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\*\*South Korea\*\*

1NC Shell

Text – The Republic of Korea should, through the Mutual Security Agreement of 1954, request that the United States:

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Solvency:

South Korea can request the affirmative under the mutual defense treaty

**Hwang 6** (Balbina Ph.D Government @ Georgetown, Oct. 16 2006, The Heritage Foundation, http://www.heritage.org/Research/Lectures/The-US-Korea-Alliance-on-the-Rocks-Shaken-Not-Stirred)IM

The American supporters of ending the alliance make an argument akin to the following: We should withdraw all U.S. forces from the peninsula and abrogate the U.S.-ROK Mutual Defense Treaty due to rampant anti-Americanism in South Korea, a growing tendency by the government in Seoul to appease Pyongyang, and the Korean penchant for blaming the United States for blocking unification. By ending the alliance, they argue, we would be able to walk away from North Korea because the problems that the Pyongyang regime pos≠es-nuclear and missile proliferation, conventional military provocations and threats, illicit activities, and even human rights abuses-are too difficult and chal≠lenging for the United States to handle.[1] On the Korean side, those who cry "Yankee, go home!" are increasingly confident in their national sovereign abilities, find the hosting of U.S. troops intrusive, fear that U.S. policies toward North Korea will cause instability or even a war, and are overall resentful of Korean dependence on the United States. The Korean administration has the power to request partial removal of US troops through the United States Forces Korea established by the Mutual Security Agreement of 1954. Our response to these arguments should not be to end the alliance, but precisely the opposite: We should strengthen our bilateral relationship with South Korea by confronting these issues directly and forthrightly, perhaps yielding to South Korea’s wishes. Legitimate differences about the function, purpose, and utility of the alliance have arisen due to dramatic shifts in the domestic, regional, and global environ≠ment. But just as the alliance is not the cause of ten≠sions in the bilateral relationship, we should also not allow it to become the victim. Rather, both govern≠ments must endeavor to reassess the current configu≠ration and create a new alliance that meets the needs of both allies. If we do not invest energy in renewing the alliance, it will end sooner rather than later. And this would have devastating consequences for Ameri≠ca's future, not just in Asia but around the globe.

**This solves the whole case – Obama would cave**

**Healy 10** (Gene, VP @ Cato Institute, Washington Examiner, June 29 2010, http://www.washingtonexaminer.com/opinion/columns/US-out-of-South-Korea-973375240.html)IM

The Korean government can, under the terms of the mutual defense treaty and the management of the USFK, make requests of the US regarding the behavior of American troops. As my colleague Doug Bandow puts it in a forthcoming study, "Americans are borrowing money to pay to defend the South so South Koreans can spend their money on other priorities." That's a common pattern in our Cold War-era alliances. U.S. membership in NATO, an alliance crafted to contain an enemy that collapsed 18 years ago, has helped keep European defense budgets low and subsidize lavish welfare states for NATO members. Yet we still account for half of the world's military expenditures with a bloated "defense" budget largely devoted to the defense of other nations. In his first inaugural address, Thomas Jefferson outlined the ideal American foreign policy: "peace, commerce and honest friendship with all nations, entangling alliances with none." Toward that end, President Obama's other announcement Saturday, that he would (finally) back a free-trade agreement with South Korea, was at least a half-step in the right direction. In the years to come, we would do well to move closer to the Jeffersonian ideal in international affairs. One thing is clear: In an era of trillion-dollar deficits as far as the eye can see, America can't afford to play globocop any longer, if given an excuse to pull out of South Korea, Obama would have no choice but to take the opportunity.

Solvency Mechanism

**The Mutual Security Agreement allows the ROK to address requests to the US**

**USFKPIM 9** (United States Forces Korea Personnel Information Management, June 27 2009, https://pimsk.korea.army.mil/)IM

The longtime U.S. Security commitment to the Republic of Korea (ROK) has both legal and moral sanctions. US legal obligations are those under U.N. Security Council Resolutions of 1950, by which the US leads the United Nations Command, and the ROK/US Mutual Security Agreement of 1954, which commits both nations to assist each other in case of attack from outside forces. The US is also partner in the operations of the ROK/US Combined Forces Command (CFC), an integrated headquarters established in 1978, and is responsible for planning for the defense of the Republic of Korea. The Commander of USFK also serves as Commander in Chief of the United Nations Command (CINCUNC) and the CFC. As CINCUNC, he is responsible for maintaining the armistice agreement which suspended the Korean War on July 27, 1953. If he feels the US is not upholding the proper terms of the agreement he has the power to request a change in United States policy. US Forces, Korea (USFK) is the joint headquarters through which US combat forces would be sent to the CFC's fighting components - the Ground, Air, Naval and Combined Marine Forces Component Commands. Major USFK Elements include the Eighth US Army, US Air Forces Korea (Seventh Air Force) and US Naval Forces Korea. USFK includes more than 85 active installations in the Republic of Korea and has about 37,500 US military personnel assigned in Korea. Major U.S. units in the ROK include the Eighth U.S. Army and Seventh Air Force.

South Korea can lodge formal complaints against US Military Presence through the Defense Treaty

**KNS 9** (Korean News Service, Sept. 12 2009, http://www.kcna.co.jp/item/2009/200909/news12/20090912-06ee.html)IM

Pyongyang, September 12 (KCNA) -- The Solidarity for Implementing the South-North Joint Declaration in south Korea released a statement titled "Let us terminate the U.S. forces' presence in south Korea and achieve independent reunification" on Sept. 8 calling upon all the Koreans to turn out in the struggle to drive the U.S. forces out of south Korea. The statement said that after the landing of the U.S. forces in south Korea on Sept. 8, 1945 they killed Koreans, rejoiced at the liberation of the country, laying bare their true colors as aggressor forces and occupation troops. The U.S. forces brutally suppressed at the point of bayonet all the movements to build an independent and sovereign state while enforcing a "military rule" and committed such atrocities as killing millions of innocent civilians during the Korean war, the statement noted. It also denounced the U.S. forces for having persisted in all sorts of moves for a war of aggression against the north, keeping south Korea under their occupation, and thereby straining the situation on the Korean Peninsula in crude violation of the Armistice Agreement which calls for the withdrawal of all the foreign troops. It condemned the U.S. forces for having staged ceaseless large-scale exercises for a war of aggression against the north including Key Resolve and Ulji Freedom Guardian joint military exercises this year. The peace of the Korean nation and its reunification can hardly be achieved nor can the people's life and security be expected as long as the U.S. forces remain in south Korea, the statement held, calling for putting an end to the disgraceful history of the U.S. forces' presence in south Korea and ushering in a new era of independent reunification, peace and prosperity. The statement called for citizens to demand the government to take action; a complaint can be made to the United States government under the original mutual defense treaty between the two countries, which established the USFK.

Says Yes

Say no does not assume mounting criticism and International law

**Sohn 9** (Kim Johng, Rodong Sinmun, Sept. 8th, 2009,

http://tongilkorea.net/2009/09/08/us-should-terminate-military-presence-in-s-korea-as-early-as-possible/)IM

Pyongyang — It has passed 64 years since the U.S. imperialists’ occupation of south Korea. If the United States persistently enforces its policy of military presence in south Korea, lending a deaf ear to the voices of the peoples of Korea and other countries of the world demanding the earliest withdrawal of the U.S. forces from south Korea, it will face bitterer rebuff and denunciation at home and abroad. The U.S. forces’ landing in south Korea was aimed at keeping it under its occupation and turning it into its colony, dividing Korea into two parts and using its southern half as a military appendage for executing its policy of aggression. The U.S. moves to seek its forces’ permanent presence in south Korea and bolster up its combat capability are a challenge to the demand of the times for the withdrawal of foreign troops and their trend. The U.S. should pull its forces out of south Korea as early as possible as demanded by international law and the times. The termination of the U.S. forces’ presence in south Korea would remove the basic factor of threatening the peace in Korea and the biggest hurdle lying in the way of national reunification. The pullback of the U.S. forces from south Korea would result in eliminating the most dangerous hotbed of war in the world and thus help create environment favorable for ensuring peace and security on the Korean peninsula and the rest of Asia and the world. How to approach the issue of the U.S. forces’ withdrawal from south Korea serves as a barometer judging whether the U.S. has a will to rectify its hostile policy towards the DPRK or not and whether it wishes to see Korea’s reunification and peace or not. The world is waiting for the U.S. to make a switchover in its attitude.

Obama will pull troops – too expensive, ROK military is strong, ROK self-determination

**Nautilus 9** (John Kim and Indong Oh, Nautilus Institute for Security and Sustainability, May 13 2009, http://www.nautilus.org/publications/essays/napsnet/policy-forums-online/security2009-2010/09038KimOh.html)IM

As the denuclearization process, peace treaty and normalization talks move forward, the United States should gradually withdraw its 28,500 troops stationed in South Korea by 2012, which is the target date for relinquishing the U.S. military's wartime operational control over the ROK troops to the South Korean government. Our troops have been in Korea for too long, and the goal of defending South Korea is no longer credible. Since it costs about $2-4 billion per year to station the U.S. troops in South Korea, and there is a great need to reduce our military spending at present, it will serve the U.S. interests to reduce our troop strength in the ROK, which already has a powerful military to defend itself. South Korea also has twice the population of North Korea, and its annual military spending is about eight times larger than North Korea's, while South Korea's GDP is 40 times greater than North Korea's. The withdrawal of U.S. troops from South Korea will also help in facilitating the self-determination of the Korean people as for the future destiny of their country-free from outside interferences. The U.S. owes a heavy responsibility for the artificial division of Korea at the end of the WW II. That decision went against the long history and interest of the Korean people as a united country. To achieve a permanent peace and security on the Korean Peninsula, it is essential that the division of Korea be ended and the country be allowed to reunite in a peaceful manner. In other words, from now on, Uncle Sam should stop trying to dictate the future of Korean people's destiny, as it had done in the past.

Generic Say Yes

Obama will cave – UN speech proves

Gardiner 9 (Niles, “The UN loves Barack Obama because he is weak”, Telegraph)AJK

As the figures indicate, Barack Obama is highly likely to receive a warm reception when he addresses the United Nations General Assembly today, whereas his predecessor in the White House was greeted with undisguised contempt and stony silence. It is not hard to see why a standing ovation awaits the president at Turtle Bay. Obama’s popularity at the UN boils down essentially to his willingness to downplay American global power. He is the first American president who has made an art form out of apologizing for the United States, which he has done on numerous occasions on foreign soil, from Strasbourg to Cairo. The Obama mantra appears to be – ask not what your country can do for you, but what you can do to atone for your country. This is a message that goes down very well in a world that is still seething with anti-Americanism. It is natural that much of the UN will embrace an American president who declines to offer strong American leadership. A president who engages dictators like Mahmoud Ahmadinejad and Hugo Chavez will naturally gain respect from the leaders of the more than 100 members of the United Nations who are currently designated as “partly free” or “not free” by respected watchdog Freedom House. The UN is not a club of democracies - who still remain a minority within its membership – it is a vast melting pot of free societies, socialist regimes and outright tyrannies. Obama’s clear lack of interest in human rights issues is a big seller at the UN, where at least half its members have poor human rights records. The president scores highly at the UN for refusing to project American values and military might on the world stage, with rare exceptions like the war against the Taliban. His appeasement of Iran, his bullying of Israel, his surrender to Moscow, his call for a nuclear free world, his siding with Marxists in Honduras, his talk of a climate change deal, have all won him plaudits in the large number of UN member states where US foreign policy has traditionally been viewed with contempt. Simply put, Barack Obama is loved at the UN because he largely fails to advance real American leadership. This is a dangerous strategy of decline that will weaken US power and make her far more vulnerable to attack. As we saw last week with his shameful surrender to Moscow over missile defence, the president is perfectly happy to undermine America’s allies and gut its strategic defences while currying favour with enemies and strategic competitors. The missile defence debacle is rightly viewed as a betrayal by the Poles and the Czechs, and Washington has clearly give the impression that it cares little about those who have bravely stood shoulder to shoulder with their US allies in Iraq, Afghanistan and the wider war on terror. The Obama administration is now overseeing and implementing the biggest decline in American global power since Jimmy Carter.

Obama’s foreign policy is built on listening to allies – will say yes

**CSM** 3-31-**09** (Christian Science Monitor, “Obama’s foreign-policy credo: listen and lead”, http://www.csmonitor.com/Commentary/the-monitors-view/2009/0331/p08s01-comv.html)AJK

When President Obama left for his first major trip abroad, he arguably left behind the "American century" and flew into – what? The "give-and-take century"? The "sharing-power century"? Whatever it's going to be called, it is an era that will require more listening and more compromise than US presidents are used to. Mr. Obama seems to recognize this. "The president and America are going to listen in London as well as lead," said his press secretary, talking about this Thursday's G20 meeting on the global recession. It's a high-stakes gathering at which leaders of the world's major economies will have plenty to say. Listening and leading should be Obama's foreign-policy watchwords not just for this summit, but for the rest of his presidency.

Internal Net Benefit – Internal Link

**Withdrawal would cause South Korean self-dependence**

**Bandow 5** (Doug, former assistant to Ronald Reagan and fellow at Cato Institute, http://findarticles.com/p/articles/mi\_m2751/is\_81/ai\_n15753425/pg\_6/?tag=content;col1)IM

IT SHOULD come as no surprise that the majority of South Koreans, who most obviously benefit from their defense free-ride, oppose proposals for America to withdraw its troops and end its security guarantee. However**, there are good reasons for South Koreans to be dissatisfied with the current relationship. The price of the American guarantee is turning decisions about South Korea's defense over to Washington.** For many decades, this was not a grave concern for South Koreans, especially when it appeared that war with the North was inevitable if the United States left the peninsula. Today, however, peace on the Korean Peninsula is possible apart from the Mutual Defense Treaty. Far more important, **South Koreans are finding that they are much more risk averse than the United States**--as represented by both the Clinton and George W. Bush Administrations--**in terms of engaging in military adventures in the region.** Moreover, **objections from South Korea might not sway the United States from its chosen course**. Attitudes toward the North now diverge widely. The reasons are complex, but many South Koreans, in particular younger people, view North Koreans more as long-lost brothers than long-time enemies. Hostility toward America also has risen, as the older generation, which remembers the United States fondly for having intervened to prevent North Korean conquest in 1950, passes on. In contrast, young people are more likely to think of Washington's support for assorted military dictators. Finally, **with Seoul barely 25 miles from the North Korean border, ROK leaders and citizens alike are acutely aware of their vulnerability in any conflict, even though the allies would ultimately prevai**l. South Koreans could not have been reassured when, in early 2004, Senate Foreign Relations Committee Chairman Senator Richard G. Lugar (R-IN) contended that the United States should "not rule out any options, including--as a last resort--the use of force" to deal with North Korea or other regional threats. Even blunter was Senator John McCain's (R-AZ) statement: "While they may risk their populations, the United States will do whatever it must to guarantee the security of the American people. And spare us the usual lectures about American unilateralism. We would prefer the company of North Korea's neighbors, but we will make do without it if we must." **So long as American forces are based in the South, Washington will seek to dominate and control the alliance. Real equality is simply impossible. Seoul cannot escape being tied to U.S. policy, even if it tries to disassociate itself from Washington. Imagine the imposition of sanctions, enforcement of a blockade or military strikes on the North--conducted by American forces located beyond South Korea's borders and acting outside of South Korea's borders over the objections of the ROK**. North Korea is unlikely to distinguish the positions of the two members of the Mutual Defense Pact and is likely to view the South as an appropriate target of retaliation. Other dangers also await the South if it continues to tie itself to American defense policy. The most important future international relationship may well be that between the United States and China. Can Beijing peacefully assert itself on the East Asian and global stage, and can the United States accommodate itself to a more influential China? Is the ROK willing to risk its survival as a prosperous and independent nation by getting in between those two powers? This is why the relationship between the United States and South Korea must change. There is much the United States and ROK can do in the coming years to cooperate to encourage South Korean and regional security. The SPI talks should focus on refashioning the relationship to fit today's dramatically new security environment. Most important, **they should begin with the presumption that Seoul will begin taking over responsibility for its own defense. Rather than maintaining a formal commitment to defend the South from North Korea** (or China, for that matter), **Washington should pursue more limited forms of defense cooperation advantageous to both sides**. Cooperation on missile defense would be one such step. Another would be joint naval training and maneuvers to prepare for future contingencies, such as seizure of illicit North Korean weapons shipments. **Arrangements also should be made for emergency base access, should American support be needed to thwart a serious hegemonic threat beyond the capacity of friendly regional states to contain**. In 1971, Prime Minister Kim Jongpil responded to the Nixon Administration's partial withdrawal by stating: "**Now is no time to survive by depending on others--U.S. troops in our country will go home sooner or later, which means that we must defend our country through our own strength."** **Surely that time is now, thereby freeing the American people from a commitment that** costs far more than it is worth, absorbs valuable military resources, and **keeps the Korean people in a dependent relationship that insults their nationhood and puts their destiny in another country's hands. Only then can South Korea and the United States decide on the contours of future military cooperation that will serve both nations**.

Internal Net Benefit – Impact: Nukes

The ROK is key to deter North Korea, absent American presence

**Sung-ki 10** (Jung, The Korea Times, June 29 2010, http://www.koreatimes.co.kr/www/news/nation/2010/06/113\_68448.html)IM

In wartime, the United States would bring more of its military power to bear and thereby reduce some but not all of the gaps in the ROK military, he said, but in peacetime, the U.S. presence in Korea is very limited, and ROK forces need to be more self-reliant, he advised. He continued, "So the question is: Will the ROK government decide to increase its military self-reliance, and thereby strengthen its abilities to both counter provocation and win if a major war occurs? Note that strong ROK capabilities in these areas will also tend to deter North Korean attacks better than other regional powers: North Korea is unlikely to pursue provocations where it anticipates being soundly defeated." Deputy Defense Minister for Policy Jang Kwang-il was wary of any controversy over Seoul's financial burden following the delay of OPCON transition. "The agreement (between Presidents Lee Myung-bak and Barack Obama) doesn't demand any financial burden on South Korea," Jang told reporters. Seoul's defense budget has failed to meet its yearly targets for the Defense Reform 2020 initiative. When the defense reform plan was originally formulated in 2005, the budget for 2010 was projected to be about 33 trillion won ($28 billion). But reductions from the planned budgets leave 2010 instead at only about 29.6 trillion, a substantial difference. Bennett said these reductions have caused a number of South Korean acquisition programs to be postponed. "I am told the 2010 reduction, in particular, was so serious that it caused a military wage freeze in 2010," he said.

Conflict on the Korean peninsula would result in use of chemical and nuclear weapons

**MacLeod 10** [Calum, Reporter, June 1, USA Today, Lexis]

The report and demands for sanctions have prompted threats of war from the North, which denies sinking the Cheonan and maintains a massive army along most of the Demilitarized Zone (DMZ) between the North and South. On Sunday, North Korea mobilized 100,000 people in Pyongyang for a rally with signs that read, "Beat up the reactionary traitor Lee Myung Bak" and "Stop and destroy provocations by the bellicose South Koreans and the U.S. mavericks," according to The Chosun Ilbo newspaper. North Korea might not be done. Adm. Michael Mullen, chairman of the U.S. Joint Chiefs of Staff, says a provocative act might come soon if tensions do not ease. Koreans have long lived with the nightmarish possibility of a devastating war, but the likelihood of conflict increases when all communications are cut off as they are now, says Daniel Pinkston, a regional analyst based in Seoul for the International Crisis Group, a think tank. If war does break out, "there could be casualties like we've never seen," Pinkston says, as the North will "get off a lot of artillery" before being stopped, and there is the potential that chemical and even nuclear weapons could be used.

A2: Backlash

Public Pressure is mounting for official government action – No Backlash

**AINDF 9** (The Anti-Imperialist National Democratic Front, Aug. 16 2009, http://www.korea-dpr.com/ocn/?p=127)IM

The south Koreans’ growing tendency towards independence and peace against war has developed into a vigorous campaign to drive out US troops, the wrecker of peace on the Korean Peninsula and the root cause of all misfortune and sufferings of the nation. To mark the fifth anniversary of death of two schoolgirls run over by a US armored vehicle voices calling for US troop withdrawal rocked the whole of south Korea this year. Civic organizations including the society of Candlelight for Independence and Peace to Cherish the Memory of Hyo Sun and Mi Son held a press conference in front of the Jongro District Office in Seoul in demand of the restoration of the monument to candlelight for independence and peace. Speakers said that the monument reflects the will of the people to cherish the memory of the two schoolgirls, their desire for national independence and peace and their determination not leave their destiny in the hands of the US any longer. The press headquarters of the Southern Committee for the Implementation of the June 15 Joint Declaration, the Citizens’ Federation for Democratic Society, the south Korean Federation of University Student Councils and the National Council of Women Student Representatives declared that they would settle accounts with US troops, a warlike group and a group of murders and peace destroyers for all of their crimes, pledging themselves to launch a dynamic campaign to drive them out of south Korea. Different organizations including the People for Peace and Reunification, Hyangrin Church and Daejeon-Chungnam Solidarity for Implementation of the June 15 Joint Declarationheld an anti-US solidarity meeting, the inaugural ceremony of the movement for a full-scale, popular campaign to drive out US troops, candlelit meeting, press conference and seminar and launched a ten million people signature campaign for the withdrawal of US troops in different parts of south Korea. The 172nd Friday rally against the US and war and for the withdrawal of US troops was held by the Solidarity for Implementing the South-North Joint Declaration and other civic organizations in front of the US embassy in Seoul on November 9. Speakers at the rally denounced the US for having forced the south Korean authorities to strengthen the war-oriented alliance and openly revealed its design to permanently station its troops in south Korea at the recent annual security consultative meeting. Disclosing the ever-rising crimes of US troops in south Korea, they called upon all the people to turn out in the efforts to implement the June 15 Joint Declaration so as to establish a peace mechanism for a US troop-free Korean Peninsula and bring earlier the day of independent reunification. Women also took active part in the struggle to withdraw US troops. At Duksung Women’s University in Seoul there was an inaugural ceremony of the National Women’s Solidarity involving sixteen women’s organizations including the women’s committees of the Democratic Labor Party and the south Korean Confederation of Trade Unions and the Anti-US Women’s Society. The participants said that the destiny of south Korean women remains exposed to danger as long as there are US troops in south Korea and that the anti-US campaign is the only way out for them, expressing their will to win back their human rights trampled down by outside forces and lead a dignified life. The south Koreans’ campaigns to withdraw US troops reflect their determination to drive out US troops and exalt the dignity and spirit of the nation. The organizations’ signature campaign can convince the South Korean government to address concerns to the US government, under conditions in the mutual defense treaty which created the USFK.

