOP circles is "in the past tense" when it comes to Bush, says a participant in Republican strategy sessions -- focusing on what Bush has done or tried to do, such as enacting massive tax cuts and especially waging the Iraq war, rather than on his agenda for the future. So, in the end, yesterday's success in blocking the resolutions masks a deeper problem of declining White House influence. "Does scoring a touchdown when you're down 28 points really matter?" asks a senior adviser to a GOP senator who is generally sympathetic to Bush. -- Bulletin exclusive from U.S. News

Links- Turkey- TNWs Controversial

TNW removal controversial

Chossudovsky 6 [Michel, February 22, Professor of Economics at the University of Ottawa and Director of the Center for Research on Globalization, Global Research, http://www.globalresearch.ca/index.php?context=va&aid=2032]

Debate and discussion must also take place within the Military and Intelligence community, particularly with regard to the use of tactical nuclear weapons, within the corridors of the US Congress, in municipalities and at all levels of government. Ultimately, the legitimacy of the political and military actors in high office must be challenged.

Republicans opposed to Iranian nuclearization- Bush, Rice

Chossudovsky 6 [Michel, February 22, Professor of Economics at the University of Ottawa and Director of the Center for Research on Globalization, Global Research, http://www.globalresearch.ca/index.php?context=va&aid=2032]

Condoleezza Rice has trekked across the Middle East, "expressing concern over Iran's nuclear program", seeking the unequivocal endorsement of the governments of the region against Tehran. Meanwhile the Bush administration has allocated funds in support of Iranian dissident groups within Iran.

Links- Turkey- TNWs

There’s powerful political opposition to TNW withdrawal—congressional commission opposes
Wood 9 [David, Staff, 7/8 Politics Daily http://www.politicsdaily.com/2009/07/08/tactical-nuclear-weapons-the-menace-no-one-is-talking-about]

 "Russia enjoys a sizable numerical advantage,'' the Congressional Commission on the Strategic Posture of the United States, a blue-ribbon panel headed by former Defense Secretary William Perry, reported this spring. Russia "stores thousands of these weapons in apparent support of possible military operations west of the Urals,'' the report said. Whatever the number, strategists are coming to consider these weapons as an increasingly destabilizing factor in Europe. Ultimately, of course, there is concern about miscalculation in an escalating confrontation over, say, Georgia. Many conflicts start unintentionally, and the tactical nuclear weapons are close at hand for saber-rattling purposes. A more immediate problem looms, however. As Russia and the United States reduce their strategic nuclear weapons, the relative clout of tactical nukes rises. The existing imbalance in tactical nukes "will become more apparent" and U.S. allies will be "less assured,'' the commission said. As Kristensen described it to me, the concern is that "as you cut down the deployed strategic forces, you end up with more tactical than strategic weapons deployed and that begins to create some problems. In the U.S., we don't have very many non-strategic [tactical] nuclear weapons compared to the Russians. If we agree to go down to very low levels of strategic weapons, that begins to matter to strategists.'' Especially to strategists concerned about maintaining a strong "nuclear umbrella'' over its friends and allies in Europe. Let's say, however improbable, that Moscow and Washington agree to throw tactical nuclear weapons into the arms reduction negotiations that Obama and Medvedev agreed to this week. How likely is a deal? Not very, experts suggest. For one thing, tactical nukes are small and easily hidden. And their "delivery vehicles'' -- arms-control jargon for the aircraft or missiles that carry them -- are also used for other purposes. Reliably counting these weapons and verifying reductions is devilishly difficult, the experts say. Another reason is that the numbers are too important to each side to think seriously about reductions. Russia's conventional military forces are smaller and vastly inferior to those of the United States, and Russian analysts see their nuclear weapons as a critical counterbalance. Russia also needs its tactical nukes to deter problems along its long border with China. On the U.S. side, a key goal is keeping Europeans reassured that Russia can't muscle them around. It's not that Washington would fire off its tactical nuclear weapons in a crisis, but that simply withdrawing the weapons would make some vulnerable European nations -- Lithuania comes to mind -- uneasy. And "uneasy'' is something to be avoided in a crisis. The blue-ribbon commission, in laying out a proposed U.S. approach to the issue, succinctly demonstrated the problem: The United States should go after deep cuts in Russian tactical nukes, but go easy in cutting its own.

Links- Turkey – TNWs- General

TNW withdrawal drains capital
Boese 6 [Wade, March 25, editorial adviser to the Arms Control Association, Arms Control Association, http://www.armscontrol.org/print/128] KLS
Tackling Tactical Nuclear Weapons in Europe Today, NATO continues to deploy up to 480 nuclear gravity bombs on the territories of six European countries (Belgium, Germany, Italy, the Netherlands, Turkey, and the United Kingdom). Russia's tactical nuclear weapons are estimated to total around 3,000, but this figure could be larger. Neither of these Cold War-era leftover arsenals serves any purpose today. Yet, the dangers they pose are very real, particularly in the case of Russia where great uncertainty exists about the location, quantity, and security of these arms. It is in the world's interest to help Russia secure and eliminate these weapons, which are probably most attractive to and vulnerable to terrorist theft. But Russia refuses to engage on this issue, citing the continued deployment of U.S. tactical nuclear weapons in Europe. Hence, NATO's 26 members, particularly the six hosting U.S. arms, should be the focus of an intensive campaign to end the alliance's deployment of nuclear weapons. Returning these relics to the United States would not be detrimental to alliance security, but a boon because it would pave the way to begin the process of accounting for, securing, and eliminating Russia's tactical nuclear weapons. It is imperative that this effort to discontinue NATO's archaic nuclear posture be aimed at European capitals. There is minimal support in the United States for maintaining these weapons in Europe. Indeed, the Pentagon several years ago concluded that they served no military purpose. The weapons remain out of political reasons and this motivation is strongest on the European side of the Atlantic Ocean. Secretary of Defense Donald Rumsfeld and Assistant Secretary of State for International Security and Nonproliferation Stephen Rademaker have both dismissed the possibility of withdrawing U.S. nuclear weapons from Europe by contending that no single European country is raising the issue. This needs to change. Initiating this debate in NATO could also serve to spark a wider debate in the United States about the utility of nuclear weapons. Some, including members of Congress, are trying to get this conversation started. Representative David Hobson (R-Ohio) stated in February 2005, "I think the time is now for a thoughtful and open debate on the role of nuclear weapons in our country's national security strategy." Holding Friends Accountable Any increase in nuclear weapons is a setback for disarmament. The enormous size of the U.S. and Russian stockpiles does not mean that other nuclear weapons possessors' buildups of their smaller arsenals should be accepted with a shrug. All should be held similarly accountable as the United States and Russia in the eyes of non-nuclear-weapon states when it comes to advancing nuclear disarmament. India, as part of the U.S.-Indian civil nuclear cooperation plan, has pledged to accept all the same obligations of the recognized nuclear-weapon states. These five states have all signed the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty (CTBT). India has not. Both New Delhi and Islamabad should be urged to sign this important agreement as soon as possible. In addition, more pressure should be put on Beijing to ratify the accord. The irresponsible and misguided October 1999 Senate rejection of the treaty should not serve as an excuse or provide cover for others, including Indonesia and other members of the Nonaligned Movement, to neglect what is an essential nuclear disarmament step. Without continued expression of support for the treaty, opponents of the CTBT in the United States and elsewhere may gain the upper hand. British Trident Decision A debate is beginning in the United Kingdom on whether it should develop a successor to its sole nuclear delivery system, the Trident ballistic missile submarine, which is set to reach the end of its lifespan in less than 20 years. The United Kingdom should not be permitted to approach this question as if it is solely a technical question about extending the status quo. At its core, it is a matter of whether the United Kingdom sees nuclear weapons as necessary for its future security. It is incumbent upon non-nuclear-weapon states, particularly those who had weapons or weapons programs and gave them up, such as Brazil and South Africa, to share with the United Kingdom about how their security has not been negatively impacted by the decision to forswear nuclear weapons. Creating Conditions for Progress None of the measures mentioned above are necessarily easy or likely to move swiftly. Today's political climate may not be conducive to some of them. However, that does not mean that they should be shelved until circumstances are perceived as favorable. Now is the time to start creating the conditions that will allow for progress when the political will exists. Keep in mind that in 2009 a new government will be seated in Washington and will review most current nonproliferation and disarmament policies. The time to offer practical ideas and create expectations is now.

