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Capitalism

PMCs are inherently capitalist- removing PMCs means a decrease in capitalism

Goddard 1 (Major S., <http://www.globalsecurity.org/military/library/report/2001/pmc-legitimate-entity.pdf>, date accessed: 6/28/2010) AJK
Abdel-Fatau Musah, the Research Coordinator at the Center for Democracy and Development, asserts that “it is no longer a secret that a major objective of the new mercenary business is access to natural and mineral resources. Confident that most of the [nations] in desperate need of their services are not in a position to pay in cash, security firms demand payment in the form of mining concessions and oil contracts.”24 Executive Outcomes is alleged to have negotiated contracts with Angola and Sierra Leone worth $40 million and $50 million, respectively. Yet according to the UN Development Program Human Development Index, these two countries are at the very bottom of their list of the world’s poorest nations.25 There exists a very serious issue concerning the operations of some PMCs that become associated with a convoluted network of associate 66 corporate entities that persue “legitimate” dealings with national governments reliant on the PMC for their security and in some instances actual survival against an armed opposition. There are very strong indications that PMCs, such as Executive Outcomes and Sandline International, are indeed inter-related business enterprises that are also heavily connected to Western mining and resource companies, such as Heritage Oil and Gas Incorporated, Strategic Resources Corporation, Diamondworks and Branch International that operate throughout Africa. There is a strong indication that a UK-registered company Plaza 107 is at the hub of this network of international mining, oil, and security interests.

PMCs will drag out conflicts to profit- plan solves

Prado 8 (Jose,[www.privatesecurityregulation.net/files/Impact%20in %20Human%20Rights%20of%20Private%20Military%20and%20Security%20Companies%27%20Activities.pdf](http://www.privatesecurityregulation.net/files/Impact%20in%20Human%20Rights%20of%20Private%20Military%20and%20Security%20Companies%27%20Activities.pdf), date accessed: 6/28/2010) AJK
The distinction between humanitarian non-profit organizations and corporations working for pecuniary gain is also an area which is being blurred by PMSCs. In conflict or post-conflict areas, such as Afghanistan and Iraq, where PMSCs sometimes provide security details and protection work to humanitarian NGOs, it has become difficult for the population as well as government officials to distinguish one from another. Humanitarian and aid-type assistance risk becoming associated with an intervening force and PMSCs which may be perceived as biased. It is paradoxical to see that reconstruction and infrastructure building in post conflict situations which need to be implemented in the long term are more and more given to PMSC whose commercial motivations drive them to obtain the maximum profit in the shortest-term possible. The perception of PMSCs by the Afghan local population, for example, indicate that employees of PMSCs may contribute to insecurity by perpetuating a “culture of war”, and raise concerns as to the lack of transparency blurring responsibility and accountability of PMSCs and their employees. The local population in Afghanistan also appears to consider that PMSCs are diverting needed funds for reconstruction to pay private security companies, which thus paradoxically may in effect prevent the stabilization of peace in the country.1

**PMCs are inherently capitalist**

Misencik 8 (http://socyberty.com/politics/the-military-industrial-complex-private-military-firms-and-the-effect-on-us-policy/, Jim Misencik, September 30th 2008)

With a rise in neoliberal ideology following the Cold War, a larger niche in the lucrative MIC had been created. Not only weaponry and technology but security services in general, manifested in the PMF, could be undertaken for private profit. According to international security expert P.W. Singer, PMFs are… “companies first and foremost… often tied through complex financial arrangements to other firms, both within and beyond their own industry…they can make use of complex corporate financing—ranging from the sale of [stock](http://socyberty.com/politics/the-military-industrial-complex-private-military-firms-and-the-effect-on-us-policy/) to intrafirm trade—and can engage in a wider variety of deals and contracts.” Like all companies, PMFs are reliant upon [financial](http://socyberty.com/politics/the-military-industrial-complex-private-military-firms-and-the-effect-on-us-policy/) relationships and are legally accountable to the bottom-line interests of increasing the [stock](http://socyberty.com/politics/the-military-industrial-complex-private-military-firms-and-the-effect-on-us-policy/) for their investors. PMFs, for very obvious reasons, make the greatest profits when they can participate in conflict. Additionally, through complex corporate financing arrangements, investors in seemingly unconnected sectors will also see their economic interests tied to warfare. This is candidly revealed by Fortune Magazine analysts when they note that… “[t]he upshot [to war in Iraq] is that the Pentagon is outsourcing as many tasks as possible…we wouldn’t be so crass as to describe it as a business opportunity—too many lives are on the line. But the fact is that if America goes to war, private companies are going to be deeply involved,” in both war and reconstruction. Statements to the contrary aside, they are precisely—and with depraving accuracy—describing war in Iraq as a ‘business opportunity’. But acknowledging the potential profitability of war is not a major departure from common understanding. The profitability of PMFs, however, combined with their direct war-fighting and support functions—thereby freeing up more soldiers to engage in direct combat—do, in fact, transcend the traditional MIC-sphere of political and economic influence. Neoliberal ideology demands the transfer of formerly public organizations to private hands. As “the ultimate representation of neoliberalism,” PMFs have moved the “control of force” farther from popular reach. This results in less popular control as one more layer insulates private organizations from the popular vote and creates greater ambiguity. Illinois Representative Jan Schakowsky affirms that… “[t]here’s a great lack of transparency when you contract out.” This substitution of public for private means of supporting military action allows the US to increase their actual numbers in conflict zones and to keep these numbers more or less concealed from the public eye. Additionally, because the executive branch of the US government maintains a large amount of budgetary discretion in allocating defense funds, these monies can be funneled to PMFs that become invisible when the official numbers of troops on the ground are made public.

Capitalism

PMCs prolong conflict for capitalist goals

Selber 9 (Jessee, <http://www.ippnw.org/MGS/V7N2Selber.html#Comment>, date accessed: 6/28/2010) AJK

Private military companies (PMCs) provide services ranging from personnel training,and technical assistance to actual combat. They frequently have a dual role as government/corporate consultants and as stakeholders. In Sierra Leone one PMC’s close ties with the diamond industry contributed to political instability and continued armed conflict. PMC involvement with the government of Angola prolonged a war that has taken hundreds of thousands of lives and has devastated that country’s economy. The international system of conflict resolution must either be restructured to include a legitimate and restricted setting for the continued use of PMCs, or their activity should be banned altogether under international humanitarian law. M&GS 2002;7:90-95.

Security

PMCs embody securitization, creating threats to serve themselves- plan solves

Prado 8 (Jose, http://www.privatesecurityregulation.net/files/Impact%20in%20Human%20Rights%20of%20Private%20Military%20and%20Security%20Companies%27%20Activities.pdf, date accessed: 6/28/2010) AJK
The distinction between humanitarian non-profit organizations and corporations working for pecuniary gain is also an area which is being blurred by PMSCs. In conflict or post-conflict areas, such as Afghanistan and Iraq, where PMSCs sometimes provide security details and protection work to humanitarian NGOs, it has become difficult for the population as well as government officials to distinguish one from another. Humanitarian and aid-type assistance risk becoming associated with an intervening force and PMSCs which may be perceived as biased. It is paradoxical to see that reconstruction and infrastructure building in post conflict situations which need to be implemented in the long term are more and more given to PMSC whose commercial motivations drive them to obtain the maximum profit in the shortest-term possible. The perception of PMSCs by the Afghan local population, for example, indicate that employees of PMSCs may contribute to insecurity by perpetuating a “culture of war”, and raise concerns as to the lack of transparency blurring responsibility and accountability of PMSCs and their employees. The local population in Afghanistan also appears to consider that PMSCs are diverting needed funds for reconstruction to pay private security companies, which thus paradoxically may in effect prevent the stabilization of peace in the country.1

Feminism

PMCs are intrinsically patriarchal- plan solves

Enloe 4 (Cynthia, The Curious Feminist: Searching for Women in a New Age of Empire, Google Books, date accessed: 6/28/2010) AJK

Patriarchy is not old hat. And it is not fixed. The structures and beliefs that combine to privilege masculinity are continuously being modernized. Nowadays there are so many feminists and other women’s advocates internationally sharing information, insights, and strategies that the enterprise of patriarchy is perhaps less assured of success than it has ever been. Still, every new constitution drafting, every new economic planning, every new treaty negotiation provides at least the opportunity for those who benefit from the privileging of masculinity to equip patriarchy with a deceptive “new look.” Patriarchy, consequently, can be as fashionable as hiring Bechtel, Lockheed, and other private military contractors to carry on the tasks of foreign occupation. That is, as the U.S. government’s strategists seek to give their postwar reconstruction steps in Iraq and Afghanistan the look of something that is the opposite of old fashioned dictatorships and imperialism, in practice they are paying some of the most profoundly masculinity- privileging organizations to carry out this agenda. What is allegedly new thus may be reproducing something that is all too familiar. Patriarchy can be as ubiquitous as nationalism, patriotism, and postwar reconstruction.

PMSCs are responsible for re-masculinisation

Large 2010 (Judith, http://www.wiscomp.org/pp-v3/pdfs/judith.pdf, date accessed:6/28/2010) AJK

The history of companies like Blackwater (now known as Xe) is based on the private commodification of heavy battle-ready ‘real men’ whose toughness can literally be bought for battle and defense purposes. The exponential rise in their use is striking, as per the fact that in 2007 their presence as part of the occupation of Iraq was estimated to be close to 200,000 in comparison to the 160,000 uniformed personnel of national militaries occupying the country. 13 The ethical, governance and economic implications of PMSCs are profound. The image they present is of the modern warrior with ruthless expertise in ‘taking out’ ‘targets’ and offering highly armed defence. Scholar Paul Higate thus points to the extreme masculinity portrayed by, and indeed performed by PMSCs: ‘It is not simply that PMSCs have become increasingly important to how conflict is managed, but crucially - in contrast to regular militaries - their activities remain largely unregulated and their personnel almost entirely unaccountable. When seen alongside the perpetration of human rights abuses by a not insignificant number of private military contractors - including most notoriously the shooting of 17 unarmed Iraqi civilians in Najaf in September 2007…. it is possible to suggest that PMSCs represent a key moment of (re)masculinisation in the contemporary period.’

PMSCs are responsible for patriarchy and the re-masculinisation of war

Large 2010 (Judith, http://www.wiscomp.org/pp-v3/pdfs/judith.pdf, date accessed:6/28/2010) AJK

The ‘re-masculinisation of war’ is evident in a myriad of uncomfortable features which appear to echo each other across a manufactured divide: The glorification of manly force and killing evident in both the macho PMSC swagger and the zealous bearded, robed warrior. The sanitization of death through invisible PMSC casualties (and heroes’ funerals for the fallen from national service) on one side, and glorified suicide or jihadist sacrifice on the other. One side accusing the other of subjugating women, while the other counters with accusations of defiling and corrupting women. Battle by stealth, whether the high-tech drone or the low-tech lone assassin or bomber. Marginalisation of the victims, the social cost, the grief and internalization of memory, rage and despair created by indiscriminate violence in communities. Invisibility of Women’s Constituencies and Voice on either side.

PSMCs are inherently masculine and set up patriarchal f/ws

Higate 9 (Paul, <http://www.bristol.ac.uk/politics/workingpapers/03-09phpaper.pdf>, date accessed:6/28/2010) AJK Private Military Security Companies (PMSC) have come increasingly to supplant the activities of regular, national militaries - most notably in such contexts as Iraq and Afghanistan. Though a wide scholarship has addressed questions of legitimacy, regulation and control of PMSCs, critical commentators on gender have almost entirely overlooked the masculinised cultures of these private firms, the majority of which employ former military personnel. This is surprising since masculine norms, values and cultures shape private contractors security practices and can be used to explain human rights abuses, as well as the everyday ways in which these men imagine security. In these terms, the key critical issue concerns what is missed when masculinity is ignored in analyses of PMSCs, a question that is taken up in this working paper within the context of a potential research agenda for this topic of research.

Feminism

PMSCs make peace impossible and re-masculinate geopolitics

Higate 9 (Paul, <http://www.bristol.ac.uk/politics/workingpapers/03-09phpaper.pdf>, date accessed:6/28/2010) AJK Private Military Security Companies (PMSCs) should be seen as a critical subject of political enquiry as they engage international relations, domestic politics, and national/international legislative systems within the context of both ethical and moral questions concerning the use of violence. Companies are involved in: the security of convoys, close protection of dignitaries, security sector reform, provision of logistical and support functions to military peacekeeping operations and combat operations. Curiously, however, scholars working within the fields of Political Science, Critical Security Studies, Law and Gender Studies have almost entirely overlooked the importance of masculinity in their analyses of this sector (for a focus on women see Schultz and Yeung, 2005). What do we miss when masculinity is ignored in analyses of PMSCs? It is not simply that PMSCs have become increasingly important to how conflict is managed, but crucially - in contrast to regular militaries - their activities remain largely unregulated and their personnel almost entirely unaccountable. When seen alongside the perpetration of human rights abuses by a not insignificant number of private military contractors - including most notoriously the shooting of 17 unarmed Iraqi civilians in Najaf in September 2007 (Tavernise, 2007), it is possible to suggest that PMSCs represent a key moment of (re)masculinisation in the contemporary period. It is for this reason that the curiosity of critical scholars of gender should be sparked since the mobilisation of thousands of men trained in violence who go on to work in spaces of legal exception is a unique phenomena that can, at times, exacerbate the insecurity of those vulnerable populations forced to host them. Not only does co-opting the profit motive into security work of this kind shape the conditions of possibility by which conflict is negotiated, but in a related sense, assumes an immanent logic that is difficult to escape.. The quest for a peaceful world is harmed by increasing the number of private military contractors who – by no means perfect – remain outside the regulatory mechanisms of state militaries who in relative terms have constrained the actions of men of violence over many decades. How might we begin to challenge this unregulated form of militarization?

PMSCs are responsible for the current re-masculinisation

Higate 9 (Paul, <http://www.bristol.ac.uk/politics/workingpapers/03-09phpaper.pdf>, date accessed:6/28/2010) AJK
Developing an analytical sensitivity to the identity work of these men can throw light on their unique and diverse inner worlds through revealing the norms, values, attitudes and rituals that constitute everyday realities in both professional and personal contexts. As the journalist and writer Robert Young Pelton puts it in direct reference to contractors of the US firm Blackwater: ‘The ultimate moral leash on these people is on how they view themselves not on how other people view them’ (Pelton, 2006: 6) It is not enough, however, to consider identities in their immediate social context as privatised military masculinities articulate closely with the geopolitical, not least the ways that the discourses around the ‘war on terror’ shape their manly performances and world views. For this reason, it is important to examine some of the ways in which traces of both distant and local political events emerge in the identities of these men. To do this, it is useful to draw on the so-called ‘man question’ literature that has been developed in recent years by gender scholars working within International Relations (IR). This scholarship is informed by the critical men’s studies approach touched on earlier, although it emphasises macro analyses (Parpart and Zalewski, 1998; 2008). Given that gender and IR scholars generally agree that masculinity is ‘an integral … feature of the worldwide structure of diplomatic, military and economic relations’ (Connell, 2008: ix), PMSCs provide an exemplary context in which to integrate the micro-practices of masculinity with the ‘higher level’ concerns of IR. Of particular interest is the intersectionality of security contractor masculinities with ‘the war on terror’ and the quasi-military masculine/privatised/corporate (Hooper, 2001; Griffin, 2007) spheres in which they are employed. Equally applicable to the current scholarship on PMSCs, and set within the context of scholarship on the ‘US as Empire’, Catherine Lutz has called for ethnographic rather than political economic approaches that would ‘[r]eshape [the field] in more adequate, less economistic forms, make the human face and frailties of imperialism more visible and … make challenges to imperial practice more likely’ (Lutz, 2006: 593).

 PMSCs create systems of patriarchy and repression

Higate 9 (Paul, <http://www.bristol.ac.uk/politics/workingpapers/03-09phpaper.pdf>, date accessed:6/28/2010) AJK As vibrant sites of gender, PMSCs are also noted here in their productive capacity. Not only do they establish hierarchies through which women are marginalised, but in addition they have the capacity to create spaces of disadvantage for men too. In this way, their effects can be seen as neo-colonial, casting ‘third world men’ as subordinate in numerous ways. A potentially interesting line of enquiry here is to trace the journey private military contractors in this category have made to the post-conflict site of Iraq, for example. How is it that men from these contexts end up in subordinate roles supporting coalition efforts? What might their journey involve? The example of the Fijian male contractor is apposite and is now considered briefly.

Free-Market CP 2AC

Free market can’t regulate PMC’s – non-competitive bids get many contractors jobs.

SALZMAN 9 (“PRIVATE MILITARY CONTRACTORS AND THE TAINT OF A MERCENARY” REPUTATION ZOE New York University School of Law INTERNATIONAL LAW AND POLITICS [Vol. 40:853 May 14, http://law.nyu.edu/ecm\_dlv4/groups/public/@nyu\_law\_website\_\_journals\_\_journal\_of\_international\_law\_and\_politics/documents/documents/ecm\_pro\_058877.pdf)KM

Compounding this shortfall in public accountability, it is also unclear how privately accountable private contractors actually are. It is sometimes assumed that private contractors are accountable to the controls of the market and that a disreputable reputation will reduce a PMC’s competitive edge, making it less likely that it will be hired. In practice, however, PMCs often escape oversight through sole-source, non-competitive bids and other practices that circumvent the market (a prominent example is Halliburton’s non-competitive bid for the contract to manage logistics for the Iraq war), putting into question just how effective a control the market really provides.108

Market self-regulation still has a long way to go – regulations are key.

Isenberg 9 (David researcher and leader of the Norwegian Initiative on Small Arms Transfers, “Private Military Contractors and U.S. Grand Strategy” http://www.cato.org/pubs/articles/isenberg-private%20military-contractors-2009.pdf)KM

PERHAPS, IN TIME, American PMCs will be able to rely on self-regulation, as their trade associations often call for, through codes of conduct.66 The British government recently suggested such an option for its industry.67 But now, when PMCs don’t even have their own industry-wide standard, is not the time. Jake Allen, a U.S. military veteran who worked as a security contractor in Iraq, and who publishes an e-zine on private contractors wrote: We are long past self-regulation. We’ve had ample opportunity to do that in the past decade and we could have done it if we had had real visionary industry leadership as opposed to self-centered corporate greed out to make only fast money at the expense of long-term sustainable revenues.” 68 Given the obvious potential for conflicts of interest, stricter oversight is essential. To continue on our present course, with too little information and inadequate public scrutiny is an invitation to waste, inefficiency, and in extreme cases, outright fraud.

A2: Iraq and Afghan CP

CP can’t solve – US contractors would subvert the Iraqi law system

IGC 08 (http://www.crowell.com/documents/Iraq-Reconstruction\_Political-Situations-Creating-Legal-Risks-for-Contractors.pdf, News and Analysis on International Public Procurement and Export Controls, Vol. 5, No. 8 August 2008)

Precisely how the lifting of immunity will occur and the implications for U.S. contractors are unclear. Most commentary on the issue has focused on potential criminal prosecutions of, for example, security contractors that harm or kill Iraqi bystanders. In this author’s view, however, there are immediate practical considerations, such as increased insurance costs and more difficulty recruiting personnel. But the greatest legal risk for companies most likely lies in the unknown Iraqi civil courts. If contractor personnel are involved in a crime, the contractor may be able to move its people out of Iraq quickly to avoid prosecution. But imagine if the contractor were subject to tort and contract claims brought by Iraqis in Iraqi domestic courts. This could include claims for wrongful death, intentional and negligent infliction of emotional distress, and violations of international law such as human trafficking. A negative decision in a civil claim could be enforced against contractor assets in Iraq or, potentially, in other foreign jurisdictions.