A2: Perm – Do Both

If the US dictates withdrawal it provokes the North and sends a signal of abandonment – diplomatic relations are key to stability

**Sung-ki 10** (Jung, The Korea Times, June 29 2010, http://www.koreatimes.co.kr/www/news/nation/2010/06/113\_68448.html)IM

For example, a collapse will lead to little food being available for most of the North Korean population, and the roads across the Demilitarized Zone are inadequate to carry all of the food aid that would be needed in such a condition. So in addition, "President Lee should task the ROK and U.S. Marines to prepare to deliver food and other humanitarian aid along the coasts of North Korea," he said. "ROK and U.S. Marines should exercise for the delivery of humanitarian aid along the ROK east and west coast, film these exercises, and broadcast/send pictures and films into North Korea as part of the media campaign the ROK will do," the expert said. The objective is to show the North Korean people and even the military elite that the ROK and U.S. are not their enemies, and instead are preparing to help them if their government fails, he said. To make the ROK-U.S. Marine efforts work, he added, President Lee should ask the U.S. government to base several thousand U.S. Marines at Pohang with the ROK 1st Marine Division. The U.S. and ROK Marines work very well together, but a permanent U.S. deployment in Korea to provide enough capability for prompt delivery of humanitarian aid to the North after a collapse would still be militarily threatening to North Korea, the scholar argued. To avoid provoking the North the U.S. needs to work with the ROK diplomatically about withdrawal, not dictate policy. "By making such a move, the U.S. government would also demonstrate increased support for the ROK, reducing the concerns of conservatives that the U.S. was moving to abandon the ROK," he said. "All of these measures directly attack Kim Jong-il's diversionary strategy, by showing the North Korean people that the ROK and the U.S. are interested in their welfare and are not their enemies.''

To be perceived as dialogue the US can’t come into discussions already knowing the outcome

**Quixley 8** (Suzi, Consultation 2008, www.suziqconsulting.com.au/.../CD%20-%20Consultation%20-%20May08.pdf)IM

Most consultants have their own understanding of what consultation is. So do most participants! When the two do not match, participant disappointment or anger can be the result. Legitimate, genuine consultation should affect outcomes. Therefore, consultation not designed to affect outcomes is not genuine consultation. However, the remainder of this handout does not take a position on which is the correct definition of the word consultation, amongst those intended to affect outcomes, to some extent at least It does, however, argue that: Consultation is conducted using engaging, participatory processes. Talkfests do not suit many people. Use of creative, participatory processes during consultations is useful in maximising the contribution of all stakeholders. Methodologies other than the conventional large group discussions (requiring confidence from participants) input from consultants (risking telling rather than asking) and/or questionnaires (requiring literacy skills, often of a high order) can enable all participants to explore options and generate consensus.

Internal Politics Link Shield

Countries worldwide have been demanding troop withdrawal – the CP would be a win for Myung-Bak

**Sohn 9** (Kim Johng, Rodong Sinmun, Sept. 8th, 2009,

http://tongilkorea.net/2009/09/08/us-should-terminate-military-presence-in-s-korea-as-early-as-possible/)IM

Pyongyang — It has passed 64 years since the U.S. imperialists’ occupation of south Korea. If the United States persistently enforces its policy of military presence in south Korea, lending a deaf ear to the voices of the peoples of Korea and other countries of the world demanding the earliest withdrawal of the U.S. forces from south Korea, it will face bitter rebuff and denunciation at home and abroad. The U.S. forces’ landing in South Korea was aimed at keeping it under its occupation and turning it into its colony, dividing Korea into two parts and using its southern half as a military appendage for executing its policy of aggression. The U.S. moves to seek its forces’ permanent presence in south Korea and bolster up its combat capability are a challenge to the demand of the times for the withdrawal of foreign troops and their trend. The U.S. should pull its forces out of south Korea as early as possible as demanded by international law and the times. The termination of the U.S. forces’ presence in south Korea would remove the basic factor of threatening the peace in Korea and the biggest hurdle lying in the way of national reunification. The pullback of the U.S. forces from South Korea would result in eliminating the most dangerous hotbed of war in the world and thus help create environment favorable for ensuring peace and security on the Korean peninsula and the rest of Asia and the world. How to approach the issue of the U.S. forces’ withdrawal from south Korea serves as a barometer judging whether the U.S. has a will to rectify its hostile policy towards the DPRK or not and whether it wishes to see Korea’s reunification and peace or not. The world is waiting for the U.S. to make a switchover in its attitude.

US presence in Afghanistan is globally unpopular – removal of troops would boost Karzai’s popularity

**Steyn 10** (Mark, Macleans Newswire, July 1 2010, http://www2.macleans.ca/2010/07/01/where-nice-obama-has-got-us/)IM

And so here we are, nine years, billions of dollars and many dead soldiers later, watching the guy we’ve propped up with Western blood and treasure make peace overtures to the Taliban’s most virulently anti-American and pro-al-Qaeda faction in hopes of bringing them back within the government. Being perceived as the weak horse is contagious: today, were Washington to call Moscow for use of those Central Asian bases, Putin would tell Obama to get lost, and then make sneering jokes about it afterwards. Were Washington to call Islamabad as it did on Sept. 12, the Pakistanis would thank them politely and say they’d think it over and get back in 30 days. The leaders of Turkey and Brazil, two supposed American allies assiduously courted and flattered by Obama this past year, flew in to high-five Mahmoud Ahmadinejad. The new President wished to reposition his nation by forswearing American power: he thought that made him the nice horse; everyone else looked on it as a self-gelding operation—or, as last week’s U.S. News & World Report headlined it, “World sees Obama as incompetent and amateur.”

Politics Link Shield

Withdraw popular – domestically and abroad

**Sohn 9** (Kim Johng, Rodong Sinmun, Sept. 8th, 2009,

http://tongilkorea.net/2009/09/08/us-should-terminate-military-presence-in-s-korea-as-early-as-possible/)IM

Pyongyang — It has passed 64 years since the U.S. imperialists’ occupation of south Korea. If the United States persistently enforces its policy of military presence in south Korea, lending a deaf ear to the voices of the peoples of Korea and other countries of the world demanding the earliest withdrawal of the U.S. forces from south Korea, it will face bitter rebuff and denunciation at home and abroad. The U.S. forces’ landing in South Korea was aimed at keeping it under its occupation and turning it into its colony, dividing Korea into two parts and using its southern half as a military appendage for executing its policy of aggression. The U.S. moves to seek its forces’ permanent presence in south Korea and bolster up its combat capability are a challenge to the demand of the times for the withdrawal of foreign troops and their trend. The U.S. should pull its forces out of south Korea as early as possible as demanded by international law and the times. The termination of the U.S. forces’ presence in south Korea would remove the basic factor of threatening the peace in Korea and the biggest hurdle lying in the way of national reunification. The pullback of the U.S. forces from South Korea would result in eliminating the most dangerous hotbed of war in the world and thus help create environment favorable for ensuring peace and security on the Korean peninsula and the rest of Asia and the world. How to approach the issue of the U.S. forces’ withdrawal from south Korea serves as a barometer judging whether the U.S. has a will to rectify its hostile policy towards the DPRK or not and whether it wishes to see Korea’s reunification and peace or not. The world is waiting for the U.S. to make a switchover in its attitude.

 \*\*Japan\*\*

1NC Shell

Text – Japan should, through the Security Consultative Committee, request that the United States \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_.

Solves the whole case – the US would cave

**Bandow 8** (Doug, Cato Institute, Feb. 9 2008, http://www.cato.org/pub\_display.php?pub\_id=59510)IM

Supposedly, the United States and Japan long ago resolved the most contentious security issue dividing the two countries: American bases on Okinawa. Washington was to consolidate its forces and replace Futenma Air Station with an offshore heliport. But voters in the Okinawa town of Nago recently rejected the plan. With Prime Minister Ryutaro Hashimoto promising to respect his citizens' wishes, American deployments are again in doubt. The Nago vote is just the latest evidence that Japan's outdated security dependence on the US no longer serves the interests of either nation. It is time for a civil divorce. Washington and Tokyo updated their military cooperation agreement last fall. But, given the fine print, Japan's professed willingness to cooperate beyond the defense of its own archipelago means little. Tokyo's military will not fight or even enter a combat zone, and Japan's logistics support excludes weapons and ammunition. Moreover, the Japanese government is cutting defense outlays, as well as host-nation support for the US. The purpose of the existing security relationship has disappeared. In 1945, Washington was concerned about containing communism after the collapse of wartime Japan. Five decades later, communism has collapsed, while Japan has become an economic powerhouse. Yet, the US continues to bear a disproportionate defense burden, devoting roughly 4 percent of gross domestic product to its military, quadruple Japan's level. Equally important, Americans remain at risk in order to guard Japan's national interests with little or no assistance from Tokyo. This was illustrated by Japan's tepid support for Washington's policies toward North Korea and China. Tokyo also has unambiguously stated its opinion of potential conflicts elsewhere in the region - they are America's problems. This relationship is hardly a serious partnership, let alone a military alliance worth the $20 billion or so it costs the US. Although Washington has promised to maintain 100,000 troops in East Asia for the near future the rationale for that presence has disappeared. Japan faces no serious threats and has no incentive to launch another aggressive war; South Korea can protect itself; China's defense buildup remains years away from endangering Japan; and Russia's Pacific military forces are in shambles. "We cannot be a superpower, we cannot have global reach without allies," Defense Secretary William Cohen said last year in Japan. But military alliances should have a purpose. The alliance with Tokyo costs the US far more than it provides in benefits. America should scale back its disproportionate presence in Okinawa, followed by a general withdrawal of US forces from Japan, and cancellation of the so-called mutual defense treaty. The United States has come to believe it is omnipotent, but if challenged, the government would have no choice but to recognize the pointless quality of occupation of Japan. Washington could then turn its position of unhealthy dominance into a truly equal partnership, benefiting both nations.

Solvency Mechanism

**The SCC is the forum for the status of US forces in Japan**

**Dolan and Worden 94** (Ronald and Robert, Japan: A Country Study, US Library of Congress, p.217)IM

United States pressures continued and intensified, particularly as events in Iran and elsewhere in the Middle East after 1979 caused the United States to relocate more than 50 percent of its naval strength from East Asian waters to the Indian Ocean. Japan was repeatedly pressed not only to increase its defense expenditures and build up its antisubmarine and naval patrol capabilities but also to play a more active and positive security role generally. The Japanese government, constrained by constitutional limitations and strongly pacifist public opinion, responded slowly to pressures for a more rapid buildup of its Self-Defense Forces (SDF). It steadily increased its budgetary outlays for those forces, however, and indicated its willingness to shoulder more of the cost of maintaining the United States military bases in Japan. In 1976 the United States and Japan formally established a subcommittee for defense cooperation, in the framework of a bilateral Security Consultative Committee provided for under the 1960 security treaty. This subcommittee, in turn, drew up new Guidelines for Japan-United States Defense Cooperation, under which military planners of the two countries have conducted studies relating to joint military action in the event of an armed attack on Japan. The SCC also provides a forum for discussion of concerns over the status of and restrictions on US forces in Japan.

Japan can force us out – SOFA renegotiation

**Minnick 9** (Wendell, Defense News, Dec. 14 2009, http://www.defensenews.com/story.php?i=44174650)IM

TAIPEI - The presence of U.S. military forces on Okinawa and the home island of Japan will continue to strain Japanese-U.S. relations in 2010, especially since the left-of-center Democratic Party's (DPJ's) electoral victory. U.S. strategic policymakers and planners appear to have been ill-prepared for the unseating in August of the conservative Liberal Democratic Party (LDP), which had been Japan's dominant party since 1955. Under the LDP, the military had enjoyed an unmatched 10-year rise in political and strategic influence. The LDP raised the status of the military from an agency to a ministry. The military built new Aegis-equipped destroyers and a new helicopter destroyer modeled on an aircraft carrier, and upgraded its ballistic missile defense program with new Patriot PAC-3 air defense systems. There were even calls for the United States to sell Japan the new F-22 Raptor fighter. However, during the recent political campaign, the DPJ called for the ejection of U.S. forces and the canceling of the 1960 U.S.-Japan Status of Forces Agreement (SOFA). It also called for drastic cuts in defense spending and the end of Japanese refueling missions in the Indian Ocean in support of coalition forces in Afghanistan. There were hopes the DPJ would tone down the rhetoric after the election, but just prior to U.S. Defense Secretary Robert Gates' visit in October, new Japanese Defense Minister Toshimi Kitazawa raised the specter of threats to remove U.S. military forces from Okinawa and called for renegotiation of the SOFA. The key complaint is the new location of the U.S. Marine Corps Futenma Air Station on Okinawa. In 2006, the United States and Japan finalized an agreement to move the base to the Marines' Camp Schwab in northern Okinawa at Henoko. Now the new government in Tokyo wants to cancel the agreement, but to do so they have to commit their requests to the scrutiny of the **U.S.-Japan Security Consultative Committee, which coordinates the military alliance of the two countries.**

Solvency Mechanism

Requests regarding US troops in Japan are addressed to the SCC

**US-Japan SCC 10** (Joint Statement of the US-Japan Security Consultative Committee, May 28 2010, http://www.dmzhawaii.org/?p=7150)IM

In view of shared responsibilities on environmental stewardship, and in response to complaints from the Japanese people, the Ministers instructed their staffs to discuss the potential for the United States and Japan to take a “Green Alliance” approach to our bases and the environment. U.S.-Japanese collaboration on a “Green Alliance” would consider ways to introduce renewable energy technology into U.S. bases in Japan and under development in Guam, including as a component of Host Nation Support. The Ministers instructed their staffs to consider promptly and seriously an agreement on the environment, including reasonable access to U.S. facilities and areas in cases of environmental incidents, and reasonable access to U.S. facilities and areas for environmental surveys prior to land returns. Both sides also committed to examine the relocation of troops outside of Japan, such as to Guam. The two sides intend to study opportunities to expand the shared use of facilities between U.S. forces and the SDF, which would contribute to closer bilateral operational coordination, improved interoperability, and stronger relations with local communities. The two sides affirmed their commitment to further noise reduction at Kadena through such measures as expansion of both bilateral and unilateral training outside of Okinawa, including improvements to the aviation training relocation program, and steady implementation of the Special Action Committee on Okinawa (SACO) Final Report.

Conditions of the US-Japan military alliance are negotiated through the SCC

**Japan Today 10** (Takehiko Kajita, Jan 23 2010, http://www.japantoday.com/category/commentary/view/course-unclear-for-japan-us-alliance)IM

Despite last week’s accord between Foreign Minister Katsuya Okada and U.S. Secretary of State Hillary Clinton to further deepen the Japan-U.S. alliance, it is unclear what will actually be achieved in light of a disagreement over a U.S. military air base that has strained bilateral relations. Both the top Japanese and U.S. diplomats spoke highly of the bilateral alliance, saying it has underpinned security in the Asia-Pacific region for the past 50 years. They formally agreed to launch talks to further deepen the alliance, with foreign and defense ministers from the two nations holding a meeting of the Security Consultative Committee in the first half of this year for a midterm review and seeking a final conclusion in November. Noting that this year marks the 50th anniversary of the current bilateral security arrangements, Clinton said, ‘‘It is an opportunity to mark the progress we have achieved together for our people and for the people of the region and the world.’‘ Okada said he hopes the upcoming talks will result in a new document replacing the 1996 Japan-U.S. security declaration, which expanded the scope of the bilateral alliance from one configured for the Cold War era to one encompassing the entire Asia-Pacific region. But questions arise on whether the project will proceed as hoped for, in light of the tension spawned by the bickering over where the U.S. Marine Corps’ Futenma Air Station in Okinawa Prefecture should be relocated.

Solvency Mechanism

The SCC oversees the US-Japan security relationship and addresses the concerns of the Japanese government

**Mathur 6** (Arpita, Strategic Analysis 30(3), Jul-Sep 2006, p. 620)IM

The so-called ‘normalisation’ is clearly perceptible in the incremental shifts in Japan’s security policy since the end of the Cold War. The most prominent of these shifts first appeared at the time of the redefinition of the US-Japan guidelines in 1997 and became even more discernible in the course of Japan’s assistance to the US in the war on terror following the 9/11 Al Qaida attacks. Japan offered assistance and took steps such as the quick passage of laws to empower the Self-Defense Forces (SDF) to provide logistical support to the US in counter-terror operations and dispatch of its maritime SDF for intelligence gathering abroad. An anti-terrorism bill (October 2001) and a basic plan (November 2001) were passed by the Diet, enabling the SDF to provide non-combat and humanitarian assistance. The way was also cleared for the dispatch of Maritime SDF ships to the Indian Ocean specially to refuel US and allied ships. The enlargement in the role of the SDF has been noteworthy. Other indicators include a definitive augmentation of Japanese participation in UN peacekeeping, the changing role of the Japanese SDF, the ongoing process of revisions in the Constitution (especially a rethinking on Article 9 that commits it to pacifism), Japanese participation in research on Ballistic Missile Defence (BMD) with the United States and the inclusion of the Taiwan clause as an area of common concern with Washington in the Joint Statement following the US-Japan Security Consultative Committee 2+2 meeting in February 2005. These visible signs of change are marked indicators of the willingness of Tokyo and the US to alter security policy in response to the requirements of the changing times and the security environment. In other words Japan is clearly moving towards realism and normal statehood – a movement that is likely to get a powerful impetus as a result of the 10th October 2006 North Korean nuclear test.

Potential US troop withdrawal is addressed by the SCC

**Mathur 6** (Arpita, Strategic Analysis 30(3), Jul-Sep 2006, p. 620)IM

Goaded by the United States, Japan’s security role within the partnership has considerably grown within the structure of the alliance. The most prominent recent developments include the proposed realignment of American bases in Japan and the joint development of missile defense. Another landmark initiative was the meeting of the US-Japan Security Consultative Committee (SCC) in Washington on February 19, 2005 and the consequently released Joint Statement, which in many ways proved to be an update on both the priority areas of cooperation as well as the prominent common causes of concern to both allies in the present context. The ‘Common Strategic Objectives’ earmarked in the statement included the following: Identification of international terrorism and proliferation of WMDs as common challenges; Modernisation of military capabilities in the region to be paid attention to (an obvious reference to China); Ensuring the security of Japan and regional peace and stability of the Asia-Pacific region; Encouraging Japanese military self-dependence; Support to the peaceful reunification of the Korean Peninsula, as well as resolution of issues with regard to North Korean developments such as its nuclear programme, missile activities and abduction issues; Potential United States troop withdrawal, and stress on cooperative relationship with China and encouraging it to improve transparency in military affairs.

Says Yes

The Japanese people are tired of being ignored by the US – Obama will say yes to avoid revolution

**The Japan Times 10** (Kazuo Ogoura, June 13 2010, http://search.japantimes.co.jp/cgi-bin/eo20100613ko.html)IM

Ripples, frictions, uneasiness, concern and even dismay — these are the words by which most of the Japanese mass-media commentaries characterize present Japan-U.S. relations. Behind this phenomenon lies the impact from several issues. The problem of bases in Okinawa, particularly the so-called Futenma air base issue, is one. In this case there are two aspects of friction. The first was the change in the position of a new Japanese government divorced from an "agreement" that had been reached between the former LDP government of Japan and the Bush administration. The second aspect appears to be related to the series of "changes" in the position of the Japanese authorities, which has wavered between consideration for international strategy and and the strong resistance of the people in Okinawa. Somewhat related to the base issue is a question as to how to deal with the mitsuyaku (secret deals or agreements) between Japanese and American authorities over the Okinawa reversion. Though, in substance, the contents of the secret agreement, even if proved to be true, does not directly jeopardize Japan-U.S. strategic relations, the underlying political implication is rather serious. The existence of a secret agreement between the conservative government of Japan and the American administration is regarded by many Japanese as a typical example of insincerity toward and neglect of the people's wishes at the expense of military or strategic dealings between the two governments. Unless Obama wishes to face a full-scale revolution in Japan he will start listening to the Japanese government. In other words, popular support and more transparent decision-making are now required in dealing with politico-military issues between Japan and the U.S. Then comes former Prime Minister Yukio Hatoyama's emphasis on the formation of an East Asia Community coupled with the concept of yuai or fraternity. Although neither the idea of an East Asian Community nor yuai should necessarily give rise to concern in the American mind, these concepts have been viewed by some observers on both sides of the Pacific as signs of the new Japanese administration's "inclination" toward less attachment to strategic considerations in international relations.