Links- Turkey- TNWs- Weapons Developers

Weapons developers, who have powerful Congressional clout, oppose the plan

Pilisuk and Rowen 5 [Marc, Saybrook Graduate SchooL and Research Center Jamie April 28, Psychologists for Social Responsibility, pg 21-22, http://www.psysr.org/about/pubs\_resources/Using%20Psychology%20to%20Help%20Abolish%20Nuclear%20Weapons.pdf] KLS

For those who work in the labs, studies show an in-bred culture within a strong hierarchy of authority that some refer to as the priesthood. Many work on assigned small portions of a larger project such as the test of a particular weapon. Most may be assumed to be intelligent, technically well educated and oriented toward achievement• and success. Many are firm believers that the work they do represents a part of a scientific enterprise and that those who find fault with it are not scientific. The view is enhanced by internal communications employing technical language about the programs in which they work, about environmental safety, and about the organizational regulations that govern their work. They are captive audiences for reports that the Department of Energy wishes to have emphasized, a critical factor in an administration that has shown a propensity for selectively ignoring results of studies that it does not favor. Some weapon specialists feel that issues of the advisability of programs are matters of government decision and that their jobs are merely to fulfill the mandates. At higher levels, however, weapons developers testify and lobby the congress for new and expanded weapon systems. Private weapons contractors are large contributors to electoral campaigns and to think tanks that study strategic conditions and scenarios that would call for greater expenditures for weapons.

Links- XOs Link to Politics

XOs are politically unpopular- they link to the counterplan

Stone 3/29 [Daniel, Staff Writer, 2010, Newsweek, Lexis] KLS

Jackson knew that threatening to act by executive fiat wouldn't be popular. But she also knew it would get people's attention, and maybe prod Congress to act. She says that she would prefer to go through--instead of around--Congress. "You can definitely cut emissions through regulation, but a much more efficient way is through legislation," she says. For one thing, Congress could sugarcoat a carbon-cutting bill with tax cuts and other incentives, making it easier to get industry on board.

\*\*Obama Bad Links\*\*

Links- Afghanistan - Democrats

And, democrats would like the plan- ¾ of them want to end the war on Afghanistan

Steinhauser 9 ( Paul, CNN deputy political director, Sep 1, *CNN Politics*, http://politicalticker.blogs.cnn.com/2009/09/01/cnn-poll-afghanistan-war-opposition-at-all-time-high/?fbid=YD3UMXcN53S) ET

The poll indicates that opposition to the war is coming mainly from Democrats and independents. "Fifty-seven percent of independents and nearly three-quarters of Democrats oppose the war. Seven in 10 Republicans support what the U.S. is doing in Afghanistan," says CNN Polling Director Keating Holland. "Democrats mildly opposed the war in April while independents and Republicans favored it. But opposition has grown 18 points among Democrats and 10 points among independents." The poll suggests that nearly six in 10 think the U.S. can win the conflict in Afghanistan, but only 35 percent questioned in the survey say that American is currently winning the war.

Links- Afghanistan- Pelosi

Pelosi opposes troops in Afghanistan

Wall Street Journal 9 (Sep 12, *Wall Street Journal,* http://online.wsj.com/article/SB10001424052970203440104574407280921341384.html ) ET

This past Thursday, House Speaker Nancy Pelosi gave the most explicit suggestion so far that Democrats may oppose any such request. "I don't think there is a great deal of support for sending more troops to Afghanistan," Speaker Pelosi said, "in the country or in Congress." It is well known that Mr. Obama has called Afghanistan a "war of necessity." Less publicized is that in 2007 Speaker Pelosi was also saying that our real interests were in Afghanistan. "The war on terror is in Afghanistan," Ms. Pelosi said just two years ago. "The fact that we weakened our commitment to Afghanistan in order to concentrate in Iraq has taken a toll."

**Links- Afghanistan- Public Support**

Majority of Americans support removing troops from Afghanistan.