CP can’t solve –US government and contractors will host country’s law, Blackwater proves

Washington Times 9 (http://www.washingtontimes.com/news/2009/mar/17/new-deal-for-blackwater-bucks-decision-by-iraq/)

Days after the Baghdad government decided it no longer wanted the company then known as Blackwater in Iraq, the State Department signed a $22.2 million deal in February to keep the embattled contractor working there through most of the summer, contract records show. The decision keeps Blackwater - since renamed Xe - in Iraq months longer than anyone has suggested publicly, while raising questions about why the U.S. would pay a contractor for work in Iraq if it may not be able to operate there legally. The State Department has been under pressure from Blackwater critics, including several in Congress, not to renew the company's contracts in Iraq. Much of the concern stems from a 2007 incident that left 14 Iraqi civilians dead and six former Blackwater guards facing manslaughter charges. One of the guards pleaded guilty, but the company was accused of no wrongdoing in the incident. In late January, the Iraqi government said it would not renew Blackwater's operating license and that the company would have to leave as soon as a joint Iraqi-U.S. committee completes its work on guidelines for the operation of private security companies. State Department officials said they would honor the decision. On Feb. 2, a department spokesman was asked whether officials planned to renew one of Blackwater's contracts past May. The spokesman, Robert Wood, said the department had told Blackwater "we did not plan to renew the company's existing task force orders for protective security details in Iraq." But records available through a federal procurement database show that on that same day, the State Department approved a $22.2 million contract modification for Blackwater "security personnel" in Iraq, with a job completion date of Sept. 3, 2009. "Why would you continue to use Blackwater when the Iraqi government has banned the highly controversial company and there are other choices?" asked Melanie Sloan, executive director of the nonpartisan Citizens for Responsibility and Ethics in Washington. State Department spokesman Noel Clay said the contract modification involves aviation services. "The place of performance is Iraq, but it is totally different than the Baghdad one that expires in May," he said.

2AC: Reform/Regulate CP

And, reform alone won’t work- we must get rid of them

Singer 7 (Peter, senior fellow at the Brookings Institution, *Harpers Magazine*, Sept 3,7, http://harpers.org/archive/2007/09/hbc-90001311)

As you know, I was in this camp for several years, trying to analyze and suggesting policy ideas for finding our way out of the issues of outsourcing–through better oversight procedures, improved laws, etc. But I have simply come to the conclusion that it just keeps sending us further down the rabbit hole. The emperor has no clothes on, and the solution is not to say, “well, let’s put a scarf on him.”

Consult NATO 2AC – Say No

NATO perceives PMC’s as critical to their success overseas, they would say no to the plan.

Al-Fattal 7 (Rouba, Researcher At The Intestate For International And European Policy, “The Privatization of Peace” Pg. 59, <http://cejiss.org/assets/pdf/articles/vol1-1/Rouba_Al-Fattal_The_Privatization_of_Peace.pdf>)KFC

PMFs within NATO altered the military asymmetry, and balanced powers between conflicting parties. Thus, creating a ripe moment for negotiation and diplomacy that was wisely used; which led as a result to ceasefire, and the signing of the Dayton Pace Accords in late 1995. Although this Accord managed to maintain peace between Bosnians and Croats, it failed to sustain peace between Kosovar Albanians (Muslims) and Serbs in Kosovo. Therefore, after three years of its signature, another bloody conflict arisen between Albanians and Serbs in Kosovo. And once again contractors from PMFs alongside NATO forces managed to put an end to this horrifying second war, which also ended in bringing the two parties to the negotiation table, signing yet another peace agreement in 1999 which, luckily, is still effective

A2: Consult Japan – Say No

Japan wants the possibilities offered by PMCs – they’d say no to the counterplan

Dan 8 (Yusuke, lecturer for the International Security Academy, http://www.allacademic.com/meta/p\_mla\_apa\_research\_citation/2/5/4/4/3/pages254437/p254437-5.php) GAT

The last aspect with respect to PMSCs’ current missions concerns Japan. Professors Akira Kato and Heigo Sato referred to Japanese PMSCs and their relation with the Ministry of Defense of Japan. There are very few PMSCs based in Japan, since the Japanese government has been cautious about military operations abroad since WWII with the constraints under the national constitution. To be sure, there are many private security companies operating at home, but very few abroad. Akira Kato has visited Fuji General, a Japanese private military company, and its branch office in Afghanistan, which up to now has restricted itself to information gathering. This firm employs former SDF personnel. Japan’s Ministry of Defense seems keen to explore possibilities of PMSCs as part of Japan’s national defense policy. This is part of the reason why Kato, Sato and I were commissioned to write a report on PMSCs for the Ministry 8 . Seeing Japanese embassies secured by a company, Control Risks 9 , which merely has a subsidized company in Japan, there is room to consider outsourcing Japanese national security. Japan employs non-Japanese firms to man embassies abroad, which is a byproduct of Japan’s reluctance to dispatch troops abroad.

A2: Consult UN – Say No

The UN has recently changed its stance – they support PMCs

Lynch 10 (Colum, writer for Foreign Policy, http://turtlebay.foreignpolicy.com/posts/2010/01/17/un\_embraces\_private\_military\_contractors) GAT

For years, the U.N.'s top peacekeepers have been among the world's staunchest critics of private security contractors, often portraying them as unaccountable mercenaries. Now they are clients. As the U.N. prepares to expand its operations in Afghanistan, it is in talks with a British security firm to send in scores of additional Nepalese Gurkhas to the country to protect them. The U.N.'s top security official, Gregory Starr, the former head of U.S. State Department Security, has also been advocating an increase in the use of private security firms in Pakistan, where U.N. relief workers have been the target of kidnappings and killings, according to U.N. officials. The embrace of a private security contractor marks a shift for the United Nations, which has relied on governments to supply peacekeepers to protect U.N. staff. In Iraq, the U.N. used a contingent of Fijian peacekeepers for protection. But it has accelerated its move toward hired guns in Pakistan since the Taliban launched an October attack against a U.N. residence, killing five U.N. employees, including two Afghan security guards, and triggered the withdrawal of U.N. personnel from the country. Those officials will return along with an additional 800 U.N. staff that have been budgeted for the Afghan mission. The latest drive has been led by Starr, who relied heavily on private security contractors to protect American diplomats in Iraq and Afghanistan. Starr who joined the U.N. last May, once defended the security company Xe Services, formerly known as Blackwater USA, following allegations that it killed Iraqi civilians. "Essentially, I think they do a very good job," he [told Reuters](http://bit.ly/74ldLs) in 2008. Starr declined to discuss the U.N.'s policy. But a U.N. spokesman, Farhan Haq, responded on behalf of Starr. "He wanted you to know that our understanding of the current usage of the term ‘Private Security Contractors' typically refers to contractors doing close protection work for movement security, such as Blackwater/Xe, Triple Canopy, Dyncorps, Aegis, and many other companies providing this type of service. However, the U.N. doesn't avail itself of this type of service. We do use some private companies to provide static security guards at some sites in Afghanistan and Pakistan, but primarily rely on host countries to provide our security." Still, the trend has alarmed some U.N. officials and experts, who fear that the U.N. will not be able to hold private contractors accountable. "I am not a fan," said Jean-Marie Guehenno, the U.N.'s top peacekeeping official from 2000 to 2008. "The signal from the international community is we care about you, but not to the point of risking our own boys, and that's not a good thing," he said. "This is a dangerous precedent for the U.N.," added Jake Sherman, who served in the U.N. mission in Afghanistan from 2003 to 2005. Sherman recalls encountering a group of security guards that was hired by a western security firm to act as unarmed security guards at Afghan election sites. Sherman said they possessed concealed automatic weapons. The use of private contractors has always been controversial at the U.N., which commissioned a feasibility study in the late 1990s to determine whether private military contractors could maintain security in the refugee camps established in Eastern Zaire following the Rwandan genocide. The idea was dropped as too costly and politically controversial. Today, there's a U.N. special rapporteur who monitors their behavior, and routinely issues scathing reports on the alleged excesses of these firms, including the former Blackwater USA. The U.N. General Assembly has passed a resolution urging the U.N. to take precautions that its hiring practices don't alter the international character of the U.N. or endanger its staff. But a study by the Humanitarian Policy Group of security by the U.N. and other humanitarian organizations shows that U.N. peacekeepers have been quietly turning to private security, particularly in hazard stations like Somalia and Afghanistan. And the U.N.'s secretary general, Ban Ki-moon, recently confirmed that his organization will have to turn to the private sector to protect its people. In Afghanistan, the U.N. has contracted an Afghan subsidiary of the London-based company, IDG Security Ltd., to provide 169 Gurkhas, according to figures compiled by the U.N. Mission in Afghanistan (some U.N. officials say there may be as many as 400 Gurkhas protecting U.N. officials). They are charged with supplementing security provided by the Afghan National Police. Many U.N. officials in the field said it is naive to think you can rely on barely functioning governments to provide security for U.N. workers, particularly when they are being targeted by combatants or terrorists. Nick Horne, a former U.N. political officer, said the Gurkhas were first brought in about three years ago because of concerns that the U.N. couldn't count on the Afghans in a pinch.

A2: Consult Britain – Say No

95% of British missions involve PMCs – they buy into the sales pitches of the private military – they’ll say no

Voegeli 8 (Erika, contributor to Current Concerns, http://www.currentconcerns.ch/index.php?id=499) GAT

In the following lecture, a young, dynamic representative of this line of business presented herself: Mrs. Dr. Sabrina Schulz is Director of Policy of the British Association for Private Security Companies (BAPSC), in which 22 British security companies have united. These companies cover 95% of all missions ordered in Great Britain with a turnover of approximately 1 billion British Pounds a year. Along the lines of the New Economy, she explained that security could no longer be provided by the state alone and must sometimes be traded by private companies as a consequence of the “slim state” concept. As a representative of the business she justified their deployment by saying that in developing countries the state was not capable of providing the security of its citizens. She also said that in Iraq the reconstruction would never have been accomplished without the help of these companies, that were striving for self-regulation and “good practices” – and in contrast to the aggressive US-American actions, the British companies as well as the British army – would rather focus on “winning hearts and mind” campaigns. However, Mrs. Schulz had to admit that “self-regulation” cannot to be sufficient and that only governments and states can implement valid laws and punish offences, after all. When listening to this lady, one could not help thinking that the London School of Economics releases graduates, who can give polished speeches, remain unfazed in discussions and can run a business according to economic criteria. Obviously, it fails however to provide them with a critical attitude to the purely economic worldview or with respect and understanding for other peoples, cultures and history. Such attitude should include the fact that Iraq – today drowned in chaos and violence, under US dictatorship – had been – before US/UK invasions and the period of the sanctions – a country with a health service that presented a model for the region and was just as freely accessible to the population as were its institutions of education. Moreover, Iraqi women (whose liberation the West likes to boast of in other Arab countries) were naturally integrated in the work process and held top positions. It should be considered that not only Blackwater and others are involved in attacks and torture scandals, but that British soldiers and the MI 6 “questioned” convicts in Abu Ghraib with the knowledge of their government.

The British PMC market has exploded recently, and British troops need to have the more experienced private soldiers in the field – they won’t approve the counterplan

Wither 5 (James K., Prof. of Natl. Security Studies at George C. Marshall European Center for Security Studies, The Quarterly Journal, Summer 2005, pp. 112-113) GAT

While Europe’s state militaries struggle with reform and restructuring, the heirs of the *condottieri* are thriving. Globally, the private sector offers the full range of military services from combat infantrymen to strategic consultancy. Between 1994 and 2002, the Pentagon entered into more than three thousand contracts with PMCs.24 The extent of privatization is illustrated by statistics from the two wars against Iraq. In the campaign of 2003, the ratio of civilian contractors to military personnel was 1:10, compared to an estimated 1:50 at the time of the Gulf War in 1991.25 A two-year research project by the International Consortium of Investigative Journalists completed in 2002 identified around 90 PMCs, which had collectively operated in 110 countries throughout the world.26 The war in Iraq and its aftermath have resulted in a huge expansion in private sector military activity. The revenues of British PMCs alone are estimated to have risen from $320 million before the war to over $1.6 billion by March 2004.27 The growth of PMCs has been driven by a number of factors, most of them unique to the post-Cold War era. Since the early 1990s there has been a significant reduction in the size of armed forces around the world. The U.S. military, for example, is 35 percent smaller than at the time of the Gulf War. During the same period, North American and European soldiers have deployed on more military operations than they had during all forty years of the Cold War. These operations have covered the full spectrum of conflict, from peace support to high-intensity combat, demanding a range of military skills and experience beyond the capabilities of many states. Private contractors have expanded to meet the skills gap and to fill the shortages caused by the reduction in the number of military personnel. This expansion has been assisted by the availability of individuals with appropriate expertise who have found themselves without work through the downsizing of state militaries. The complexity of modern military hardware has also fuelled the growth of a small army of civilian maintenance specialists. The U.K. employed around 1500 civilian contractors during the Iraq campaign in 2003, mainly to provide equipment and technical support, not least because British soldiers lacked the specialized skills to service the more sophisticated equipment in the field.28 As equipment maintenance is increasingly carried out by the original manufacturer, contractor support on operations has become vital for advanced Western militaries. 29

A2: Consult EU – Say No

EU member states use PMCs, and there is no unified opinion on them due to the lack of harmonized regulation – they’d say no

AI 5 (Amnesty International, http://www.iansa.org/regions/europe/documents/undermining\_security/private\_military.htm) GAT

Whilst the international community has sought to prohibit the activities of mercenaries outright, this has not been the case with private military companies (PMCs) or private security companies (PSCs). It is argued by a number of governments, businesses and NGOs that there are certain legitimate and acceptable roles for PMCs and PSCs, as long as they act in accordance with national and international law. As shown by the information below, the provision of private military and security services is a growing market. Research for this report identified 51 companies in 8 EU Member States and new member countries providing private military or security services or training(227). However, in his 2001 report the UN Human Rights Commission's Special Rapporteur on the use of mercenaries states: "While private companies play an important role in the area of security, there are certain limits that should not be exceeded. They should not participate actively in armed conflicts, nor recruit and hire mercenaries, much less attempt to replace the State in defending national sovereignty, preserving the right of self-determination, protecting external borders or maintaining public order."(228) Of particular concern is the lack of accountability and absence of regulation in the private provision of military and security services that are being exploited by unscrupulous companies and mercenaries, The national legislation applicable to PSCs and PMCs varies throughout the EU, with no harmonised or overarching EU administrative framework or criteria. Private military or security companies have the potential to carry out directly, or to facilitate, human rights abuses by non-state and state actors in the recipient country. If this risk is to be minimised it is vital that those companies operating within the rule of law are properly registered, and that international transfers of such services are subject to stringent export controls based upon international human rights and humanitarian law.

The EU relies on PMCs for global deployment – they wouldn’t say yes to a plan that could potentially undermine that

Francioni 8 (Francesco, prof. at Univ. of Texas Law School, http://ejil.oxfordjournals.org/cgi/reprint/19/5/961.pdf) GAT

The article by Nigel White and Sorcha MacLeod examines the consequences of the increased competence of the European Union in the field of common security and defence policy and the consequent growing demand on Member States for military and security personnel to be deployed in different conflict areas of the world. With limited availability of national military forces, one inevitable implication of this trend will be the necessity to start relying on private military contractors to sustain the effort of peace operations and territorial administration of critical areas. The authors argue that present ‘soft ’ international and European law on corporate social responsibility does not guarantee effective accountability for violations of human rights and humanitarian law and that, therefore, pending the establishment of a more effective regulatory framework, wrongful acts or omissions of private military contractors should be attributed to the organization under whose authority they operate.

A2: Consult NATO

NATO likes PMCs – they’d say no to the counterplan

Appurathai 7 (James, spokesperson for NATO, http://www.nato.int/cps/en/natolive/opinions\_56742.htm) GAT

First, I should say this: private military contractors doesn't equal mercenaries. There is a lot of very important work done by private military contractors in Afghanistan, also in Iraq. We have not had the same complications in Afghanistan that have been seen in Iraq. That's true. But I wouldn't want to sort of denigrate the people who do that work. They're not just mercenaries. They do very difficult and dangerous work with us. President Karzai I think has recently made a comment on private military companies It is for the Afghan government of course also to have a say in what happens, for the Afghan government to have the say in what happens in their own territory. But what I can say from a NATO point of view is we have had no problems of which I am aware with regard to the conduct of private military companies in Afghanistan that work with ISAF. I cannot speak for any other body but NATO. I am not aware of any problems, either disciplinary or in the conduct of their operations, of private military companies in Afghanistan who work with us. Does that mean that we don't watch? We do watch carefully what is done, but we have had a good experience I have to say until now.

Fill-In DA 2AC

Many private contractors are already locals- they can easily fill in

Robichaud 7 (Carl, PROGRAM OFFICER, INTERNATIONAL PEACE AND SECURITY, INTERNATIONAL PROGRAM at the carnegie institute, *World Politics Review,* 10/31/7) ET

After the Sept. 16 Blackwater scandal, which drew unprecedented attention to the role played by private security contractors (PSCs) in Iraq, these firms have increasingly come under scrutiny in other theaters of war, such as Afghanistan. But while efforts in Afghanistan to rein in PSCs seem to parallel those in Iraq, they are driven by different dynamics—and have very different implications. Earlier this month, the Afghan parliament, emboldened by the Iraq legislature's attempt to assert jurisdiction over contractors, drafted a law that could curb operations by private security contractors. Then last week Afghanistan's Ministry of the Interior (MOI) went a step further, shutting down four Afghan private security firms. These steps sound similar to those taken the Iraq government, but there are important differences. In Iraq, virtually all private security contractors are international companies with Western employees. In Afghanistan, many private security groups are indigenous, often under the control of a single faction, and even the large international firms operating there rely upon local militiamen for much of their manpower. The Ministry's focus so far has been on small Afghan security firms that have a peripheral role. According to police and Western officials, plans are also in place to shut down 10 more contractors, including some that protect foreign embassies. The media has generally interpreted the ministry's actions as a "crackdown" on private security contractors, but the truth is more complicated.

Most PMC’s are locals- they could easily fill in when foreign ones are withdrawn

Robichaud 7 (Carl, PROGRAM OFFICER, INTERNATIONAL PEACE AND SECURITY, INTERNATIONAL PROGRAM at the carnegie institute, *World Politics Review,* 10/31/7) ET

The Defense Department says the U.S. military employs 1,000 security contractors, and the State Department and the government of Afghanistan also hire PSCs. Estimates on the number of private security personnel in Afghanistan exceed 10,000 for registered groups alone. This number is small in absolute terms when compared with the number of PSCs in Iraq, but it comprises a substantial military presence for Afghanistan. If this figure is accurate, private security personnel outnumber the troop contribution of every nation but the United States, and are almost a third the size of the Afghan National Army (estimated at around 35,000).The men comprising these forces are mostly Afghans, former combatants from mujahideen militias. As a result, reliance upon these forces has had the pernicious consequence of sustaining and empowering some of the nation's most irresponsible actors. Barnett Rubin, a leading expert on Afghanistan, argues that security contractors "have hired, armed, and trained militias that were supposed to be demobilized and disarmed, enabling them to persist and profit as part of the 'private sector,' awaiting the spark that will set off another civil war."One example cited by Rubin is Din Muhammad Jurat. Jurat, a Northern Alliance militia leader who has been implicated in organized crime and in the murder of a parliamentarian, secured a lucrative position with USPI. He now provides "former" fighters from his militia as security guards for reconstruction projects. Just this year, his men were involved in the beating of Afghanistan Attorney General Abdul Jabbar Sabet, who belongs to a different faction. Reliance on these sorts of actors, argues Rubin, is "corrupting the Afghan police and administration."

Plan Popular – Obama

Obama supports the plan

Lendman 10 (Stephen, Jan 19th, 2010, “Outsourcing War: The Rise of Private Military Contractors”, http://www.indybay.org/newsitems/2010/01/19/18635680.php)KFC

Then in February 2009 as president, Obama introduced reforms to reduce PMC spending and shift outsourced work back to government. He also promised to improve the quality of acquisition workers - government employees involved in supervising and auditing billions of dollars spent monthly on contracts. Even so, PMC’s are fully integrated into national security and other government functions, as evidenced by the massive numbers in Iraq and Afghanistan alone. Earlier, PMC’s were at times used in lieu of US forces. As mentioned above, they helped General Washington win America's war of independence. Later the war of 1812, and in WW II the Flying Tigers fought the Japanese for China's Chiang Kai-Shek. In the 1960s and early 1970s, they were prominent nation builders in South Vietnam. From 1947 through 1976, the CIA's Southern Air Transport performed paramilitary services, including delivering weapons to the Contras in Nicaragua in the 1980s.