**Says yes**

**US-Japan SCC 10** (Joint Statement of the US-Japan Security Consultative Committee, May 28 2010, http://www.dmzhawaii.org/?p=7150)IM

The Ministers reaffirmed the commitment to reduce the impact on local communities, including in Okinawa, thereby preserving a sustainable U.S. military presence in Japan. In this context, the SCC members expressed their shared commitments to relocate Marine Corps Air Station (MCAS) Futenma and return the base to Japan as part of the Alliance transformation and realignment process. The Ministers confirmed their commitment to implement steadily the realignment initiatives described in the May 1, 2006, SCC Document, “United States-Japan Roadmap for Realignment Implementation,” as supplemented by this SCC Statement. The Ministers reaffirmed that, as provided for in the Guam Agreement of February 17, 2009, the relocation of approximately 8,000 III Marine Expeditionary Force (MEF) personnel and their approximately 9,000 dependents from Okinawa to Guam is dependent on tangible progress toward the completion of the replacement facility. The relocation to Guam will realize the consolidation and return of most of the facilities south of Kadena. Bearing this in mind, the two sides intend to verify and validate that this Futenma relocation plan appropriately considers factors such as safety, operational requirements, noise impact, environmental concerns, and effects on the local community. Both sides confirmed the intention to locate the replacement facility at the Camp Schwab Henoko-saki area and adjacent waters, with the runway portion(s) of the facility to be 1,800 meters long, inclusive of overruns, exclusive of seawalls.

Says Yes

Says yes

**Global Post 9** (Justin McCurry, Nov 14 2009, http://www.globalpost.com/dispatch/japan/091114/obama-japan-reassuring-old-friend)IM

He added: "I want every American to know that we have a stake in the future of this region, because what happens here has a direct effect on our lives at home. The fortunes of America and the Asia-Pacific have become more closely linked than ever before.” It is an upbeat message he will repeat later this week in Singapore, China and South Korea. But in Tokyo, optimism is tempered by a simmering dispute over the future of the U.S. military footprint on the southern island of Okinawa, home to just over half of the 47,000 American troops based in Japan. As GlobalPost reported in August, the election of a center-left government in Tokyo led by Yukio Hatoyama has cast doubt on a 2006 agreement to close the sprawling Futenma Marine Corps base in Ginowan, central Okinawa, and build a replacement in Nago, a town in a less densely populated part of the island. The transfer of 8,000 Marines from Okinawa to Guam by 2014 – a $10 billion plan, two-thirds of which would be paid for by Japan – will only happen if a replacement is found for Futenma. Hatoyama, who, like his American counterpart was elected on a promise of radical change, is committed to reviewing the plan as part of his blueprint for a new foreign policy less beholden to the wishes of the U.S. A potentially embarrassing confrontation over Futenma was avoided after Obama agreed to set up a high-level working group to discuss the base’s future, including discussion of relocation or even withdrawal of troops. Hatoyama, meanwhile, softened the blow of his decision to withdraw Japanese naval ships from a refuelling mission in the Indian Ocean with a pledge of $5 billion dollars in aid for Afghanistan.

Obama would cave

**Minnick 9** (Wendell, Defense News, Dec. 14 2009, http://www.defensenews.com/story.php?i=44174650)IM

Futenma is not the only problem for U.S.-Japan military relations. During President Barack Obama's recent visit to Japan, the United States agreed to set up a joint committee to study a new level of alliance relations for 2010 in commemoration of the 50th anniversary of the SOFA. Reform of the base on Okinawa, removal of troops from the country and Japanese self-determination were discussed as possibilities. Such a study could cause additional friction, said Masashi Nishihara, president of the Research Institute for Peace and Security, Tokyo. "The two governments are likely to have difficult days ahead in coming to a satisfactory agreement" on Futenma, he said. "The DPJ government will also press for a revision of SOFA, with the support of its coalition partners, Democratic Socialists. On the whole, the Japan-U.S. strategic relations will continue, but with limited enthusiasm as the Japanese government moves toward Japanese security forces the and United States considers withdrawal. " Despite fears the DPJ is attempting to subvert the strategic relationship with the United States, Hughes said the party "does actually have a strategic vision toward the U.S.-Japan alliance that is attempting to be quite different from that of the LDP. "Essentially, the DPJ is saying that it no longer wants Japan to be a simple follower of the U.S., as it perceived Japan as being under the LDP, and instead wants to assert greater autonomy," he said. This will be good for U.S.-Japanese relations in the long run as it will create a more "equal partnership and oblige Japan to be less dependent on the U.S.," Hughes said.

The opposition to removal of US troops comes from Japan, not the USFG – the US would say yes

**Shuster 10** (Mike, National Public Radio, June 21 2010, http://www.scpr.org/news/2010/06/21/japans-pm-faces-test-over-us-base-on-okinawa/)IM

The Marine base at Futenma has been a sore point between the U.S. and Japan for years. The noise of the base's aircraft and the rowdy and drunken behavior of some Marines have made the base unpopular in Okinawa and elsewhere in Japan. Several times in recent years, the U.S. offered a proposal to solve the problem, but it would still leave much of Futenma intact, says Koichi Nakano, a political analyst at Sophia University. "The U.S. government [has] repeatedly said that [it wants] to relocate to a place where [it] will be welcome, or even to remove some of the Marines at Futenma. That welcome is simply not there in Okinawa at the moment," Nakano says. The U.S. says it will transfer 8,000 Marines to Guam and move a portion of the base to another part of Okinawa. Kan, the new prime minister, has pledged to seek a solution that is in line with this offer, but he still faces overwhelming opposition on Okinawa, Honda says. "So far mayors, governors and local politicians in Okinawa, everybody [is] against the proposal of the new government. So he will be completely blocked by this," he says.

Says Yes

If pressured the US would pull troops – the alliance with Japan has become useless

**Bandow 8** (Doug, Cato Institute, Feb. 9 2008, http://www.cato.org/pub\_display.php?pub\_id=59510)IM

Supposedly, the United States and Japan long ago resolved the most contentious security issue dividing the two countries: American bases on Okinawa. Washington was to consolidate its forces and replace Futenma Air Station with an offshore heliport. But voters in the Okinawa town of Nago recently rejected the plan. With Prime Minister Ryutaro Hashimoto promising to respect his citizens' wishes, American deployments are again in doubt. The Nago vote is just the latest evidence that Japan's outdated security dependence on the US no longer serves the interests of either nation. It is time for a civil divorce. Washington and Tokyo updated their military cooperation agreement last fall. But, given the fine print, Japan's professed willingness to cooperate beyond the defense of its own archipelago means little. Tokyo's military will not fight or even enter a combat zone, and Japan's logistics support excludes weapons and ammunition. Moreover, the Japanese government is cutting defense outlays, as well as host-nation support for the US. The purpose of the existing security relationship has disappeared. In 1945, Washington was concerned about containing communism after the collapse of wartime Japan. Five decades later, communism has collapsed, while Japan has become an economic powerhouse. Yet, the US continues to bear a disproportionate defense burden, devoting roughly 4 percent of gross domestic product to its military, quadruple Japan's level. Equally important, Americans remain at risk in order to guard Japan's national interests with little or no assistance from Tokyo. This was illustrated by Japan's tepid support for Washington's policies toward North Korea and China. Tokyo also has unambiguously stated its opinion of potential conflicts elsewhere in the region - they are America's problems. This relationship is hardly a serious partnership, let alone a military alliance worth the $20 billion or so it costs the US. Although Washington has promised to maintain 100,000 troops in East Asia for the near future the rationale for that presence has disappeared. Japan faces no serious threats and has no incentive to launch another aggressive war; South Korea can protect itself; China's defense buildup remains years away from endangering Japan; and Russia's Pacific military forces are in shambles. "We cannot be a superpower, we cannot have global reach without allies," Defense Secretary William Cohen said last year in Japan. But military alliances should have a purpose. The alliance with Tokyo costs the US far more than it provides in benefits. America should scale back its disproportionate presence in Okinawa, followed by a general withdrawal of US forces from Japan, and cancellation of the so-called mutual defense treaty. The United States has come to believe it is omnipotent, but if challenged, the government would have no choice but to recognize the pointless quality of occupation of Japan. Washington could then turn its position of unhealthy dominance into a truly equal partnership, benefiting both nations.

Generic Say Yes

Obama will cave – UN speech proves

Gardiner 9 (Niles, “The UN loves Barack Obama because he is weak”, Telegraph)AJK

As the figures indicate, Barack Obama is highly likely to receive a warm reception when he addresses the United Nations General Assembly today, whereas his predecessor in the White House was greeted with undisguised contempt and stony silence. It is not hard to see why a standing ovation awaits the president at Turtle Bay. Obama’s popularity at the UN boils down essentially to his willingness to downplay American global power. He is the first American president who has made an art form out of apologizing for the United States, which he has done on numerous occasions on foreign soil, from Strasbourg to Cairo. The Obama mantra appears to be – ask not what your country can do for you, but what you can do to atone for your country. This is a message that goes down very well in a world that is still seething with anti-Americanism. It is natural that much of the UN will embrace an American president who declines to offer strong American leadership. A president who engages dictators like Mahmoud Ahmadinejad and Hugo Chavez will naturally gain respect from the leaders of the more than 100 members of the United Nations who are currently designated as “partly free” or “not free” by respected watchdog Freedom House. The UN is not a club of democracies - who still remain a minority within its membership – it is a vast melting pot of free societies, socialist regimes and outright tyrannies. Obama’s clear lack of interest in human rights issues is a big seller at the UN, where at least half its members have poor human rights records. The president scores highly at the UN for refusing to project American values and military might on the world stage, with rare exceptions like the war against the Taliban. His appeasement of Iran, his bullying of Israel, his surrender to Moscow, his call for a nuclear free world, his siding with Marxists in Honduras, his talk of a climate change deal, have all won him plaudits in the large number of UN member states where US foreign policy has traditionally been viewed with contempt. Simply put, Barack Obama is loved at the UN because he largely fails to advance real American leadership. This is a dangerous strategy of decline that will weaken US power and make her far more vulnerable to attack. As we saw last week with his shameful surrender to Moscow over missile defence, the president is perfectly happy to undermine America’s allies and gut its strategic defences while currying favour with enemies and strategic competitors. The missile defence debacle is rightly viewed as a betrayal by the Poles and the Czechs, and Washington has clearly give the impression that it cares little about those who have bravely stood shoulder to shoulder with their US allies in Iraq, Afghanistan and the wider war on terror. The Obama administration is now overseeing and implementing the biggest decline in American global power since Jimmy Carter.

Obama’s foreign policy is built on listening to allies – will say yes

**CSM** 3-31-**09** (Christian Science Monitor, “Obama’s foreign-policy credo: listen and lead”, http://www.csmonitor.com/Commentary/the-monitors-view/2009/0331/p08s01-comv.html)AJK

When President Obama left for his first major trip abroad, he arguably left behind the "American century" and flew into – what? The "give-and-take century"? The "sharing-power century"? Whatever it's going to be called, it is an era that will require more listening and more compromise than US presidents are used to. Mr. Obama seems to recognize this. "The president and America are going to listen in London as well as lead," said his press secretary, talking about this Thursday's G20 meeting on the global recession. It's a high-stakes gathering at which leaders of the world's major economies will have plenty to say. Listening and leading should be Obama's foreign-policy watchwords not just for this summit, but for the rest of his presidency.

Internal Net Benefit – Internal Link

Japan is pushing for a more independent relationship but is held back by US presence the CP would signal the end of unilateralism in East Asia

Rozman 3 (Gilbert, Prof of Sociology at Princeton, “Japan’s North Korea Initiative and U.S.-Japanese Relations”, Foreign Policy Research Institute, http://www.fpri.org/orbis/4703/rozman.japannk.html)IM

A different image can be drawn from scrutinizing the debates inside Japan: that of a country repeatedly striving to gain an independent voice on matters of East Asian security, even if it has so far been unsuccessful in that endeavor. Reviewing Japan’s quest gives us a different perspective on Japan’s relations with the United States, especially since 9/11, as the United States vaunts its unrivalled power. It can also shed light on the hopes behind Koizumi’s trip to Pyongyang and the potential for future diplomacy. To those who expect little from Japan’s diplomacy, Koizumi’s announcement that he would go to Pyongyang to meet the North’s Kim Jong Il came as a surprise. Soon, however, those who downplayed the importance of the announcement of the trip outnumbered the few observers who

 were either alarmed or delighted with what they saw as a rare independent move. The doubters recalled the June 2000 summit between Kim Jong Il and South Korea’s then president Kim Dae Jung, when all the hoopla proved ephemeral. It had been a long time since a Japanese leader made a bold breakthrough at a summit, and after seeing Koizumi fail to deliver on much of his domestic agenda, many doubted that he would do so in the global arena. The initiative seemed to be largely in the hands of the Bush administration, which, after labeling the North part of the “axis of evil,” seemed unlikely to approve a Tokyo-Pyongyang deal. Finally, they noted that the main agenda item was the return of abducted Japanese citizens, an issue of great emotional appeal inside Japan but tangential to significant security questions. After Koizumi’s September trip, a fifth reason arose to discount the momentary candor of mutual apologies and pledges of future cooperation. When the United States dispatched Assistant Secretary of East Asian and Pacific Affairs James Kelly to Pyongyang two weeks later, it appeared that a coordinated approach long urged by Seoul was under way to explore just how far the North would compromise on security in order to achieve its goals for economic reform and political recognition. At the summit Kim admitted the kidnappings in the 1970s and 1980s of 13 Japanese citizens, 8 of whom were dead. As the Japanese public became absorbed in the tragic stories of the families of kidnap victims, it paid little heed to geopolitical issues. It again seemed that a Japanese leader’s initiative would bring no dramatic departure from Japan’s pattern of reliance on U.S. leadership. On October 29-30, when Japanese diplomats met with their North Korean counterparts in Kuala Lumpur, the same message emerged: the North rebuffed Japan’s interest in discussing its nuclear weapons program. But what many observers have missed is a continuing thread in the evolution of Japan’s post-Cold War foreign policy, which leads to a different conclusion about the significance of Koizumi’s trip to North Korea. Looking back, we can identify a streak of failed breakout strategies aimed at giving Japan an independent voice on the global stage. Each strategy has had implications for U.S.-Japanese relations, each has been negotiated from the U.S. as the dominant power and provides us with clues about how Japan wants to reshape the overall security of East Asia. The old Left, though fading, has long dreamed of a breakout strategy. The resurgent Right has pressed for it, although often differing on how to proceed. Mainstream as well as maverick Liberal Democratic Party (LDP) leaders are tantalized by its potential impact on public opinion. The goal is shared across the political spectrum, even if no single approach has appeal. Japan’s motive for distancing itself from the United States to an important degree but not breaking the bonds of alliance lies less in any new perception of a military threat than in lingering discomfort over its absence of a strong voice in international circles. Many have a sense that, as politician Ichiro Ozawa put it, Japan is not a “normal” state.[4] So far they cannot agree on what it takes to become “normal,” but each time hopes arise for a breakthrough with one or another significant foreign partner, the nation rallies around the prospect that it will finally happen. The chances are slim that Tokyo could cut a deal with the outcast Pyongyang. They rise considerably, however, if Pyongyang really determines to bargain its WMDchips for a large economic payoff and recognizes the promise of multilateral diplomacy, in an age of unwelcome unilateralism. The North’s choice remains an enigma, leaving Tokyo restlessly awaiting the right opportunity.

Internal Net Benefit – Impact

A less dependent Japan would use its military to tackle regional security issues instead of relying on US

**Preble 6** (Christopher, Director of foreign policy studies at the Cato Institute, CATO Policy Analysis, April 18, 2006, http://www.cato.org/pubs/pas/pa566.pdf)IM

A U.S.-Japan strategic relationship that more closely resembles an alliance in the traditional sense of the term, as opposed to the current patron-client relationship, is likely to be an enduring model for U.S.-Japanese security cooperation in the future, especially if it is based on popular support. Fortunately, popular sentiment within Japan offers still more clues about how the three cases discussed above might play out in a future in which Japan behaves as a normal country, that is, as a country responsible for defending its interests, and not dependent on the United States. Of the three cases discussed above, popular support for an active role by Japanese military forces is weakest with respect to Iraq. Japanese elites place great importance on retaining the favor of their security patron. It is unlikely that there would be Japanese forces operating in Iraq today were it not for U.S. pressure, and the Japanese may be reluctant to become involved in similar military missions in the future. However, lingering anti-militarism within Japan does not proscribe the SDF from serving in the more ambiguous role of security provider in postconflict settings, with or without U.S. encouragement. If the pattern of SDF peacekeeping established in the 1990s were to continue, or even expand, that should not be seen as a manifestation of resurgent Japanese militarism. On the other hand, it seems more likely that, in the absence of U.S. pressure to become more actively involved around the world, a more independent Japan would use its military forces to deal with issues more directly relevant to its own national security. That would be beneficial to both the United States and Japan. To be sure, an equitable strategic partnership could make things more difficult for U.S. policymakers in certain instances, but that is a chance worth taking in the interest of devolving security responsibilities away from the United States and lowering U.S. risk exposure. Reducing the global U.S. military presence is essential to alleviating the considerable burdens on U.S. taxpayers, who collectively spend more than 10 times as much on defense as do the Japanese. U.S. policy should seek to accelerate Japan’s emergence as a more effective military ally in the region. Within the context of a more equitable U.S.-Japan alliance, if Japanese forces were deployed to any country far outside the East Asian region, their dispatch would be dependent on Tokyo’s assessment of Japanese security interests and therefore would be far more likely to enjoy the support of the Japanese public. Under the current patron-client relationship, Japanese and American officials alike have bent over backwards to place the small number of SDF troops in a location where they are unlikely to be exposed to harm; by extension, this small number of troops is not measurably contributing to the completion of the mission in Iraq; nor are they substantially reducing the threat to other Coalition forces. In short, their presence is almost entirely symbolic and has little, if any, strategic value. Nonetheless, Prime Minister Koizumi risked some political capital, as well as time and attention, rallying a modicum of public support for an exceedingly modest, even token, military deployment. And while the Japanese agonized over the dispatch of a few hundred troops to a country thousands of miles away, China ratcheted up its threats against a democratic entity a few hundred miles away from Japan and North Korea continued to process nuclear material. At best, Japan’s conduct seems a case of misplaced priorities and confusion over Japan’s strategic interests; at worst, Japan has subordinated its own interests to those of its distant patron.

Asian instability leads to nuclear war and destruction of the world

**May 97** (Michael, Engineering-Economic Systems at Stanford, Washington Quarterly, Summer 1997)IM

The unpalatable facts, to Europeans and North Americans, are that Asia has about half of the world's people, that it is growing faster than other parts of the world, and that, by mid-century, it will probably have more than half the population of the developed world and more than half of its money. Energy consumption, economic influence, and military power will be distributed in proportion. That is the rosy scenario. The dark scenario is that of a war that would, in all likelihood -- because nuclear weapons can be procured and deployed by any of these countries at a fraction of the cost of peaceful development --leave most of the civilized world devastated.

A2: Says No

Even if they win that the US will say no it’s only short term – the US is committed to a gradual withdrawal, which is key to the plan

**AP 10** (Malcolm Foster, Associated Press, May 28 2010, articles.sfgate.com/.../21649821\_1\_futenma-prime-minister-yukio-hatoyama-okinawa)IM

Washington and Tokyo agreed Friday to keep a contentious U.S. Marine base in Okinawa, with Prime Minister Yukio Hatoyama highlighting the importance of the Japanese-American security alliance amid rising tension on the nearby Korean peninsula. In a joint statement, the two allies agreed to move the Marine Corps Air Station Futenma to Henoko, in a less crowded, northern part of the island. The decision is broadly in line with a 2006 deal forged with the previous Tokyo government, but it breaks Hatoyama's campaign promise and has infuriated Okinawa residents who have complained about pollution, noise and possible danger from the bases across the island. The Futenma move is part of a broader plan to reorganize American troops in Japan that includes moving 8,000 Marines to the U.S. territory of Guam by 2014. But U.S. officials had said that the other pieces cannot move forward until the Futenma issue was resolved. The two countries said an environmental impact assessment and construction of the replacement facility should proceed "without significant delay." The statement called for a logistical study to be completed by the end of August. The base, whose plans call for a 1,800-meter (5,900-feet) runway built partly on reclaimed land off the coast of Henoko, faces intense opposition from residents and environmentalists. Hatoyama said Okinawa makes up only 0.6 percent of Japan's land mass but hosts 75 percent of the U.S. troops in the country. "I am keenly aware that Okinawans ... are angry about the agreement, but I had no choice but to ask them to shoulder a burden," he said. The joint statement said the two countries would consider moving military training facilities off of Okinawa, possibly to nearby Tokunoshima, or out of Japan completely. The accord called for more environmental stewardship, through which U.S. bases in Japan might incorporate renewable energy technology.