Jones 10(Mike, The Western Mail, “US death toll hits 1,000 in relentless Afghan war; Support for war wavers as new campaign looms”)AQB

The first American service member killed in combat in Afghanistan was Sgt Nathan Ross Chapman, in January 2002. For many US services members in Afghanistan, the 1,000th death mark passed without fanfare. It comes midway between the president's decision last December to send 30,000 more US troops to Afghanistan and a check on the war's progress he has promised by the end of the year. After a long conflict in Iraq - which has claimed nearly 4,400 American military lives - Mr Obama has promised not to be backed into an open-ended war in Afghanistan, insisting some US troops will come home beginning in July 2011. That has not been enough to satisfy his anti-war supporters. At the same time, mid-2011 may be too soon to turn the tide. As casualties rise, the slide in support for the war may accelerate. A majority of Americans - 52% - say the war is not worth the cost. The negative assessment in a new Washington Post-ABC News poll followed a brief rise in support for the war after Obama

And, public opposition to troops is at a new high- plan would be popular

Steinhauser 9 ( Paul, CNN deputy political director, Sep 1, *CNN Politics*, http://politicalticker.blogs.cnn.com/2009/09/01/cnn-poll-afghanistan-war-opposition-at-all-time-high/?fbid=YD3UMXcN53S) ET

Opposition to the war in Afghanistan is at an all-time high in a new national poll. Fifty-seven percent of Americans questioned in a CNN/Opinion Research Corporation survey released Tuesday say they oppose the U.S. war in Afghanistan, with 42 percent supporting the military mission. The percentage of those in opposition to the war is up 11 points since April, and is the highest ever in CNN polling since the launch of the U.S. military involvement in Afghanistan soon after the September 11 terrorist attacks in 2001. The poll indicates that opposition to the war is coming mainly from Democrats and independents.

The public supports withdrawal of troops from Afghanistan- plan popular

Binckes June 29th (Jeremy, Huffington Post staffwriter, *The Huffington Post*, http://www.huffingtonpost.com/2010/06/29/most-americans-support-af\_n\_629396.html , June 29th, 10) ET

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.

Link – Afghanistan – GOP

Republicans like the plan- taxation, existing support

Naiman 4/23 [Robert, Policy Director at Just Foreign Policy, 2010, Progressive Democrats of America http://www.pdamerica.org/articles/news/2010-04-23-09-01-23-news.php] KLS

On Tuesday, Rep. Michael Honda [signed his name](http://thomas.loc.gov/cgi-bin/bdquery/z?d111:HR05015:@@@P) to legislation put forward by Sen. Russ Feingold, Rep. Jim McGovern and Rep. Walter Jones that would require the President to establish a timetable for the redeployment of U.S. troops from Afghanistan.

This is potentially a bellwether event, because Rep. Honda--together with Rep. Grijalva, who also signed his name to the McGovern bill on Tuesday--has been a leader on Afghanistan in the Congressional Progressive Caucus, including chairing the CPC Afghanistan task force. Rep. Honda has been very critical of the war, but he has not been an automatic supporter of anti-war legislative initiatives.

If the "Democratic wing of the Democratic Party" in Washington gets onto the McGovern bill in the next few weeks, the political space to be a "liberal" in Washington who supports an open-ended military commitment in Afghanistan will have largely evaporated when the House considers $33 billion more for war in Afghanistan between now and Memorial Day. Progressives in the House may be able to extract from the leadership a vote on a timetable for withdrawal when the House considers the war supplemental.

Winning such a vote will be a heavy lift if the overwhelming majority of House Republicans continue to remain lockstep supporters of an open-ended military commitment. One hopes that a fraction of the Tea Partiers will decide that taxation and government debt are not in fact made holy by being used to kill people, and that some House Republicans will follow suit. But even if the overwhelming majority of House Republicans stay put, 150 votes on the House floor in favor of a timetable for withdrawal is a feasible goal - the universe of Members of the House who have done something significant in the last year in opposition to an open-ended military commitment in Afghanistan is around [138](http://clerk.house.gov/evs/2009/roll453.xml).

GOP likes the plan- fiscal concerns outweighing previous goals

Rosenbaum 6/2[Jason, political analyst, FDL News, http://seminal.firedoglake.com/diary/58000] KLS

Last night, that amendment got 162 votes. That’s huge. It’s way more than any amendment of the sort has gotten in the past. A solid majority of Democrats in the House voted for it, something that leadership will have to keep in mind as they develop further bills having to do with the war. And a handful of Republicans voted for it as well, showing that some of the messages Rep. Grijalva and others were sending about fiscal discipline and Afghanistan are sinking in.

Links- Generic- Arms Cuts

Controversial arms cuts are key to political capital – they build coalitions around Obama
Rozen 1/29 [Laura, 2010 Foreign Policy Reporter, Politico, Http://www.politico.com/blogs/laurarozen/0110/Debate\_heats\_up\_on\_Obamas\_nuclear\_agenda.

Html]

As Vice President Joseph Biden took to the Wall Street Journal oped page today to argue for Obama's nuclear vision, security experts and non-proliferation advocates seized the moment to try to advance Obama's ambitious non-proliferation goals in the face of recent political setbacks. "For as long as nuclear weapons are required to defend our country and our allies, we will maintain a safe, secure and effective nuclear arsenal," Biden writes. "The budget we will submit to Congress on Monday both reverses this decline and enables us to implement the president's nuclear-security agenda. These goals are intertwined." One administration official, speaking on background, said the op-ed can be considered the opening salvo in an administration effort to reframe the debate on U.S. nuclear weapons policy in advance of key developments this spring: the budget release next week, which Biden previews, completion of the Nuclear Posture Review, the anticipated signature and ratification of a Strategic Arms Reduction Treaty [START] follow-on agreement with Moscow, two key nuclear summits in the U.S. in the spring, and laying the groundwork for eventual Senate consideration of the comprehensive nuclear test ban convention, the CTBT. He cited White House concerns that critics have been unchallenged on these issues for too long. "The Obama administration's plan to increase long-term funding for the nuclear stockpile management program underscores the fact that the United States can continue maintain a reliable arsenal without resuming nuclear testing or building newly-designed nuclear warheads," Daryl Kimball, executive director of the Arms Control Association and Director of the Project for the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty, writes.

Links- Japan- democrats

Plan popular with Democrats- Obama proves

Japan Times 8 [October 22, Lexis]

America's Democrats continue to argue for complete withdrawal of United States forces from Iraq within 18 months, despite the fact that no rational observer believes that Iraqi forces will by then be able to secure Iraq's borders and face down the country's numerous militias, which remain armed to the teeth. Indeed, the Democratic plan (if it can be called one) ignores Iran's ongoing subversion of Iraq's state institutions, which will continue unless and until they become strong enough to resist such machinations. Moreover, Barack Obama's insistence that Iraq has never constituted a central front in the war on terror insults the memory of tens of thousands - perhaps hundreds of thousands - of Iraqi civilians and U.S. troops murdered by al-Qaida's suicide bombers since 2003. Indeed, by 2004, the terrorists themselves regarded Iraq as the central front of their campaign.