Plan Popular – Generic

The administration supports the plan

Cover 5/15 (Matt, Staff Writer CNS News, Friday, May 15, 2009, <http://www.cnsnews.com/news/article/48171>)KFC

Washington – Defense Secretary Robert Gates said he wants to reduce the role support-service contractor employees by a third and replace them with more than 30,000 new government employees. Testifying before the Senate Armed Services Committee Thursday, Gates said that the Obama administration’s goal was to reduce the number of private Defense contractors to pre-Bush administration--and thus, pre-war--levels. The Pentagon, he said, plans to reduce “the number of support service contractors from our current 39 percent of the workforce to the pre-2001 level of 26 percent and replacing them with full-time government employees. “Our goal is to hire as many as 13,800 new civil servants in FY10 (fiscal year 2010) to replace contractors and up to 33,600 new civil servants in place of contractors over the next five years,” Gates told the committee. Gates also said that the Defense Department planned to convert an additional 10,000 contractors working in acquisitions into government workers and hire an additional 10,000 government acquisition professionals by 2015 – beginning with 4,080 acquisitions positions in FY’10. “Acquisitions” is the process of buying weapons, hardware or equipment the military needs. Gates explained to the committee that the dilemma facing the Defense Department was how many "unnecessary" weapons the Pentagon should buy in the interest of job creation in the private sector -- telling senators that every dollar of unnecessary purchases was a dollar that couldn’t be used to buy the weapons needed to fight terrorists. “The key question for us is, ‘In order to keep a competitive base: how much stuff do we buy that we know we don’t need?’” Gates said. “Because everything that I buy that I don’t need takes a dollar away from a place where I do need it.” Gates described the annual defense budget as a “reform budget” that seeks to re-focus the U.S. military away from conflicts of the past and toward the conflicts of the future, eliminating weapons the country doesn’t need or ones that are too costly. “The responsibility of this department first and foremost is to fight and win wars – not just constantly prepare for them,” Gates said in his opening statement. “In that respect, the conflicts we are in have revealed numerous problems that I am working to improve; this budget makes real headway in that respect.” Sen. Claire McCaskill (D-Mo.) told CNSNews.com that the contracting process had gotten out of hand and needed to be reformed, saying that foreign nationals were now doing jobs previously done by U.S. troops. “If we don’t have (federal) acquisition personnel, then we don’t have anybody to keep the contractors accountable. We’ve been hiring contractors to watch the contractors, hiring contractors to decide what we want from contractors. “We have commanders who don’t really think it’s important how much stuff costs when it comes to contractors, particularly now that we’re going toward supporting our fighting men and women with contractors,” she said. “In the old days, we used to have soldiers peel potatoes, now we have foreign nationals peel potatoes for $0.50 an hour.” Sen. Evan Bayh (D-Ind.) praised Gates for addressing the contracting situation saluting the proposed swaps between private and public sector jobs. “This (contracting) has been an issue that has been put off and I highly salute you for addressing it,” Bayh said. Bayh congratulated Gates on his proposed reforms, saying that he felt the Pentagon was ending “business as usual” and being more honest than ever before.

\*\*2AC AT: Afghan Theatre- Non Unique\*\*

2AC AT: Afghan Theatre DA- Non Unique- Losing Now

Non unique- we can’t win Afghanistan now- Mccain warrants

CNN 9 (*CNN Politics* , Feb 25, http://www.cnn.com/2009/POLITICS/02/25/mccain.afghan.war/index.html ) ET

The Arizona senator, the ranking Republican on the Senate Armed Services Committee, said that while he approved of President Obama's recent decision to send 17,000 more troops to the country, he believed an additional allied military and civilian surge would be necessary to prevent it from once again becoming an al Qaeda safe haven. The Obama administration is conducting a review of overall U.S. policy in the troubled Islamic republic, the president said in his joint address to Congress on Tuesday.m"With our friends and allies, we will forge a new and comprehensive strategy for Afghanistan and Pakistan to defeat al Qaeda and combat extremism," Obama said Tuesday. "Because I will not allow terrorists to plot against the American people from safe havens halfway around the world. We will not allow it." But McCain said on Wednesday, "When you aren't winning in this kind of war, you are losing. And, in Afghanistan today, we are not winning." He delivered his remarks at the American Enterprise Institute, a Washington-based think tank. McCain claimed that while the situation in Afghanistan is "nowhere near as dire as it was in Iraq," the number of insurgent attacks had spiked in 2008 and violence had increased more than 500 percent in the past four years.

Non Unique- we are going to lose- too low troop levels

CNN 9 (*CNN Politics* , Feb 25, http://www.cnn.com/2009/POLITICS/02/25/mccain.afghan.war/index.html ) ET

A Vietnam War veteran, former prisoner of war and longtime member of the Armed Services Committee, McCain said that while he knows Americans "are weary of war ... we must win [in Afghanistan]. The alternative is to risk that country's return to its previous function as a terrorist sanctuary, from which al Qaeda could train and plan attacks against America." Among other things, McCain stated that the U.S. needs to establish a larger military headquarters capable of executing "the necessary planning and coordination for a nationwide counterinsurgency campaign." He also said plans to expand the Afghan army from 68,000 to 134,000 troops were insufficient. He recommended expanding the Afghan army to between 160,000 and 200,000 troops.

Non Unique- things aren’t going to winnable in Afghanistan for a long time

CNN 9 (*CNN Politics* , Feb 25, http://www.cnn.com/2009/POLITICS/02/25/mccain.afghan.war/index.html ) ET

At the same time, he said, the U.S. needs to boost the country's nonmilitary assistance to help strengthen "its [civilian] institutions, the rule of law, and the economy in order to provide a sustainable alternative to the drug trade." Southern Afghanistan provides about two thirds of the world's opium and heroin. Over the years, those two drugs have served as a major source of revenue for the insurgency, including the Taliban. McCain warned that, even if his recommendations are adopted, the violence in Afghanistan is "likely to get worse before it gets better. The scale of resources required to prevail will be enormous."

2AC AT: Afghan Theatre DA- Non Unique- Losing War Now

Non unique- we’re losing despite our best efforts

Petras June 16th (James- e Bartle Professor (Emeritus) of Sociology at Binghamton University, SUNY, *Pacific Free Press*, http://www.pacificfreepress.com/news/1/6419-afghanistan-the-long-march-to-a-losing-war.html) ET

Despite almost a decade of warfare, including an invasion and occupation, the US military and its allies and client state armed forces are losing the war in Afghanistan. Outside of the central districts of a few cities and the military fortresses, the Afghan national resistance forces, in all of their complex local, regional and national alliances, are in control, of territory, people and administration.

and, the war has no end in sight

Petras June 16th (James- e Bartle Professor (Emeritus) of Sociology at Binghamton University, SUNY, *Pacific Free Press*, http://www.pacificfreepress.com/news/1/6419-afghanistan-the-long-march-to-a-losing-war.html) ET

The prolonged unending war has become a major drain on the morale of the US armed forces and undermined civilian support in the US, limiting the capacity of the White House to launch new imperial wars. The annual multi-billion dollar military expenditures, are exacerbating the out-of-control budget deficit and forcing harsh unpopular cuts on social programs, at all levels of government. There is no end in sight, as the Obama regime keeps increasing the number of troops by the tens of thousands and military expenditures by the dozens of billions but the resistance advances, both military and politically.

and, use of contractors show we are losing

Petras June 16th (James- e Bartle Professor (Emeritus) of Sociology at Binghamton University, SUNY, *Pacific Free Press*, http://www.pacificfreepress.com/news/1/6419-afghanistan-the-long-march-to-a-losing-war.html) ET

Faced with rising popular discontent and demands for fiscal restraint by a wide spectrum of banking and citizen groups, Obama and the general command have sought “partial exit” via the recruitment and training of a large scale long term Afghan mercenary army and police force under the direction of US and NATO officers.

And, increased efforts don’t matter- they only fund insurgencies

Petras June 16th (James- e Bartle Professor (Emeritus) of Sociology at Binghamton University, SUNY, *Pacific Free Press*, http://www.pacificfreepress.com/news/1/6419-afghanistan-the-long-march-to-a-losing-war.html) ET

Between 2001-2010 the US military expenditures total $428 billion dollars; the colonial occupation has led to over 7,228 dead and wounded as of June 1, 2010. As the US military situation deteriorates, the White House escalates the number of troops resulting in a greater number of killed and wounded. During the past 18 months of the Obama regime more soldiers were killed or wounded than in the previous eight years. The White House and Pentagon strategy is premised on massive flows of money, arms and an increase in the number of surrogates, mainly subsidized warlords and puppet western educated ex-pats. The White House “development aid” involves, literally, purchasing the transient loyalties of clan leaders. The White House attempts to give a veneer of legitimacy by running elections, which enhance the corrupt image of the incumbent puppet regime in Kabul and its regional associates.

2AC AT: Afghan Theatre DA- Non Unique- Losing War

News.com.au 7 (http://www.news.com.au/were-losing-war-in-afghanistan/story-e6frfkp9-1111115130654 , Dec 17) ET

NEW Defence Minister Joel Fitzgibbon says the war in Afghanistan will be lost unless NATO and its close allies change tactics, overhauling military and civil programs designed to bring stability to the country. Mr Fitzgibbon's blunt warning was delivered to a closed-door meeting in Scotland of eight defence ministers, from the US, Australia and six other NATO nations with military forces in Afghanistan. His comments reflect the classified intelligence assessments presented to the former Howard government in recent months, which have painted a bleak picture of the military situation facing NATO and its allies as they battle Taliban forces in Afghanistan. "The previous government would have us believe that good progress is being made in Afghanistan. The reality is quite a different one," Mr Fitzgibbon told The Australian last night soon after returning from the meeting in Edinburgh.

And, we are losing in Afghanistan- we need a new strategy

News.com.au 7 (http://www.news.com.au/were-losing-war-in-afghanistan/story-e6frfkp9-1111115130654 , Dec 17) ET

"We are winning the battles and not the war, in my view. We have been very successful in clearing areas of the Taliban but it's having no real strategic effect." Labor came to power with a promise to withdraw Australia's combat troops from Iraq but to continue the fight against the Taliban in Afghanistan. NATO and its allies have about 33,000 troops in Afghanistan. Australia's military contribution now totals about 1000 troops, including special forces and RAAF personnel, mostly stationed in Oruzgan province. At Friday's talks with defence ministers representing countries with military forces in southern Afghanistan, Mr Fitzgibbon also expressed frustration at the lack of a coherent strategy that could underpin the successful rehabilitation of Afghanistan as a nation state.

And, we are losing because of lack of troops- PMC’s not key

News.com.au 7 (http://www.news.com.au/were-losing-war-in-afghanistan/story-e6frfkp9-1111115130654 , Dec 17) ET

"We are lacking in Afghanistan a coherent plan for the country," a senior defence source told The Australian. "The command chain is confused. We (ISAF) don't have enough troops on the ground. We don't have proper co-ordination between our military and civilian goals and actions." He said Australian and NATO troops had been doing good work in clearing out insurgents but did not have the overall capacity to hold ground in key areas of southern Afghanistan.

And,we are losing because of lack of hearts and minds

News.com.au 7 (http://www.news.com.au/were-losing-war-in-afghanistan/story-e6frfkp9-1111115130654 , Dec 17) ET

In Oruzgan, Australian special forces cleared much of the province of insurgents in 2005 only to find the Taliban returning after their withdrawal. Mr Fitzgibbon told his colleagues that the Australian Defence Force had half of its infantry and cavalry committed to overseas deployments, including Iraq, Afghanistan and East Timor. Australia's 1000 troops in Afghanistan makes it the biggest non-NATO contributor to the military campaign in the country, and the 10th-biggest contributor overall. "We are just so frustrated that so many other NATO countries are not making a contribution," Mr Fitzgibbon told The Australian last night. Mr Fitzgibbon also told his colleagues in Edinburgh, including US Defence Secretary Robert Gates, that while NATO and its allies had been successfully "stomping on lots of ants, we have not been dealing with the ants' nest". "We need much more than a military response," he said. "This is largely about winning the hearts and minds of the more moderate of the Taliban and other sections of the Afghan community.

2AC AT: Afghan Theatre DA- Non Unique- Losing the War

And , war on Afghanistan is losing now- need more political advisors

News.com.au 7 (http://www.news.com.au/were-losing-war-in-afghanistan/story-e6frfkp9-1111115130654 , Dec 17) ET

"We need more political advisers in the civil service. There is no administrative infrastructure. "We need more training for the Afghan army and the Afghan police. We need someone there as a senior envoy co-ordinating this overall strategy." Mr Fitzgibbon said until now, NATO and its allies had been providing a military and reconstruction response but had failed to successfully deal with the "big picture" in Afghanistan. He said nations with military forces in southern Afghanistan had to deal with significant domestic political pressures. "We have to hold the will of our constituencies. If we don't do that we will all be packing up and leaving," he said. Mr Fitzgibbon stressed a new military plan for ISAF operations in southern Afghanistan would endeavour to measure just how much larger the ISAF force should be to hold the ground they were gaining in recent military operations.

Obama says we’re losing the war

San Francisco Chronicle June 19th ( *San Francisco Chronicle* , June 19-10, http://www.sfgate.com/cgi-bin/article.cgi?f=/c/a/2010/06/19/EDHL1E1AS3.DTL) ET

President Obama conceded yesterday that America was not winning the war in Afghanistan and opened the way for negotiations with moderate elements of the Taleban, much as the US did with Sunni tribes in Iraq.

The new strategy, which comes as Mr Obama prepares to send an additional 17,000 US troops to Afghanistan, emerged after a frantic 48 hours of American diplomacy in the region involving new overtures to Iran, Russia and the Muslim world. The fresh approach to Tehran, however, is causing significant concern in Israel and the Arab world, amid fears that Mr Obama is making too many concessions at a time when his own officials say Iran has enough enriched uranium to make one nuclear weapon.

And, interviews with obama say he concedes we are losing this war

San Francisco Chronicle June 19th ( *San Francisco Chronicle* , June 19-10, http://www.sfgate.com/cgi-bin/article.cgi?f=/c/a/2010/06/19/EDHL1E1AS3.DTL) ET

Mr Obama’s admission of the dire situation in Afghanistan followed an invitation to Iran by Hillary Clinton, the US Secretary of State, to participate in a regional conference on Afghanistan this month. The offer was part of a broad arc of diplomacy in recent days that marks a decisive shift away from the Bush Administration’s more hardline approach to the region. Asked during an interview with The New York Times if the US was winning in Afghanistan, Mr Obama replied “no”. He pointed to the success of peeling away Iraqi insurgents from al-Qaeda in Iraq, and said there might be “comparable opportunities” with the Taleban, although he warned that the situation there was more complex than in Iraq.

\*\*2AC AT: Links\*\*

2AC AT: Afghan Theatre DA- Link Turn- Contractors hurt efforts

Link turn: And, contractors destroys chances at winning the war- flames violence and anti-US sentiment

ABC News 7 ( Sept 23, http://blogs.abcnews.com/theblotter/2007/09/report-private-.html , *ABC News*) ET

The United States' use of mercenary contractors like Blackwater has led to unnecessary violence against civilians, inflamed sentiment towards the United States and jeopardized military strategies to defeat the insurgency, a new report concludes. "The U.S. government needs to go back to the drawing board and re-evaluate its use of private military contractors," finds the Brookings Institution's Peter Singer, who authored the report. In particular, he writes, using armed soldiers-for-hire to escort U.S. officials, as they now do, "has created both huge vulnerabilities and negative consequences for the overall mission."

Link turn: contractors undermines the war- make the military hated by public

ABC News 7 ( Sept 23, http://blogs.abcnews.com/theblotter/2007/09/report-private-.html , *ABC News*) ET

Singer says his report is based on talking with hundreds of subjects, "from private military firm employees to active and retired soldiers." The academic has studied private military contractors for over a decade, and is considered one of the foremost policy experts on the topic. His study was first reported on by Mmuckraker.com. Military contractors are "one of the most visible and hated aspects of the American presence Singer writes in his paper. While most are "highly talented ex-soldiers," their role -- as a buffer between U.S. officials and the populace -- makes their harshness the public face of the United States.

Link turn: convoys add to the conflict

ABC News 7 ( Sept 23, http://blogs.abcnews.com/theblotter/2007/09/report-private-.html , *ABC News*) ET

"In an effort to keep potential threats away, contractors drive convoys up the wrong side of the road, ram civilian vehicles, toss smoke bombs, and fire weaponry as warnings, all as standard practices," Singer writes. "While understandable" as security measures, "it undermines the broader operation." Blackwater, the private military contractor whom the government of Iraq wants to ban after a recent incident in which Iraqi civilians were killed, "has earned a special reputation among Iraqis," according to Singer, who says the company has been implicated in at least seven incidents of civilian harm.

And, contractors are seen as a defense weakness

Schwartz 9 ( Moshe, specialist in defense acquisition, *Congressional Research Service*, Dec 14, pg 17, http://www.fas.org/sgp/crs/natsec/R40764.pdf ) ET

According to DOD officials, the upcoming QDR will include a more robust discussion on

contractors.55 The National Defense Strategy runs 23 pages and mentions contractors on two occasions. In the

first instance, it states “The Total Force distributes and balances skills across each of its constituent elements: the Active Component, the Reserve Component, the civilian workforce, and the private sector and contractor base.”56 In the second instance, the report states “We also must continue to improve our acquisition and contracting regulations, procedures, and oversight to ensure agile and timely procurement of critical equipment and materials for our forces.”57

And, contractors make the overall military look bad

Schwartz 9 ( Moshe, specialist in defense acquisition, *Congressional Research Service*, Dec 14, pg 16, http://www.fas.org/sgp/crs/natsec/R40764.pdf ) ET

There have been published reports of local nationals being abused and mistreated by some DOD

contractors in such incidents as the shooting at Iraqi civilians by private security contractors43 and

the abuse of prisoners at Abu Ghraib prison in Iraq.44 Local nationals may not draw a distinction

between government contractors and the U.S. military, and the abuses committed by contractors

may strengthen anti-American insurgents, as evidenced by the public outcry following such

incidents.

2AC AT: Afghan Theatre DA- Link Turn- good cards

Contractors just run loose and make messes for the military to clean up- General warrants

Singer 7 (Peter, senior fellow at the Brookings Institution, *Harpers Magazine*, Sept 3,7, http://harpers.org/archive/2007/09/hbc-90001311)

In May 2007, there was another two reported shootings of Iraqi civilians by the Blackwater contractors, including of an Interior Ministry employee, which led to an armed standoff between the firm and Iraqi police. Thus, many felt the great tension between the firm and the locals would soon erupt. In the weeks before the September killings, Matthew Degn, a senior American civilian adviser to the Interior Ministry’s intelligence directorate, described the ministry as “a powder keg” of anger at Blackwater.44. Fainaru, “Where Military Rules Don’t Apply.” As a result of this pattern, U.S. military officers frequently expressed their frustrations with sharing the battlefield with such private forces operating under their own rules and agendas, and worry about the consequences for their own operations. As far back as 2005, for example, Brigadier General Karl Horst, deputy commander of the US 3rd Infantry Division (responsible for security in the Baghdad area at the time) tried to keep track of contractor shootings in his sector. Over the course of two months, he found twelve shootings that resulted in at least six Iraqi civilian deaths and three more wounded. Horst tellingly put it, “These guys run loose in this country and do stupid stuff. There’s no authority over them, so you can’t come down on them hard when they escalate force. They shoot people, and someone else has to deal with the aftermath.”55. As quoted in “Contractors in Spotlight as Shootings Add Up,” Charlotte Observer, September 11, 2005.

Contractors undermine the credibility and effectiveness- they aren’t any help to the military or the war

Schwartz 9 ( Moshe, specialist in defense acquisition, *Congressional Research Service*, Dec 14, pg. 16. http://www.fas.org/sgp/crs/natsec/R40764.pdf ) ET

Given the critical role contractors are playing in supporting military operations and the billions of dollars DOD spends on contractors, the ability of the operational force to manage and oversee contractors has become increasingly important. Poor contract management can lead to troops not receiving needed support and the wasteful spending of billions of dollars.11 A lack of effective contractor management can even undermine the credibility and effectiveness of the U.S. military. For example, according to an Army investigative report, a lack of good contractor surveillance at Abu Ghraib prison contributed to fostering a permissive environment in which prisoner abuses took place.12 Many observers believe that the fallout from Abu Ghraib and other incidents, such as the shooting of Iraqi civilians by private security contractors hired by the United States government, have hurt the credibility of the U.S. military and undermined efforts in Iraq.