A2: Not Real World

Japan has asked the US to withdraw before – just not in the right place

**JPRI 96** (Tatou Takahama, Japan Policy Research Institute, JPRI Critique 3(4))IM

In the Japan-U.S. security setup, it is not clear what specific roles Japan will play in emergencies. That leaves the Japan-U.S. alliance defective and ineffectual. Hashimoto made tremendous efforts to bring about the bilateral acquisition and cross-servicing agreement (ACSA). While not very significant, this accord marks a step forward in correcting defective security arrangements and restoring U.S. trust in Japan. Under the new agreement Japan will supply fuel and equipment to U.S. troops stationed in Japan in peacetime. The Foreign Ministry remained undecided, as usual, as to whether it should approve the agreement due to differences in the Japanese and U.S. legal systems. I was told that the ministry had finally agreed to support the accord under angry orders from Hashimoto. Japanese politicians rarely take up issues regarding national emergencies and military affairs during an election. Politicians who preach unrealistic views of pacifism have a greater chance of winning an election than serious, hawkish ones. Japanese politicians' "principles" normally differ from their true intentions, and their statements in Japan also differ from those they make abroad, especially regarding defense affairs. Such behavior inevitably leads the Japanese people to worry only about Japan's safety and not take into account international concerns. Remarks by two former prime ministers, Morihiro Hosokawa and Kiichi Miyazawa, recently drew attention in the United States and Britain. But their comments were not reported in Japan, and neither man repeated them at home although both had the chance to do so. Hosokawa visited the United States in the middle of March and made a bold proposal for the withdrawal of U.S. troops from Okinawa Prefecture in speeches at the Council on Foreign Relations in Washington and the Japan-America Society in Seattle. He referred to the European arrangement that allows the pre-positioning of critical American military supplies and provides a framework for the dispatch of personnel during an emergency, and he asked, "Under such a scheme, could we not develop procedures that would allow for a reduction in the area and facilities of U.S. bases in Japan? More specifically, it should be possible to transfer the main marine bases in Okinawa to Hawaii or Guam."

The Japanese government wants a greater say in troop movements

**AP 10** (Eric Talmadge, The Associated Press, June 22 2010, http://www.marinecorpstimes.com/news/2010/06/ap\_us\_japan\_062210/)IM

Recent tension on the Korean peninsula and China's growing military assertiveness have undoubtedly driven home the importance of the U.S. security pact with Japanese leaders. Before he stepped down, Hatoyama suggested that the March sinking of a South Korean warship, allegedly by a North Korean torpedo, contributed to his decision keep Futenma on Okinawa — reversing a campaign pledge to move it off the island. Tokyo was alarmed in April when a Chinese helicopter came within 300 feet (90 meters) of a Japanese military monitoring vessel in the vicinity of a Chinese naval exercise. That same month, Chinese ships were also spotted in international waters off Okinawa. Tensions were heightened as the Japanese government feels more and more insecure about Japan’s inability to defend itself. Still, the Okinawa problem underscores an increasingly skeptical stance among some Japanese leaders toward the role of the security alliance. Though the pact was strongly supported by the staunchly pro-U.S. conservative party that ruled Japan for most of the past 60 years, the newly empowered Democratic Party of Japan, which swept to office last year, have taken a more nuanced approach, saying that while close security ties with Washington remain crucial Japan needs to improve its relations with its Asian neighbors, particularly China. On Monday, Kan said he will reassure Obama when they meet at a summit this weekend that Japan-U.S. ties continue to be "the cornerstone" of Japan's diplomacy. But he added that "I want to view this relationship from a broader point of view," and stressed Japan must not forget the importance of developing its Asian relationships while expressing a desire for greater dialogue between the two countries.

A2: Perm – Do Both

**Japan can’t operate on a regional level until it demands the removal of US troops**

Harris 07 (Tobias, Japanese politics specialist, http://www.observingjapan.com/search/label/US-South%20Korea%20relations.)IM

Based on the coverage in Japan's newspapers, it seems that Japan was blindsided by the US-ROK free-trade agreement. Perhaps Japanese observers did not quite believe that negotiators would be able conclude an agreement before time ran out. Of course, the agreement's passage in both the US and South Korean legislatures is hardly a foregone conclusion, as the Japanese media has noted, but the prospect of Korean companies -- especially automakers -- having preferential access to the US market seems to have stirred the Japanese government to action. The FT reports today that Japan has announced that it is interested in ramping up talks with South Korea on a Japan-South Korea FTA, and quotes Abe as saying that even an FTA with the US should be considered. The FT also notes, however, that Korea is more interested in trade negotiations with the EU than with Japan. Perhaps another sign of the deficiencies of the Japanese government's foreign policy making; Tokyo seems utterly incapable of shaping the regional environment, and is continually being outflanked by its neighbors, allies, and rivals, particularly the United States, whether on trade, security, or in the six-party talks. It’s time Japan took a stronger hand in its foreign policy and defy the unilateral military presence of the U.S.

To be perceived as dialogue the US can’t come into discussions already knowing the outcome

**Quixley 8** (Suzi, Consultation 2008, www.suziqconsulting.com.au/.../CD%20-%20Consultation%20-%20May08.pdf)IM

Most consultants have their own understanding of what consultation is. So do most participants! When the two do not match, participant disappointment or anger can be the result. Legitimate, genuine consultation should affect outcomes. Therefore, consultation not designed to affect outcomes is not genuine consultation. However, the remainder of this handout does not take a position on which is the correct definition of the word consultation, amongst those intended to affect outcomes, to some extent at least It does, however, argue that: Consultation is conducted using engaging, participatory processes. Talkfests do not suit many people. Use of creative, participatory processes during consultations is useful in maximising the contribution of all stakeholders. Methodologies other than the conventional large group discussions (requiring confidence from participants) input from consultants (risking telling rather than asking) and/or questionnaires (requiring literacy skills, often of a high order) can enable all participants to explore options and generate consensus.

A2: Perm – Do Both (Okinawa)

Hatoyama’s inability to renegotiate with the U.S. on Okinawa kills support

Sieg 10(Linda, Chief correspondent at Reuters, “Okinawa Angry as Japan PM flipflops on U.S. Base”, http://www.reuters.com/article/idUSTRE64D0PW20100514, accessed 7/3/10)jn

Kazufumi Ota admits he was skeptical when Japan's then-opposition Democratic Party leader promised last year to try to move a U.S. airbase off his home island of Okinawa, host to half the U.S. forces in the country. But that doesn't make Ota any less angry at Yukio Hatoyama for backtracking on the pledge now that he is prime minister. "No matter how much the people of Okinawa ask, in the end, nothing changes," said Ota, 31, during a break at a shopping center in the island's capital of Naha. "I voted for the Democrats but in the end, they were only paying lip service." During the campaign that swept his party to power last year, Hatoyama had raised hopes that the U.S. Marines' Futenma airbase could be shifted off Okinawa, despite a 2006 deal with Washington to move the facility from a crowded city to a less populous site. But with an end of May deadline for resolving the feud looming, Hatoyama shifted gears, saying he had come to realize that some Marines must stay on the island to deter threats. Hatoyama has set himself the Herculean task of finding a solution that satisfies Washington's strategic demands while also gaining the understanding of Okinawans and local residents in any potential sites where some Futenma functions might be relocated. On Friday he said he was sticking to the deadline, though a day earlier he vowed to keep trying after the deadline passed. Hatoyama's perceived mishandling of the feud has eroded voter support ahead of a mid-year upper house poll that the Democrats need to win to avoid policy stalemate as Japan struggles to keep a recovery on track while reining in a massive public debt.

Internal Politics Link Shield

US presence in Japan is globally unpopular – removal of troops would boost Kan’s popularity

**Steyn 10** (Mark, Macleans Newswire, July 1 2010, http://www2.macleans.ca/2010/07/01/where-nice-obama-has-got-us/)IM

And so here we are, nine years, billions of dollars and many dead soldiers later, watching the guy we’ve propped up with Western blood and treasure make peace overtures to the Taliban’s most virulently anti-American and pro-al-Qaeda faction in hopes of bringing them back within the government. Being perceived as the weak horse is contagious: today, were Washington to call Moscow for use of those Central Asian bases, Putin would tell Obama to get lost, and then make sneering jokes about it afterwards. Were Washington to call Islamabad as it did on Sept. 12, the Pakistanis would thank them politely and say they’d think it over and get back in 30 days. The leaders of Turkey and Brazil, two supposed American allies assiduously courted and flattered by Obama this past year, flew in to high-five Mahmoud Ahmadinejad. The new President wished to reposition his nation by forswearing American power: he thought that made him the nice horse; everyone else looked on it as a self-gelding operation—or, as last week’s U.S. News & World Report headlined it, “World sees Obama as incompetent and amateur.” The world now has a choice of who stands up to the US and who gains global influence because of it.

Politics Link Shield

Bringing troops home would be popular among Congress and the public

**Swanson 10** (David, political expert and analyst, May 25 2010, http://www.afterdowningstreet.org/node/52562)IM

Fifty-five congressional candidates and 19 activist organizations are opposing any more funding for the wars in Afghanistan and Iraq, as well as American military occupation worldwide, and inviting more candidates, incumbents, and organizations to join them. The 52 candidates, from 21 different states, include 19 Democrats, 16 Libertarians, 15 Greens, 2 Independents, and 0 Republicans (and more may be added to the website by the time you read this). Forty-six are candidates for the U.S. House of Representatives, and six for the Senate. They do not all agree with each other on many topics, including their reasons for opposing war spending. But they all back this short statement: "The wars in Iraq and Afghanistan have cost Americans over $1 trillion in direct costs, and over $3 trillion altogether. At a time when our national debt exceeds $13 trillion, we can no longer afford these wars. It's time for Congress to reject any funding except to bring all our troops safely home." The Coalition Against War Spending ( http://warisacrime.org/caws ) has posted online a variety of divergent statements -- in text and video -- from signers elaborating on their reasons for opposing war spending. A wide ideological spectrum finds consensus around opposing more spending to continue or escalate the current wars and military occupations. The coalition is inviting any congressional candidate, incumbent or challenger, and any national organization to join. This announcement comes just as Congress is set to vote on whether to spend another $33.5 billion in an off-the-books "emergency" supplemental spending bill to escalate a war in Afghanistan that polls show a majority of Americans opposes. One candidate who has joined the coalition is Tracy Emblem, a Democrat in California's 50th District (San Diego). Emblem said: "I support our troops. It's time to bring our troops home. The Iraq and Afghanistan 'wars' with thousands of civilian casualties have created more terrorists. Our brave troops have been killed and maimed and they are suffering from post traumatic stress. The military chemicals used are creating havoc on the environment and making our troops sick. Our priorities must change. We can no longer afford to blindly accept that these 'wars' are 'just' or 'necessary' when so many people are suffering the effects of prolonged wars. My neighbor, a Vietnam veteran, who loves and fought for our country has tied a yellow ribbon on his fence to bring our troops home. And I'm joining him. We must start a movement to bring our troops home now." A Gallup poll indicates that 71% of Americans oppose U.S. troop presence overseas, given the current economic situation. Another member of the Coalition Against War Spending is John Finger, a Libertarian candidate for U.S. Senate from Colorado. "Both of these wars are a waste of valuable life and resources," says Finger. "As a veteran, I'd be the first to stand up for a war which is worth fighting. But these wars are going nowhere: there's no mission, there's no measure of success, and we're sending our overburdened troops to die or be injured in wars which do not affect our own national security.

\*\*Iraq\*\*

1NC Shell (1/2)

Text – Iraq should, through the Joint Military Operations Coordination Committee, request that the United States \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_.

The Iraqi government makes changes to the conduct of US troops through the JMOCC

**US-Iraq SOFA 8** (Agreement Between the USA and the Republic of Iraq on the withdrawal of US forces from Iraq and the Organization of their activities during their temporary presence in iraq, Nov. 17 2008, Article 23, p. 19)IM

1. A joint Ministerial Committee shall be established with participation at the Ministerial level determined by both Parties. The Joint Ministerial Committee shall deal with issues that are fundamental to the interpretation and implementation of this Agreement. 2. The Joint Ministerial Committee shall establish a JMOCC consisting of representatives from both Parties. The JMOCC shall be co-chaired by representatives of each Party. 3. The Joint Ministerial Committee shall also establish a Joint Committee consisting of representatives to be determined by both Parties. The Joint Committee shall be co-chaired by representatives of each Party, and shall deal with all issues related to this Agreement outside the exclusive competence of the JMOCC. 4. In accordance with paragraph 3 of this Article, the Joint Committee shall establish Joint Sub-Committees in different areas to consider the issues arising under this Agreement or under the presence of United States troops in Iraq, according to their competencies.

Withdrawal due to an order from Iraq is key to regional stability

**Lind 10** (William, Poli Sci @ Dartmouth, Military News, June 24 2010, http://www.military.com/opinion/0,152020,170341,00.html)IM

Washington should be dancing in the streets. There could at this point be no better way for American troops to exit Iraq than in response to a request from the Iraqi "government." Contrary to the neo-cons's promises, the Iraqis did not welcome American troops with flowers, but they might but they might be willing to toss a few our way as we pulled out. We could withdraw from a failed enterprise with flags flying and drums rolling, maintaining a half-way credible pretense that we did not lose. We are not likely to do better than that. At the same time, the al-Maliki "government" has a heaven – sent opportunity to acquire what it needs most, namely some legitimacy. A legitimate Iraqi government would be a valuable asset to the United States and could prove crucial to the stability of the region. So long as it is propped up by American troops, it will remain Vichy. But if it ordered the Americans out, it would suddenly begin to look like a real Iraqi government. That is far from enough to restore a state in Iraq, but it would be a step in the right direction. There is little doubt that if a referendum were held in Iraq on sending the Americans home, it would win in a landslide. Iraqi politicians know where their public is on this issue, and like politicians everywhere they want to swim with the tide. More, some seem to sense that the Americans' time in Iraq is ending if not over. As usual, the Desert Fox, Muqtada al-Sadr, is making all the right moves. He is positioning himself as leader of all Iraqi resistance to the American occupation, not just head of a Shiite faction. By welcoming Iraqi troops (many of whom are his militiamen) into areas he controls but fighting the Americans, he is splitting his opposition. Most importantly, he is maintaining his credentials as the Iraqi leader least willing to condone a continued occupation, thereby gaining that decisive quality, legitimacy. If the Iraqi government orders American troops out, the result would be a win-win situation. America would win, and so would Iraq. In fact, it would be a win-win outcome, and there's the rub. The third winner would be Iran. A Shiite – dominated Iran free of American occupation would have a close relationship with Iran. In fact, in order to defend itself in a nasty neighborhood Iraq would probably conclude a formal alliance with Iran.

1NC Shell (2/2)

War in the Middle East escalates and goes nuclear

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

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

Solvency Mechanism

Military operations, including withdrawal, can be carried out at the behest of the Iraqi government through the JMOCC – the US has to agree due to international law

**US-Iraq SOFA 8** (Agreement Between the USA and the Republic of Iraq on the withdrawal of US forces from Iraq and the Organization of their activities during their temporary presence in iraq, Nov. 17 2008, Article 4, p. 3)IM

2. All such military operations that are carried out pursuant to this Agreement shall be conducted with the agreement or at the behest of the Government of Iraq. Such operations shall be fully coordinated with Iraqi authorities. The coordination of all such military operations shall be overseen by a Joint Military Operations Coordination Committee (JMOCC) to be established pursuant to this Agreement. Issues regarding proposed military operations that cannot be resolved by the JMOCC shall be forwarded to the Joint Ministerial Committee. 3. All such operations shall be conducted with full respect for the Iraqi Constitution and the laws of Iraq. Execution of such operations shall not infringe upon the sovereignty of Iraq and its national interests, as defined by the Government of Iraq. It is the duty of the United States Forces to respect the laws, customs, and traditions of Iraq and applicable to international law which includes agreement with or compromise of the requests, conditions and demands of the hosting Government. 4. The Parties shall continue their efforts to cooperate to strengthen Iraq’s security capabilities including, as may be mutually agreed, on training, equipping, supporting, supplying, and establishing and upgrading logistical systems, including transportation, housing, and supplies or Iraqi Security Forces.

All movement of US troops is conducted through joint operations under the SOFA

**USF-I 10** (U.S. Forces Iraq Press Release, July 1 2010, http://www.usf-iraq.com/news/press-releases/isf-arrest-suspected-aqi-vehicle-borne-ied-facilitator)IM

BAGHDAD – Iraqi Security Forces arrested a suspected Al-Qaeda in Iraq (AQI) member during a joint security operation approximately 48km southwest of Kirkuk. ISF and U.S. advisors searched a building for the suspected AQI member believed to be in charge of facilitating the movement, procurement, and construction of vehicles for use as AQI vehicle-borne improvised explosive devices. Information and evidence gathered at the scene led Iraqi forces to identify and arrest the warranted individual. All joint operations are conducted pursuant to a warrant issued by an Iraqi judge. Iraqi and U.S. forces conduct joint operations, which involves all movement of US troops, be it withdrawal or offensive operations, in accordance with the Security Agreement and in coordination with the Iraqi government to target terrorists seeking to disrupt the security and stability of Iraq.

Through the SOFA, the Iraqi government can request the withdrawal of US troops at any time

**US-Iraq SOFA 8** (Agreement Between the USA and the Republic of Iraq on the withdrawal of US forces from Iraq and the Organization of their activities during their temporary presence in iraq, Nov. 17 2008, Article 24, p. 22)IM

2. All United States combat forces shall withdraw from Iraqi cities, villages, and localities no later than the time at which Iraqi Security Forces assume full responsibility for security in an Iraqi province, provided that such withdrawal is completed no later than June 30, 2009. 3. United States combat forces withdrawn pursuant to paragraph 2 above shall be stationed in the agreed facilities and areas outside cities, villages, and localities to be designated by the JMOCC before the date established in paragraph 2 above. 4. The United States recognizes the sovereign right of the Government of Iraq to request the departure of the United States Forces from Iraq at any time. The Government of Iraq recognizes the sovereign right of the United States to withdraw the United States Forces from Iraq at any time.

Solvency Mechanism

To move troops the US has to either seek Iraqi approval or receive a request from the Iraqi government – there are grounds to remove US forces from the country because of a breach of the SOFA

**Asia Times 9** (Mohammed al-Zaidi, Aug 29 2009, http://www.atimes.com/atimes/Middle\_East/KH29Ak02.html)IM

The agreement was ratified by the Iraqi parliament last December. Critics who said the deal was a smokescreen for prolonging the US military occupation were promised it would be put to a referendum this summer. The accord includes provisions for some US troops to stay behind to assist, train or advise their Iraqi counterparts. To carry out military operations, which includes troop movement, in Iraq, US troops must seek prior Iraqi approval and be accompanied by Iraqi forces - or they must show they are acting in self-defense. They cannot be tried in Iraqi courts as long they can prove they were on an official mission. A US military statement, released hours after the raid in Kut on April 26, said the operation had been "fully coordinated and approved by the Iraqi government". However, Iraqi officials in Baghdad and in Kut are adamant that the Americans broke the rules when they attacked the Baderi house and other dwellings across the city. The Iraqi cabinet called the assault an "unacceptable breach" of the SOFA. Yusef Mihawish, the deputy governor of Wasit province, where Kut is located, insisted that US forces had not gone through the appropriate channels to receive approval for the raid. "We have a security committee, chaired by the provincial governor, and we have a joint operations room with the US forces. The Americans should have informed us of the raid through the operations room," Mihawish said. "Instead, they violated the security agreement." Wasit provincial council chairman Mahmud Talal said, "There was no coordination between local authorities and the forces that stormed the house." He said he learnt of the raid only the following morning. Among some people in Kut, shock at the raid mingled with skepticism that Iraqi officials had no warning of it. "How can a military force enter a city without the knowledge of the local authorities?" asked Abdul-Fattah, a vehicle mechanic. "Where is the local government and what role does it play?"

Says Yes

The Sadrists are enraged at the lack of commitment from the USFG – Obama will make concessions to prevent an uprising

**Seymour 10** (Richard, Poli Sci @ U of London, Apr. 21 2010, http://www.thecommentfactory.com/the-iraq-status-of-forces-agreement-is-the-product-of-iraqi-resistance-6820/)IM

Obama is typically bland: he says he wants to gradually withdraw the contractors, but certainly not ban them or anything bold like that. And, of course, the draw-down is tactically linked to the plans to increase the troop commitment in Afghanistan. Nevertheless, if the provisions are as reported, then the pact already expresses a substantial defeat for the occupiers. It would be preferrable to see the last soldiers and diplomats chased out of the country, a la 22 Gia Long Street, Saigon. But the occupiers would never have proposed the exit terms they have without years of armed struggle and political resistance. The US, despite the self-congratulatory language of the ’surge’ preferred by the Bush administration, had to cut a series of ignominious deals with armed resistance forces that basically demonstrated the complete inability of the occupiers to remain without the acquiescence of leading resistance forces. The Sadrists, quite rightly, reject the agreement, and have been threatening a return to full-scale armed resistance. That would mean ‘Iraqi security forces’ being chucked out of Sadr City and other ’strongholds’ for a start, which would be a serious setback for both the Maliki government and the occupiers. Maliki was humiliated last April when a combined Iraqi and US assault failed to take Sadr City or conquer Basra. They had to negotiate a ceasefire with Moqtada on both occasions. The Sadrists probably surmise that the U.S. is in a panic, anxious to live up to the expectations of the SOFA. So, either the US can stay on in perpetual limbo and risk another violent uprising, or it can make further concessions regarding the number and distribution of troops deployed in Iraq in order to win over the Sadrists and Sunni opposition groups.