Links- Japan- Foreign support for war on afghan

And, getting rid of the troops is key to Japanese perception and their support in Afghanistan

Trends Updates 9 ( Sep 1, http://trendsupdates.com/japan-wants-to-withdraw-u-s-troops/ ) ET

The political group that won the elections of this weekend in Japan promised to treat in a different way the subject of the American forces in its territory and to go away from the foreign policy of the USA. The American press has been speculating with the possibility that the future Japanese prime minister, Yukio Hatoyama, ask for the reopening of the conversations with the USA on the military bases of that country in Japan. The Americans, that they occupied Japan after winning of the War World II, maintain 47 thousand soldiers in the country. The predecessor of Hatoyama, Ichiro Ozawa, was criticized when he said in the beginning of this year that most of the troops was not necessary. But some Japanese activists–leaning for the party of Hatoyama when it was in the opposition– want the United States to leave completely of Okinawa, stage of one of the bloodiest battles among Americans and Japanese in the WW II (1939 -1945), and where many inhabitants complain about the presence of the foreign troops, to who, they attribute crimes, noise and pollution. The expected autonomy from the Hatoyama administration should also affect the American war effort in Afghanistan. The future prime minister already said that won’t renew the mandate of Japanese ships in a replenishment mission in Indian Ocean in support to the western operation in Afghanistan.

Links- Japan-public

Public opposed to continued military presence in Pacific theatre

Cagurangan 2/23 [Mar-Vic, University of Hawaii Press, http://www.dmzhawaii.org/?tag=hawaii] KLS

ACTIVISTS from Guam and the CNMI, joined by their supporters from Okinawa and Hawaii, are holding a protest rally today at the front gate of Pacific Command Headquarters at Camp Smith in ‘Aiea, Oahu, to oppose the military expansion in the Marianas. Joining the Guam and CNMI groups are students from Okinawa and members of the American Friends Service Committee and DMZ Hawai’i/Aloha ‘Ain. “The grassroots voices of our people are being ignored by the military, U.S. politicians and the mainstream media,” said Kisha Borja-Kicho’cho’, a University of Hawai’i student and a coordinator for the local organization “Fight for Guahan.” “So, we came to deliver a message directly to the Commander of the U.S. military in the Pacific that we, the peoples of Guahan, the Northern Marianas, Okinawa and Hawai‘i reject any further military build up in the Pacific. Our islands are not weapons to be used in wars against other peoples and countries. We demand peace,” she added. Dr. Hope Cristobal, criticized the Department of Defense’s plan to take over 40 percent of Guam, where citizens are excluded from voting in national elections. Retired U.S. Army Reserve Colonel Ann Wright said that across the Pacific, including in Okinawa, Guam and Hawai‘I, people are opposing the military expansion in the region. “We want Admiral Willard to hear this: No means no. When you force yourself on someone against their will, it’s called rape-rape of the people, the culture and the land. We Americans must stop our government’s military expansion in the Pacific,” Wright said. AFSC Hawai‘i program director Kyle Kajihiro said Okinawa has been presented with false options. “Removing bases and troops from Okinawa, does not require moving them to Guam or Hawai‘i. The military can reduce its overall footprint in the Pacific,” he said. “Clean up and give back the lands taken from the peoples in Okinawa, Guam and Hawai‘i.”

Links – Japan – AT: Public

No Link- Public indifferent about Japan as an economic or political threat

Sutter 96 [Robert G., Professor, School of Foreign Service, April 25, http://www.strategicstudiesinstitute.army.mil/pdffiles/pub95.pdf] KLS

Under these circumstances, these advocates see a strong need for the United States to work prudently and closely with traditional U.S. allies and associates. Their cautious approach argues, for example, that it seems foolish and inconsistent with U.S. goals not to preserve the long-standing U.S. stake in good relations with Japan and with friends and allies along the periphery of Asia and in Oceania. Their security policies and political-cultural orientations are generally seen as in accord with U.S. interests. Although opinion surveys sometime claim that the American public and some U.S. leaders see Japan as an economic competitive "threat" to U.S. well-being, these observers stress a different line of argument. They highlight the fact that few polls of U.S. public opinion or U.S. leaders support the view that it is now in America's interest to focus U.S. energies on the need to confront the Japanese economic threat, in a way that confrontation with the Soviet Union came to dominate U.S. policy during the Cold War.

Public no longer regards Japanese defense as important

Huntington 96 [Samuel P, Political Scientist, “The Clash of Civilization and the Remaking of World Order”, Simon and Shuster Publications, Pg 221- 222] KLS

In the early 1990's Japanese-American relations became increasingly heated with controversies over a wide range of issues, including Japanese attitudes toward American human rights policies with respect to China and other countries, Japanese participation in peacekeeping missions, and, most important, economic relations, especially trade. References to trade wars became commonplace. American officials, particularly in the Clinton administration demanded more and more concessions from Japan; Japanese officials resisted these demands more and more forcefully. Each Japanese-American trade controversy was more acrimonious and more difficult to resolve than the previous one. In March 1994, for instance, President Clinton signed an order giving him authority to apply stricter trade sanctions on Japan, which brought protest not only from the Japanese but also from the head of GATT, the principal world trading organization. A short while later Japan responded with a "blistering attack" on U.S. policies, and shortly after that the United States "formally accused Japan" of discriminating against U.S. companies in awarding government contracts. In the spring of 1995 the Clinton administration threatened to impose 100 percent tariffs on Japanese luxury cars, with an agreement averting this being reached just before the sanctions would have gone into effect. Something closely resembling a trade war was clearly underway between the two countries. By the mid 1990's the acrimony had reached the point where leading Japanese political figures began to question the US military presence in Japan. During these years the public in each country became steadily less favorably disposed towards the other country. In 1985, 87 percent of the American public said they had a generally friendly attitude toward Japan. By 1990 this had dropped to 67 percent, and by 1993 a bare 50 percent of Americans felt favorably disposed toward Japan and almost two- thirds as they tried to avoid buying Japanese products. In 1985, 73 percent of Japanese described U.S.- Japanese relations as friendly; by 1993, 64 percent said they were unfriendly. The year 1991 marked the crucial turning point in the shift of public opinion out of its Cold war mold. In that year each country displaced the Soviet Union in the perceptions of the other. For the first time Americans rated Japan ahead of the Soviet Union as a threat to American security, and for the first time Japanese rated the United States ahead of the Soviet Union as a threat to Japan's security.