And, contractors undermine the Afghanistan army efforts

Singer 7 (Peter, senior fellow at the Brookings Institution, *Harpers Magazine*, Sept 3,7, http://harpers.org/archive/2007/09/hbc-90001311)

3. Afghanistan is also the scene of a major counterinsurgency operation, targeting the resurgent Taliban. Your report is largely focused on Iraq. Do you consider the role of private security forces to have played a similar negative role in Afghanistan? And can you cite any particular incidents? It is not as extreme, but there have been reported abuses in Afghanistan. One CIA contractor beat a detainee to death with a flashlight, while another freelance contractor (who reportedly told everyone he was working for the Pentagon, but this didn’t seem to be the case) was jailed for running his own private prison. There have also been numerous reports of tensions even inside Kabul between local civilians and contractors working on the Karzai contract. Another interesting incident in Afghanistan was when a contractor and two U.S. Air Force officers had an armed standoff after the contractor was claimed (by the officers) to have tried to run them off the road in his SUV.4.

2AC AT: Afghan Theatre DA- Link Turn

Contractors undermine the US efforts

Schwartz 9 ( Moshe, specialist in defense acquisition, *Congressional Research Service*, Dec 14, pg 16, http://www.fas.org/sgp/crs/natsec/R40764.pdf ) ET

Poor contract management may also undermine U.S. efforts in the region. GAO stated that poor

contract management can lead to wasteful spending of billions of dollars.45 Wasteful spending can

divert limited resources away from important U.S. efforts as providing security, social services,

and economic development programs. According to the Army, efforts to establish social services

and develop economic programs are critical to a successful counterinsurgency campaign.46

Therefore, wasting resources that could otherwise have been spent on social services and

economic development may limit the effectiveness of U.S. efforts. Poor contract management

may also result in increased fraud, which could similarly undermine the credibility of the U.S. in

the eyes of the local population.

And, lack of accountability makes PMCs a disadvantage to the military

Singer 7 (Peter, senior fellow at the Brookings Institution, *Harpers Magazine*, Sept 3,7, http://harpers.org/archive/2007/09/hbc-90001311)

Indeed, the only application of MEJA in the last four years in Iraq was against a KBR contractor, who had attempted to rape an American reservist while she was sleeping inside a trailer in the Green Zone. In turn, while the UCMJ [Uniform Code of Military Justice] legal change happened in Fall 2006, the Pentagon is yet to issue a guidance on how JAG officers should use it in the field. Its effect has been like a tree falling in the forest with no one there. Is real or not if no one hears it fall? That the only time the law kicked in was when Americans were the victims certainly has not helped the counterinsurgency effort. Not only did this vacuum help impel contractors towards more aggressive actions, but it completely invalidated the message that American political advisors were trying to push to their Iraqi counterparts on the necessity of establishing “rule of law” as a way of ending the insurgency. Finally, the contractors’ seeming freedom from justice was considered a particular affront. “The Iraqis despised them, because they were untouchable,” said Matthew Degn, former senior American adviser to the Interior Ministry. “They were above the law.”77. Fainaru, “Where Military Rules Don’t Apply.”

Private Military contractors create military inefficiency through the gray legal area which they fall under

Singer 7 (Peter, senior fellow at the Brookings Institution, *Harpers Magazine*, Sept 3,7, http://harpers.org/archive/2007/09/hbc-90001311)

Yes. Although private military firms and their employees are now integral parts of many military operations, they tend to fall through the cracks of legal codes, which sharply distinguish civilians from soldiers. Private military contractors are not exactly civilians, given that they often carry and use weapons, interrogate prisoners, load bombs, and fulfill other critical military roles. Yet, they are not quite soldiers, either, in that they are not part of the service or in the chain of command, and might not even be of the same nationality. A number of laws might be applied to them, ranging from local laws to extra-territorial application of civilian law (the Military Extra-territorial Jurisdiction Act or MEJA), to even the Uniform Code of Military Justice (with the definition of civilians falling under the jurisdiction of military law expanded from times of declared war to contingency operations in Fall 2006).66. Peter W. Singer, “Frequently Asked Questions on the UCMJ Change and its Applicability to Private Military Contractors.” January 12 (2007). The reality is that they are almost never actually used.

2AC AT: Afghan Theatre DA- Link Turn

And, PMCs lock the US in a position where they undermine the attempts to win the war but we can’t get rid of them

Singer 7 (Peter, senior fellow at the Brookings Institution, *Harpers Magazine*, Sept 3,7, http://harpers.org/archive/2007/09/hbc-90001311)

More broadly, however, there is the underlying findings of the report, which I need to bring up. Even if there was perfect oversight and legal accountability for the Blackwater contractors in this latest incident, there is still a crucial problem. The data on eight different parameters in the report shows that the use of private military contractors appears to have harmed, rather than helped, the counterinsurgency efforts of the U.S. mission Even worse, government can no longer carry out one of its core missions: to fight and win the nation’s wars. If we judge by what has happened, when it comes to private military contractors and counterinsurgency, the U.S. has locked its national security endevaors into a vicious cycle. It can’t win with them, but can’t go to war without them.

2AC AT: Afghan Theatre DA- Link Turn- Hearts and Minds

Contractors destroy hearts and minds

Schwartz 9 ( Moshe, specialist in defense acquisition, *Congressional Research Service*, Dec 14, pg 17, http://www.fas.org/sgp/crs/natsec/R40764.pdf ) ET

Some analysts believe that DOD strategy and doctrine does not sufficiently address the issue of

contractors. These analysts argue that the public backlash following Abu Ghraib and other such

incidents, as well wasteful spending, should compel DOD to reexamine the role contractors play

in contingency operations and the way DOD integrates contractor support into current strategy

and doctrine.47 For example, then Senator Barack Obama stated that “we cannot win a fight for

hearts and minds when we outsource critical missions to unaccountable contractors.

Contractors undermine hearts and minds- destroying US strategy- plan would help

Schwartz 9 ( Moshe, specialist in defense acquisition, *Congressional Research Service*, Dec 14,pg. 16 http://www.fas.org/sgp/crs/natsec/R40764.pdf ) ET

According to the Army Field Manual on counterinsurgency, one of the fundamental strategies in counterinsurgency operations–such as those undertaken by DOD in Iraq and Afghanistan–is to retain legitimacy by winning the hearts and minds of the local population.40 Conversely, the field manual argues that abusing or mistreating the population undermines counterinsurgency efforts, stating Though firmness by security forces is often necessary to establish a secure environment, a government that exceeds accepted local norms and abuses its people ... generates resistance to its rule. People who have been maltreated or have had close friends or relatives killed ... may strike back at their attackers. Security force abuses ... can be major escalating factors for insurgencies.41 In accordance with the manual’s assertion that the local population will ultimately determine the winner of the conflict, abuses and crimes committed by armed private security contractors and

interrogators against local nationals may have undermined U.S. efforts in Iraq and Afghanistan.

And contractors unaccountability destroys the hearts and mind campaigns

Singer 7 (Peter, senior fellow at the Brookings Institution, *Harpers Magazine*, Sept 3,7, http://harpers.org/archive/2007/09/hbc-90001311)

2. You conclude that security contractors “participated in a series of abuses that have undermined efforts at winning ‘hearts and minds’ of the Iraqi people.” Can you describe the sorts of incidents that lead you to these conclusions? For example, it was reported that 100% of the translators and up to 50% of the interrogators at the Abu Ghraib prison were private contractors from the Titan and CACI firms respectively. The U.S. Army found that contractors were involved in 36% of the proven abuse incidents from 2003-2004 and identified 6 particular employees as being culpable in the abuses.11. Major General George Fay and Lieutenant General Anthony Jones, “Investigation of Intelligence Activities at Abu Ghraib,”(PDF) (US Army, 2004). However, while the enlisted U.S. Army soldiers involved in the Abu Ghraib abuse were properly court martialed for their crimes, three years later, not one of the private contractors named in the U.S. Army investigation reports has been charged, prosecuted, or punished.

And, contractors ruin hearts and minds, undermining our war efforts

Singer 7 (Peter, senior fellow at the Brookings Institution, *Harpers Magazine*, Sept 3,7, http://harpers.org/archive/2007/09/hbc-90001311)

. As these examples show, Blackwater is certainly not the only company to be accused of incidents that reverberate negatively on the efforts to win “hearts and minds” of the Iraqis. However, Blackwater has earned a special reputation among Iraqis. Much of this stems from the highly visible role it has played in escorting U.S. officials, but Iraqi government officials claim that there have been at least seven incidents of civilian harm in which the company has been involved. The most notable that have been reported in the press was on Christmas Eve 2006, when a Blackwater employee allegedly got drunk while inside the Green Zone in Baghdad and got in an argument with a guard of the Iraqi Vice President. He then shot the Iraqi dead. The employee was quickly flown out of the country and, nine months later, has not been charged with any crime. Imagine the same thing happening in the U.S.–an Iraqi embassy guard, drunk at a Christmas party in D.C., shooting a Secret Service agent guarding Vice President Cheney–and you can see some potential for how the firm’s Christmas tidings were not a happy one for U.S. efforts at winning hearts and minds.

2AC AT: Afghan Theatre DA- Link Turn

And, contractors undermine US efforts in Afghanistan

Kane 9 (Muriel, Washington Post Staff writer, *The Raw Story,* dec 2, http://rawstory.com/2009/12/army-times-triggerhappy-private-security-undermine-afghan-mission/ ) ET

According to one Afghan security official, private security guards have killed or wounded more than thirty civilians over the past four years in just the Marwand district, and the district chief there claims that "most of them are addicted to heroin." "Although the convoys sometimes carry U.S. military vehicles and represent a vital lifeline for the coalition effort," the Times explains, "no Afghan, U.S. or other coalition military forces accompany them. Instead, each convoy is protected by Afghan security guards armed with AK-series assault rifles and rocket-propelled grenades in sport utility vehicles." The problem is not new. A Congressional Research Service report (pdf) obtained last summer by Secrecy Times revealed that as of March 2009 there were more private contractors working in Afghanistan for the Department of Defense than there were US military personnel. The report further warned that "abuses and crimes committed by armed private security contractors and interrogators against local nationals may have undermined U.S. efforts in Iraq and Afghanistan."

And, PMCs put the US’s security interests at risk

Soder 10 (Brenda, June 18, Media Relations Director Joined Human Rights First, http://www.humanrightsfirst.org/media/usls/2010/alert/624/index.htm , *Human Rights First*) ET

"Private security contractors are being asked to function in active combat zones in ways that dangerously blur the line between civilians and the military. Consequently, contractors have continued to engage in hostile activity with minimal command, contractual, or judicial oversight. This has put other civilians, and America's security interests, at risk and contributed to a lack of political will to hold contractors accountable when they engage in criminal activity," said Human Rights First. The group went on to note that to correct this, the definition of what is an "inherently governmental" function should reflect a strong preference that contractors not engage in hostile activity. Contractors must also be held responsible by a robust and adequately-resourced judicial system when they commit crimes, and additional, credible, oversight must be exercised in the field.

Contractors make militaries’ job even more difficult

Lubold 10 (Gordon- Staff Writer, Feb 24, *Christian Science Monitor* , http://www.csmonitor.com/USA/Military/2010/0224/Blackwater-fallout-Senate-moves-to-rein-in-military-contractors ) ET

Even as US forces in Afghanistan operate under orders to protect Afghan civilians, erring on the side of caution and even holding their fire rather than risk harming them while fighting Taliban insurgents, concern is mounting that civilian contractors operate under a different set of rules – or simply don't follow the rules. “If we don’t fix the problems of oversight and make sure contractors like Blackwater play by the rules and live up to their commitments, we’ll be doing a disservice to our troops by making their already-difficult and dangerous job even more so,” said Sen. Carl Levin (D) of Michigan. Senator Levin, chairman of the Senate Armed Services Committee, takes up the topic at a hearing Wednesday.

And, contractors hurt our military through reckless behavior

Lubold 10 (Gordon- Staff Writer, Feb 24, *Christian Science Monitor* , http://www.csmonitor.com/USA/Military/2010/0224/Blackwater-fallout-Senate-moves-to-rein-in-military-contractors ) ET

“The behavior of private contractors has endangered our military, hurt relationships with foreign governments, and undermined our missions overseas,” said Rep. Jan Schakowsky (D) of Illinois, in introducing the Stop Outsourcing Security Act with Sen. Bernie Sanders (I) of Vermont. Tuesday. But the Senate hearing Wednesday will focus on incidents involving Blackwater, now known as Xe Services, and a sister firm, Paravant, that have given lawmakers pause.

2AC AT: Afghan Theatre DA- No Link

And, PMCs can’t do most things the military needs done, no link

Petersohn 9 (Ulrich, Fellow, *Weatherhead Center for International Affairs, Harvard University*, http://www.wcfia.harvard.edu/sites/default/files/Petersohn\_Outsourcing.pdf ) ET

This bottom line is implicitly reflected in DoD Instruction 3020.37, according to which essential functions can be outsourced to private hands. Essential functions are services provided by a contractor to support vital systems for which the military may not have the capabilities to perform and that impair or interrupt the effectiveness of defense systems or operations when not available immediately (DoD 3020.37, 2.1.3). Indirectly it can be inferred that vital systems cannot be outsourced. The instruction defines the following functions as vital: “Command, control, communications, and intelligence (C3I) systems, including tactical and strategic information, intelligence collection, and computer subsystems. Selected operational weapons systems … and [o]perational logistics support … medical services, noncombatant evacuation activities…” (DoD 3020.37, 2.1.6).

2AC AT: Afghan Theatre DA- No Link

Contractors undermine the credibility and effectiveness- they aren’t any help to the military or the war

Schwartz 9 ( Moshe, specialist in defense acquisition, *Congressional Research Service*, Dec 14, http://www.fas.org/sgp/crs/natsec/R40764.pdf ) ET

Given the critical role contractors are playing in supporting military operations and the billions of dollars DOD spends on contractors, the ability of the operational force to manage and oversee contractors has become increasingly important. Poor contract management can lead to troops not receiving needed support and the wasteful spending of billions of dollars.11 A lack of effective contractor management can even undermine the credibility and effectiveness of the U.S. military. For example, according to an Army investigative report, a lack of good contractor surveillance at Abu Ghraib prison contributed to fostering a permissive environment in which prisoner abuses took place.12 Many observers believe that the fallout from Abu Ghraib and other incidents, such as the shooting of Iraqi civilians by private security contractors hired by the United States government, have hurt the credibility of the U.S. military and undermined efforts in Iraq.

No link- analysts debate over whether or not contractors matter or not

Schwartz 9 ( Moshe, specialist in defense acquisition, *Congressional Research Service*, Dec 14, pg 17, http://www.fas.org/sgp/crs/natsec/R40764.pdf ) ET

Some analysts argue that the extent to which contractors are addressed in doctrine that is not specifically aimed at contracting issues, such as the Quadrennial Defense Review and field manual on operations, reflects the extent to which DOD incorporates contracting into the overall culture of the military. Other analysts argue that more appropriate publications to determine the extent to which contractors are incorporated into doctrine are the operational and tactical level Field Manual on Operations In February 2008, the Army updated Field Manual (FM) 3-0, Operations, the first update since September 11, 2001

.and, congressional report says they aren’t significant

Schwartz 9 ( Moshe, specialist in defense acquisition, *Congressional Research Service*, Dec 14, pg 17, http://www.fas.org/sgp/crs/natsec/R40764.pdf ) ET

 In 200 pages, the combined discussion on contractors consists of less than a page. The most extensive discussion, found in the section on Interagency Coordination and Cooperation with Other Organizations, states, in toto, A contractor is a person or business that provides products or services for monetary compensation. A contractor furnishes supplies and services or performs work at a certain price or rate based on the terms of a contract (FM 3-100.21). Contracted support often includes traditional goods and services support but may include interpreter communications, infrastructure, and other related support. In military operations, contractors may provide life support, construction and engineering support, weapons system support, security, other technical services (FM 3-100.21 contains doctrine for contractors accompanying deployed forces). There are other isolated references to contractors or contracting, but most analysts consider that these references provide little actual guidance. For example, one mention of contracting states “the Army identifies technical matters, such as network operations or contracting, and assigns responsibilities for them to an appropriate organization.

2AC AT: Politics- Obama Good- No Link

Contractors are used to dodge political backlash- no one would perceive plan

Singer 7 (Peter, senior fellow at the Brookings Institution, *Harpers Magazine*, Sept 3,7, http://harpers.org/archive/2007/09/hbc-90001311)

. One of your first conclusions is that by using military contractors, policymakers “dodge key decisions that carry political costs, thus leading to operational choices that might not reflect the public interest.” Moving away from the operations in Iraq which are more immediately topical, security contractors have been pushed as surrogates for uniformed military as peacekeepers in Darfur, Liberia, Sierra Leone, and a variety of other circumstances. A Marine general recently told me that he was concerned that the heavy reliance on contractors might allow policymakers to ease into a foreign conflict in a way that avoided Congressional scrutiny and oversight. Do you agree that this is a realistic concern? Yes, and I wouldn’t use the word “might,” as if it were a future scenario. Contractors have already been used in all sorts of operations, in both an overt (Iraq, Balkans) and covert (Colombia, Sudan), manner to get around certain political consequences or congressional restrictions.

Contractors are used to avoid political controversy- plan goes under the radar

Singer 7 (Peter, senior fellow at the Brookings Institution, *Harpers Magazine*, Sept 3,7, http://harpers.org/archive/2007/09/hbc-90001311)

When the U.S. military shifted to an all-volunteer, professional force in the wake of the Vietnam War, military leaders set up a series of organization “tripwires” to preserve the tie between the nation’s foreign policy decisions and local communities. Led by then-Army Chief of Staff General Creighton Abrams (1972-74), they wanted to ensure that the military would not go to war without the sufficient backing and involvement of the nation. Much like a call center moved to India, this “Abrams Doctrine” has been outsourced. Instead, contractors offer the means for choices to be dodged at the onset of deployment, and for scrutiny and public concern to be lessened after deployment. Your home-front does not get as involved when its contractors are being called up and deployed, nor do the people there ask key questions when contractors are lost. Over 1,000 have been killed in Iraq and 13,000 wounded, but they are not counted on official Department of Defense reports. In turn, if you want to go to a non-Iraq example, where is the concern over the three American contractors still held captive by the FARC in Colombia today? Imagine if we had three soldiers as POWs instead.

And, contractors aren’t perceived by even the media – no link

Singer 7 (Peter, senior fellow at the Brookings Institution, *Harpers Magazine*, Sept 3,7, http://harpers.org/archive/2007/09/hbc-90001311)

In addition, your media also becomes less likely to cover the story when contractors are involved. One quarter of one percent of all news stories out of Iraq mention contractors. This new option is obviously greatly appealing to executive branch policymakers, but the underlying premise of the Abrams Doctrine was that, if a military operation could not garner public support of the level needed to involve the full nation, then maybe it shouldn’t happen in the first place.

\*\*2AC AT: Politics- Obama Good\*\*

2AC AT: Politics- Obama Bad

PMC’s popular- plan incites political attack on the war

Boemcken 3 ( Marc Von,  BICC's Project Leader in the field of arms, *Peace and Conflict Monitor*, Dec 13) ET

Maybe the figure will be even much higher. With an incessantly rising body count of US soldiers in Iraq paralleled by a growing unpopularity of the Bush administration, the prospect of further accelerating the privatization of military tasks in the Gulf may appear to behold some distinct advantages. Outsourcing the provision of security in Iraq to private companies could give the US government a much-needed exit-strategy, thus avoiding a strenuous entanglement of American soldiers. The death of private employees generally attracts a lot less media attention than the killing of soldiers wearing US uniforms (see Yeoman, 2003). Indeed, given the approaching presidential elections, such concerns are likely to be high on the administration's agenda. In particular, PMCs can be expected to be heavily involved in Iraqi security sector reform. Halliburton's contract in Iraq has already been extended to January 2004 (Margasak, 2003). And the controversial company DynCorp, which was allegedly implicated in the sex and arms trade on the Balkans and is presently also providing close protection for Afghan President Hamid Karzai, was tasked to train the Iraqi police force. More contracts of a similar nature are likely to follow suit in due course. Other corporate consultants are reportedly going to facilitate the build-up of the new Iraqi military (Singer, 2003b). Moreover, in the long run, the increasing employment of PMCs by the Pentagon could considerably lessen the United States' inhibitions concerning the use of force in many other areas of the world, since the political risks associated with such operations are much lower.