Pulling out of Iraq is key to the economy – Obama will have to say yes

**Lind 8** (William, Director for the Center for Cultural Conservatism, Oct 9 2008, http://www.lewrockwell.com/lind/lind150.html)IM

How might the U.S. best meet the challenge of less money for defense? To start with, we must impose the right priorities on the Pentagon. I say impose, because left to its own devices the building will cut combat units first and programs last. A new administration must demand the opposite: as resources diminish, combat units, especially in the land forces, must be retained while programs, contractors, headquarters and service bureaucracies are quietly garroted. Note: this would mean a very small Air Force. Next, we must reduce commitments. That starts with getting out of both of the wars we are now fighting, in Iraq and Afghanistan. No activity of the state is more expensive than war, much less two. All over the world, we need to pull back troops and our long nose, the one meddling in someone else’s business. Reducing distant commitments may enable us to afford to meet the one situation we must face, that on our southern border. The disintegration of the Mexican state is starting to spill over the frontier, and if we do not man the walls we will soon face widespread 4GW in the American southwest. The key to bringing America’s armed forces through the Panic of ’08 and the following recession or depression is to act quickly. If we continue to overextend our commitments while pouring hundreds of billions of dollars into legacy forces and systems, we will bring about a general collapse. Historically, this has usually taken the form of irredeemable military and foreign policy defeats coupled with runaway inflation: think 17th-century Spain. Avoiding Spain’s fate requires the next administration to make some major decisions, and set a very different course, right at the beginning. In most administrations, that is the only time large course corrections are possible, before the usual interests have established a stranglehold.

Generic Say Yes

Obama will cave – UN speech proves

Gardiner 9 (Niles, “The UN loves Barack Obama because he is weak”, Telegraph)AJK

As the figures indicate, Barack Obama is highly likely to receive a warm reception when he addresses the United Nations General Assembly today, whereas his predecessor in the White House was greeted with undisguised contempt and stony silence. It is not hard to see why a standing ovation awaits the president at Turtle Bay. Obama’s popularity at the UN boils down essentially to his willingness to downplay American global power. He is the first American president who has made an art form out of apologizing for the United States, which he has done on numerous occasions on foreign soil, from Strasbourg to Cairo. The Obama mantra appears to be – ask not what your country can do for you, but what you can do to atone for your country. This is a message that goes down very well in a world that is still seething with anti-Americanism. It is natural that much of the UN will embrace an American president who declines to offer strong American leadership. A president who engages dictators like Mahmoud Ahmadinejad and Hugo Chavez will naturally gain respect from the leaders of the more than 100 members of the United Nations who are currently designated as “partly free” or “not free” by respected watchdog Freedom House. The UN is not a club of democracies - who still remain a minority within its membership – it is a vast melting pot of free societies, socialist regimes and outright tyrannies. Obama’s clear lack of interest in human rights issues is a big seller at the UN, where at least half its members have poor human rights records. The president scores highly at the UN for refusing to project American values and military might on the world stage, with rare exceptions like the war against the Taliban. His appeasement of Iran, his bullying of Israel, his surrender to Moscow, his call for a nuclear free world, his siding with Marxists in Honduras, his talk of a climate change deal, have all won him plaudits in the large number of UN member states where US foreign policy has traditionally been viewed with contempt. Simply put, Barack Obama is loved at the UN because he largely fails to advance real American leadership. This is a dangerous strategy of decline that will weaken US power and make her far more vulnerable to attack. As we saw last week with his shameful surrender to Moscow over missile defence, the president is perfectly happy to undermine America’s allies and gut its strategic defences while currying favour with enemies and strategic competitors. The missile defence debacle is rightly viewed as a betrayal by the Poles and the Czechs, and Washington has clearly give the impression that it cares little about those who have bravely stood shoulder to shoulder with their US allies in Iraq, Afghanistan and the wider war on terror. The Obama administration is now overseeing and implementing the biggest decline in American global power since Jimmy Carter.

Obama’s foreign policy is built on listening to allies – will say yes

**CSM** 3-31-**09** (Christian Science Monitor, “Obama’s foreign-policy credo: listen and lead”, http://www.csmonitor.com/Commentary/the-monitors-view/2009/0331/p08s01-comv.html)AJK

When President Obama left for his first major trip abroad, he arguably left behind the "American century" and flew into – what? The "give-and-take century"? The "sharing-power century"? Whatever it's going to be called, it is an era that will require more listening and more compromise than US presidents are used to. Mr. Obama seems to recognize this. "The president and America are going to listen in London as well as lead," said his press secretary, talking about this Thursday's G20 meeting on the global recession. It's a high-stakes gathering at which leaders of the world's major economies will have plenty to say. Listening and leading should be Obama's foreign-policy watchwords not just for this summit, but for the rest of his presidency.

Internal Net Benefit

**Active requests by the Iraqi government are key to uphold the US-Iraq alliance and prevent global conflict**

**Craven 10** (Jim, Sociology @ City U of NY, Fight Racism, Fight Imperialism, June/July 2010 (June 9 2010))IM

Three waves of attacks in April and May, mainly against Iraqi government, security and Shia targets, killed over 250 people. Al Sadr threatened to put the Mehdi Army on the streets again. Many political factions still have their own militias. According to Human Rights Watch, the Baghdad Brigade, that answers personally to Al Maliki, has been running a secret prison in West Baghdad where Sunni anti-occupation fighters have been sexually abused and tortured. The US has been pushing for a coalition by which Al Maliki and Allawi would each serve for two years. The Obama Administration has a vested interest in the region and is pushing the government in order to withdraw troops from the region. The US will be keen to sign a new agreement allowing US bases to remain when the present Status of Forces Agreement (SOFA) expires at the end of next year. Continued pressure from the United States to withdraw troops, or action on that front, would be further pressure to unite the government. Allawi was the imperialists’ choice as interim prime minister after the invasion. He had been an agent for the CIA and was instrumental in maintaining the lie that Saddam had weapons of mass destruction. Allawi’s election campaign was financed by Saudi Arabia and other Sunni states, together with Turkey, which has threatened to invade Iraq if ever an independent Kurdish region is established. Iyad Allawi told The Guardian: ‘This conflict will not remain within the borders of Iraq. It will spill over and it has the potential to reach the world at large, not just the neighbouring countries.’ If the factions of the Iraqi government can come together on anything, its their desperation for independence and recognition from the United States. To achieve this they need to take a more active role in the future of their country – take a page out of the US’s book and start dictating back.

A2: Perm – Do Both

Iraq has to order the withdrawal to solve – the US can’t hold the power

**Lind 10** (William, Poli Sci @ Dartmouth, Military News, June 24 2010, http://www.military.com/opinion/0,152020,170341,00.html)IM

Washington should be dancing in the streets. There could at this point be no better way for American troops to exit Iraq than in response to a request from the Iraqi "government." Contrary to the neo-cons's promises, the Iraqis did not welcome American troops with flowers, but they might but they might be willing to toss a few our way as we pulled out. We could withdraw from a failed enterprise with flags flying and drums rolling, maintaining a half-way credible pretense that we did not lose. We are not likely to do better than that. At the same time, the al-Maliki "government" has a heaven – sent opportunity to acquire what it needs most, namely some legitimacy. A legitimate Iraqi government would be a valuable asset to the United States and could prove crucial to the stability of the region. So long as it is propped up by American troops, it will remain Vichy. But if it ordered the Americans out, it would suddenly begin to look like a real Iraqi government. That is far from enough to restore a state in Iraq, but it would be a step in the right direction. There is little doubt that if a referendum were held in Iraq on sending the Americans home, it would win in a landslide. Iraqi politicians know where their public is on this issue, and like politicians everywhere they want to swim with the tide. More, some seem to sense that the Americans' time in Iraq is ending if not over. As usual, the Desert Fox, Muqtada al-Sadr, is making all the right moves. He is positioning himself as leader of all Iraqi resistance to the American occupation, not just head of a Shiite faction. By welcoming Iraqi troops (many of whom are his militiamen) into areas he controls but fighting the Americans, he is splitting his opposition. Most importantly, he is maintaining his credentials as the Iraqi leader least willing to condone a continued occupation, thereby gaining that decisive quality, legitimacy. If the Iraqi government orders American troops out, the result would be a win-win situation. America would win, and so would Iraq. In fact, it would be a win-win outcome, and there's the rub. The third winner would be Iran. A Shiite – dominated Iran free of American occupation would have a close relationship with Iran. In fact, in order to defend itself in a nasty neighborhood Iraq would probably conclude a formal alliance with Iran.

To be perceived as dialogue the US can’t come into discussions already knowing the outcome

**Quixley 8** (Suzi, Consultation 2008, www.suziqconsulting.com.au/.../CD%20-%20Consultation%20-%20May08.pdf)IM

Most consultants have their own understanding of what consultation is. So do most participants! When the two do not match, participant disappointment or anger can be the result. Legitimate, genuine consultation should affect outcomes. Therefore, consultation not designed to affect outcomes is not genuine consultation. However, the remainder of this handout does not take a position on which is the correct definition of the word consultation, amongst those intended to affect outcomes, to some extent at least It does, however, argue that: Consultation is conducted using engaging, participatory processes. Talkfests do not suit many people. Use of creative, participatory processes during consultations is useful in maximising the contribution of all stakeholders. Methodologies other than the conventional large group discussions (requiring confidence from participants) input from consultants (risking telling rather than asking) and/or questionnaires (requiring literacy skills, often of a high order) can enable all participants to explore options and generate consensus.

Internal Politics Link Shield

Any leader who makes Obama seem less unilateral will gain huge amounts of popularity

**IPS News Agency 10** (Jim Lobe, June 17 2010, http://www.newjerseynewsroom.com/international/obama-has-gained-an-amazing-degree-of-popularity-around-the-world)IM

While U.S. President Barack Obama has largely retained huge popularity among most of the world's publics, disillusionment with his leadership appears to have set in throughout much of the Islamic world, according to the latest annual survey of global public opinion by the Washington-based Pew Research Centre released here Thursday. And despite Obama's personal popularity, disapproval of U.S. foreign policy, especially regarding the Middle East and Southwest Asia, remains high in much of the world, according to the survey by the Centre's Global Attitudes Project (GAP). "(Obama) has an amazing degree of popularity," noted former Republican Sen. John Danforth, who co-chairs GAP along with former Secretary of State Madeleine Albright. "(But) I don't see the translation of support for Obama into support for specific policies." Moreover, the perception that Washington acts on the world stage without taking sufficient account of the interests of other countries an impression that came to dominate foreign views of the U.S. under Obama's predecessor, George W. Bush - persists, according to the survey, which covered 22 of the world's most populous and influential countries. "The U.S. continues to be seen as acting unilaterally," said Andrew Kohout, the Research Centre's president, who has directed all nine surveys GAP has published since 2001.

Obama is not popular in the Middle East – kicking him out would boost domestic leaders’ popularity

**The Heritage Foundation 10** (June 20 2010, http://blog.heritage.org/2010/06/20/just-wild-about-obama/)IM

The one exception to these glowing attitudes is the Middle East, the centerpiece of the Obama foreign policy thrust when the president came into office. In major foreign policy addresses, such as the Cairo and the Ghana speeches, Mr. Obama presented much “hope and change,” but has so far failed to produce any measurable results. As a result, publics of largely Muslim countries continue to look at the United States in negative light. In both Turkey and Pakistan, two U.S. allies, only 17 percent hold a positive opinion. In Egypt, America’s favorability rating dropped from 27 percent to 17 percent – the lowest percentage since 2006 when the surveys were first done. What is it about the Obama Doctrine that has such foreign appeal? Based on the set of strategy documents from the Obama administration released this spring, the National Security Strategy, the Nuclear Posture Review, the National Communications Strategy, and others, it is a strategy to manage the decline of the United States as a global actor. It emphasizes soft power over hard power, as declining defense budgets and increasing aid budgets suggest. It increases U.S. reliance on international institutions, as in the new rather tame new U.N. sanctions on Iran. And it seeks to reign in American power to present a more humble international presence, as the president’s numerous acknowledgements of American short-comings regularly remind international audiences.

Reverse Internal Politics Link Shield

Obama is globally popular – opposition would reduce domestic leaders’ popularity

**The Heritage Foundation 10** (June 20 2010, http://blog.heritage.org/2010/06/20/just-wild-about-obama/)IM

You can’t argue with success – or can you? Newly released international opinion polls of the image of the United States bring the good news that global publics continue to view the American president and United States as a country in a favorable light. The question that has to be asked, though, is whether this improved image is a result of a perceived new direction in American foreign policy – the Obama Doctrine –which could end up weakening American leadership as the sole remaining superpower and American national security. According to the Pew Global Attitudes Survey, Mr. Obama himself remains popular to the point of adulation among West Europeans. As many as 90 percent of Germans, 87 percent of Frenchmen, 84 percent of Brits expressed a faith in Mr. Obama to do the right thing as an international leader. It is worth noting, however that in every case, except two countries, some slippage from last years’ numbers were in evidence, suggesting that reality checks are setting in. The two exceptions were Kenya, Obama’s paternal homeland, where his approval rating is up to 94 percent, and interestingly Russia, where, following the START treaty negotiations, 41 percent now express a favorable view of the United States, up by 4 points from last year. As the Russian government came out of the negotiations with significant concessions from the American side on Missile Defense, this is maybe not so strange. Not surprisingly, Americans were less enthusiastic. Like president’s domestic approval ratings, there was a significant downward trend. Last year, 74 percent and this year to 65 percent expressed confidence in the president when it comes to foreign affairs.

Politics Link Shield

Withdrawal under the CP is key to public support for Obama

**AP 10** (Anne Gearan, Associated Press, June 20 2010, http://blog.taragana.com/politics/2010/06/20/in-spite-of-concerns-white-house-says-troop-pullout-in-afghanistan-still-set-for-july-2011-44187/)IM

WASHINGTON — The Obama administration reaffirmed Sunday that it will begin pulling U.S. troops out of Afghanistan next summer, despite reservations among top generals that absolute deadlines are a mistake. President Barack Obama’s chief of staff said an announced plan to begin bringing forces home in July 2011 still holds. “That’s not changing. Everybody agreed on that date,” Rahm Emanuel said, adding by name the top three officials overseeing the policy girding the war: Gen. David Petraeus, Defense Secretary Robert Gates and the chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, Adm. Mike Mullen. Petraeus, the war’s top military boss, said last week that he would recommend delaying the pullout if conditions in Afghanistan warranted it. Days after the date was announced in December, Gates pointedly said it was not a deadline. Emanuel’s remarks reflect the White House view that Obama must offer a war-weary American public and Congress a promise that the nearly nine-year war is not open-ended. The problem, congressional Republicans and some military leaders say, is that a fixed date encourages the Taliban-led insurgency and undermines U.S. leverage with Afghan leaders. Earlier this month, Gates said the United States and its partners must demonstrate progress this year or risk the collapse of already dwindling public support for the war. Petraeus told Congress last week that he would recommend postponing the start of the withdrawal if security conditions and the capability of the Afghan government could not support it. That does not mean Petraeus is opposed to bringing some troops home, and he said repeatedly that he supports Obama’s strategy. His caution, however, is rooted in the fact that the uniformed military — and counterinsurgency specialists in particular — have always been uncomfortable with fixed parameters for an inexact process of persuasion.

 \*\*Afghanistan\*\*

1NC Shell

Text – Afghanistan should, under the Joint Declaration of the United States-Afghanistan Strategic Partnership, request that the United States \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_.

Based in the agreement Afghanistan can demand removal because of a breach of international law

**Joint Declaration of the United States-Afghanistan Strategic Partnership 5** (http://www.afghan-web.com/politics/us-afghan-partnership.html)IM

Afghanistan confronts important challenges to its security and its efforts to build a government based on democratic principles, respect for human rights, and a market economy. To address these challenges, Afghanistan proposed that the United States join in a strategic partnership and establish close cooperation, including regular, high-level exchanges on the political, security, and eco≠nomic issues contained herein and other issues of mutual interest. The United States and Afghanistan plan to work together to develop appropriate arrangements and agreements to implement their strategic partnership. This shared effort will be based on a number of key principles, including a dedication to the rule of law, protection of the human rights and civil liberties of all individuals regardless of ethnic affiliations or gender, support for democratic governance, and reliance on the free market as the best means to further Afghanistan's economic progress. The strategic partnership's primary goal will be to strengthen U.S.-Afghan ties to help ensure Afghanistan's long-term security, democracy, and prosperity. It should contribute to peaceful and productive relations between Afghanistan and its neighbors. It is not directed against any third country. This partnership will serve as the basis for our common efforts to cooperate in the war against international terror and the struggle against violent extremism, to promote stability and prosperity in the region, and to remain steadfast in supporting Afghanistan's campaign to eradicate poppy cultivation, provide alternate livelihoods assistance, and fight the production and trafficking of drugs. The partnership will be anchored in the constitutions of our two countries, and will be guided by the United States and Afghanistan's respective obligations under the United Nations Charter and other international agreements and conventions. If either Party breaches international agreements the related government has the right to request reparations, including removal of troops, relocation of bases and redistribution of resources, from the offending Party.

1NC Shell

Targeted killings by the US in Afghanistan are in violation of international law

**Maniquet 10** (Scott, June 2, 2010, The National Post,

http://news.nationalpost.com/2010/06/02/u-s-should-stop-cia-drone-targeted-killings-un-report-says/)IM

A new report by the Human Rights Council, calls on the United States to stop using unmanned drone aircraft to conduct targeted killings in Pakistan and Afghanistan. The report comes just two days after the U.S. announced that they believe al-Qaeda’s third-in-command was killed by a CIA-operated drone missile strike in Pakistan. In a media release about the report (download PDF here), author Philip Alston said he is concerned about the CIA drones may exceed what is considered legal by the UN Charter: “There are indeed circumstances in which targeted killings may be legal. They are permitted in armed conflict situations when used against combatants or fighters, or civilians who directly engage in combat-like activities. But they are increasingly being used far from any battle zone. The United States, in particular, has put forward a novel theory that there is a ‘law of 9/11’ that enables it to legally use force in the territory of other States as part of its inherent right to self-defence on the basis that it is in an armed conflict with al-Qaeda, the Taliban and ‘associated forces’, although the latter group is fluid and undefined.” Alston, a New York University School of Law professor, says “it would cause chaos” if countries were able to use such an “expansive and open-ended interpretation of the right to self-defence.” Alston says he is all for fighting terrorism but is concerned that the ease that drones can kill may tempt countries to expand the circumstances in which they are used. “I condemn wholeheartedly the actions of al-Qaeda and all other groups that kill innocent civilians, as well as any groups that increase the danger of attacks on civilians by hiding in their midst. These actions, as well as those of the U.S. unequivocally violate international law. The fact that such enemies do not play by the rules does not mean that a Government can cast those rules aside or unilaterally re-interpret them.” Alston told CNN that about 40 countries currently possess drone capability, although most cannot fire missiles from them yet.

Solvency Mechanism

Karzai can demand the removal of US troops under the Joint Declaration and US drone strikes legitimize removal

**NYT 8** (Carlotta Gall, August 25, 2008, http://www.nytimes.com/2008/08/26/world/asia/26afghan.html)IM

KABUL, Afghanistan — The Afghan Council of Ministers decided Monday to review the presence of international forces and agreements with foreign allies, including NATO and the United States, after a series of military operations that have caused mounting civilian losses. The ministers demanded a status of forces agreement, which would stipulate that the authority and responsibilities of international forces be negotiated, and they said that aerial bombing, illegal detentions and house raids by international forces must be stopped. The declaration came after several military operations involving American forces resulted in heavy civilian casualties, most recently airstrikes and attacks from drones in western Afghanistan on Friday that killed more than 90 people, most of them women and children, according to a government commission. The United States military is investigating the latest episode; it earlier said the airstrikes had killed 5 civilians and 25 militants. As security has deteriorated in the country and economic conditions have worsened, the government and its international partners have encountered rising popular dissatisfaction. Heavy-handed bombing raids and house raids, which are seen as culturally unacceptable by many Afghans who guard their privacy fiercely, and the detention of hundreds of suspects for years without trial at the Bagram air base and Guantánamo Bay, Cuba, have stirred up Afghans’ strong independent streak and ancient dislike of invaders. President Hamid Karzai has repeatedly called for foreign forces to coordinate operations with Afghan forces and local authorities, and for greater care to be used with airstrikes. It is time for President Karzai to step up to the plate and address the root of the problem – American troops. The agreement between the United States and Afghan governments outlines guidelines of international law which must be upheld to legitimize further American presence in the country. In an interview in April, Mr. Karzai warned that civilian casualties were undermining the fight against terrorism, and he questioned, as many Afghans do, why Afghan villagers were under attack when the militants’ training camps in Pakistan were left untouched. “The war against terrorism is not in Afghan villages,” he said. “The war against terrorism is elsewhere, and that’s where the war should go.”