Links- Kuwait - Money

And, the pentagon spends a ton of unperceived money troops in the Kuwait- plan would be popular

Turse 9 (Nick, editor at the nations institute Tom dispatch, http://www.corpwatch.org/article.php?id=15479 , *Corp watch*, nov 22) ET

In fact, since 2001 the Pentagon has been pouring significant sums of money into the "critical base and port facilities" mentioned by the general -- both U.S. sites and those of its key regional partners. These are often ignored facts-on-the-ground, which signal just how enduring the U.S. military presence in the region is likely to be, no matter what happens in Iraq. Press coverage of this long-term infrastructural build-up has been remarkably minimal, given the implications for future conflicts in the oil heartlands of the planet. After all, Washington is sending tremendous amounts of military materiel into autocratic Middle Eastern nations and building-up bases in countries whose governments, due to domestic public opinion, often prefer that no publicity be given to the growing American military "footprint."

**Links – Kuwait – Plan Not Percieved**

And, the government withholds information on the invasion of these countries- plan wouldn’t even be perceived

Turse 9 (Nick, editor at the nations institute Tom dispatch, http://www.corpwatch.org/article.php?id=15479 , *Corp watch*, nov 22) ET

Given that the current conflict with al-Qaeda stemmed, in no small part, from the U.S. military presence in the region, the issue is obviously of importance. Nonetheless, coverage has been so poor that much about U.S. military efforts there remains unknown. A review of U.S. government documents, financial data, and other open-source material by TomDispatch, however, reveals that an American military building boom yet to be seriously scrutinized, analyzed, or assessed is underway in the Middle East. Consider, then, what we can at present know now about this Pentagon build-up, country by country from Qatar to Jordan, and while you're reading, think about what we don't know -- and why Washington has chosen this path.

Links- Turkey- Turkish Lobbies/Democrats

A. Overwhelming Turkish support for the plan

Lamond and Ingram 9[Claudine, Paul, January 23, BASIC Getting to Zero Papers, No. 1, http://www.atlantic-community.org/app/webroot/files/articlepdf/CLamondTNWinNATO.pdf] KLS

There is a rising sentiment amongst the population for the removal of US nuclear weapons from Turkish territory. In a recent survey,20 more than half the respondents stated that they are against nuclear weapons being stationed in Turkey. Almost 60% of the Turkish population would support a government request to remove the nuclear weapons from their country, and 72% said they would support an initiative to make Turkey a nuclear-free zone.21 There may be several causes behind this sentiment, including the Iraq War, Turkish relations with neighboring states, budget expenditure and the moral concern over nuclear weapons. The historic precedence of Greece, a NATO member and Turkey’s historic rival, ending its commitment to nuclear sharing in NATO may have further strengthened this tendency. There have been public expressions of resentment towards the US military presence in Turkey ever since the lead up to the US war with Iraq. The United States insisted on the government allowing American troops to use Turkey as a staging post, despite overwhelmingly antiwar Turkish public and political opinion. Limited permission was granted after heavy debates and delay in the Turkish parliament. Turkey’s location has added an element of both risk and opportunity to NATO nuclear sharing. Turkey’s close proximity to states deemed potentially hostile, such as Iran and Syria, make Turkey a preferred NATO base for tactical nuclear weapons. The risk, of course, is that stationing tactical nuclear weapons in Turkey might provoke a pre-emptive strike upon NATO bases. Turkish parliamentarians have expressed to NATO the difficulty of explaining the continued presence of US tactical nuclear weapons on Turkish territory to Muslim and Arab neighbors. There is a fear that they undermine Turkey’s clear diplomatic objectives to act as a mediator within the region. Turkey has a unique opportunity to play a positive role in promoting non-proliferation. Ending nuclear sharing and fully complying with the NPT would act as a powerful example to neighboring states and strengthen Turkey’s legitimacy. Moreover, efforts by the Turkish government to play a leading role in the elimination of nuclear and other weapons of mass destruction would receive overwhelming public support.22

B. Turkish lobby influence African American congressmen allow powerful opposition in Congress and control key Democrats

Edmonds 2/18 [Sibel, founder of the National Security Whistleblowers Coalition, 2010,http://www.boilingfrogspost.com/2010/02/18/the-turkish-lobby-the-congressional-black-caucus] KLS

To most casual observers, the Turkish Embassy would seem an odd place for a foundation run by a group of African American legislators to hold a celebration of such historic measure. It turns out, however, that there is some connection between the two communities. One famous Turkish-American, Ahmet Ertegun, founder of Atlantic Records, had a great appreciation for jazz and helped to promote the growth of black music in the United States. However, reporting last year from Washington D.C., freelance reporter Joshua Kucera suggested something a little deeper might be going on between the Turkish lobbyists and CBC members than a simple shared love for soul music: Turkish lobbying groups have specifically targeted black members of Congress. Twelve members of the Congressional Black Caucus are also in the Turkish Caucus, according to Lydia Borland. Ankara’s lobby in the U.S., which now seems to be principally coordinated through the Turkish Coalition USA PAC and the American Turkish Council, seems to have been successful in getting several black members of Congress, all Democrats, on board as members of the 72 member Congressional Turkish Caucus. Turkey’s representatives in the U.S. have recruited a total of 12 African American members, comprising more than 25% of the Congressional Black Caucus. The list includes a well-known name from the civil rights movement, John Lewis of Georgia as well as the son of a civil rights leader, Jesse Jackson Jr. of Illinois. This is quite a large percentage of African American Congresspersons that Ms. Borland and her associates have recruited. One might brush the 25% statistic off, were it not for an inherent contradiction in their association with the Congressional Turkish Caucus: some of these African Americans in Congress, including Mr. Lewis, are staunch opponents of the genocide in Darfur. Yet, hypocritically, they have tied themselves with a Turkish regime that is not exactly known as the world leader on civil rights and which, furthermore, refuses to acknowledge the genocide perpetrated by the Ottoman Empire during World War I.

Links- Turkey- Turkish Lobbies/Democrats (2/2)

**C. Democrats control the house agenda – GOP insiders admit**

Human Events 7 [6/26 http://www.humanevents.com/article.php?id=21286]

HENSARLING: We both act and react. Let’s face it, we are now on defense. You can score on defense, but it’s a lot more difficult than scoring on offense. Democrats control the agenda on the House floor. We have a strategy on playing defense on a number of issues we think the Democrats will deal with. We still intend to play offense. We announced about six weeks ago a taxpayer bill of rights that the RSC has undertaken. That was one example of playing offense. Again, the Democrats control the House agenda and to some extent they control the national media attention. We will always attempt to play offense, but we also understand the new reality of congress.