PMC’s popular- shields the war effort from public disapproval

**Singer 7** (Peter, director of defense at the Brookings Institute, *Stimson Center*, Nov 19) ET

In Iraq, PMCs have been achieving critical mission goals, but their effect on the overall mission has been negative, for several reasons. Like a steroid, a ready supply of PMCs has allowed the U.S. military to lift weights it wouldn’t have been able to lift otherwise, enabling military commitments that might not receive the same level of support if soldiers were used instead. In effect, policymakers can avoid politically unpopular troop deployments by supplementing the force with PMCs much less visible to the American public. The ability to avoid difficult choices and political costs makes for bad policy decisions

PMC’s popular- no one cares how many of them die

Singer 5 (Peter, fellow and director of the Project on U.S. Policy Towards the Islamic World at the Brookings Institution's, mar 22, *PBS Frontline*) ET

It's really been about political cost savings. It's been about avoiding the hard choices that come with deploying military forces. And the way to look at this is the counterfactuals: What would we have done otherwise? We would have either had to expand the regular force -- it would have had to either be with regular forces, or it would have had to be with Reserves. That's also politically unpopular, because that's more families that are upset, brunt of the war, etc. Also takes place within a presidential campaign season. Or we would have had to have brought in allies. Well, that's difficult, because you would have had to make political compromises with those allies that we weren't willing to make. Or you bring in contractors. And by the way, contractors come with the extra positive externality from the perspective of the client here that if contractors are killed, wounded or go missing, they don't go on the public rolls.

2AC AT: Politics- Obama Bad A2: Military Hates them

And, doesn’t matter if the military hates them- they will have to cooperate anyway

Kwok 6 (James, Sr Editor @ Harvard Review, Spring 6, *Soviet Legacies* vol 28) ET

Finally, it is more important than ever to formalize the military-PMC relationship. The two groups must find a way to make their relationship a productive and responsible one. Firstly, there needs to be a close dialogue between PMCs and the military. Talks concerning cooperation between the national military and private security companies are currently underway. This is especially crucial when very important persons are passing over an area that the military does not deem secure. The US Government Accountability Office (GAO) report cites one example in which PMC personnel escorted a CPA administrator into the middle of a military operation in Najaf. As a result, the military diverted personnel from the operation in order to assist the CPA administrator, who subsequently came under attack. Even though a number of Reconstruction Operations Centers are spread throughout Iraq to coordinate between military troops and PMCs, more official and institutionalized communication between PMCs and the military is crucial. If an adequate flow of information between the two parties is achieved, this may reduce collateral damage and enable PMC personnel to avoid direct combat in carrying out their security duties.

2AC AT: Politics- Obama Good

PMC’s cause wide resentment in the army

Singer 5 (Peter, fellow and director of the Project on U.S. Policy Towards the Islamic World at the Brookings Institution's, mar 22, *PBS Frontline*) ET

How much of a debate is there inside the military over whether or not the participation of private contractors is appropriate or not? ... [I]n the mid-90s, it was, "Well, we're not comfortable with it, but we need these guys." And that was because they were in roles like logistics, and the military was being downsized at the moment. And there's kind of a "What are we going to do?" attitude. Iraq, though, has really brought it to a head, and you're starting to sense a backlash from the military. There's still that sense of "We are overstretched, and what would happen if they weren't there?" But there's also a bubbling resentment in terms of these guys are in roles that are inappropriate, be it -- you know, you had military interrogators getting quite upset that we had contract military interrogators at Abu Ghraib prison. It was not only sort of a professional issue, but also for these guys, that was the Super Bowl, and someone else was invited to go do it. You've got soldiers in the field who are uncomfortable with being out there, and then having a bunch of contractors drive through who are also armed, but outside the chain of command. So you're a military officer, and you're responsible for a sector, and yet you've got armed units coming through your sector, getting into all sorts of trouble that would happen in this kind of area, and they're not part of your chain of command, and that you can't order them to do anything. You don't know if something goes wrong with them, but you do know that you're obligated to go out and rescue them, even though they're not part of it.

And, PMC’s anger the military- lack of regulation

Kwok 6 (James, Sr Editor @ Harvard Review, Spring 6, *Soviet Legacies* vol 28) ET

In the case of PMC involvement in Iraq, holding employees of PMCs accountable for their actions proved difficult for the Coalition Provisional Authority (CPA) because of CPA Order 17, which stipulated that “contractors [including PMCs] shall be immune from the Iraqi legal process with respect to acts performed by them pursuant to the terms and conditions of a contract or any sub-contract thereto.” Since the termination of the CPA, Iraqi efforts to keep a closer watch on PMCs have proved difficult. In May 2005, erstwhile Deputy Interior Minister Adnan Asadi sent a letter to PMCs operating in Iraq, warning the companies that if they continued to disobey local laws, “the cancellation [of PMC licenses] will be circulated to all state offices, with the aim of shunning any dealing with [PMCs].” However, such threats have often been disregarded; the Washington Post reported in September 2005 that Iraqi citizen Ali Ismail was shot at by PMCs while in traffic. It therefore seems clear that it is a duty of the US government as well as the Iraqi government to rein in the PMCs.

How Do We Regulate PMCs in Iraq?

Contractors disable the military- they hate them

Khan 2 (Mafruza, Associate Director of Corporate Research Project ,*Good Jobs First*, 17 Dec) ET

Other unresolved issues include the specific obligations of private contractors in times of combat. Experts agree that private contractors are not obligated to take orders or to follow military codes of conduct, since a contractor is bound by contract, not by oath. One suggested solution is to have contractors sign pledges to stay in the battlefield. But according to a legal opinion cited in an Army study, such agreements cannot be enforced, since it would constitute involuntary servitude. Nor are contractors subject to the Uniform Code of Military Justice. Equally ambiguous is the question of who protects contractors in combat and who exactly is in charge of them. According to a November 2, 2002 U.S. News and World Report article, the Army has ordered an about face in the use of battlefield contractors. The article also reported that a series of exercises run by the Joint Staff showed that contractors make the military more visible to its enemies, require more troops for force protection, and require backup plans if contractors default.

2AC AT: Politics- Obama Good

(needs army – powerful lobby)

Contractors are unpopular- hurt our war effort

Singer 7 (P.W. Senior Fellow and Director of the 21st Century Defense Initiative at the Brookings Institution, *Salon*) ET

The effort in Iraq is just one theater within a larger effort against extremist forces, in which the "war of ideas" is the critical battleground. The global war on terrorism is not a traditional military conflict made up of set-piece battles, but rather made up of a series of small wars and insurgencies in places ranging from Iraq and Afghanistan to Pakistan and Egypt, where the U.S. must sway a broader population from hostility to support if it ever wants to oust terror cells and shut down recruiting pipelines. As the newly revised foreword to the famous U.S. Marine Corps Small Wars manual notes, "Small wars are battles of ideas and battles for the perceptions and attitudes of target populations." Within these wars, it is non-kinetic tools (as opposed to fielded weaponry) that make up "the fire and maneuvers of small wars. They frequently are the main effort simply because of the criticality of the functions they perform." Unfortunately, here again contractors have proven to be a drag on efforts to explain and justify the already highly unpopular U.S. effort in Iraq.

And, Dyncorp makes PMCs unpopular

Khan 2 (Mafruza, Associate Director of Corporate Research Project ,*Good Jobs First*, 17 Dec) ET

The issue of accountability extends beyond the boundaries of the battlefield. For example, DynCorp has been the subject of unflattering coverage in the U.S. and British press after being caught in a scandal in 2000 when two employees deployed on the company's $15 million annual contract in Bosnia and Kosovo alleged that several of their colleagues had colluded in the business of prostitution of women and children. The company fired the whistleblowers, who sued the company for wrongful dismissal. In late November, DynCorp was ordered by an employment tribunal in Britain to pay one of the former employee 111,000 pounds as compensation. The other suit was settled out of court. As employees of a company, rather than the U.S. government/military, the accused were able to avoid trial by a military court.

And, congress doesn’t like PMC’s- they’ve introduced legislation to get rid of them before

Horowitz 8 (Jake, center's sentencing and corrections initiative, the Public Safety Performance Project, *Human Rights*) ET

Last week, two trailblazers in Congress, Rep. Jan Schakowsky (D - IL) and Sen. Bernie Sanders (D - VT) introduced the Stop Outsourcing Our Security Act, a bill aimed at rolling back the use of private military contractors in warfare. Almost every week, scandals are emerging over the presence of private military contractors - like Blackwater (now called Xe Services LLC) - in Afghanistan, Iraq, and Pakistan. Recent news that Blackwater billed the government for prostitution is just the latest in a series of damaging revelations, highlighted by Blackwater's massacre of 17 unarmed Iraqi civilians at Nisour Square in September 2007.

2AC AT: Politics- Obama Good- Blackwater changed

Blackwater changed public opinion

Singer 7 (P.W. Senior Fellow and Director of the 21st Century Defense Initiative at the Brookings Institution, *Salon*) ET

WASHINGTON -- On Sept. 16, 2007, a convoy of Blackwater contractors guarding State Department employees entered a crowded square near the Mansour district in Baghdad, Iraq. But versions of what caused the ensuing bloodshed diverge. Employees from the firm claim they were attacked by gunmen and responded within the rules of engagement, fighting their way out of the square after one of their vehicles was disabled. Iraqi police and witnesses instead report that the contractors opened fire first, shooting at a small car driven by a couple with their child that did not get out of the convoy's way as traffic slowed. At some point in the 20-minute gunfight, Iraqi police and army forces stationed in watchtowers above the square also began firing. Other Iraqi security forces and Blackwater quick-reaction forces soon reportedly joined the battle. There are also reports that one Blackwater employee may even have pointed his weapon at his fellow contractors, in an effort to get them to cease firing. Since then, the Iraqi and U.S. governments have launched separate investigations, likely ensuring that the differing versions of the story will never meet. The only thing agreed upon is the consequences: After a reported 20 Iraqi civilians were killed, including the couple and their child, who was subsequently burned to the mother's body after the car caught fire, the Iraqi government and populace exploded with anger.

And, Capitol hill hates PMC’s- Blackwater changed perception

Singer 7 (P.W. Senior Fellow and Director of the 21st Century Defense Initiative at the Brookings Institution, *Salon*) ET

WASHINGTON Iraqi Prime Minister Nouri al-Maliki called the killings a crime, announcing that his government was pulling Blackwater's license to operate in Iraq and would prosecute any foreign contractors found to have been involved in the killings. But there were two problems: Despite its mission of guarding U.S. officials in Iraq, Blackwater had no license with the Iraqi government. Secondly, the murky legal status of the contractors meant they might be considered exempt from Iraqi law because of a mandate left over from the Coalition Provisional Authority, the U.S. governing authority in Iraq that was dissolved more than two years prior. The Blackwater mess has roiled Capitol Hill and shined light on the many questions surrounding the legal status, management, oversight and accountability of the private military force in Iraq, which numbers more than 160,000 -- at least as many as the total number of uniformed American forces there. The debate will heat up again Tuesday with hearings by the House Oversight and Government Reform Committee led by Democratic Rep. Henry Waxman of California. The problem is, some of the most critical questions may yet go unasked.

2AC AT: Politics- Obama Good- State Dep

And, the state department doesn’t want PMC’s to be public- want to be shielded from blame

Singer 7 (P.W. Senior Fellow and Director of the 21st Century Defense Initiative at the Brookings Institution, *Salon*) ET

On Tuesday, among those testifying on Capitol Hill will be Erik Prince, the chairman and owner of Blackwater, as well as a series of State Department officials who were supposed to have overseen the firm's activities. We can expect that Prince will wrap himself in the flag, discussing all the vital missions that Blackwater conducts in Iraq, while downplaying the recent killings. State Department officials are likely to say that they had no other option but to use the firm, given their lack of Diplomatic Security forces -- conveniently ignoring that the department has chosen to hollow out its Diplomatic Security corps and instead hand over the task to a consortium of private firms led by Blackwater under a multibillion-dollar contract.Waxman's committee, which has already been focused on politically connected companies and contracting corruption in Iraq, has disclosed a series of documents in recent days that reveal some dark patterns with Blackwater. The documents appear to show that the firm cut corners that may have contributed to employee deaths, it may have tried to have documents classified in order to cover up corporate failures, and the State Department's own inspector general may have tried to impede investigations into Blackwater, including threatening to fire any of his inspectors who cooperated with Congress. Prince will take his shots, and State officials will point to new investigations they are now launching to try to mollify congressional anger. But regardless of whether the Blackwater contractors were justified in the shooting, whether there was proper jurisdiction to ensure accountability, or even whether using firms like Blackwater saves money (the data shows it does not), there is an underlying problem that everyone is ignoring.

2AC AT: Politics- Obama Good- Bipartisan

And, blackwater proves PMC’s are politically unpopular with both democrats and republican-see them as just another wasted resource on the war effort

 Brownfeld 4 (Peter, a writer and editor at the American Enterprise Institute, *Fox News*, Apr 18-4, http://www.foxnews.com/story/0,2933,117235,00.html ) ET

In this case, too, one question is whether prosecutors felt they could get away with such abusive behavior because Blackwater was such a politically unpopular defendant. The firm had political ties to Republicans, and Democrats and their media allies had made Blackwater a whipping boy to further undermine public support for the Iraq war. (Blackwater is now renamed Xe Services and no longer contracting in Iraq.)

2AC AT: Politics- Obama Good- Cost

And, Contractors cost a lot more –plan would be politically popular

Weinter 6 (Rebecca- , *Belfer Center for Science and International Affairs, Harvard Kennedy School*, http://belfercenter.ksg.harvard.edu/publication/19402/private\_military\_contractors\_come\_with\_strings\_attached.html Winter ,2005-06) ET

On the other hand, as corporations, PSFs possess the leverage of private-sector mechanisms for structuring incentives. While even the most elite soldiers are compensated like mid-level bureaucrats, contractors are compensated like management consultants. The effect has been to cannibalize the military's labor pool-in particular the top echelon. Lured by salary increases of up to 400 percent, hundreds of soldiers have decided not to re-enlist but to "go private," adding to the resentment of the less-compensated and increasingly shorthanded force they leave behind. The Army has recently resorted to offering bonuses of up to $150,000 as incentive for soldiers to stay. Finally, there is the Pentagon's preference for "cost-plus" contracts, which treat PSFs as if they are on retainer-they respond quickly when they are needed, provide the service desired, and bill after the fact for the costs outlaid, adding a fixed award on top. The result encourages neither cost-cutting nor enhanced performance. The rationale for using this form of contract is efficiency: it allows PSFs to provide surge capacity. However, when the surge turns out to be chronic and constant, this logic should be re-examined.

2AC AT: Politics- Obama Good- Collins

And Collins opposes contractors- KBR (one of the biggest contractors) controversy proves

Bloomberg 10 ( *Bloomberg Business week,* May 6-10, http://www.businessweek.com/news/2010-05-06/kbr-to-get-no-bid-army-work-as-u-s-alleges-kickbacks-update1-.html) ET

KBR’s no-bid work order drew criticism from Congress even before it was announced. Senator Claire McCaskill, the Missouri Democrat who heads a subcommittee that oversees military contracting, and the panel’s ranking Republican, Susan Collins of Maine, wrote to Defense Secretary Robert Gates on April 30 urging the Army against “continued reliance” on KBR in light of the Justice Department’s April lawsuit. Under the new competitive-bid approach, KBR on March 2 won a one-year, $571 million contract with four option years that, if exercised, could be worth as much as $2.77 billion. That contract calls for KBR to provide services including transportation and postal operations. DynCorp initially protested the award and then dropped its objections.

Collins likes regulation of PMC’s- rape amendment proves

Make a difference 9 ( *Care2MakeADifference*, http://www.care2.com/causes/womens-rights/blog/republicans-for-rape/ ) ET

Yesterday, senators opposed an amendment to the Defense Appropriations bill that would prohibit federal defense contractors like Halliburton/KBR from getting money "if they restrict their employees from taking workplace sexual assault, battery and discrimination cases to court." In other words, 30 GOP senators want to deny rape victims their day in court. Think Progress has the story of the woman who prompted this amendment:

In 2005, Jamie Leigh Jones was gang-raped by her co-workers while she was working for Halliburton/KBR in Baghdad. She was detained in a shipping container for at least 24 hours without food, water, or a bed, and "warned her that if she left Iraq for medical treatment, she’d be out of a job." (Jones was not an isolated case.) Jones was prevented from bringing charges in court against KBR because her employment contract stipulated that sexual assault allegations would only be heard in private arbitration. Senator Al Franken introduced the amendment to the appropriations bill last week to prevent such complete disregard for the rights of rape victims. Nine senators (Mary Landrieu, Benjamin Cardin, Amy Klobuchar, John Kerry, Jeff Merkley, Bill NElson, Dianne Feinstein, Sherrod Brown and Jeanne Shaheen) joined Franken in cosponsoring the bill -- and it passed with 10 GOP senators supporting it after a passionate speech from Franken:All four Republican women (Susan Collins, Kay Bailey Hutchison, Lisa Murkowski and Olympia Snowe) voted for the amendment, and they were joined by Bob Bennett, Orrin Hatch, Chuck Grassley, George LeMieux, Dick Lugar and George Voinovich. These GOP senators deserve our thanks for truly embracing bipartisanship to vote for a bill that is clearly a good idea

2AC AT: Politics- Obama Good- Congress

Congress thinks that regulations are not harsh enough- they would support plan

Falconer 7 (Bruce, Washington bureau reporter, *Mother Jones*, Dec 19, http://motherjones.com/mojo/2007/12/congress-looks-tighten-military-contractor-accountability ) ET

As KBR employees working on contract for the U.S. Army, Jones' attackers are almost certainly covered under the Military Extraterritorial Jurisdiction Act, more simply known as MEJA, which subjects all civilians working abroad with U.S. armed forces to a defined legal code. But in today's hearing, several members of Congress drew attention to loopholes in the law, which may have enabled certain contractors to escape punishment for serious crimes. One obvious example involves the Blackwater contractors involved in the September 16 shooting in Baghdad's Nisoor Square, which left 17 Iraqi civilians dead and another 24 wounded; the shooters were in Iraq under a State Department contract and therefore may not be prosecuted under current MEJA regulations.In Jones' case, MEJA seems to have fallen short for a different reason: a lack of investigative muscle in the Green Zone. According to Poe, the Department of Justice lacks investigators in Baghdad with responsibility for looking into crimes committed by private contractors against their own. Horton agreed, saying that the Justice Department "is effectively not present on the scene, does not have personnel deployed charged with conducting investigations, collecting evidence, and making preliminary decisions as to whether incidents are suitable for prosecution. This would require a team of FBI agents with appropriate training, including access to forensic labs and personnel."

And the house has tried to pass regulations of contractors before- they would support the plan

Falconer 7 (Bruce, Washington bureau reporter, *Mother Jones*, Dec 19, http://motherjones.com/mojo/2007/12/congress-looks-tighten-military-contractor-accountability ) ET

Shortcomings in the current law stand to be closed by an amendment to MEJA, sponsored by Rep. David Price (D-N.C.). The bill, approved by the House and now awaiting consideration by the Senate, would bring all civilians, no matter their contracting agency, under MEJA's umbrella. More relevant to the Jones case, it would require the FBI to create "Theater Investigative Units" to look into civilian crimes and would mandate an annual FBI report to Congress, detailing the number of contractor-related complaints received, the number of cases referred to the attorney general for prosecution, and any recommended changes to the law that would better enable investigators to do their jobs. For its part, the Justice Department refused to send a witness to today's hearing despite being invited to do so, claiming that Jones' case remains under investigation. Subcommittee members questioned the pace of the department's efforts, suggesting that official inattention has allowed KBR to sweep things under the rug. Near the end of the hearing, Rep. Dan Lungren (R-Calif.) seemed to speak for both sides of the aisle when he said, "There's something rotten, and we better take care of it."

And, lack of transparency frustrates Congress- plan would be popular

Lendman 10 (Stever, MA @ Harvard, *Steve Lendman Blog*, jan 19-10) ET

In April 2003, the initiative stalled when White resigned, among other reasons for a lack of basic information required to effectively manage a growing PMC force, then estimated to be between 124,000 - 605,000 workers. Today, more precise figures are known and for what functions, but a lack of transparency and oversight makes it impossible for the public, Congress, the administration, or others in government to assess them with regard to cost, effectiveness, their services, whether government or business should perform them, and their effect on the nation for good or ill, with strong evidence of the latter.