US troop presence in Afghanistan is subject to international law

**Matheson 8** (Michael, Law @ George Washington U, Feb 28 2008, http://foreignaffairs.house.gov/110/mat022808.htm)IM

The Operation Enduring Freedom force is governed by separate instruments. In 2005, Presidents Bush and Karzai signed a Joint Declaration of the United States-Afghanistan Strategic Partnership which describes the overall purposes and goals of the two countries. Among other things, it says that the United States will: “help organize, train, equip and sustain Afghan security forces”; “consult with respect to taking appropriate measures in the event that Afghanistan perceives that its territorial integrity, independence, or security is threatened or at risk”; and “continue to conduct counter-terrorism operations in cooperation with Afghan forces”. It states that “in order to achieve the objectives contained herein,” U.S. forces are to have access to various Afghan facilities and “are to continue to have the freedom of action required to conduct appropriate military operations based on consultations and pre-agreed procedures, under the restrictions of international law.” [12] The status and immunities of this force are governed by an Agreement regarding the Status of United States Military and Civilian Personnel of the U.S. Department of Defense Present in Afghanistan, concluded by an exchange of notes in 2003. Among other things, it gives U.S. personnel the status of administrative and technical staff of the U.S. Embassy (which exempts them from Afghan criminal jurisdiction), and regulates exit and entry, uniforms and driving licenses, fees and inspections, contracts and claims. This agreement says that it is “without prejudice to the conduct of ongoing military operations by the United States”, language which does not actually authorize U.S. forces to conduct such operations, but may suggest the context in which the parties understood those forces would be operating. It concludes, “The partnership will be anchored in the constitutions of our two countries, and will be guided by the United States and Afghanistan's respective obligations under the United Nations Charter and other international agreements and conventions. If either Party breaches international agreements the related government has the right to request reparations, including removal of troops, relocation of bases and redistribution of resources, from the offending Party.”

Say Yes

Obama would have to say yes – continued presence violates US law, he needs to save face

**Weirich 9** (David, The Daily Mail, Dec 3, 2009,

http://www.dailymail.co.uk/articles/Keeping-troops-in-Afghanis-by-David-Weirich-091130-579.html)IM

Never mind if sending troops overseas to fight undeclared and never-ending wars violates international law. The more immediate concern for President Obama is whether or not keeping troops in Afghanistan violates U.S. law, which would obviously be extremely embarrassing for a Harvard constitutional law professor. Although I support most of the positions which Barack Obama took during the presidential campaign, and he is still the much better choice over John McCain, the abuses of presidential power which were prevalent during the Bush administration need to be put to a halt ˇ˝" and to do so, why not beat the government over the head with its own laws? Too bad I didn't find this earlier, because it was George W. Bush who initially violated U.S. law by keeping our troops in Afghanistan for greater than 60 days without formal congressional approval. But President Obama had an opportunity to correct that policy, so I don't feel too badly. President Obama is violating Title 50 of the United States by keeping troops in Afghanistan, let alone sending more. According to 50 U.S.C. 1544(b), the president can send troops into hostilities for up to 60 days. After those initial 60 days, the Congress must either declare war or grant "specific authority" for the continued use of force. But according to 50 U.S.C. 1547(a)(1), this "specific authority" must be in writing and be VERY specific - appropriations bills by themselves are not enough, unless there is other wording stating that the bill is designed to meet the requirements of specific authority. And after contacting a staffer at Senator Maria Cantwell's Seattle office, I can verify that such express congressional approval does not exist. Here is the section of U.S. law which allows the president to send troops into hostilities for 60 days, after which congressional approval must be attained: 50 U.S.C. 1544(b) Termination of use of United States Armed Forces; exceptions; extension period Within sixty calendar days after a report is submitted or is required to be submitted pursuant to section 1543(a)(1) of this title, whichever is earlier, the President shall terminate any use of United States Armed Forces with respect to which such report was submitted (or required to be submitted), unless the Congress (1) has declared war or has enacted a specific authorization for such use of United States Armed Forces, (2) has extended by law such sixty-day period, or (3) is physically unable to meet as a result of an armed attack upon the United States. And according to 50 U.S.C. section 1547(a)(1) with respect to "specific authorization" given by Congress to meet the requirement of the above law, 1547. Interpretation of joint resolution (a) Inferences from any law or treaty Authority to introduce United States Armed Forces into hostilities or into situations wherein involvement in hostilities is clearly indicated by the circumstances shall not be inferred-- (1) from any provision of law (whether or not in effect before November 7, 1973), including any provision contained in any appropriation Act, unless such provision specifically authorizes the introduction of United States Armed Forces into hostilities or into such situations and states that it is intended to constitute specific statutory authorization within the meaning of this chapter; Obviously, the Congress has not declared war. So President Obama requires specific authorization for the use of the Armed Forces in Afghanistan, since we are well past the 60-day limit, and according to the second law such specific authorization must state "that it is intended to constitute specific statutory authority". Furthermore, appropriations acts to finance hostilities are not by themselves specific authorization, unless they also meet the requirements of 50 U.S.C. section 1547(a)(1). President Obama should look into this before it becomes a humiliating international incident.

The actions of the US in Afghanistan are illegal under US law – violates executive order 12333 – Obama would have to agree

**Machon 6** (Maj. Matthew, School of Advanced Military Studies in Fort Leavenworth Kansas, May 25 2006, www.fas.org/irp/eprint/machon.pdf)IM

While the efficacy of the U.S. policy is certainly a subject worthy of further attention and study, the intent of this monograph is to examine the moral and legal legitimacy of a U.S. policy of ‘targeted killing’ of trans-national terrorists under both U.S. domestic and international law. The first section of this study will examine the effect of the assassination ban of Executive Order 12333 and its impact upon a policy of ‘targeted killing.’ Many opponents of the policy of ‘targeted killing’ assert the policy is a violation of this executive order and therefore in contravention of domestic law. This section will examine the historical background leading to the creation of Executive Order 12333; the reason for its development, the intent behind it, and its overall impact on U.S. foreign policy. Opponents of a policy of ‘targeted killing’ often claim that such a policy is in direct violation of articles 2.11 and 2.12 of Executive Order 12333 (hereafter EO 12333) prohibiting assassination.

Generic Say Yes

Obama will cave – UN speech proves

Gardiner 9 (Niles, “The UN loves Barack Obama because he is weak”, Telegraph)AJK

As the figures indicate, Barack Obama is highly likely to receive a warm reception when he addresses the United Nations General Assembly today, whereas his predecessor in the White House was greeted with undisguised contempt and stony silence. It is not hard to see why a standing ovation awaits the president at Turtle Bay. Obama’s popularity at the UN boils down essentially to his willingness to downplay American global power. He is the first American president who has made an art form out of apologizing for the United States, which he has done on numerous occasions on foreign soil, from Strasbourg to Cairo. The Obama mantra appears to be – ask not what your country can do for you, but what you can do to atone for your country. This is a message that goes down very well in a world that is still seething with anti-Americanism. It is natural that much of the UN will embrace an American president who declines to offer strong American leadership. A president who engages dictators like Mahmoud Ahmadinejad and Hugo Chavez will naturally gain respect from the leaders of the more than 100 members of the United Nations who are currently designated as “partly free” or “not free” by respected watchdog Freedom House. The UN is not a club of democracies - who still remain a minority within its membership – it is a vast melting pot of free societies, socialist regimes and outright tyrannies. Obama’s clear lack of interest in human rights issues is a big seller at the UN, where at least half its members have poor human rights records. The president scores highly at the UN for refusing to project American values and military might on the world stage, with rare exceptions like the war against the Taliban. His appeasement of Iran, his bullying of Israel, his surrender to Moscow, his call for a nuclear free world, his siding with Marxists in Honduras, his talk of a climate change deal, have all won him plaudits in the large number of UN member states where US foreign policy has traditionally been viewed with contempt. Simply put, Barack Obama is loved at the UN because he largely fails to advance real American leadership. This is a dangerous strategy of decline that will weaken US power and make her far more vulnerable to attack. As we saw last week with his shameful surrender to Moscow over missile defence, the president is perfectly happy to undermine America’s allies and gut its strategic defences while currying favour with enemies and strategic competitors. The missile defence debacle is rightly viewed as a betrayal by the Poles and the Czechs, and Washington has clearly give the impression that it cares little about those who have bravely stood shoulder to shoulder with their US allies in Iraq, Afghanistan and the wider war on terror. The Obama administration is now overseeing and implementing the biggest decline in American global power since Jimmy Carter.

Obama’s foreign policy is built on listening to allies – will say yes

**CSM** 3-31-**09** (Christian Science Monitor, “Obama’s foreign-policy credo: listen and lead”, http://www.csmonitor.com/Commentary/the-monitors-view/2009/0331/p08s01-comv.html)AJK

When President Obama left for his first major trip abroad, he arguably left behind the "American century" and flew into – what? The "give-and-take century"? The "sharing-power century"? Whatever it's going to be called, it is an era that will require more listening and more compromise than US presidents are used to. Mr. Obama seems to recognize this. "The president and America are going to listen in London as well as lead," said his press secretary, talking about this Thursday's G20 meeting on the global recession. It's a high-stakes gathering at which leaders of the world's major economies will have plenty to say. Listening and leading should be Obama's foreign-policy watchwords not just for this summit, but for the rest of his presidency.

US Breaking I-Law

US activity in Afghanistan is a war crime

**Dawn Media Group 10** (June 2 2010,

http://www.dawn.com/wps/wcm/connect/dawn-content-library/dawn/news/world/06-targeted-killings-may-be-war-crimes-un-expert-rs-03)IM

Philip Alston, the independent UN investigator on extrajudicial killings, called on countries to lay out the rules and safeguards they use when carrying out so-called targeted killings, publish figures on civilian casualties and prove they have attempted to capture or incapacitate suspects without killing them. His 29-page report to the UN Human Rights Council will put unwanted scrutiny on intelligence operations of the United States, Israel and Russia, who Alston says are(is) all credibly reported to have used drones to kill alleged terrorists and insurgents. Alston, a New York University law professor, said the use of unmanned aerial vehicles to carry out targeted killings in Afghanistan, Pakistan and elsewhere is particularly fraught because of the secrecy surrounding such operations. Although not illegal as such, drone strikes are more likely to breach the rules of war than similar operations carried out by armed forces, who are more familiar with international law and can resort to non-lethal means because they have troops on the ground, Alston said.

US use of drones is a war crime and breaches multiple instances of international law

**AP 10** (Frank Jordan, Associated Press, June 2 2010,

http://www.huffingtonpost.com/2010/06/02/un-targeted-killings-war-crimes\_n\_597886.html)IM

GENEVA — Governments must come clean on their methods for killing suspected terrorists and insurgents – especially when using unmanned drones – because they may be committing war crimes, a U.N. human rights expert said Wednesday. Philip Alston, the independent U.N. investigator on extrajudicial killings, called on countries to lay out the rules and safeguards they use when carrying out so-called targeted killings, publish figures on civilian casualties and prove they have attempted to capture or incapacitate suspects without killing them. His 29-page report to the U.N. Human Rights Council will put unwanted scrutiny on intelligence operations of the United States, Israel and Russia, who Alston says are all credibly reported to have used drones to kill alleged terrorists and insurgents. Alston, a New York University law professor, said the use of unmanned aerial vehicles to carry out targeted killings in Afghanistan, Pakistan and elsewhere is particularly fraught because of the secrecy surrounding such operations. "In a situation in which there is no disclosure of who has been killed, for what reason, and whether innocent civilians have died, the legal principle of international accountability is, by definition, comprehensively violated," Alston said. Although not illegal as such, drone strikes are also more likely to breach the rules of war than similar operations carried out by armed forces, who are more familiar with international law and can resort to non-lethal means because they have troops on the ground, Alston said.

US Breaking I-Law

US actions in Afghanistan are illegal under international law

**Rogers 10** (Paul, Peace Studies @ U of London, International Centre on Human Rights and Drug Policy

http://www.humanrightsanddrugs.org/)IM

In 2009, the United States announced that it had placed fifty Afghan drug traffickers with links to the Taliban on a ‘kill list.’ This controversial proposal essentially weds the counter-narcotics effort with the mission to defeat the Taliban, and challenges a cornerstone of international humanitarian law, the principle of distinction. This article argues that drug traffickers, even those who support the Taliban, are not legitimate targets according to the rules applicable to non-international armed conflict. It explores the notions of membership in armed groups, civilian status and acts that result in the loss of protection, and argues that the US plan violates international humanitarian law. Drug traffickers are clearly not ‘combatants’ or ‘fighters’ in the sense intended by international humanitarian law. They remain civilians, and as such are subject to arrest and prosecution. Organised criminals plague any number of societies around the world, but the vast majority of them should not be in the line of fire of state militaries, even when operating in an armed conflict. As such, the US military’s policy to kill suspected drug traffickers is inconsistent with multiple principles of international humanitarian and human rights law. There is no argument over the nexus between the drug trade and the Taliban. The insurgency has clearly exploited Afghanistan’s lucrative heroin trade to subsidise its efforts to topple the Karzai government. Yet legitimate targeting hinges on membership in an armed group or direct participation in hostilities. While these topics are notoriously nebulous areas of international law, they have received much-needed clarification from the ICRC. The conditions articulated in that document would plainly not allow for the killing of drug traffickers due to their financial support for the Taliban. However, even before the ICRC released its interpretive guidance, the killing of financiers was established to be unlawful. There is nothing in the treaties relevant to non-international armed conflict that makes targeting sponsors of an insurgency permissible. Even the Israeli Supreme Court decision supporting the assassination of those who directly participate in hostilities explicitly removed financiers from the list of legitimate targets. Targeting people for death is not an appropriate or legal means for holding those involved in criminal activities accountable for their actions. If a mode of liability can be established, civilian criminals could be prosecuted domestically or even theoretically be brought before the International Criminal Court. As Luis Moreno-Ocampo, the prosecutor of the ICC, once said, ‘Investigation of the financial aspects of the alleged atrocities will be crucial to prevent future crimes and for the prosecution of crimes already committed.’

US breaking international laws in Afghanistan

**Alston 10** (Philip, Special Rapporteur on Extrajudicial Executions UN Human Rights Council, June 2 2010, http://outofcentralasianow.wordpress.com/2010/06/)IM

Targeted killings pose a rapidly growing challenge to the international rule of law, as they are increasingly used in circumstances which violate the relevant rules of international law, particularly in the case of US troops in Afghanistan” warned on Wednesday Philip Alston, the UN Special Rapporteur on extrajudicial executions, launching his report\* to the Human Rights Council on legal issues raised by targeted killing. “The result is that the rules being set today are going to govern the conduct of many States tomorrow,” Mr. Alston said. “The international community needs to be more forceful in demanding accountability.” “The most prolific user of targeted killings today is the United States, which primarily uses drones for attacks,” said the independent expert noting that “some 40 states already possess drone technology, and some already have, or are seeking, the capacity to fire missiles from them.” “I’m particularly concerned that the United States seems oblivious to this fact when it asserts an ever-expanding entitlement for itself to target individuals across the globe. But this strongly asserted but ill-defined license to kill without accountability is not an entitlement which the United States or other States can have without doing grave damage to the rules designed to protect the right to life and prevent extrajudicial executions.” According to the UN Special Rapporteur, the United States, in particular, has put forward a novel theory that there is a ‘law of 9/11’ that enables it to legally use force in the territory of other States as part of its inherent right to self-defence on the basis that it is in an armed conflict with al-Qaeda, the Taliban and ‘associated forces’, although the latter group is fluid and undefined. “This expansive and open-ended interpretation of the right to self-defence goes a long way towards destroying the prohibition on the use of armed force contained in the UN Charter. If invoked by other States, in pursuit of those they deem to be terrorists and to have attacked them, it would cause chaos,” he said.

Internal Net Benefit – Internal Links

**Standing up to the US boosts Karzai’s credibility and that of his government**

**Orange County Register 10** (Apr. 1 2010, http://www.ocregister.com/articles/karzai-242026-afghanistan-american.html)IM

So, this is the thinking of an Afghan leader whose continuance in power rests almost entirely on American military prowess and good will? This is the leader whose government we are spilling American blood to prop up? These major complications are mere sidelights compared with the shaky strategic basis of continuing American involvement in Afghanistan. The stated reason is to keep al-Qaida, which still has international terrorist ambitions, out of Afghanistan. But most intelligence authorities agree that al-Qaida is not in Afghanistan just now, and it is far from certain that even if the Taliban, an indigenous Afghan outfit, were to return to power that it would welcome back al-Qaida. They remember how that turned out the last time. U.S. military forces are performing with bravery and skill in Afghanistan, but the basis for their presence is deeply flawed. There is one option which no one seems to realize and that is heeding the wishes of President Karzai. It would be a win for him, as he gains credibility for standing up to the US, and the US can stop spilling unnecessary blood without losing credibility. It is high time for the Obama administration to reconsider its decision to escalate the Afghan war and begin preparing for a withdrawal that would eliminate the American crutch and leave Afghanistan to the Afghans.

Credibility of Karzai’s government is key to stop the Taliban

**Landay 9** (Jonathon, McClatchy Newspapers, Nov. 2 2009, http://www.mcclatchydc.com/2009/11/02/78214/exclusive-us-drafts-afghan-compact.html)IM

WASHINGTON — The Obama administration has been quietly working with U.S. allies and Afghan officials on a package of reforms and anti-corruption measures that it hopes will boost popular support for President Hamid Karzai and erase the doubts about his legitimacy raised by his fraud-marred re-election. The success of the so-called "Afghanistan Compact" will hinge on Karzai's willingness to take bold actions such as cracking down on official corruption, replacing ineffective ministers and surrendering some power to local authorities, which in the past he's resisted or failed to undertake. "As long as the population views its government as weak or predatory, the Taliban's 'alternative' style of delivering security and some form of justice will continue to have traction," says a U.S. government document that outlines part of the proposed Compact and was obtained by McClatchy. "We would have to see some really concrete actions on the part of Karzai to be able to take this seriously," said Marvin Weinbaum, a former State Department intelligence analyst, now at the Middle East Institute. "It looks great on paper." Bolstering the credibility of Karzai's government is essential to the Obama administration's efforts to curb the worsening Taliban-led insurgency amid growing casualties and shrinking public support for a war that entered its ninth year last month.

Internal Net Benefit – Impact: Regional Collapse

Collapse of Afghanistan collapses central Asia

**Akbulut 7** (Isis. Afghan Profile, July 19 2007 http://afghanprofile.net/index.php?option=com\_content&task=view&id=163&Itemid=27)IM

Apart from Pakistan, Afghanistan is a key country for the Central Asia as well. Uzbeks, Tajiks and other societies are widespread in Afghanistan, and the changes in this country would inevitably affect the neighboring Muslim Central Asian republics. Besides most of Central Asian republics, especially Uzbekistan would not be able to resist the extremist and radical movements in Afghanistan. Under these circumstances, there is the risk that Afghanistan’s problems would spread not only on the direction of Southern Asia but also to Central Asia. In addition to Pakistan and Central Asia, the failure of the reforms and moderate groups in Afghanistan will add another Palestine, Iraq or Chechnya issue for the Muslim world. All these problems increased the victimization feeling of the Muslims and deepened the mistrust between Muslims and the West by luring many Muslims to the extremist ideas. In another word, if the world cannot solve the Afghanistan problem, Afghanistan will spread all over the world.

That leads to nuclear conflicts

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

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

**Internal Net Benefit – Impact: Terrorism**

Instability in Afghanistan collapses rule of law – that leads to a Taliban takeover

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

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

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

Terrorism leads to extinction

**Sid-Ahmed 4** (Al-Ahram Mohamed, Weekly political analyst August 26 2004, http://weekly.ahram.org.eg/2004/705/op5.htm)IM

What would be the consequences of a nuclear attack by terrorists? Even if it fails, it would further exacerbate the negative features of the new and frightening world in which we are now living. Societies would close in on themselves, police measures would be stepped up at the expense of human rights, tensions between civilisations and religions would rise and ethnic conflicts would proliferate. It would also speed up the arms race and develop the awareness that a different type of world order is imperative if humankind is to survive. But the still more critical scenario is if the attack succeeds. This could lead to a third world war, from which no one will emerge victorious. Unlike a conventional war which ends when one side triumphs over another, this war will be without winners and losers. When nuclear pollution infects the whole planet, we will all be losers.

Internal Net Benefit – Impact: Nukes

Instability in Afghanistan leads to nuclear war

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

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

A2: Perm – Do Both

**Authentically responding to and deliberating about a request from Karzai is key to his credibility**

**Orange County Register 10** (Apr. 1 2010, http://www.ocregister.com/articles/karzai-242026-afghanistan-american.html)IM

So, this is the thinking of an Afghan leader whose continuance in power rests almost entirely on American military prowess and good will? This is the leader whose government we are spilling American blood to prop up? These major complications are mere sidelights compared with the shaky strategic basis of continuing American involvement in Afghanistan. The stated reason is to keep al-Qaida, which still has international terrorist ambitions, out of Afghanistan. But most intelligence authorities agree that al-Qaida is not in Afghanistan just now, and it is far from certain that even if the Taliban, an indigenous Afghan outfit, were to return to power that it would welcome back al-Qaida. They remember how that turned out the last time. U.S. military forces are performing with bravery and skill in Afghanistan, but the basis for their presence is deeply flawed. No one seems to realize the best option, and that is heeding the wishes of President Karzai. It would be a win for him, as he gains credibility for standing up to the US, and the US can stop spilling unnecessary blood without losing credibility. It is high time for the Obama administration to reconsider its decision to escalate the Afghan war and begin preparing for a withdrawal that would eliminate the American crutch and leave Afghanistan to the Afghans.