Links- Turkey- TNW’s

Positive European reaction will restore political capital
BASIC 2010 [British American Security Information Council, “Mind the Gap: Healing the NATO rift over US tactical nuclear weapons in Europe,” <http://www.basicint.org/pubs/BASIC-MindtheGapNATOnuclear.pdf>]

The Obama administration is operating in a highly charged political atmosphere and domestic opponents will seize on any perceived concession to Moscow. The removal of tactical nuclear weapons from Europe will provide such an opportunity although criticism in the US could be blunted through a media campaign that would demonstrate public support in the countries from where the bombs are to be removed. Allied support would also be canvassed in countries where bipartisan coalitions have sprung up in favor of President Obama’s vision of a nuclear weapons free world, and the removal of the TNWs would be shown to be consistent with this. European public opinion would be favorable to the weapons’ removal, insofar as people are even aware of their presence.

Bipartisan support for removal due to budget constraints
Withington 8 [“The Tactical Nuclear Weapons Game,” <http://www.isn.ethz.ch/isn/Current-Affairs/Security-Watch/Detail/?ots591=4888CAA0-B3DB-1461-98B9-E20E7B9C13D4&lng=en&id=89456>]

Moreover, the two main parties in the US have indicated that they want to revisit the European tactical nuclear weapons issue. McCain made his statement to that effect in May, and, according Ingram; "there's some form of debate [in the Democratic Party] between those who say that they should be withdrawn unilaterally, and those who say they should be used as a negotiating tool" by which the US and Russian governments could negotiate a bilateral agreement to eliminate tactical nuclear weapons from the European continent. Whichever way one looks at the debate, it seems that both political parties would like to see the removal of US nuclear weapons from Europe, but that differences exist on the conditions under which this could happen. Certainly, the cost to the Pentagon of administering and maintaining these weapons in Europe must be considerable at a time when a faltering US economy, high oil prices and escalating costs for defense equipment are all having a detrimental effect on the US defense budget.

Links- Turkey- TNW’s- Lobby

A. Plan popular- Funding for TNWs is controversial
JEN 5 [February 10, Japan Economic Newswire, Lexis]

Hiroshima Mayor Tadatoshi Akiba on Thursday sent letters to U.S. President George. W. Bush and U.S. Ambassador to Japan Howard Baker to protest Bush's federal budget plan for fiscal 2006 which includes spending to research new nuclear weapons such as controversial bunker busters, the mayor's office said. Akiba said in the letters, 'I am gravely concerned that your explicit intention to develop new nuclear weapons inevitably brings the use of those weapons a step closer to reality.' 'Your own Congress refused to appropriate funds in the 2005 budget for research into tactical nuclear weapons...the majority of conscientious American citizens wish to see nuclear weapons abolished.' On the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty Review Conference slated for May in New York, Akiba said, 'your budget runs counter to the tide flowing toward nuclear disarmament and tramples on the desires of peacekeeping people around the world. As mayor of the A-bombed city Hiroshima, I am outraged, and on behalf of my constituents, I vehemently protest.' The spending is part of Bush's proposed outlays related to nuclear arms. Bush requested $6.63 billion for nuclear weapons activities at the Energy Department. The budget for the year starting in October includes $4 million to revive a controversial study on a bunker-buster nuclear weapon called the 'robust nuclear earth penetrator.' Congress killed the study in the fiscal 2005 budget due to concerns that it would hinder international nonproliferation efforts. The Bush administration began researching bunker-buster nuclear weapons in 2003. They are aimed at attacking underground facilities such as terrorist hideouts and stashes of biological and chemical weapons.

B. Popular acts boost political capital

Roberts 4 [Dane, Political Science BA November 9,, University of New Mexico, Daily Lobo, via University Wire] KLS

"Political capital" might be described as good will and a willingness to accommodate, if not support, a leader. His previous political capital came from Sept. 11, after which his approval ratings soared, and Congress gave him broad power, not the 2000 election in which he lost the popular vote. What does it mean to "spend" this capital? It means to use your popularity to push otherwise unlikely or unpopular initiatives. Bush certainly spent his little capital in his first term. Among other robust but not-quite-popular actions, his war on Iraq and extensions of budget-busting tax cuts resulted in a steady erosion of his approval ratings. This time around, according to the White House, there is broad support for Bush's agenda. The voters gave him a mandate. Why, then, will Bush have to spend his capital? If his policies are the will of the people, getting them done will increase, not decrease, his political capital.

AT: Israel Lobby

No Link - The Israel lobby is mostly hype – Most members of congress aren’t die-hard supporters of the lobby.

Zunes 3(Stephen, professor of politics at the University of San Francisco “IS THE ISRAEL LOBBY REALLY THAT POWERFUL?”)AQB

THERE IS LITTLE QUESTION that mainstream and conservative Jewish organizations have mobilized considerable lobbying resources, financial contributions from the Jewish community, and citizen pressure on the news media and other forums of public discourse in support of the Israeli government. At times, they have even created a climate of intimidation against those (myself included) who speak out for peace and human rights and support the Palestinians' right of self-determination. It is wrong, however, to assume that members of Congress so stridently support the policies of the Israeli government because their careers would be at stake if they did otherwise. Indeed, the majority of the most outspoken congressional supporters of the Israeli government are from some of the safest districts in the country and need no support from pro-Israel PACs or Jewish donors in order to be re-elected. A number of cases are often used as examples of the supposed power of the Israel lobby to defeat incumbents who dare challenge U.S. support for Israeli policies, but upon examination, these cases prove to be less clear cut than they are often presented to be. For example, Illinois Republican Congressman Paul Findley was indeed targeted by pro-Israel PACs in his unsuccessful re-election bid in 1982, but he was also targeted by pro-union, pro-environmentalist, pro-feminist, and pro-Democratic PACs. Findley represented a rural district when farm prices were low and was running in an off year election as the nominee of the incumbent party in the White House. Not surprisingly, a number of other Republican incumbents from the Midwest, who were not targeted by pro-Israel PACs, were also defeated that year.

No Link - It’s impossible to assume that the Israel lobby can control the vast spectrum of American politics.
Zunes 3(Stephen, professor of politics at the University of San Francisco “IS THE ISRAEL LOBBY REALLY THAT POWERFUL?”)AQB

In any case, Congress only rarely plays a crucial role in the development of America's foreign policy, and recent decades have seen international relations become increasingly the prerogative of the executive branch. During this period, Congress has played a limited, and largely reactive, role in foreign policy decisions. Indeed, it is naive to assume that foreign policy decision making in the United States sufficiently pluralistic enough for any one lobbying group, particularly one associated with a small ethnic minority, to have so much influence. Blaming the Israel lobby also assumes that U.S. policy towards the Middle East should somehow be more enlightened than it is towards other third world regions where the United States has strategic interests. For example, no Moroccan-American lobby has been needed to convince the United States to support Morocco's thirty-year occupation of Western Sahara, and no Indonesian-American lobby was responsible for successive U.S. administrations backing Indonesia's brutal quarter-century occupation of East Timor. Unfortunately, the United States government is perfectly capable on its own of supporting allied governments that invade, occupy, colonize, and oppress weaker neighbors without a domestic ethnic lobbying group somehow pulling the strings.