2AC AT: Politics- Obama Good- Democrats

And, Reed has always wanted to regulate contractors- his leadership would mean plan is a win

Brownfeld 4 (Peter, a writer and editor at the American Enterprise Institute, *Fox News*, Apr 18-4, http://www.foxnews.com/story/0,2933,117235,00.html ) ET

There are a lot of questions that need to be answered before we continue to outsource these positions," said Nadeam Elshami, spokesman for Rep. Jan Schakowsky (search), D-Ill. Critics say these hired guns, who draw salaries two, three or four times higher than soldiers, are used to avoid the politically sensitive implications of having to send more American troops. In Iraq, 15,000 or more armed contractors provide security and thousands of others work as engineers, truck drivers, cooks, etc. The proliferation of these contractors has been highlighted by the recent brutal killing in Fallujah of four men employed by Blackwater U.S.A. (search) as well as the execution Wednesday of an Italian contractor. Sen. Jack Reed, D-R.I., has been a leading critic of the way these contractors are used. "I think we have to regulate these contractors. We have to know who is there and what they're doing not only for their own protection, but also so our military can coordinate effectively," Reed told Fox News.

And, democrats will only support PMCs if they become regulated- plan key to Dem support

Brownfeld 4 (Peter, a writer and editor at the American Enterprise Institute, *Fox News*, Apr 18-4, http://www.foxnews.com/story/0,2933,117235,00.html ) ET

 He acknowledged that the contractors relieve some of the burden from the military, but he said they need to be better accounted for. Calling it "almost a unique situation," Reed said, "this is in many respects a large paramilitary force." Last week, a group of Democratic senators, including Reed, expressed their concerns in a letter to Secretary of Defense Donald Rumsfeld (search). "It would be a dangerous precedent if the United States allowed the presence of private armies operating outside the control of governmental authority and beholden only to those who pay them. In the context of Iraq, unless these forces are properly screened by United States' authorities and are required to operate under clear guidelines and appropriate supervision, their presence will contribute to Iraqi resentment.

And, democratic leaders have empirically not likes PMC’s – Plan would be popular with dems

Brownfeld 4 (Peter, a writer and editor at the American Enterprise Institute, *Fox News*, Apr 18-4, http://www.foxnews.com/story/0,2933,117235,00.html ) ET

The presence and number of these private security personnel again raise the question of the adequacy of United States troop levels in Iraq," the senators wrote. The 13 Democratic senators, including Minority Leader Tom Daschle (search) and Carl Levin, the ranking member on the Armed Services Committee, called on Rumsfeld to provide a tally of the armed non-Iraqi security personnel in Iraq. They also asked that the Defense Department adopt written guidelines, "including the legal justifications for their use, both now and after June 30, 2004; the rules of engagement for these contractors; and the lines of coordination among U.S. military forces, the Coalition Provisional Authority (and after June 30th, the sovereign Iraqi entity) and the contractor community." On the House side, Schakowsky questioned why the military needs to pay some contractors $100,000 or more while many American soldiers are getting paid half or a third of that.

2AC AT: Politics- Obama Good- DOD

And, DOD officials think there are too many contractors- plan is popular

Scahill 7 (Jeremy, Puffin Foundation Writing Fellow at The Nation Institute, is the author of the bestselling Blackwater, *The Independent,* Aug 10, http://www.uruknet.info/?p=35239 ) ET

These services are provided through companies like KBR and Fluor and through their vast labyrinth of subcontractors. But many other private personnel are also engaged in armed combat and "security" operations. They interrogate prisoners, gather intelligence, operate rendition flights, protect senior occupation officials and, in at least one case, have commanded U.S. and international troops in battle. In a revealing admission, Gen. David Petraeus, who is overseeing Bush’s troop "surge," said earlier this year that he has, at times, been guarded in Iraq by "contract security." At least three U.S. commanding generals, not including Petraeus, are currently being guarded in Iraq by hired guns. "To have half of your army be contractors, I don’t know that there’s a precedent for that," says Rep. Dennis Kucinich (D-Ohio), a member of the House Oversight and Government Reform Committee, which has been investigating war contractors.

2AC AT: Politics- Obama Good- Empirics

And, Congress has empirically tried to regulate PMC’s- they just didn’t have bush’s backing- plan would be win in congress

Yahoo News 7( posted on military photos.net, http://www.militaryphotos.net/forums/showthread.php?121294-House-OKs-bill-to-prosecute-PMCs&p=2798026&viewfull=1, 10/4/7) ET

The House passed a bill Thursday that would make all private contractors working in Iraq and other combat zones subject to prosecution by U.S. courts. It was the first major legislation of its kind to pass since a deadly shootout last month involving Blackwater employees. Democrats called the 389-30 vote an indictment of the shooting incident there that left 11 Iraqis dead. Senate Democratic leaders said they planned to follow suit with similar legislation and send a bill to President Bush as soon as possible. There is simply no excuse for the de facto legal immunity for tens of thousands of individuals working in countries" on behalf of the United States, said Rep. Sheila Jackson-Lee, D-Texas. The FBI is currently leading an investigation into the Sept. 16 shootout, although administration officials acknowledge they are unsure whether U.S. courts would have jurisdiction in the case or others like it. In a separate incident, a drunk Blackwater employee left a Christmas eve party in Baghdad and fatally shot the guard of one of Iraq's vice presidents. That contractor was fired, fined and returned home to the United States, but no charges have been filed.

And, past laws to regulated PMCs were supported- this one would be too

Yahoo News 7( posted on military photos.net, http://www.militaryphotos.net/forums/showthread.php?121294-House-OKs-bill-to-prosecute-PMCs&p=2798026&viewfull=1, 10/4/7) ET

The current law, called the Military Extraterritorial Jurisdiction Act, covers personnel supporting the mission of Defense Department operations overseas. But because Blackwater's primary mission is to protect State Department officials, defense lawyers would likely argue that the law doesn't apply. At the same time, all U.S. contractors are immune from prosecution by Iraqi courts. The bill's passage came on the same day that a government minister told The Associated Press that the official Iraqi investigation said Blackwater security guards involved in the September incident face trial in Iraqi courts and the company should pay compensation to the victims. The White House and congressional Republicans said they support the intent of the bill, but thought it was drafted poorly.

Congress supports regulation of PMCs- they are frustrated by inability to punish bad behavior

Yahoo News 7( posted on military photos.net, http://www.militaryphotos.net/forums/showthread.php?121294-House-OKs-bill-to-prosecute-PMCs&p=2798026&viewfull=1, 10/4/7) ET

" Rep. David Price, who sponsored the bill, said the White House's objections were unfounded and "should infuriate anyone who believes in the rule of law." Blackwater founder Erik Prince told a House panel Tuesday that he supports expanding the law. "Beyond firing him for breaking the rules, withholding any funds we can, we can't flog him," Prince said of the intoxicated Blackwater guard. "We can't incarcerate him. We can't do anything beyond that."

And, plan is popular with congress- they don’t want another backwater

Yahoo News 7( posted on military photos.net, http://www.militaryphotos.net/forums/showthread.php?121294-House-OKs-bill-to-prosecute-PMCs&p=2798026&viewfull=1, 10/4/7) ET

FBI agents will take control of the Sept. 16 probe from the State Department's Bureau of Diplomatic Security as soon as a full team has been assembled in the Iraqi capital, State Department spokesman Sean McCormack told reporters on Thursday. McCormack stressed that the step did not necessarily imply that the investigation would result in criminal charges being brought against the contractors. Under the State Department's contract with Blackwater, the company's guard's would have provided security for the FBI team while in Iraq. But FBI spokesman John Miller said the team will rely on U.S. government personnel "to avoid even the appearance of any conflict."

2AC AT: Politics- Obama Good- Empirics

And, PMC’s unpopular- empirics

Lendman 10 (Stever, MA @ Harvard, *Steve Lendman Blog*, jan 19-10) ET

Called various names, including mercenaries, soldiers of fortune, dogs of war, and Condottieri for wealthy city states in Renaissance Italy, employing them goes back centuries. In 13th century BC Egypt, Rameses II used thousands of them in battle. Ancient Greeks and Romans also used them. So didn't Alexander the Great, feudal lords in the Middle Ages, popes since 1506, Napoleon, and George Washington against the British in America's war of independence even though by the early 18th century western states enacted laws prohibiting their citizens from bearing arms for other nations. Although the practice continued sporadically, until more recently, private armies fell out of favor.

2AC AT: Politics- Obama Bad- Empiric

And plan unpopular- it was introduced in 2007 and failed

Lendman 10 (Stever, MA @ Harvard, *Steve Lendman Blog*, http://sjlendman.blogspot.com/2010/01/outsourcing-war-rise-of-private.html ,jan 19-10) ET

Originally introduced in 2007 but not passed, Schakowsky says: "The legislation would prohibit the use of private contractors for military, security, law enforcement, intelligence, and armed rescue functions unless the President tells Congress why the military is unable to perform those functions. It would also increase transparency over any remaining security contracts by increasing reporting requirements and giving Congress access to details about large contracts."Meanwhile on January 12, 2010, a coalition of groups opposed to Blackwater called on Congress to investigate why criminal charges against the company were dismissed on grounds of prosecutorial misconduct. They also want to "pull the funding on war profiteers like Blackwater (and) stop them for good." It's a tall order given how entrenched they are and expanding. In Haiti, for example, reports say Blackwater is there providing security, an indication perhaps of more contingents to follow, from them and other armed contractors, "authorized to commit violence in the name of their employers."

2AC AT: Politics- Obama Good- General

And, Capitol Hill is already putting contractors on the chopping block- plan is popular

Ackerman 9 (Spencer, sr reporter of Washington independent, *The Washington Independent, http://washingtonindependent.com/37246/defense-contractors-angered-by-gates-budget-strategy* 4-3-9) ET

Still, Guardiano’s op-ed was indicative of two facts that remain salient as Gates is expected to deliver the substance of his long-awaited Pentagon budget to the White House next week. First, defense contractors and their Capitol Hill allies are alarmed at how Gates has shut them out of the the decision-making process about the Pentagon budget as he has publicly warned, in vague terms, about making “hard choices” that will place defense systems and weapons programs beloved by the armed services and their contractors on the chopping block. And second, Gates has adopted a strategy for his budget that presumes that most of the defense industry is an obstacle at best and an adversary at worst.

And, even those who work for contractors find the corruption leading to PMC funding bad- un-regulation is unpopular

Ackerman 9 (Spencer, sr reporter of Washington independent, *The Washington Independent, http://washingtonindependent.com/37246/defense-contractors-angered-by-gates-budget-strategy* 4-3-9) ET

On Monday, an Iraq veteran named John Guardiano took to the right-leaning op-ed page of The Washington Examiner, a free daily paper in the district, to inveigh against the “Secret Defense Budget Tribunals” of Pentagon chief Bob Gates. Guardiano, troubled by the unusual steps taken by Gates to hold the details of his fiscal-2010 budget close to the vest, compared Gates’ efforts to the ill-fated efforts of then-first lady Hillary Rodham Clinton to construct a universal health-care regime in secret that ended in 1994. Needless to say, he disapproved. “Democracy can be messy and untidy, noisy and boisterous,” he wrote, “it can disrupt the work of the ruling class, who think they know better than we the people.” After all, Guardiano reminded, “America is not the Soviet Union or China.” Guardiano’s bio for the paper quickly noted that his views “do not necessarily reflect the views of the U.S. military or his employer, a defense contractor.” The paper didn’t see fit to name the contractor

And, contractors funding getting cut is popular

Ackerman 9 (Spencer, sr reporter of Washington independent, *The Washington Independent, http://washingtonindependent.com/37246/defense-contractors-angered-by-gates-budget-strategy* 4-3-9) ET

Gates’ allies say that keeping the decision-making process open would have empowered defense contractors to lobby Congress to protect beloved — and expensive — defense programs at a time when the economy is forcing the closure of what Gates has called the “spigot” of defense cash opened by the 9/11 attacks. While the budget still represents an increase over last year’s defense spending, Gates testified to Congress in January about restricting Cold War-era systems or those of uncertain value to irregular conflicts like the Iraq and Afghanistan wars. “This budget going to involve very significant shifts and changes from what was done in past,” the Pentagon official said, but declined to characterize how the budget would change.

and, PMCs are happily getting funding cut- plan popular

Ackerman 9 (Spencer, sr reporter of Washington independent, *The Washington Independent, http://washingtonindependent.com/37246/defense-contractors-angered-by-gates-budget-strategy* 4-3-9) ET

Gates has taken extraordinary steps to keep the details of the fiscal 2010 budget to himself. First, he announced that he would withhold the substance of the budget from the Obama administration’s overall budget, delivered in February, and just divulge the overall spending request of $534 billion. ($663.7 billion when counting the costs of the Iraq and Afghanistan wars for the year, which will be funded through a supplemental budget request later this year.) Then he announced that he would empanel a review to determine what defense systems needed to be scaled back in funding or were no longer relevant for national security. He went so far as to insist that defense officials and military officers consulted by the review sign non-disclosure agreements to prevent them from leaking. “In principle, you’re not supposed to talk about this thing outside of the building, or share it within,” said an official who requested anonymity and who was one of several dozen officials asked to sign the non-disclosure agreement.

2AC AT: Politics- Obama Good- Kerry

And, Kerry doesn’t like contractors- he would push the plan- no po cap loss for obama

Loughlin 4 (Sean, Deputy Editor @ CNN, *CNN Washington Bureau*, May 6, http://www.cnn.com/2004/ALLPOLITICS/03/17/kerry/index.html ) ET

The Kerry and Bush campaigns have been leveling charges at each other for days over the issue of national security and defense. The Bush campaign recently launched a television ad that criticizes Kerry's vote against a spending bill for Iraq and Afghanistan last year, saying it showed that he -- not Bush -- was failing to provide U.S. troops with the help they need. Kerry, a four-term senator from Massachusetts and decorated Vietnam veteran, said his "bill of rights" would -- among other things -- fully fund health care for service members and veterans, provide men and women in uniform with the best equipment, increase life insurance for reservists and allow military families who lose loved ones to live in military housing for up to one year. Kerry gave no specifics on how he would pay for such items, but said they could be accomplished by "shifting priorities" and "scaling back some programs that do more for defense contractors than for the national defense."

And, our evidence assumes your corruption claims- this has no effect on Kerry

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

"So common are these companies, both as personal investments and as defense contractors, it would appear difficult to build a diverse blue-chip stock portfolio without at least some of them," Mayer wrote. Kerry, D-Mass., a member of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, is identified as earning the most — at least $2.6 million between 2004 and 2006 from investments worth up to $38.2 million. Spokesman David Wade said Kerry, who staunchly opposes the war in Iraq, is one of many beneficiaries of family trusts that he doesn't control. Wade also noted that Kerry does not sit on the Appropriations Committee, which has direct control of the defense budget."He has a 24-year Senate record of working and voting in the best interests of our men and women in the military, not of any defense contractors," Wade said.

And Kerry cosponsored a bill on regulation of PMCs- proves he supports

Make a difference 9 ( *Care2MakeADifference*, http://www.care2.com/causes/womens-rights/blog/republicans-for-rape/ ) ET

Yesterday, senators opposed an amendment to the Defense Appropriations bill that would prohibit federal defense contractors like Halliburton/KBR from getting money "if they restrict their employees from taking workplace sexual assault, battery and discrimination cases to court." In other words, 30 GOP senators want to deny rape victims their day in court. Think Progress has the story of the woman who prompted this amendment:

In 2005, Jamie Leigh Jones was gang-raped by her co-workers while she was working for Halliburton/KBR in Baghdad. She was detained in a shipping container for at least 24 hours without food, water, or a bed, and "warned her that if she left Iraq for medical treatment, she’d be out of a job." (Jones was not an isolated case.) Jones was prevented from bringing charges in court against KBR because her employment contract stipulated that sexual assault allegations would only be heard in private arbitration. Senator Al Franken introduced the amendment to the appropriations bill last week to prevent such complete disregard for the rights of rape victims. Nine senators (Mary Landrieu, Benjamin Cardin, Amy Klobuchar, John Kerry, Jeff Merkley, Bill NElson, Dianne Feinstein, Sherrod Brown and Jeanne Shaheen) joined Franken in cosponsoring the bill -- and it passed with 10 GOP senators supporting it after a passionate speech from Franken:All four Republican women (Susan Collins, Kay Bailey Hutchison, Lisa Murkowski and Olympia Snowe) voted for the amendment, and they were joined by Bob Bennett, Orrin Hatch, Chuck Grassley, George LeMieux, Dick Lugar and George Voinovich. These GOP senators deserve our thanks for truly embracing bipartisanship to vote for a bill that is clearly a good idea

2AC AT: Politics- Obama Good- NO LINK

And plan wouldn’t be perceived- PMCs lie under the radar

Scahill 7 (Jeremy, Puffin Foundation Writing Fellow at The Nation Institute, is the author of the bestselling Blackwater, *The Independent,* Aug 10, http://www.uruknet.info/?p=35239 ) ET

Privatized forces are also politically expedient for many governments. Their casualties go uncounted, their actions largely unmonitored and their crimes unpunished. Indeed, four years into the occupation, there is no effective system of oversight or accountability governing contractors and their operations, nor is there any effective law — military or civilian being applied to their activities. They have not been subjected to military courts martial (despite a recent congressional attempt to place them under the Uniform Code of Military Justice), nor have they been prosecuted in U.S. civilian courts. And no matter what their acts in Iraq, they cannot be prosecuted in Iraqi courts because in 2004 the U.S. occupying authority granted them complete immunity

2AC AT: Politics- Obama Good- Populace

And, blackwater was used to make PMC’s extremely unpopular by the media

The indictments—which were thrown out by D.C. District Judge Ricardo Urbina in a derisive and detailed 90-page opinion—stemmed from a 2007 firefight in Baghdad’s Nisour Square that left 14 Iraqis dead and others wounded. The government contends that five Blackwater guards, who were providing tactical support for the State Department after an IED exploded in the vicinity of a meeting with Iraqi officials, went on an unprovoked killing spree against unarmed civilians. The guards maintain that they came under attack by insurgents and were responding in self-defense to a mortal threat.Judge Urbina dismissed the charges because prosecutors misused sworn statements the guards were compelled to make to investigators after the shooting, under the threat of job loss. This was routine practice under military contracting rules, though the statements could not be used in criminal prosecutions. Promptly after the Nisour incident these statements were also leaked to the media, which ran with the narrative of modern-day Hessians gone berserk.

2AC AT: Politics- Obama Good- Win 4 Obama

And, PMCs are viewed as impossible for even obama to regulate- plan would be a political win

Lendman 10 (Stever, MA @ Harvard, *Steve Lendman Blog*, jan 19-10) ET

Then under Bush/Cheney, outsourcing accelerated further, so today there's one KBR worker for every three US soldiers in Iraq. They build base infrastructure and maintain them by handling all their duties - feeding soldiers, doing their laundry, performing maintenance, and virtually all other non-combat functions. Despite its abusive practices, KBR is such an integral part of the Pentagon that Chatterjee asks "could Obama dismiss (its) army, even if he wanted to?" Not at all so expect KRB's $150 billion 10-year LOGCAP contract (the Army's Logistics Augmentation Program - beginning September 20, 2008) to continue, and KBR's army to remain on the march reaping billions from the public treasury as the nation's largest PMC war profiteer.

And, obama has failed on PMC’s before- plan would be a political triumph

Lendman 10 (Stever, MA @ Harvard, *Steve Lendman Blog*, jan 19-10) ET

PMCs Under Obama In February 2007, Senator Obama introduced the Transparency and Accountability in Military Security Contracting Act as an amendment to the 2008 Defense Authorization Act, requiring federal agencies to report to Congress on the numbers of security contractors employed, killed, wounded, and disciplinary actions taken against them. Referred to the Senate Armed Services Committee, it never passed.

And, Obama’s legislation that did get passed wasn’t enforced- plan would increase his legitimacy

Lendman 10 (Stever, MA @ Harvard, *Steve Lendman Blog*, jan 19-10) ET

Then in February 2009 as president, Obama introduced reforms to reduce PMC spending and shift outsourced work back to government. He also promised to improve the quality of acquisition workers - government employees involved in supervising and auditing billions of dollars spent monthly on contracts. Even so, PMCs are fully integrated into national security and other government functions, as evidenced by the massive numbers in Iraq and Afghanistan alone.

And, PMC’s have been challenges to each president- success would show effectiveness

Lendman 10 (Stever, MA @ Harvard, *Steve Lendman Blog*, jan 19-10) ET

The Clinton administration's "Reinventing Government" initiative promised to downsize it by shifting functions to contractors as a way cut costs and improve efficiency. Later under George Bush, private companies got to compete for 450,000 government jobs, and in 2001, the Pentagon's contracted workforce exceeded civilian DOD employees for the first time.