To be perceived as dialogue the US can’t come into discussions already knowing the outcome

**Quixley 8** (Suzi, Consultation 2008, www.suziqconsulting.com.au/.../CD%20-%20Consultation%20-%20May08.pdf)IM

Most consultants have their own understanding of what consultation is. So do most participants! When the two do not match, participant disappointment or anger can be the result. Legitimate, genuine consultation should affect outcomes. Therefore, consultation not designed to affect outcomes is not genuine consultation. However, the remainder of this handout does not take a position on which is the correct definition of the word consultation, amongst those intended to affect outcomes, to some extent at least It does, however, argue that: Consultation is conducted using engaging, participatory processes. Talkfests do not suit many people. Use of creative, participatory processes during consultations is useful in maximising the contribution of all stakeholders. Methodologies other than the conventional large group discussions (requiring confidence from participants) input from consultants (risking telling rather than asking) and/or questionnaires (requiring literacy skills, often of a high order) can enable all participants to explore options and generate consensus.

Internal Politics Link Shield

Any leader who makes Obama seem less unilateral will gain huge amounts of popularity

**IPS News Agency 10** (Jim Lobe, June 17 2010, http://www.newjerseynewsroom.com/international/obama-has-gained-an-amazing-degree-of-popularity-around-the-world)IM

While U.S. President Barack Obama has largely retained huge popularity among most of the world's publics, disillusionment with his leadership appears to have set in throughout much of the Islamic world, according to the latest annual survey of global public opinion by the Washington-based Pew Research Centre released here Thursday. And despite Obama's personal popularity, disapproval of U.S. foreign policy, especially regarding the Middle East and Southwest Asia, remains high in much of the world, according to the survey by the Centre's Global Attitudes Project (GAP). "(Obama) has an amazing degree of popularity," noted former Republican Sen. John Danforth, who co-chairs GAP along with former Secretary of State Madeleine Albright. "(But) I don't see the translation of support for Obama into support for specific policies." Moreover, the perception that Washington acts on the world stage without taking sufficient account of the interests of other countries an impression that came to dominate foreign views of the U.S. under Obama's predecessor, George W. Bush - persists, according to the survey, which covered 22 of the world's most populous and influential countries. "The U.S. continues to be seen as acting unilaterally," said Andrew Kohout, the Research Centre's president, who has directed all nine surveys GAP has published since 2001.

Obama is not popular in the Middle East – kicking him out would boost domestic leaders’ popularity

**The Heritage Foundation 10** (June 20 2010, http://blog.heritage.org/2010/06/20/just-wild-about-obama/)IM

The one exception to these glowing attitudes is the Middle East, the centerpiece of the Obama foreign policy thrust when the president came into office. In major foreign policy addresses, such as the Cairo and the Ghana speeches, Mr. Obama presented much “hope and change,” but has so far failed to produce any measurable results. As a result, publics of largely Muslim countries continue to look at the United States in negative light. In both Turkey and Pakistan, two U.S. allies, only 17 percent hold a positive opinion. In Egypt, America’s favorability rating dropped from 27 percent to 17 percent – the lowest percentage since 2006 when the surveys were first done. What is it about the Obama Doctrine that has such foreign appeal? Based on the set of strategy documents from the Obama administration released this spring, the National Security Strategy, the Nuclear Posture Review, the National Communications Strategy, and others, it is a strategy to manage the decline of the United States as a global actor. It emphasizes soft power over hard power, as declining defense budgets and increasing aid budgets suggest. It increases U.S. reliance on international institutions, as in the new rather tame new U.N. sanctions on Iran. And it seeks to reign in American power to present a more humble international presence, as the president’s numerous acknowledgements of American short-comings regularly remind international audiences.

**The CP is a win for Karzai**

**Orange County Register 10** (Apr. 1 2010, http://www.ocregister.com/articles/karzai-242026-afghanistan-american.html)IM

These major complications are mere sidelights compared with the shaky strategic basis of continuing American involvement in Afghanistan. The stated reason is to keep al-Qaida, which still has international terrorist ambitions, out of Afghanistan. But most intelligence authorities agree that al-Qaida is not in Afghanistan just now, and it is far from certain that even if the Taliban, an indigenous Afghan outfit, were to return to power that it would welcome back al-Qaida. They remember how that turned out the last time. U.S. military forces are performing with bravery and skill in Afghanistan, but the basis for their presence is deeply flawed. No one seems to realize the best option, and that is heeding the wishes of President Karzai. It would be a win for him, as he gains credibility for standing up to the US, and the US can stop spilling unnecessary blood without losing credibility. It is high time for the Obama administration to reconsider its decision to escalate the Afghan war and begin preparing for a withdrawal that would eliminate the American crutch and leave Afghanistan to the Afghans.

Reverse Internal Politics Link Shield

Obama is globally popular – opposition would reduce Karzai’s popularity

**The Heritage Foundation 10** (June 20 2010, http://blog.heritage.org/2010/06/20/just-wild-about-obama/)IM

You can’t argue with success – or can you? Newly released international opinion polls of the image of the United States bring the good news that global publics continue to view the American president and United States as a country in a favorable light. The question that has to be asked, though, is whether this improved image is a result of a perceived new direction in American foreign policy – the Obama Doctrine –which could end up weakening American leadership as the sole remaining superpower and American national security. According to the Pew Global Attitudes Survey, Mr. Obama himself remains popular to the point of adulation among West Europeans. As many as 90 percent of Germans, 87 percent of Frenchmen, 84 percent of Brits expressed a faith in Mr. Obama to do the right thing as an international leader. It is worth noting, however that in every case, except two countries, some slippage from last years’ numbers were in evidence, suggesting that reality checks are setting in. The two exceptions were Kenya, Obama’s paternal homeland, where his approval rating is up to 94 percent, and interestingly Russia, where, following the START treaty negotiations, 41 percent now express a favorable view of the United States, up by 4 points from last year. As the Russian government came out of the negotiations with significant concessions from the American side on Missile Defense, this is maybe not so strange. Not surprisingly, Americans were less enthusiastic. Like president’s domestic approval ratings, there was a significant downward trend. Last year, 74 percent and this year to 65 percent expressed confidence in the president when it comes to foreign affairs.

Politics Link Shield

Obama has been personally committed to stability in Afghanistan – the CP would be a win for him

**Landay 9** (Jonathon, McClatchy Newspapers, Nov. 2 2009, http://www.mcclatchydc.com/2009/11/02/78214/exclusive-us-drafts-afghan-compact.html)IM

WASHINGTON — The Obama administration has been quietly working with U.S. allies and Afghan officials on a package of reforms and anti-corruption measures that it hopes will boost popular support for President Hamid Karzai and erase the doubts about his legitimacy raised by his fraud-marred re-election. The success of the so-called "Afghanistan Compact" will hinge on Karzai's willingness to take bold actions such as cracking down on official corruption, replacing ineffective ministers and surrendering some power to local authorities, which in the past he's resisted or failed to undertake. "As long as the population views its government as weak or predatory, the Taliban's 'alternative' style of delivering security and some form of justice will continue to have traction," says a U.S. government document that outlines part of the proposed Compact and was obtained by McClatchy. "We would have to see some really concrete actions on the part of Karzai to be able to take this seriously," said Marvin Weinbaum, a former State Department intelligence analyst, now at the Middle East Institute. "It looks great on paper." Bolstering the credibility of Karzai's government is essential to the Obama administration's efforts to curb the worsening Taliban-led insurgency amid growing casualties and shrinking public support for a war that entered its ninth year last month.

The CP would be a win for Obama – the war is unpopular

**Loven 10** (Jennifer, Associated Press, Mar. 28 2010, http://blog.taragana.com/politics/2010/03/28/on-surprise-quick-trip-to-afghanistan-obama-demands-corruption-crackdown-good-governance-25958/)IM

KABUL — On an Afghanistan trip shrouded in secrecy, President Barack Obama demanded accountability from the country’s leaders, greater vigilance against corruption and better governing as he widens America’s commitment to the 8-year-old war he inherited and then dramatically escalated. Obama said the U.S. would not quit in Afghanistan, but he made clear that he’s looking for an end to direct involvement in the fight against Taliban and al-Qaida extremists. He drove that point home in meetings with Afghan President Hamid Karzai and his Cabinet in the capital, and in a speech before a cheering crowd of about 2,500 troops and civilians at Bagram Air Field north of Kabul. “The United States is a partner but our intent is to make sure that the Afghans have the capacity to provide for their own security, that is core to our mission,” Obama told the troops at Bagram, where he was greeted with thunderous applause. He said a Taliban takeover of Afghanistan would put more Americans in danger. “The Afghans have suffered for decades,” he said, “decades of war but we are here to help the Afghans forge a hard-won peace.” Obama’s aides did not try to hide U.S. impatience about Afghanistan’s halting efforts to battle corruption and cronyism in government. “The president (Karzai) needs to be seized with how important that is,” said Jim Jones, Obama’s national security adviser. Obama stressed that Afghans need to see conditions on the ground get better. “Progress will continue to be made … but we also want to continue make progress on the civilian front,” Obama said, referring to anti-corruption efforts, good governance and adherence to the rule of law. “All of these things end up resulting in an Afghanistan that is more prosperous and more secure,” he said after a brief meeting with Karzai. Karzai promised that his country “would move forward into the future” to eventually take over its own security, and he thanked Obama for the American intervention in his country. The U.S. also wants Karzai to cut the flow of money from poppy production and drug trafficking that is sustaining the insurgency. Moreover, the U.S. is pressing him to create an effective, credible judicial system and to halt cronyism and rewards for warlords in government hiring. Both of Karzai’s vice presidents are former warlords whose forces allegedly killed thousands of people in the civil war of the 1990s that paved the way for the rise of the Taliban. The White House insisted that Karzai’s Cabinet participate in most of the meetings with Obama. The Cabinet includes a number of ministers favored by the U.S., including the heads of finance, interior and defense, whom the Obama administration wants to empower as a way of reducing the influence of presidential cronies. Some talented Afghan administrators have complained that Karzai marginalized them in an attempt to solidify his powers. The war is unpopular with a majority of Americans, especially progressives in the base of Obama’s Democratic Party. Successfully convincing Karzai to act in the face of corruption would be perceived as a movement toward withdrawal. A victory for Obama in an issue he has been personally committed to would improve his public perception at home. This was reflected in Obama’s new Afghanistan strategy. He combined the large buildup — his second to the Afghanistan force in less than a year as president — with a call to start bringing troops home in July 2011, just a year after the full contingent is in place.

 \*\*Turkey\*\*

1NC Shell

Text – Prime Minister Erdogan should demand the United States \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_.

Turkish independence from Washington is key to regional stability

**The Guardian 10** (Stephen Kinzer, June 15 2010, http://www.guardian.co.uk/commentisfree/cifamerica/2010/jun/15/turkey-america-relations)IM

Erdogan bears some of the blame for last week's tragedy on the high seas. He abandoned his government's proclaimed policy of conciliation and chose confrontation instead. Now Turkey is in a state of national outrage, and that is never a good time to make calm, forward-looking decisions. Yet by showing its independence from Washington, Turkey has further strengthened its credibility in the Middle East. This credibility can be a strategic asset for the west, because Turkish diplomats can go places, talk to factions and make deals that Americans cannot. Yet the US has not been able to take advantage of it. That is because beneath the new tension in American-Turkish relations lies a deep conceptual disagreement that goes beyond Iran or Gaza. It is over the best way to approach geopolitics, particularly in the Middle East. Fearing the effect of violence and upheaval, Turkey seeks to resolve regional problems through diplomacy and compromise. It opposes sanctions on Iran and insists, to Washington's consternation, that there is still a diplomatic alternative. Turks insist that the world is changing in profound ways, and that if the US wants to ease the fiendishly interlocked Middle East crises, it should take a new, more co-operative approach. To some in Washington, that smacks of surrender. They see the Turks as useful idiots or worse. Good ties between Turkey and the US serve the cause of regional peace. So do good ties between Turkey and Israel. All three countries should do whatever necessary to salvage this "power triangle".

War in the Middle East escalates and goes nuclear

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

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

Solvency Mechanism

Turkey can deny the US access to the Incirlik air base – the only source of US troops in Turkey

**The Guardian 10** (Robert Tait and Ewen MacAskill, Mar. 5 2010, http://www.guardian.co.uk/world/2010/mar/05/turkey-us-vote-armenian-genocide)IM

Turkey has threatened to downgrade its strategic relationship with the US amid nationalist anger over a vote in the US Congress that defined the mass killings of Armenians during the first world war as genocide. Barack Obama's administration, which regards Turkey as an important ally, was today desperately seeking to defuse the row. It expressed its frustration with the House of Representatives' foreign affairs committee, which voted 23-22 yesterday in favour of a resolution labelling the 1915 massacre of up to 1.5 million Armenians a "genocide". A furious Turkey may now deny the US access to the Incirlik air base, a staging post for Iraq, as it did at the time of the 2003 invasion, or withdraw its sizeable troop contribution to the coalition forces in Afghanistan. On the diplomatic front, the US needs the support of Turkey, which has a seat on the UN security council, in the push for sanctions against Iran over its nuclear programme. Turkey is also helpful to the US on a host of other diplomatic issues in the Middle East and central Asia. The White House and state department began work today to try to prevent the controversial issue making its way to the floor of the house for a full vote. In Turkey, Suat Kiniklioglu, the influential deputy chairman for external affairs in the ruling Justice and Development party (AKP), warned of "major consequences" if the resolution was accepted by the full House of Representatives.

Erdogan can deny the US access to Incirlik

**CNN 7** (Oct 11 2007, http://transcripts.cnn.com/TRANSCRIPTS/0710/11/ldt.01.html)IM

Turks take to the streets, tired of supporting the U.S. and having little to show for it. Turkish officials say they just don't trust the U.S. which they thought was their closest ally. They feel betrayed by a congressional committee vote calling the killing of Armenians by Turks in World War I genocide. Turkey warned of consequences and now it is making good on its threat, recalling its ambassador to the U.S. for consultations. That's their decision. I think that it certainly will not do anything to limit our efforts to continue to reach out to Turkish officials. Turkey is threatening more action if the resolution passes the full House. Despite our warnings, U.S. Congress wants to play hardball. We know how the play hardball as well. Like cutting off its airspace to the U.S. military like it did with France and Canada, who passed similar measures. It could also end access to Incirlik Air Base, which the U.S. military uses to transport critical cargo and fuel supplies to Iraq. The passage of this resolution at this time would indeed be very problematic for everything that we are trying to do in the Middle East. And might open a dangerous new front in the Iraq war. Turkey wants to destroy Kurdish rebels called the PKK that have launched cross-border attacks from northern Iraq, killing Turks.

Turkey can deny the US access to Incirlik

**CSIS 10** (Bulent Aliriza, Center for Strategic and International Studies, Mar 8 2010, http://csis.org/publication/turkey-update-genocide-vote-congress-and-us-turkish-relations)IM

On March 4, 2010, the House of Representatives Foreign Affairs Committee passed the “Affirmation of the United States Record on the Armenian Genocide” resolution by a vote of 23 to 22. The Turkish government showed its strong displeasure by immediately recalling Ambassador Namik Tan from Washington. Prior to the vote, Prime Minister Recep Tayyip Erdogan had cautioned against “a wrong step on March 4 and April 24” while Foreign Minister Ahmet Davutoglu had called on the Obama Administration to “convince the House of Representatives not to vote in favor of the resolution.” Erdogan was predictably harsh in his comments after the vote. Saying that what had taken place was “a comedy” involving “Congressmen who cannot even find Armenia on the map” he warned that Turkey was “seriously concerned that this resolution approved by the committee despite all our warnings will harm Turkey-US ties and efforts to normalize Turkey- Armenia relations.” When asked if Turkey might withdraw its troops from Afghanistan or curtail US forces’ use of Incirlik airbase, Davutoglu responded by saying that the government would now be “reviewing all its options.” He also pointedly called for “a more effective policy from the administration.”

Internal Net Benefit – Internal Link

If Erdogan orders US troops out of Turkey his approval ratings would go through the roof

Lamond and Ingram 9 (Claudine and Paul, both researchers at British American Security Information Council, http://www.basicint.org/gtz/gtz11.htm)IM

There is a rising sentiment amongst the population for the removal of US nuclear weapons from Turkish territory. In a recent survey,[[20]](http://www.basicint.org/gtz/gtz11.htm%22%20%5Cl%20%22en20) more than half the respondents stated that they are against nuclear weapons being stationed in Turkey. Almost 60% of the Turkish population would support a government request to remove the nuclear weapons from their country, and 72% said they would support an initiative to make Turkey a nuclear-free zone.[[21]](http://www.basicint.org/gtz/gtz11.htm%22%20%5Cl%20%22en21) There may be several causes behind this sentiment, including the Iraq War, Turkish relations with neighboring states, budget expenditure and the moral concern over nuclear weapons. The historic precedence of Greece, a NATO member and Turkey's historic rival, ending its commitment to nuclear sharing in NATO may have further strengthened this tendency. There have been public expressions of resentment towards the US military presence in Turkey ever since the lead up to the US war with Iraq. The United States insisted on the government allowing American troops to use Turkey as a staging post, despite overwhelmingly antiwar Turkish public and political opinion. Limited permission was granted after heavy debates and delay in the Turkish parliament. Turkey's location has added an element of both risk and opportunity to NATO nuclear sharing. Turkey's close proximity to states deemed potentially hostile, such as Iran and Syria, make Turkey a preferred NATO base for TNWs. The risk, of course, is that stationing TNWs in Turkey might provoke a pre-emptive strike upon NATO bases. Turkish parliamentarians have expressed to NATO the difficulty of explaining the continued presence of US TNWs on Turkish territory to Muslim and Arab neighbors. There is a fear that they undermine Turkey's clear diplomatic objectives to act as a mediator within the region. Turkey has a unique opportunity to play a positive role in promoting non-proliferation. Ending nuclear sharing and fully complying with the NPT would act as a powerful example to neighboring states and strengthen Turkey's legitimacy. Moreover, efforts by the Turkish government to play a leading role in the elimination of nuclear and other weapons of mass destruction would receive overwhelming public support.[[22]](http://www.basicint.org/gtz/gtz11.htm%22%20%5Cl%20%22en22)

Internal Net Benefit – Internal Link

The Turkish people resent US presence in their country – they want us out

Menon and Wimbush 7 (Rajan and S. Enders, Prof. of Intl. Relations at Lehigh University, Director of Center for Future Security Strategies, http://www.hudson.org/files/pdf\_upload/Turkey%20PDF.pdf)IM

The widespread belief among Turks that the United States undertook the Iraq war without regard to the consequences for Turkey’s security and that Washington now seeks to punish it for the Turkish parliament’s vote has created enormous resentment toward the United States. This sentiment is reflected across the political spectrum. It is evident among elites, including the leadership of the Turkish military, arguably the country’s most influential institution, but also pervades society more generally. Opinion polls show that Turks, who once viewed the United States as an ally and friend, increasingly see it as not just unfriendly, but as a direct threat to their national security. As a result, influential Turks, government officials and foreign policy experts alike, are discussing a strategic reassessment. This reorientation would involve building deep ties with new partners, among them Russia, China, Iran, and Syria and would, moreover, abandon the longstanding premise that the United States remains the indispensable ally.

Turkey is sick of US military presence in their country

Larrabee 10 (F. Stephen, http://www.rand.org/pubs/monographs/2009/RAND\_MG899.pdf)IM

To hedge against a serious deterioration of U.S.-Turkish relations that could result in severe constraints on the use of Turkish bases or denial of their use altogether, the United States could gradually reduce its military presence in Turkey and conduct some of the missions currently carried out in Turkey from other friendly or allied countries in the region, such as Kuwait or Qatar. Doing so could have several benefits. It could reduce popular Turkish resentment against the U.S. military presence and diminish anti-Americanism in Turkey, while still allowing the United States to continue to carry out most of the current missions being performed at İncirlik and other facilities in Turkey. Such a move could be portrayed as an adjustment to the new security requirement arising after the end of the Cold War and as part of the overall Global Posture Review initiated by the Bush administration.