AT: Israel Lobby

The Israel Lobby doesn’t actually have dominant influence in Congress.

Zunes 3(Stephen, professor of politics at the University of San Francisco “IS THE ISRAEL LOBBY REALLY THAT POWERFUL?”)AQB

A lobby may appear a lot more powerful than it really is if there is not an effective counter-lobby. Indeed, the myth of an all-powerful Israel Lobby is so pervasive that it has scared off funding for progressive organizations that could conceivably challenge it. For those of us with white, Protestant backgrounds, there is a tendency to project our own failings through a usually subconscious anti-Semitism. Rather than making the effort to overcome our own timidity, we instead complain that Jews are "pushy." Rather than getting our own financial house in order, we instead complain that Jews are "money-grubbing." Similarly, rather than successfully organizing to change U.S. policy on Israel-Palestine, we adopt this fatalistic attitude that the Israel lobby is too powerful to overcome. While the lobby may certainly make things more challenging for those of us working for a more enlightened U.S. policy toward Israel and Palestine, it is inaccurate to blame them for the overall direction of U.S. policy. In many respects, the forces pushing America's policy toward Israel and Palestine are even more powerful and entrenched. But popular movements for peace and justice have overcome such obstacles before. Current U.S. policy is not only bad for the Palestinians, who are currently bearing the brunt of it, but ultimately for Israel and the United States as well. And therein lies the hope of creating a popular movement strong enough to overcome the powerful interests that have until now led U.S. Middle East policy in such a dangerous and self-defeating direction.

No Link - The Israel lobby only seems powerful because Israel’s interests and ours have coincided.

Zunes 3(Stephen, professor of politics at the University of San Francisco “IS THE ISRAEL LOBBY REALLY THAT POWERFUL?”)AQB

The Israel lobby appears powerful because its agenda largely corresponds with perceived American strategic priorities, which are routinely at odds with moral and legal concerns. While it is true that the lobby pushes the United States to support policies that conflict with basic standards of human rights and international law and that undercut arms control and nonproliferation efforts, when and in what region has the United States ever consistently pursued policies that have supported human rights, international law, arms control, and nonproliferation? If AIPAC and its allied PACs did not exist, would U.S. policy toward the Israeli-Palestinian conflict be any more enlightened than U.S. policies have been in recent decades regarding conflicts in, for example, Central America or Southern Africa? Furthermore, U.S. presidents have taken on the lobby directly when they believed it was in America's interest to do so and have generally won handily--for example, President Eisenhower in 1956 during the Suez crisis, President Carter in 1978 following Israel's first invasion of Lebanon, President Reagan in 1981 over the AWACS sale to Saudi Arabia, and the first President Bush in 1991 in regard to the proposed loan guarantees for Israeli settlements. Throughout most of the 1950s and 1960s, it was widely assumed in Washington that there could never be diplomatic relations between the United States and Communist China because of the supposed power of the pro-Taiwanese "China lobby." However, once President Nixon, Secretary of State Kissinger and other national security elites realized it was in the national interest to open up to "Red China," there was little the pro-Taiwan lobbyists could do about it. Similarly, if there ever came a time when those in power in Washington decided a major shift in policy toward Israel was necessary, they could effect one as well.

AT: Israel Lobby

The Israel Lobby is losing power to opposing lobbies.

Chernus 9(Ira, Professor of Religious Studies at the University of Colorado at Boulder, “Israel Not As Powerful As You May Think” August 20)AQB

It's controversial from the U.S. side because completing the wall might mean that Israel is defining permanent borders. It's controversial from the Israeli side because the public there largely supports the wall project. To give it up is a political risk. Yet it's one that the Netanyahu government is willing to take. It's easy enough to understand why Netanyahu and his cabinet ministers keep saying publicly that they'll never give in to U.S. pressure. They want to minimize their political risk, and (as a recent Washington Post headline put it) "Netanyahu's Defiance of U.S. Resonates at Home; Polls Show Resistance to Settlement Freeze." But the words that count most are the ones exchanged among the diplomats behind the scenes -- where, according to all indications, some progress is being made toward compromise by Israelis as well as Arabs. It's harder to understand why these reports of progress, and all the other encouraging signs of Israel concessions, are so widely overlooked by peace and justice activists. Perhaps the belief in Israeli intransigence heightens the sense of Israeli evil. And let's face it. The more evil the enemy in a moral battle, the more pleasure we may get in waging that battle. Perhaps some are even tempted by the lure of absolutism: If you are fighting an enemy that's absolutely evil, then you must be absolutely good. But whatever the appeal of seeing Israel as immune to all pressure, it's a political mistake. Peace activists are most effective when they have an accurate assessment of the political realities they are dealing with. In this case, the reality is that the most crucial decisions will be made in the White House, not in Jerusalem or anywhere else. They certainly won't be made in the offices of AIPAC. Yes, the right-wing "pro-Israel" lobby does carry weight in Washington, though more on Capitol Hill than at the other end of Pennsylvania Avenue. But at both ends its clout is weakening -- not because AIPAC pushes any less, but because the peace movement, especially the Jewish-American peace movement, is pushing more. Groups like J Street, Brit Tzedek, and Americans for Peace Now are real players in the political game for the first time, and the rules of the game itself are changing accordingly. The most important new rule is that the team that pushes hardest can win. On the Middle East as on health care reform, the White House has its finger up, checking the political breezes. What Howard Dean knows about health care is equally true for the Israel-Palestine conflict: We should not let public words fool us into think that the battle is over, when in fact it is really just beginning. The public words are invitations to all of us to work harder than ever to push the administration in the direction of peace and justice.

AT: K of Israel Lobby

The concept of the all powerful Israel is based on anti-Semitic rhetoric.