2AC AT: Politics- Obama Good A2: Investment

Claims of corruption don’t affect voting on issues- you’re wrong ☺

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

A spokesman for Blunt, R-Mo., a senior member of House GOP leadership who held at least $15,000 in Lockheed Martin stock in 2006, said the insinuation that lawmakers' votes might be affected by their portfolios is "offensive." Like Lieberman, Blunt has been a fierce supporter of the war. "I don't pretend to speak for other offices, but I am fairly certain that no member would consider their personal finances when voting on issues as important as sending our men and women in uniform into harm's way," said Blunt spokesman Nick Simpson. The Lockheed Martin stock was given to Blunt's wife by her mother, he said.

And, claims about their shares in defense companies are flawed- senators sold them after the scandal

Mayar 8 (Lindsay, politics reporter for the Center for Responsive Politics, apr 3, http://votersforpeace.us/press/index.php?itemid=151, *Voters For Peace*) ET

Other lawmakers have decided to sell their shares in defense companies. In 2006, Sen. Orrin Hatch (R-Utah) had $1,000 in Honeywell and $1,000 in United Technologies but has since gotten rid of those holdings, which represented a tiny percentage of his net worth, according to his office. According to her presidential personal financial disclosures, Sen. Hillary Clinton (D-N.Y.) had stock in some defense companies, such as Honeywell, Boeing and Raytheon, but sold the stock in May 2007. Neither of the remaining presidential hopefuls, Democrat Barack Obama and Republican John McCain, reported such holdings on their filings.

\*\*2AC AT: Politics- Obama Bad\*\*

2AC AT: Politics- Obama Bad- Congress Won’t Do it- Courts

Congress isn’t going to limit their power- plan would be unpopular- courts are where it should happen

Tomkins 9 (Jenny, these times boards editor, *In These Times,* may 20, http://www.inthesetimes.com/article/4431/xe\_is\_the\_problem/ ) ET

Congress is not likely to abolish or limit the power of military contractors. As an alternative, PMC opponents are considering taking the fight to the courts. They argue that use of private contractors in law enforcement violates the Posse Comitatus Act, which forbids the federal government from using the military for law enforcement.

2AC AT: Politics- Obama Bad- Congress Investment

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.

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."

2AC AT: Politics- Obama Bad- Congress Investment

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.

2AC AT: Politics- Obama Bad- Congress Investment (lesser cards)

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.

And, these PMCs want Congress to invest- will continue funding campaigns for it

Mayar 8 (Lindsay, politics reporter for the Center for Responsive Politics, apr 3, http://votersforpeace.us/press/index.php?itemid=151, *Voters For Peace*) ET

Lockheed Martin declined to comment for this article, and a Honeywell spokeswoman said lawmakers should be free to do as they choose, but that the company provides necessary services to the military. "Honeywell provides support to develop products, services and technologies to meet the needs determined by the U.S. government and its entities that appropriate the funding, and elected officials and taxpayers who elect them into office," said Cathy Gedvilas, media relations manager for the defense aerospace company. "We support the spirit of the U.S. democracy and free enterprise system, and in keeping our nation and our troops safe from harm."

Democrats have the most at stake- they’d oppose the plan

Mayar 8 (Lindsay, politics reporter for the Center for Responsive Politics, apr 3, http://votersforpeace.us/press/index.php?itemid=151, *Voters For Peace*) ET

While Democrats are more likely to advocate for ending the Iraq war sooner than Republicans, as a group they have more of their own money invested in America's military efforts. In 2006 Democrats had at least $3.7 million invested in the defense sector alone, compared to Republicans' $577,500. More Republicans, however, held stock in defense companies in 2006—28 of them, compared to 19 Democrats.

2AC AT: Politics- Obama Bad- DOD

And, the Dep of Defense Opposes plan- causes public backlash

 Espinosa 3 (William H., attorney practicing from the Washington office of The Sperduto Law Firm, *Free Library*, http://www.thefreelibrary.com/Congress+Differs+With+Department+of+Defense+And+Its+Contractors+Over+...-a0106051019 ) ET

 certain national technology and industrial base requirements, where compliance would result in unreasonable costs or delays or where cooperative programs exist between DoD and foreign countries, is deleted or severely curtailed. (Section 822.) DoD will be required to identify foreign countries that have restricted the provision or sale of military goods or services to the U.S. because of U.S. policies and actions in Iraq. DoD will be prohibited from procuring items or components in military systems that are manufactured in such countries. Existing contracts must be brought into compliance with this requirement within 24 months. (Section 823). Contractors under major defense acquisition programs will be able to use only U.S. manufactured machine tools to carry out the program, beginning in 2007. The requirement will also apply to subcontracts of $5 million or greater. (Section 826). DoD will be required to assist machine tool companies and firms using machined tools to understand government contracting regulations and opportunities. (Section 827). The domestic content (componentry) requirement for DoD procurements will be raised to 65 percent, from 50 percent. (Section 829). With a few exceptions, these changes are to become effective immediately upon enactment of the legislation. If the legislation is adopted, contractors and subcontractors will be forced to increase the domestic content of the supplies they sell to the Government and will have to use only machine tools manufactured in the U.S. beginning in 2007. Moreover, contractors and subcontractors will be faced with increased requirements for researching, reporting and certifying domestic content of subcomponents not just to administer their DoD contracts, but simply to bid on the contracts. Failure to comply could result in costly audits or litigation . Significant Opposition Campaign Launched The legislation faces significant opposition from DoD and it contractors. Secretary of Defense Rumsfeld stated in a letter to Congressman Hunter dated July 8, 2003, that if the provisions are not removed he will recommend that President Bush veto the bill because the changes: (1) "would deny U.S. forces critical technologies and capabilities obtainable only, or most economically, from non-U.S. sources;" (2) could force the U.S. government to forego $4.5 billion in contributions from foreign partners related to the Joint Strike Fighter; (3) could produce a damaging reduction in the DoD supplier base; and (4) could cost U.S. contractors (and by extension DoD) billions of dollars to replace foreign-made machine tools. Several defense-related trade associations have also begun to wage war against the bill with a campaign targeted at Congress, the Administration and the media. The associations and their members argue that the new provisions will result in fewer vendors willing to sell to the Defense Department due to the increased costs of compliance. They also argue that many crucial products are only made overseas. The cost of retrofitting and establishing separate manufacturing lines for defense and non-defense products would be prohibitive

2AC AT: Politics- Obama Bad- General

And, regulating PMCs has been unpopular and ineffective- plan would be unpopular

Lendman 10 (Stever, MA @ Harvard, *Steve Lendman Blog*, jan 19-10) ET

Efforts to do so have been fruitless despite the General Assembly trying in 1989 through the International Convention against the Recruitment, Use, Financing and Training of Mercenaries. It took over a decade to get the required 22 signatories, but neither America or other major PMC users were included. An earlier effort also failed when in 1987 a special UN rapporteur was established to examine "the use of mercenaries as a means of impeding the exercise of the right of peoples to self-determination." It was largely ignored, and a 2005 effort won't likely fare better under a working group for the same purpose. Nor will industry associations functioning more for show than a commitment to end bad practices that will always go on as long as rogue firms like Xe and others like it are employed.

PMC’s have been used since the war of independence- plan is unpopular

Lendman 10 (Stever, MA @ Harvard, *Steve Lendman Blog*, jan 19-10) ET

Earlier, PMCs were at times used in lieu of US forces. As mentioned above, they helped General Washington win America's war of independence. Later the war of 1812, and in WW II the Flying Tigers fought the Japanese for China's Chiang Kai-Shek. In the 1960s and early 1970s, they were prominent nation builders in South Vietnam. From 1947 through 1976, the CIA's Southern Air Transport performed paramilitary services, including delivering weapons to the Contras in Nicaragua in the 1980s.

Lobbyists will co-opt budget cuts- shows plan is unpopular

Ackerman 9 (Spencer, sr reporter of Washington independent, *The Washington Independent, http://washingtonindependent.com/37246/defense-contractors-angered-by-gates-budget-strategy* 4-3-9) ET

Defense reformers look at such claims with skepticism. Winslow Wheeler, a three-decade veteran of defense budget fights as a Capitol Hill staffer who now works for the Center for Defense Information, expected the budget to cut “low-hanging fruit” and leave many sacred-cow programs intact. But he said that the secrecy-centric approach to the budget would only delay the inevitable fight when it gets delivered to Congress. “They’re delaying the services running around behind their backs and [asking] Congress to please rescue” favored defense programs. “But it’s not question of if, it’s a question of when that happens. The service representatives — colonels, whomever — will come over to Congress to complain about the decisions — if Gates make some good ones.”

2AC AT: Politics- Obama Bad- Lobbyists Scenario

And, contractors are the top 10 lobbies in Washington- congress won’t remove military contractors

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

Under some political pressure, the House ethics committee disclosed in June that it had an ongoing investigation into this matter. The move came days after the FBI subpoenaed Visclosky's office for records relating to PMA and as other House members called for the ethics committee to act. The committee did not disclose the members it was scrutinizing then, and the specific details of the OCE's work have not been publicly known.

While lawmakers received generous contributions, PMA used its growing influence with the panel over the past decade to become one of the top 10 lobby shops in Washington and took in $114 million in lobbying fees, according to the Center for Responsive Politics, a watchdog group.

And, this lobby threatens congressmen and women; plan is massively unpopular for loss of funds

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."

And, the head of the lobby admits 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

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."

and, congressman concede they need the money

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

Moran said he continued to believe that Magliocchetti was a good lobbyist who knew that he had to get Defense Department backing for the earmarks he was seeking from Capitol Hill. Describing him as "the only Democratic defense [lobbyist] for the most part," Moran said Magliocchetti also was someone Democrats naturally turned to for fundraising help from the military contractor community. "When you needed to raise money for the Democratic campaign committee, he was always the first one you went to," Moran said, adding, "I don't know how he raised his money."

And, they take donations often

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

Moran hosted an event for the Democratic Congressional Campaign Committee in his Alexandria home last year, the lawmaker said, with House Speaker Nancy Pelosi (D-Calif.) as the guest of honor. Magliocchetti and some of his clients were in attendance, writing checks for $28,500 each, Moran said.

2AC AT: Politics- Obama Bad- Mccain

And, Mccain likes PMC’s – would cost Obama political capital

Private Military 8 ( 2-Oct-8, *Privatemilitary.org*, http://www.privatemilitary.org/blog/McCain\_contractors\_and\_the\_military-industrial\_complex.html ) ET

First, to recap, the notion of the military-industrial complex acquired a distinct meaning in the powerful farewell address of President Dwight D. Eisenhower in 1961. There, he warned us that: “…we must guard against the acquisition of unwarranted influence, whether sought or unsought, by the military industrial complex. …We must never let the weight of this combination endanger our liberties or democratic processes. We should take nothing for granted. Only an alert and knowledgeable citizenry can compel the proper meshing of the huge industrial and military machinery of defense with our peaceful methods and goals, so that security and liberty may prosper together.” In the 2005 documentary by Eugene Jarecki, Why We Fight, the evolving relationship between the defense sector and government were given an up-to-date exploration. This is a well-researched and stimulating film. However, the approach towards Private Military Companies (security contractors on our terminology) is problematic. This is because PMCs are understood as part of the ‘military machinery of defense’. Indeed, training and support services linked to the supply of military hardware are aspects covered by some PMCs. Yet they render many more services in areas such as protection, risk assessment, intelligence, reconstruction assistance, and homeland security that are not strictly linked to defense. That is, the private military industry overlaps the defense sector in certain areas, but the two are not the same. Senator McCain was twenty-five years old when Eisenhower issued his warning. Assimilating this knowledge during his formation years, he tends to see PMCs as a logical extension of an expanded defense sector and the military-industrial complex. In this light, in Why We Fight he states that over-billing abuses should be addressed. He had in mind certain controversies involving Halliburton-KBR. While we welcome stricter scrutiny and better regulation, McCain’s (and Jarecki’s) approach fails to capture the broader challenges and opportunities inherent in the use of PMCs. For instance, the over-billing in question involved services that fall outside defense. PMCs are service oriented rather than capital intensive like the defense sector. Their control and regulation require flexible frameworks that do not necessarily apply to defense. It is somehow a different matter regulating services associated with the longer-term production and maintenance of defense capital than, for example, the fulfillment of a task order focusing on the swift deployment of security details or a mine-clearance team to the latest humanitarian crisis.

Mccain supports the use of PMC’s- Money saving

Mccain 7 (John, Senator, former presidential candidate, *Army Times*, http://www.propublica.org/special/obama-vs-mccain-on-military-contractors 10-16 ) ET

What role should contractors play in the military?We do whatever we can to reduce costs to the taxpayers. And if there are functions that can be outsourced, we ought to do them. If there are others that lend [themselves] only to military functions and duties that can only be performed by military personnel, then those should not be.I remember the big flap when we took security from the base and did it through contracts. It was going to be the end of Western civilization as we know it. Somehow it’s turned out OK.

Mccain opposes reducing PMC’s

Mccain 7 (John, Senator, former presidential candidate, *Interview on Iowa Public Television*, 10/12, http://www.propublica.org/special/obama-vs-mccain-on-military-contractors ) ET

On reducing the government's dependence on private security companies We're not going to have more troops. I'd love to see -- I wish we had the size of Army and Marine Corps and Guard that we could send more troops… But I think that we have to now tighten up on the rules, regulations, accountability, et cetera. You know, many of these "Blackwater" -- there are many contractors -- are guarding Iraqi government officials. If you want to remove them, who's going to provide for their security? But it's sad and it's tragic that these things are happening.

2AC AT: Politics- Obama Bad- Mccain

Mccain loves contractors- he would attack this plan – election proves

Dorning 8 (Mike, Reporter @ Bloomberg, Jan 4, *The Swamp*, http://www.swamppolitics.com/news/politics/blog/2008/01/mccain\_presses\_support\_for\_ira.html ) ET

McCain chose as the site for his first public speech of the day a defense contractor that supplies the Iraq war effort. “I believe I can make America safe. I am confident we are succeeding in Iraq,” McCain told employees of BAE Systems. McCain also vowed that as president he would eliminate the leader of Al Qaeda, who has remained at large since Sept. 11. “I will get Osama bin Laden, my friends. I will follow him to the gates of Hell,” the senator said. BAE Systems, which employs about 5,000 people in New Hampshire, supplies MRAP (Mine-Resistant Ambush Protected) vehicles for Iraq and electronic countermeasures to combat roadside mines. Before McCain appeared at a town hall meeting of employees, executives of the company showed the senator a guidance system for air-to-ground rockets that BAE is developing. McCain told BAE employees “things are getting better in Iraq thanks to this new strategy--and thanks very frankly to the equipment that you are providing these brave young men and women.”

\*\*\*RMA DA 2AC\*\*\*

No RMA

RMA technology isn’t happening now

Osgood 8 (Carl, http://www.larouchepub.com/eiw/public/2008/2008\_30-39/2008\_30-39/2008-38/pdf/43-44\_3537.pdf, date accessed: 6/27/2010) AJK

The so-called Revolution in Military Affairs suffered a stinging setback on Aug. 14, when Gen. James Mattis, the commander of U.S. Joint Forces Command (JFCom), issued a memo, directing the command to stop using certain Information Age concepts in its support of training, doctrine development, and professional military education. Mattis’s memo directly targeted the concept of “effects based operations (EBO),” as well as “operational net assessment,” and “system of systems analysis,” which, according to their proponents, were supposed to completely change the nature of warfare and eliminate, or at least substantially reduce, the fog and friction of combat operations, making their outcome much more predictable. As Mattis notes, these concepts did not live up to their promises in recent operational experience, especially including the 2006 Israeli war in Lebanon.

RMAs have failed/ are failing

Hawkins 6 (William, http://www.americaneconomicalert.org/view\_art.asp?Prod\_ID=2548,date accessed: 6/27/2010) AJK

Rumsfeld’s real problem is that his “visionary” theories about a Revolution in Military Affairs (RMA) based on short, high-tech campaigns has been discredited by the Iraq and Afghan experiences. It is a truism in military lore that no plan survives contact with the enemy, but movement along the learning curve in Rumsfeld’s circle has been slow.   The rapid invasion of Iraq, which was supposed to prove the operational effectiveness of the new RMA and to set the U.S. military on the path of “transformation,” has become a nearly four year campaign against sectarian insurgents and foreign terrorists. It has not been possible to reduce ground force levels. A fierce debate has generated a rough consensus that more troops should have been deployed initially to prevent the formation of new centers of resistance in the vacuum that followed the removal of the Saddam regime, as well as to deter Iran. Though the conflict has been waged at a low level, it has still stretched U.S. Army and Marine units thin, and heavily taxed the Reserve and National Guard, in order to sustain the war effort. Even a year into the Iraq campaign, Rumsfeld was still talking about his “10-30-30" plan. This had major forces deploying to a distant theater in 10 days, defeating the enemy within 30 days and then being ready for redeployment somewhere else within another 30 days. This overly optimistic concept also had an impact on economic planning. The 2005 Annual Industrial Capabilities Report to Congress still stated that “DoD policy generally is to fight with the weapons on hand.” Short wars do not require industrial mobilization, so national security is less of a concern when corporations “globalize” their production, reducing domestic capabilities by outsourcing key components to a heterogeneous group of foreign countries.  In April 2003, the Army Transformation Industrial Base Study claimed, “Collectively, contractor-owned facilities and Army ammunition plants have the capabilities to meet current and future Force requirements.” Yet, when the post-invasion insurgency in Iraq escalated, it became necessary to import ammunition from Canada and Israel, as well as find new domestic suppliers. The need to add protection to vehicles also led to a need to import armor plate. There was also a shortage of precision-guided weapons – the backbone of the transformation concept – most of which have imported components. The concept of an RMA came from those historians who have argued that a major transformation in the way wars were fought took place during the 16th-18th centuries. The historical debate is about more than the timing and pace of military change. It is also about whether the RMA concerned only new weapons and tactics, or is more about changes in society and government that make it possible to raise, equip, deploy, and sustain advanced military forces.   Russell F. Weigley’s The Age of Battles examines the quest for decisive warfare in early modern Europe, i.e., the era from the Thirty Years War through the Napoleonic Wars. He argues “strategists hoped by means of battle to secure decisions in war, and thereby to secure the objects for which men went to war with a quickness and dispatch that would keep the costs of war reasonably proportionate to the purposes attained.” This same desire animates today’s strategists. “Yet, the age of battles nevertheless proved to be an age of prolonged and indecisive wars,”concludes Weigley – an observation that fits today’s world as well. The conflict most associated with the flowering of the earlier RMA was the Thirty Years War, which takes its name from its excessive length, as does the Seven Years War, which is heralded as the first truly world war. The wars of the French Revolution and Napoleon lasted a quarter century. At the end of the 19th century, many thought war had become too costly to be prolonged, or to even be contemplated, World War I, however, did not see the soldiers come home “before the leaves fall.” It lasted four years with unprecedented violence and social mobilization. Theorists of airpower and blitzkrieg were determined to break the stalemate of the trenches, creating an RMA that would allow a return to the mythical age of decisive battle. The result was World War II, which lasted longer than WW I and covered even larger global theaters of struggle. Increases in wealth and population have led to increases in the scale and duration of war. This is a true RMA, one that has spread across the globe.  Iraq and North Korea today have populations larger than France under Louis XIV, and Iran’s population is equal to that of Imperial Germany on the eve of World War I.  And all have access to the marvels of the techno-industrial age. Thus, even third-rate powers can possess, under determined leaders, the strategic depth to sustain military operations for long periods – as did both Iran and Iraq in their 1980-1988 conflict.  North Vietnam refused to terminate its aggression against South Vietnam until it achieved victory, despite heavy casualties and a series of lost battles. In Rumsfeld’s RMA, there would be no more wars like those of Korea, Vietnam, or even the Gulf War.  As Army General Tommy Franks, a true believer in the RMA who devised the Iraq invasion plan, states in his memoirs, “The days of half-million-strong mobilizations were over.” Rapid maneuver, highly accurate firepower, and attacks from many directions, all empowered by new technology, were supposed to substitute for large numbers of troops and equipment. Thus, there was no need to rebuild the Army, which had been reduced by 40 percent between the Gulf and Iraq Wars ’

RMA inevitable

RMA inevitable- even countries like Israel and Australia are developing RMA
Khanduri 1 (Chandra, http://www.ipcs.org/article/military/revolution-in-military-affairs-rma-ii-476.html, date accessed: 6/28/2010) AJK

The 1991 Gulf War demonstrated RMA in its initial effective form, although, the primary value of emerging technology had been substantiated during the England- Argentina Falkland war. While the NATO and the developed countries grappled with the problem of continuous technical advances, Pakistan , Japan , South Korea and China too have devoted considerable attention to it. The ASEAN countries made good progress from 1993 but the economic recession of mid-1990s, stopped them in their tracks.     The Japanese and South Koreans with American help and their own sound economies have striven hard to improve their RMA. Consequently while South Korea has a TMD and Japan ’s defence budget has arisen to about $400 billion, second only to US’s, Pakistan has continued to improve its acquisitions rather than indigenously develop its RMA but is well off in its technological applications in all fields of military capability including integration of Services, their logistics and ISR.     RMA has found its ways even amongst the lesser military enthusiasts such as Australia and Singapore . Known through its sobriquet of a ‘Phantom Army,’ the corps size Australian Army is recognizing itself and has brought about a large qualitative improvement in mobility, fire power and force multipliers. Its quick and effective response in East Timor in 1999 saw its emphasis on the RMA. The ‘strong punch’ of a tiny nation like Singapore is demonstrative of its adopting the RMA fruitfully. Among all nations of Asia , however, RMA has distinctly made significant strides in Israel and China . While Israel ’s standing is thus far unchallenged, China ’s modernization of PLA is turning its doctrine of ‘fighting in local condition’ to ‘fighting against an enemy in modern high technological battle field conditions’. It has an obvious reference to the Chinese apprehension of a future conflict over Taiwan .

Further RMA development inevitable- key to counter balance Russia

Kipp 2010 (Jacob, <http://georgiandaily.com/index.php?option=com_content&task=view&id=18877&Itemid=132>, date accessed: 6/28/2010) AJK

Discussions of the draft preceded the outbreak of the Russian-Georgian War and addressed both technological transformation and the shift from a division-based to brigade-based organization. It focused on the technological progress of foreign militaries, especially the US in terms of redefining warfare in the information age, and warned of a widening gap between Russia's capabilities and those of advanced states. The effort came to be associated with Defense Minister, Anatoly Serdyukov, and the newly appointed Chief of the General Staff, Army-General Nikolai Makarov, who became champions of the “new look.” Events in Georgia precluded the publication of the concept but stimulated the process of reform and transformation. Practical experience made the case for technological innovation and force-structure development more compelling. Both before and after the Georgian war, the defense ministry has used various publications to make a case for the “new look.”

RMA Inevitable

Ground forces are overstretched and underfunded- the USFG is turning to RMA

Kagan 6 (Frederick, <http://www.aei.org/article/24584>, date accessed: 6/28/2010) AJK
In its five years in office, the Bush administration has avoided improving the human capabilities of the military--and the crisis has grown steadily worse. The long-term deployment of U.S. soldiers to Iraq and Afghanistan has taken a severe toll on the ground forces. Combat tours, which lasted six months in the 1990s, have been extended to a full year for most army troops in Iraq and Afghanistan. Many soldiers in the active force (and in the National Guard and the Reserves) have already been deployed twice and are now facing their third tour. Although reenlistment rates have remained high, recruitment rates have fallen dangerously, morale has dropped in some units, and some experts, such as retired General Barry McCaffrey, warn that "the wheels are coming off" the army as it struggles to sustain a large deployment with insufficient personnel. Unless the United States rapidly withdraws from Iraq, moreover, there is no sign of relief on the horizon. Although the administration has permitted the army to maintain nearly 30,000 extra soldiers in its ranks for the past several years, the president's budget for next year requires the army to shed those additional troops. And the ground forces proposed both in that budget and in the 2006 Quadrennial Defense Review would support a long-term deployment of only about 18 brigade combat teams (each comprising about 3,500 troops). At the height of the campaigns in Iraq and Afghanistan, by contrast, the United States had more than 20 brigade combat teams deployed to combat zones, and even these were not enough to pacify and rebuild those countries. It is hardly a secret that the U.S. Army and the Marine Corps are short on troops; senior officers and analysts regularly refer to the problem when discussing operations in Iraq and Afghanistan or when explaining U.S. options--or the lack thereof. Lieutenant General John Vines, who stepped down as commander of U.S. ground forces in Iraq at the beginning of this year, has pointed out that many U.S. soldiers are now on their third or fourth tour of duty in Iraq. "The war has been going on nearly as long as the Second World War and we're asking a lot of the forces," he said in April. What is hard to understand is why Washington has steadfastly refused to address the issue. The explanation seems to stem from two beliefs, deeply held by top members of the Bush administration, about how war works. The first is the notion, shared by most RMA enthusiasts, that war is fundamentally about killing people and destroying things. The second is the conviction that military preparations should be guided by the business principle of investing in success. The basic flaw in both beliefs is that they take parts of the problem to be the whole. Consider the first concept. The major priority of the current "information revolution" in warfare is to enable the military to locate, identify, track, target, and destroy enemy weapons systems--from aircraft and radar installations to individual soldiers. All of the services' "transformational" programs, including the army's Future Combat Systems program (a network of manned and unmanned systems), emphasize the sensors they will deploy. The aim, clearly articulated on a number of occasions, is to gain "near-perfect" intelligence--that is, a nearly complete understanding of where the enemy's forces are so that they can be eliminated. In fact, with a few exceptions, all of the new sensor and intelligence systems the Pentagon is now developing are designed to locate and identify enemy systems--not to interact with them. The distinction is important. Under the old system (still in use in Iraq today), U.S. units seeking intelligence about the enemy did not confine themselves to halting nearby and observing the enemy's disposition. Armored or motorized cavalry formations would actually attack the enemy before them (as the Second Armored Cavalry Regiment did during the Gulf War, in 1991, and as the cavalry of the Third Infantry Division did repeatedly in 2003). The goal of such attacks was threefold: to locate and identify the enemy, to determine its intentions, and to set the terms of the ensuing battle.

RMA Inevitable

Continued RMA is initable- no way to stop it

Singer 9 (Peter, <http://www.brookings.edu/opinions/2009/0130_robots_singer.aspx>, date accessed: 6/28/2010) AJK

America has a new corps of warriors fighting on its behalf. They have saved thousands of lives, defusing hundreds of bombs and IEDs in Iraq and taking out scores of terrorist leaders hiding in Afghanistan and Pakistan, including most recently two key Al Qaeda leaders. But they also have no pulse and have killed at least three people who the United States thought were Osama bin Laden, but who later turned out not to be. Science fiction is coming true on our battlefields. The U.S. military went into Iraq with just a handful of robotic drones in the air and zero unmanned systems on the ground, none of them armed. Today there are more than 5,300 drones in the U.S. inventory and about another 12,000 on the ground. These are just the first generation, the Model T Fords, compared with what is coming next. And, yes, the tech industry term of "killer application" doesn't just describe what iPods did to the music industry. The prototypes of the next generation of unmanned systems don't just pack a lethal armory of missiles, rockets and machine guns, they make more and more of their own decisions, such as taking out targets on their own. In all the tumult over a new president and a crashing economy, it is easy to miss that something big is going on today in the overall history of war, and even humanity. A robotics revolution is at hand. But it is not the type in which you need worry about the governor of California showing up at your door a la the Terminator. Instead, when historians look back at this period, they will likely conclude that we are living at the start of the greatest revolution in warfare since the introduction of atomic bombs, maybe even bigger. Our new, unmanned systems don't just affect the "how" of fighting wars, they are also starting to change the "who" of the fighting at the most fundamental level. But while robots are proving to be valuable in moving scores of U.S. soldiers out of danger, this revolution is not turning out to be the easy, clean triumph of technology over humanity. The age-old fog of war isn't being lifted by technology, as the acolytes of former Defense Secretary Donald H. Rumsfeld once argued would happen. We are gaining amazing capabilities but also experiencing new confusions and facing complex dilemmas. For instance, the U.S. has carried out 38 officially reported drone strikes into Pakistan over just the last five months, seeking suspected terrorist camps and hiding sites. It is a remarkable capability that can destroy a hidden, implacable enemy without putting U.S. soldiers' lives at risk. But the unmanned strikes across a state border also have created an issue that Pakistani Prime Minister Yusaf Raza Gillani describes as the biggest problem in relations between our countries, highlighted by the strikes last week that killed a reported 22 people. In the long term, robots even affect the very human "war of ideas" so crucial to winning the fight against radical movements. What is the message we are sending with our "unmanning" of war, compared to how it is being received by people around the world? Some people, such as one senior State Department official I interviewed, believe that it all "plays to our strength. The thing that scares people is our technology." But when you speak with people in Lebanon, for instance, many share the feelings of a leading news editor there who described the growing use of unmanned systems as "just another sign of coldhearted, cruel Israelis and Americans, who are also cowards because they send out machines to fight us. ... They don't want to fight us like real men. ... So we just have to kill a few of their soldiers to defeat them." Or, as one American military analyst put it, "The optics of the situation could look really freaking bad. It makes us look like the "evil Empire" [from "Star Wars"] and the other guys like the "Rebel Alliance," defending themselves versus robot invaders." But the diplomatic issues of robotics are even more complex. How do 20th century international laws of war apportion out accountability with our 21st century technologies? Who is held to task when a machine mistakenly hits the wrong target? The commander, the programmer, the inventor? And, again, these attacks today are with the early versions of unmanned systems. What of the next generation being developed? Of course, one scientist working for the Pentagon whom I interviewed answered that he could see no legal or ethical problem unless the machine kills the wrong people repeatedly. "Then it is just a product-recall issue." Our wars remain driven by human failings, and even the most sophisticated fighting machines aren't going to replace humans any time soon. But that doesn't mean we will be able to avoid the science-reality of technology such as warrior-robots or the science-fiction-like dilemmas that will bring to our battlefields. The future is already upon us.

RMA Inevitable

RMA is here to stay- fundamentally changing the way we wage war means more RMA in the future

Singer 2 (Peter, <http://muse.jhu.edu/journals/international_security/v026/26.3singer.html>, date accessed: 6/28/2010) AJK

Until recently, wars were decided by Clausewitzian clashes of great numbers of men fighting on extended fronts. With the growing access to sophisticated technology, however, strategic consequences can now be achieved by relative handfuls, sometimes even by individual soldiers not on the battlefield. According to this concept of the "revolution in military affairs," the nature of the professional soldier and the execution of high-intensity warfare is changing. [25](http://muse.jhu.edu/journals/international_security/v026/26.3singer.html%22%20%5Cl%20%22FOOT25) Fewer individuals are doing the actual fighting, while massive support systems are required to maintain the world's most modern forces. The requirements of high-technology warfare have also dramatically increased the need for specialized expertise, which often must be drawn from the private sector. For example, recent U.S. military exercises reveal that its Army of the Future will be unable to operate without huge levels of technical and logistics support from private firms. [26](http://muse.jhu.edu/journals/international_security/v026/26.3singer.html%22%20%5Cl%20%22FOOT26) Other advanced powers are also setting [End Page 195] out to privatize key military services. Great Britain, for instance, recently contracted out its aircraft support units, tank transport units, and aerial refueling fleet--all of which played vital roles in the 1999 Kosovo campaign. [27](http://muse.jhu.edu/journals/international_security/v026/26.3singer.html%22%20%5Cl%20%22FOOT27) Another change in the postmodern battlefield requiring greater civilian involvement is the growing importance of information dominance (particularly when the military's ability to retain individuals with highly sought-after and well-paying information technology skills is well-nigh impossible). As one expert notes, "The U.S. army has concluded that in the future it will require contract personnel, even in the close fight area, to keep its most modern systems functioning. This applies especially to information-related systems. Information-warfare, in fact, may well become dominated by mercenaries." [28](http://muse.jhu.edu/journals/international_security/v026/26.3singer.html%22%20%5Cl%20%22FOOT28) At the same time, the motivations behind warfare also seem to be in flux. This has been particularly felt at low-intensity levels of conflict, where weak state regimes are facing increasing challenges on a variety of fronts. The state form triumphed centuries ago because it was the only one that could harness the men, machinery, and money required to take full advantage of the tools of warfare. [29](http://muse.jhu.edu/journals/international_security/v026/26.3singer.html%22%20%5Cl%20%22FOOT29) This monopoly of the nation-state, however, is over. As a result of changes in the nature of weapons technology, individuals and small groups can now easily purchase and wield relatively massive amounts of power. This plays out in numerous ways, the most disruptive of which may be the global spread of cheap infantry weapons, the primary tools of violence in low-intensity warfare. Their increased ease of use and devastating potential are reshaping local balances of power. Almost any group operating inside a weak state can now acquire at least limited military capabilities, thus lowering the bar for creating viable threats to the status quo. [30](http://muse.jhu.edu/journals/international_security/v026/26.3singer.html%22%20%5Cl%20%22FOOT30)

RMA- PMCs not key

The military kicks ass at RMAs without PMCs

Nolte 7 (William, <https://www.cia.gov/library/center-for-the-study-of-intelligence/csi-publications/csi-studies/studies/vol48no1/article01.html>, date accessed: 6/27/2010) AJK
In Operation Iraqi Freedom, the world witnessed a progress report on the revolution in military affairs (RMA). The performance of US forces in the major combat phase of the operation in Iraq demonstrated the ability of institutions functioning within standard bureaucratic, hierarchical structures to operate beyond those structures. To put it bluntly, US forces in Iraq leapt past jointness into networked operating models. They became hierarchies emulating networks. The challenge to the Intelligence Community is to keep pace with the significant flow of change emanating from the Department of Defense. This article was written and submitted to Studies in Intelligence in late summer 2003. Subsequent events support the argument, explicit in the following pages, that a "revolution in intelligence affairs (RIA)"--and even the revolution in military affairs--must take place within a comprehensive renewal of US national security capabilities. Nothing in the events between May 2003 and the end of the year fundamentally alters, in the author's view, the lessons intelligence professionals can derive from the early phases of Operation Iraqi Freedom.

The military kicks ass at RMAs without PMCs

Nolte 7 (William, <https://www.cia.gov/library/center-for-the-study-of-intelligence/csi-publications/csi-studies/studies/vol48no1/article01.html>, date accessed: 6/27/2010) AJK
From many perspectives, the dramatic advance in military operations in Iraq is an exciting, even inspiring, event. First of all, the previous major event in US military history--the Gulf War (or Gulf War I)--was a US military victory that validated new modes of warfare. Yet the services (and DOD civilian leadership, to be sure) abandoned much of the successful Desert Storm model for something even more revolutionary. That alone--a hierarchical bureaucracy transforming after success--is a rare achievement. As a possible result, some of the most vocal critics of the plan for Iraqi Freedom were not "old soldiers" from Korea or Vietnam, but more recently retired officers who had served with success in Desert Storm or the Balkans, in itself a reflection of the pace in which reform has invalidated expertise. Innovation has produced its own "Doppler effect." Such invalidation or at least disruption of conventional judgment (and expertise) will continue to be a product of the RMA and its extension into other areas of national security affairs. Secondly, the American military accomplished this feat not after a period of budgetary largesse, but immediately following an extended and relatively deep period of budget cuts. The victory in Iraq was won with relatively few new weapons systems. Rather, the characteristic "development" model of Iraqi Freedom was the enhancement of many of the systems that had proven successful in the Gulf War. Platforms as venerable as the B-52, as well as a host of significantly "middle-aged" systems (the Abrams tank, the F-16), were stretched by new or enhanced applications and systems to the point where, one suspects, participants in the Joint Strike Fighter and F-22 program offices may be entitled to some mixed reactions to the success of Iraqi Freedom. The point remains: while resource restriction can clearly reach a tipping point that destroys capability, public institutions--including security instruments--can sometimes benefit from austerity that promotes innovation and even competition, simulating some of the characteristics that the market provides private sector institutions. Finally, it should be clear that the victory was only partly a technical or technologic victory. Peter Drucker has long argued that historians of the industrial revolution have placed too much attention on railroads, steam engines, and the like. Drucker, among others, emphasizes that the dominance of the West in and through the industrial revolution was more critically the dominance of administrative, organizational, and (in governmental terms) operational skills, which in turn permitted the intelligent and advantage-gaining deployment of technology. At every step, Operation Iraqi Freedom demonstrated a similar organizational and operational success, enabled by technology. But technology was merely the tool of a broader commitment to such considerations as the centrality of information as a dominant weapon rather than merely a supporting agent of war; jointness exercised up and down the command structure; and arrangements that emphasized, permitted, and even demanded flexibility and agility. By any number of measures, the impact of the RMA has been, for want of a better word, revolutionary. The US Department of Defense and the military services, the embodiments of hierarchical organization for most of the 20th century--renowned (fairly or not) for "Catch 22," Standard Operating Procedure, "do it in triplicate," and overpriced toilet seats and hammers--demonstrated an extraordinary ability to function in ways that should lead to a significant rethinking of many stereotypes. A dramatic increase in the use of precision munitions, exponential increases in information volume and variety, and a corresponding decrease in sensor-to-shooter decision cycles are among the technical symptoms of the state of the revolution in military affairs. Even more impressively, at important moments (and perhaps in routine moments as well), an enormously complex public policy instrument behaved in ways that maximized the technical advantages available to it. History suggests that this is not automatically the case. In the end, innovative behavior and a willingness to encourage such behavior may have proven a more important factor in the success of Operation Iraqi Freedom than any technical achievement or set of such achievements.

RMA- PMCs not key

Bad ass RMA development without PMCs

Grunstein 9 (Judah, http://www.worldpoliticsreview.com/blog/4787/the-next-revolution-in-military-affairs, date accessed: 6/27/2010) AJK A lot has been written, both here on this blog and elsewhere, about COIN being the most significant military transformation to emerge from the wars in Iraq and Afghanistan. [But this Small Wars Journal post](http://smallwarsjournal.com/blog/2009/12/marine-corps-experiments-with/) on a Marine Corps experiment to reduce the smallest independent unit of action from the battalion level to the rifle company level struck me as being potentially more significant. The move grows out of stabilization operations, and so is perfectly consistent with the COIN tactical emphasis on small-unit autonomy to react to the local social terrain. But that kind of transformation, once begun, will probably outlive the doctrinal fixation on COIN. And if it does, it will represent the hybrid offspring of RMA and COIN. RMA, through its technological advances in communication, collapsed the chain of command from top down, putting colonels in the middle of the battle space. But the same technology facilitates COIN's demand for small-unit autonomy, essentially collapsing the chain of command from the bottom up, by turning captains into strategists. Eventually, though, we won't be so obsessed with fighting counterinsurgency wars. And when that happens, we'll be left with a restructured force along the lines of the Marines' experiment. By nature, I like decentralized authority, but I'd be curious to hear some of the military folks out there weigh in on what this could mean.

RMA – Doesn’t Solve

RMA doesn’t solve – technology can’t replace people.

Kagan and O’Hanlon, 2007 (Frederick and Michael \*P.h.d from Yale, professor at Westpoint\*\* Senior Fellow at The Brookings Institution, April 2007 “The Case for Larger Ground Forces” Stanley Foundation, Bridging the Foreign Policy Divide)KM

Moreover, if there was any doubt, Iraq proves technology will not let us cut back on people. Other recent operations in Afghanistan (as well as Bosnia, Kosovo, Panama, and so on) also revealed the ineffectiveness of attempting to replace people with machines on a large scale. In most of the post-conflict stabilization (or counterinsurgency) operations we have seen or can foresee, there can be no substitute for large numbers of trained and capable ground forces, deployed for a long time. It is unacceptable, therefore, simply to demand a zero-sum soldiers-versus-systems trade-off in the defense budget. Prioritizing systems at the expense of soldiers has had dreadful consequences. If we overcompensate by now doing the reverse, it would store up enormous danger for the future. The truth is that the nation is at war now, the strategic horizon is very dark, and armed forces that were seized in the strategic pause of the 1990s are inadequate today. Transformation must proceed, possibly with a change in its intellectual basis and its precise course, and the ground forces must be expanded significantly. Meeting both requirements will demand increased defense expenditures for many years into the future, although there are some approaches we could pursue to mitigate that increase. But whatever the cost, a nation at war and in a dangerous world must maintain military forces adequate to protect its vital interests, or else face an intolerable degree of national insecurity.