Zunes 3(Stephen, professor of politics at the University of San Francisco “IS THE ISRAEL LOBBY REALLY THAT POWERFUL?”)AQB

THERE IS SOMETHING QUITE CONVENIENT and discomfortingly familiar about the tendency to blame an allegedly powerful and wealthy group of Jews working behind the scenes for the overall direction of an increasingly controversial U.S. policy. Indeed, like similar exaggerated claims of Jewish power at other times in history, it serves as a means of getting those who really have the power off the hook by diverting the blame to a convenient scapegoat. This is not to say that everyone who expresses concern about the power of AIPAC is an anti-Semite, but the way in which this exaggerated view of Jewish power parallels historic anti-Semitism should give pause. Another noted professor of international relations, A.F.K. Organski, observed how "The belief that the Jewish lobby ... is very powerful has permitted top U.S. policy makers to use 'Jewish influence' or 'domestic politics' to explain the policies ... that U.S. leaders see as working to U.S. advantage, policies they would pursue regardless of Jewish opinion on the matter." He goes on to note how when Arab leaders have raised concerns about U.S. policies, "U.S. officials need give only a helpless shrug, a regretful sigh, and explain how it is not the administration's fault, but that policy makers must operate within the constraints imposed by powerful domestic pressures molding congressional decisions." My interviews with half a dozen Arab foreign ministers and deputy foreign ministers have revealed that indeed U.S. diplomats will routinely blame the Israel lobby in order to get the U.S. government off the hook.

AT: Defense Contractors

Obama on a mission to reduce defense contractor’s political clout

AFP 8 [March 25, Agency French Press, http://www.defensenews.com/story.php?i=4005316&c=AME&s=TOP]KLS

He said spending on benefits for veterans would increase under his proposed budget, but he and Defense Secretary Robert Gates would focus on saving money by changing the way weapons programs are managed and approved. "Where the savings should come in, and I have been working with Secretary Gates on this and will be detailing it more in the weeks to come, is how do we reform our procurement system so that it keeps America safe and we're not wasting taxpayer dollars?" The review of the defense budget would need to be "more disciplined than we have been in the last several years," Obama said. He reiterated that his administration had identified possibly $40 billion in savings through a reform of the procurement system.

Defense contractors no longer influential- Obama threatening veto, public, Gates opposed

Huffington Post 6/16 [2010, http://www.huffingtonpost.com/2009/07/16/defense-contractors-lobby\_n\_233843.html] KLS

The F-22 stealth fighter jets may no longer be needed, but its manufacturers, Lockheed Martin and Boeing, are lobbying aggressively to keep them in the defense budget. So far, they are succeeding. Defense Secretary Robert Gates strongly opposes the program, saying that "the F-22 is, in effect, a niche, silver-bullet solution required for a limited number of scenarios." It isn't a question of money, either. "Frankly," he said, "if my topline were $50 billion higher I would make the same decision." "This is not about national security," said Danielle Brian, executive director for the Project On Government Oversight (POGO). "Even the Pentagon doesn't want more F-22s. This is not about partisan politics -- Sen. McCain is leading the charge and President Obama is threatening to veto the entire defense authorization bill over it. "This is about breaking the cycle of a corrupt military industrial complex. This vote decides whether there will be reform in Washington or not," Brian said.

Defense contractors no political clout- hearings, regulation, perception

St. Petersburg Times 5/14 [2010, Lexis] KLS

Once upon a time, there may have been some justification for earmarks - the pet projects members of Congress slip into the federal budget. The argument was that elected representatives know the needs of their state and district best. But that was trumped long ago by the excesses and the indefensible projects. By one estimate, the House ban on earmarks for for-profit companies would have cut about 1,000 awards worth about $1.7 billion. Such spending based on seniority and political clout sends the wrong message to voters, no matter the worthiness of an individual project. Nobody has been better at securing earmarks than Young. His 41 earmarks this year were more than any other House member and worth more than $90 million. His total over three years is $323 million, according to Taxpayers for Common Sense. And the Times' Alex Leary reported last month that in this fiscal year more than $10 million in Young earmarks went to defense contractors whose lobbyist is Doug Gregory, a former long-time aide to Young. An ethics panel cleared Young and a half-dozen other House members after investigating the relationship between earmarks secured by another now-closed lobbying firm and campaign contributions. But the perception of a conflict is hard to ignore even for someone with Young's reputation for fairness and integrity. Young's earmarks have long benefited area defense contractors and other Tampa Bay interests, and he has not been shy about defending the practice. But last week even the veteran congressman acknowledged that change was inevitable. Of course, the earmark ban is a convenient election-year ploy that may wind up being temporary. Yet it is a step in the right direction, and voters should demand that the next Congress not slide backward.

AT: Defense Contractors

Defense contractors have no political sway- Obama opposed

Ackerman 9 [Spencer, American national security reporter, March 4, http://washingtonindependent.com/32399/if-youre-a-defense-lobbyist-it-might-be-time-to-panic] KLS

Obama today issued a memorandum to the heads of all the executive departments agencies directing them to restrict no-bid contracts; to rein in outsourcing of “inherently governmental activities”; and to, if necessary, cancel wasteful contracts outright. The crucial paragraph, even if it’s written in bureaucratese, particularly calls out the Defense Department: I hereby direct the Director of the Office of Management and Budget (OMB), in collaboration with the Secretary of Defense, the Administrator of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, the Administrator of General Services, the Director of the Office of Personnel Management, and the heads of such other agencies as the Director of OMB determines to be appropriate, and with the participation of appropriate management councils and program management officials, to develop and issue by July 1, 2009, Government-wide guidance to assist agencies in reviewing, and creating processes for ongoing review of, existing contracts in order to identify contracts that are wasteful, inefficient, or not otherwise likely to meet the agency’s needs, and to formulate appropriate corrective action in a timely manner. Such corrective action may include modifying or canceling such contracts in a manner and to the extent consistent with applicable laws, regulations, and policy. [My emphasis] Clearly, this has applications far beyond the Pentagon. But the list of big-ticket defense items that have experienced huge cost overruns is a long one. Future Combat Systems in the Army; the Littoral Combat Ship in the Navy; the Joint Strike Fighter in the Air Force — all of these programs, near and dear to the services, have run massively over budget. If I was a lobbyist for Lockheed or Boeing, I’d be dialing my contacts in the Pentagon and the Hill to figure out what the prospective damage to my company was. And then I’d come up with a strategy to fight this forthcoming Office of Management and Budget review. Obama went further in remarks at the White House, calling it a “false choice” to say that protecting the country requires acquiescence to Pentagon waste. “In this time of great challenges,” he said, “I recognize the real choice between investments that are designed to keep the American people safe and those that are designed to make a defense contractor rich.” He also lent support to Sens. Carl Levin (D-Mich.) and former presidential rival John McCain’s (R-Ariz.) legislation to create new procurement oversight positions at the Pentagon. “The days of giving defense contractors a blank check are over,” Obama said. ‘