The Turkish public resents the United States and wants US troops to leave

Lamond and Ingram 9 (Claudine and Paul, both researchers at British American Security Information Council, http://www.basicint.org/gtz/gtz11.htm)IM

So low has confidence in the United States become among Turks and so high is the level of resentment that Seyfi Tashan, a leading Turkish political commentator and long-time proponent of Turkey’s integration into the West, observed that whereas the United States and Turkey had stood together during the Cold War, now the United States (together with Europe) appeared to be waging “an undeclared Cold War” against Turkey.2 Let us give a heavy discount for hyperbole; nevertheless, that a prominent member of the foreign policy establishment could characterize the US-Turkish relationship thus is telling, not least because Tashan’s sentiments are not only representative of public sentiment, they are milder by comparison. For instance, a potboiler imagining a war between the US and Turkey in northern Iraq proved wildly popular among Turks, more than 80 percent of whom also opined in a 2005 survey that American policies in their region endangered Turkey’s security.3

Internal Net Benefit – Internal Link

For Erdogan to become a strong regional leader he needs to order the US out of Incirlik – his leadership is key to regional stability

**Palestine Note 10** (Ghassan Schbley, national security analyst, June 24 2010, http://palestinenote.com/cs/blogs/blogs/archive/2010/06/24/behind-the-flotilla-headlines-turkish-strategic-competition-and-u-s-policy-in-the-middle-east.aspx)IM

The current brinkmanship between Israel and Turkey over the Gaza-bound flotillas is a component of the strategic competition necessary to the "Zero Problems" policy. Such brinksmanship is intended to achieve Turkey's objective of gaining additional credibility in the Arab world. With limitations by the secular Turkish army on the Justice and Development Party's Islamic credentials, foreign policy is one of the few areas where the party's Islamist platform can be expressed at low domestic political risk. Prime Minister Tayyip Erdogan's walkout on Israeli President Shimon Peres at the Davos Forum in January 2009 was one in a series of actions he has taken in this regard. In both that case and in the current situation, Arab public opinion has been overwhelmingly supportive and Prime Minister Erdogan has become a regional Muslim leader. For Erdogan to retain this influence he needs to continue to stand up to the US, his popularity is checked by the looming presence of U.S. troops at Incirlik. However, despite the short-term antagonism, Turkey and Israel ultimately share a number of long term interests. Both states aim to check the power of Iran, also a top U.S. priority in the Middle East. Both are actively engaged in long-term conflicts against insurgencies, Turkey with the PKK and Israel with Hamas and other Palestinian factions. Turkey and Israel have regularly coordinated joint military exercises for years, and have a strong defense relationship. Both are relatively secular democracies in a Middle East dominated by Islamic republics and kingdoms. And both stand to gain from economic agreements such as the Israeli purchase of Turkish water from the Manavgat River. Ultimately, Turkey is attaining tentative leadership status in the Muslim world by conducting a deliberate and strategic balancing act with regional and global actors. As result of strategic competition, Turkey is becoming well positioned to mediate between the West and its Middle East partners. As President Obama stressed while visiting Turkey last April: "Turkey's greatness lies in [its] ability to be at the center of things... [it] is not where East and West divide - it is where they come together." Like the U.S., Turkey seeks to check Iranian military influence in the Middle East. It seeks to stabilize Iraq's Kurdistan region and maintain influence there to advance Turkish interests vis-Ã -vis the PKK as well as Iran. And like the United States, it is ultimately best served by an Israel which feels secure within its borders and is integrated as an economic and defense partner in the Middle East.-

Internal Net Benefit – Impact

Turkish influence is key to regional stability

**ICG 10** (International Crisis Group, Europe Report no. 203, Apr. 7 2010, www.crisisgroup.org/.../turkey-and-the-middle-east-ambitions-and-constraints.aspx)IM

Turkey’s new engagement with the Middle East and the charismatic appeal of its leaders among Middle Eastern peoples have made the country a player that the region and the world need to take into account. The U.S. and EU, Turkey’s two main traditional partners, are on the whole supportive of this new activism and see it as an asset. Turkey has achieved a notable economic expan- sion and has provided a living example to Middle Eastern societies of useful new ways to mix progress, tradition and democratisation. Ankara’s facilitation in regional disputes has had a mostly positive impact. Most notable were the 2008 Turkish- hosted proximity talks between Israel and Syria. Turkey can claim a minor supporting role in helping to end the Israeli-Hamas war in Gaza in 2009, as well as in trying new ways to avoid a clash with Iran over suspicions that it wants to build a nuclear weapon. Turkey s activism and soft power in the region have been building for more than a decade and are still on a broad upswing. The new generation of busi- nessmen, diplomats and television stars are all making connections in the region that will prove deep and en- during. This is particularly the case in Syria and Iraq, especially Iraqi Kurdistan. Indeed, in an echo of Foreign Minister Davuto­lu s argument about geographic and historic strategic depth, these are the places in the Mid- dle East where the old Ottoman Empire was strongest. The Turkish promise of taking the example of the early EU to the Middle East by integrating regional infra- structure and economies remains a work in progress. Work on building such bridges has certainly begun in earnest, and the indisputable new pull of the hub of Istanbul shows how important Turkey is becoming to the region. As long as Turkey does not let its new self-confidence give way to over-confidence, does not mistake regional acquiescence for powerlessness or forget that it is suc- cess in the West that makes it attractive to the East as well as vice versa, the country’s influence and ability to improve regional peace and security will grow. And just as the commercial integration and political convergence with the EU has proved such a valuable locomotive in the cause of Turkish reform, Turkey’s success in Middle Eastern markets and societies is proving to be a positive dynamic. In short, Turkey is not breaking away from the West, as some have suggested. It is rather a more modernised and internationalised Turkey that now feels strong and secure enough to take up new Middle East challenges.

Impact – East-West Relations

Turkey is an important pillar for East West Relations

Olson 06, (Robert W, Fall, Professor Middle History and Politics @

University of Kentucky, Mediterranean Quarterly,(17)4, Accessed 6/28) CM

The United States and EU initiated the ICI with the idea that NATO would be more palatable to the Arab Gulf countries’ publics than the United States.97 The leaders of the Arab Gulf countries may think that increased security ties with NATO countries might contribute to their regimes’ stability. What is important for my analysis in this article is that Bahrayn, Kuwait, Qatar, the UAE, and possibly down the line Saudi Arabia consider Turkey as an important part of the ICI, as well as being the only Muslim country that is a member of NATO. In effect, by adopting the security provisions of the ICI, Bahrayn, Kuwait, Qatar, and the UAE become associated with NATO. In this light, Turkey has become more of an important player in the security of the Arab Gulf countries and, hence, more of a trustworthy country in which to invest. Of course, all of these countries are looking for secure opportunities to invest the surplus of oil revenues resulting from high oil prices — prices that may well continue for some time. Turkey, with a population of some 73 million and a young and dynamic population, offers lucrative investment opportunities. It is notable, however, that the implementation of the ICI and its adoption by Bahrayn, Kuwait, Qatar, and the UAE, and the increased investment interest of these countries in Turkey, have occurred at the same time. It is these policies that help explain the change of position of these countries in support of Turkey’s position regarding Cyprus.

A2: Perm – Do Both

Asserting dominance over the US key to regional influence

**Feffer 10** (John, co-director of Foreign Policy in Focus at the Institute for Policy Studies, June 14 2010, http://www.salon.com/news/feature/2010/06/14/turkey\_rising\_superpower)IM

Perhaps most importantly, Turkey occupies a vital crossroads between Europe, the Middle East, and Central Asia. A predominantly Muslim democracy atop the ruins of Byzantium, it bridges the Islamic and Judeo-Christian traditions, even as it sits perched at the nexus of energy politics. All roads once led to Rome; today all pipelines seem to lead to Turkey. If superpower status followed the rules of real estate -- location, location, location -- then Turkey would already be near the top of the heap. As a quintessential rising middle power, Turkey no longer hesitates to put itself in the middle of major controversies. In the last month alone, Turkish mediation efforts nearly heralded a breakthrough in the Iran nuclear crisis, and Ankara supported the flotilla that recently tried to break Israel's blockade of Gaza. With these and other less high-profile interventions, Turkey has stepped out of the shadows and now threatens to settle into the prominent place on the world stage once held by its predecessor. In the seventeenth century, the Ottoman Empire was a force to be reckoned with, spreading through the Balkans to the gates of Vienna before devolving over the next 200 years into "the sick man of Europe." Today, a dynamic neo-Ottoman spirit animates Turkey. Once rigidly secular, it has begun to fashion a moderate Islamic democracy. Once dominated by the military, it is in the process of containing the army within the rule of law. Once intolerant of ethnic diversity, it has begun to reexamine what it means to be Turkish. Once a sleepy economy, it is becoming a nation of Islamic Calvinists. Most critically of all, it is fashioning a new foreign policy. Having broken with its more than half-century-long subservience to the United States, it is now carving out a geopolitical role all its own. Absolute clout in the region is inhibited by the continued presence of US troops in the country. The final hurdle for Erdogan is the assertion of his dominance over the United States’ military presence in Turkey, as long as he is perceived as serving at Obama’s whim he will not be respected as a true leader by the surrounding Arab countries. The rise of Turkey has by no means been smooth. Secular Turks have been uncomfortable with recent more assertive expressions of Muslim identity, particularly when backed by state power. The country's Kurds are still second-class citizens, and although the military has lost some of its teeth, it still has a bite to go along with its bark. Nonetheless, Turkey is remaking the politics of the Middle East and challenging Washington's traditional notion of itself as the mediator of last resort in the region. In the twenty-first century, the Turkish model of transitioning out of authoritarian rule while focusing on economic growth and conservative social values has considerable appeal to countries in the developing world. This "Ankara consensus" could someday compete favorably with Beijing's and Washington's versions of political and economic development. The Turkish model has, however, also spurred right-wing charges that a new Islamic fundamentalist threat is emerging on the edges of Europe. Neocon pundit Liz Cheney has even created a new version of George W. Bush's "axis of evil" in which Turkey, Iran, and Syria have become the dark trinity. These are all signs that Turkey has indeed begun to wake from its centuries-long slumber. And when Turkey wakes, as Napoleon said of China, the world will shake.

To be perceived as dialogue the US can’t come into discussions already knowing the outcome

**Quixley 8** (Suzi, Consultation 2008, www.suziqconsulting.com.au/.../CD%20-%20Consultation%20-%20May08.pdf)IM

Most consultants have their own understanding of what consultation is. So do most participants! When the two do not match, participant disappointment or anger can be the result. Legitimate, genuine consultation should affect outcomes. Therefore, consultation not designed to affect outcomes is not genuine consultation. However, the remainder of this handout does not take a position on which is the correct definition of the word consultation, amongst those intended to affect outcomes, to some extent at least It does, however, argue that: Consultation is conducted using engaging, participatory processes. Talkfests do not suit many people. Use of creative, participatory processes during consultations is useful in maximising the contribution of all stakeholders. Methodologies other than the conventional large group discussions (requiring confidence from participants) input from consultants (risking telling rather than asking) and/or questionnaires (requiring literacy skills, often of a high order) can enable all participants to explore options and generate consensus.

Internal Politics Link Shield

Any leader who makes Obama seem less unilateral will gain huge amounts of popularity

**IPS News Agency 10** (Jim Lobe, June 17 2010, http://www.newjerseynewsroom.com/international/obama-has-gained-an-amazing-degree-of-popularity-around-the-world)IM

While U.S. President Barack Obama has largely retained huge popularity among most of the world's publics, disillusionment with his leadership appears to have set in throughout much of the Islamic world, according to the latest annual survey of global public opinion by the Washington-based Pew Research Centre released here Thursday. And despite Obama's personal popularity, disapproval of U.S. foreign policy, especially regarding the Middle East and Southwest Asia, remains high in much of the world, according to the survey by the Centre's Global Attitudes Project (GAP). "(Obama) has an amazing degree of popularity," noted former Republican Sen. John Danforth, who co-chairs GAP along with former Secretary of State Madeleine Albright. "(But) I don't see the translation of support for Obama into support for specific policies." Moreover, the perception that Washington acts on the world stage without taking sufficient account of the interests of other countries an impression that came to dominate foreign views of the U.S. under Obama's predecessor, George W. Bush - persists, according to the survey, which covered 22 of the world's most populous and influential countries. "The U.S. continues to be seen as acting unilaterally," said Andrew Kohout, the Research Centre's president, who has directed all nine surveys GAP has published since 2001.

Obama is not popular in the Middle East – kicking him out would boost domestic leaders’ popularity

**The Heritage Foundation 10** (June 20 2010, http://blog.heritage.org/2010/06/20/just-wild-about-obama/)IM

The one exception to these glowing attitudes is the Middle East, the centerpiece of the Obama foreign policy thrust when the president came into office. In major foreign policy addresses, such as the Cairo and the Ghana speeches, Mr. Obama presented much “hope and change,” but has so far failed to produce any measurable results. As a result, publics of largely Muslim countries continue to look at the United States in negative light. In both Turkey and Pakistan, two U.S. allies, only 17 percent hold a positive opinion. In Egypt, America’s favorability rating dropped from 27 percent to 17 percent – the lowest percentage since 2006 when the surveys were first done. What is it about the Obama Doctrine that has such foreign appeal? Based on the set of strategy documents from the Obama administration released this spring, the National Security Strategy, the Nuclear Posture Review, the National Communications Strategy, and others, it is a strategy to manage the decline of the United States as a global actor. It emphasizes soft power over hard power, as declining defense budgets and increasing aid budgets suggest. It increases U.S. reliance on international institutions, as in the new rather tame new U.N. sanctions on Iran. And it seeks to reign in American power to present a more humble international presence, as the president’s numerous acknowledgements of American short-comings regularly remind international audiences.

Reverse Internal Politics Link Shield

Obama is globally popular – opposition would reduce domestic leaders’ popularity

**The Heritage Foundation 10** (June 20 2010, http://blog.heritage.org/2010/06/20/just-wild-about-obama/)IM

You can’t argue with success – or can you? Newly released international opinion polls of the image of the United States bring the good news that global publics continue to view the American president and United States as a country in a favorable light. The question that has to be asked, though, is whether this improved image is a result of a perceived new direction in American foreign policy – the Obama Doctrine –which could end up weakening American leadership as the sole remaining superpower and American national security. According to the Pew Global Attitudes Survey, Mr. Obama himself remains popular to the point of adulation among West Europeans. As many as 90 percent of Germans, 87 percent of Frenchmen, 84 percent of Brits expressed a faith in Mr. Obama to do the right thing as an international leader. It is worth noting, however that in every case, except two countries, some slippage from last years’ numbers were in evidence, suggesting that reality checks are setting in. The two exceptions were Kenya, Obama’s paternal homeland, where his approval rating is up to 94 percent, and interestingly Russia, where, following the START treaty negotiations, 41 percent now express a favorable view of the United States, up by 4 points from last year. As the Russian government came out of the negotiations with significant concessions from the American side on Missile Defense, this is maybe not so strange. Not surprisingly, Americans were less enthusiastic. Like president’s domestic approval ratings, there was a significant downward trend. Last year, 74 percent and this year to 65 percent expressed confidence in the president when it comes to foreign affairs.

Politics Link Shield

Obama’s withdrawal of support for Turkey would be popular in Congress

**Krieger 10** (Hilary, The Jerusalem Post, June 17 2010, http://www.jpost.com/International/Article.aspx?id=178687)IM

WASHINGTON – US Congressmen ratcheted up their criticism of Turkey Wednesday, warning that Ankara was risking its historically warm ties with Congress by reaching toward Iran and breaking with Israel. In a press conference defending Israel’s raid on a Turkish-flagged aid ship trying to break the Gaza blockade, several dozen of whose passengers had ties to terror organizations, numerous members of Congress turned their ire toward Turkey. “Turkey is responsible for the nine deaths aboard that ship. It is not Israel that’s responsible,” declared Rep. Shelley Berkley (D-Nevada), who pointed to Turkish funding and support for the expedition. “If Israel is at fault in any way, it’s by falling into the trap that was set for them by Turkey.” She continued: “The Turks have extraordinary nerve to lecture the State of Israel when they are occupiers of the island of Cyprus, where they systematically discriminate against the ecumenical patriarch, and they refuse to recognize the Armenian genocide.” Her comments – which were accompanied by an announcement that Turkish representatives were no longer welcome in her office – touched on sensitive issues with Turkey that the US has often shied away from pressing Ankara on aggressively. Her words raised the prospect that the US Congress at least would be more assertive about its displeasure with Turkey. Speaking at the same press conference, Rep. Mike Pence (R-Indiana) said he recently warned the Turkish ambassador that “With regard to Congress of the United States, there will be a cost if Turkey stays on its current path of growing closed to Iran and more antagonistic to the State of Israel.” Among other issues, he said, he was now likely to switch his vote to support a resolution recognizing the mass killing of Armenians during the Ottoman empire as a genocide, a move he had voted against in the past because he thought relations with Turkey were more important. Turkey has vehemently opposed the resolution, briefly recalling its ambassador to the US when the measure passed a House committee earlier this year. The Obama administration, in keeping with past administrations, has opposed the resolution moving to the full chamber for a vote because of Turkish sensitivities. Many Jewish lobbies in Washington opposed the resolution on the same grounds. That argument also resonated in the past with Rep. Peter King (R-NY), another participant in the press conference who said he was now likely to switch positions – as were many other of his colleagues. King stressed that this wasn’t just about Turkey’s support of the Gaza flotilla and its heavy criticism of Israel, but the government’s move toward Iran and its turn away from running a secular democratic state. “This is a clear effort, I believe, by Turkey to distance itself from the

\*\*Condition CP Answers\*\*

\*\*Generic Aff\*\*

Aff- Generic- Doesn’t Solve US leadership

And consultation kills US credibility and Heg

Carroll 9 (James FF, Notes & Comments Editor – Emory International Law Review, J.D. with Honors – Emory University School of Law, “*Emory International Law Review*, 23 Emory Int'l L. Rev. 167) ET

n221. See Thomas Friedman, Op-Ed., 9/11 is Over, N.Y. Times, Sept. 30, 2007, § 4, at 12. This does not mean, however, that foreign countries should hold a veto over U.S. foreign or domestic policies, particularly policies that are not directly related to their national survival. Allowing foreign countries or international institutions to veto or modify unrelated U.S. policies would make a mockery of our foreign policy and destroy the credibility of American leadership. International cooperation does not require making our policy subservient to the whims of other nations. See generally The Allies and Arms Control (F.O. Hampson et al. eds., 1992). See also Khalilzad, supra note 177.

Aff- Generic- Links to Politics

Obama must be an absolute leader in military missions or be seen as politically weak- counter- plan links to politics

Todd, Murra, & Montanaro June 24th (Chuck, Mark, and Domenica- staff writers, 6.24.10, *NBS News*, http://firstread.msnbc.msn.com/\_news/2010/06/24/4555507-first-thoughts-obamas-leadership-moment ) ET

\*\*\* Obama's leadership moment: Talk about turning a lemon into lemonade. President Obama's firing yesterday of Gen. Stanley McChrystal -- and replacing him with Gen. David Petraeus -- provided him with a leadership moment at a time he desperately needed it. Our brand-new NBC/WSJ poll (conducted before the Rolling Stone article came out) shows that Obama's scores on being able to handle a crisis, on being decisive, and having strong leadership qualities all have plummeted since last year. What's more, the Petraeus move also potentially gives Obama a parachute if Afghanistan is indeed unwinnable. Indeed, check out what GOP Sen. Lindsey Graham said yesterday: "Dave Petraeus is our best hope. If things don't change, nobody can pull it out in Afghanistan." So in terms of giving him a leadership moment, er, commander-in-chief moment, as well as political cover if the situation in Afghanistan doesn't improve, that Rolling Stone article might turn out to be the best thing to have happened to President Obama in quite some time.

Obama must not be seen as compromising or he will not have political support from parties

Barone June 24th (Michael, *Critical Bias*, 6.24.10, http://www.criticalbias.com/2010/06/24/whether-he-likes-it-or-not-obama-must-command/ ) ET

Obama’s decisionmaking on Afghanistan so far could be characterized as splitting the difference. He added troops early on and opted for McChrystal’s counterinsurgency strategy while propitiating his party’s left with something in the nature of a deadline for withdrawal. While backing McChrystal, he also appointed as our civilian leader in Afghanistan retired Gen. Karl Eikenberry, who disagreed with McChrystal’s strategy. By all accounts, including Rolling Stone’s, they have not had the close cooperative relationship that Gen. David Petraeus and civilian honcho Ryan Crocker had in Iraq in 2007 and 2008. A president is entitled to take political factors into consideration in making military decisions. Franklin Roosevelt, who of all our presidents showed the greatest gift for selecting the right general or admiral for particular assignments, ordered the invasion of North Africa in 1942 against the unanimous advice of the Joint Chiefs of Staff. He believed that the American people and our allies needed to see America taking decisive action in the European Theater, even in a peripheral location. Obama leads a political party that before his election argued that Afghanistan was the good war (and Iraq the bad one) but which is now divided on whether we should persevere there. He faces an opposition party that mostly supports our course in Afghanistan but is worried about our prospects there and fears a premature withdrawal. He is not the first president to head a national security establishment that is divided and distrustful, as the Rolling Stone article confirms. And he is surely not the first president to be the subject of disparaging remarks by his military subordinates. But unfortunately those remarks have come out into the open in a way that makes it very hard to go on splitting the difference. With Gen. McChrystal gone, it may be time to consider other changes in personnel. And it may be time for Obama to embrace a word he has been reluctant to utter: victory. His duty is to set a course that will produce success, to install the people who can achieve that goal and to give them the backing they need.

Aff- Generic- Links to Politics

Obama must stop attempting to compromise in national defense issues or see the decline of his administration

 Mead 10 (Walter Russell, he Henry A. Kissinger senior fellow for U.S. foreign policy at the Council on Foreign Rel, *Foreign Policy*, http://www.foreignpolicy.com/articles/2010/01/04/the\_carter\_syndrome , Jan/Feb 10) ET

Neither a cold-blooded realist nor a bleeding-heart idealist, Barack Obama has a split personality when it comes to foreign policy. So do most U.S. presidents, of course, and the ideas that inspire this one have a long history at the core of the American political tradition. In the past, such ideas have served the country well. But the conflicting impulses influencing how this young leader thinks about the world threaten to tear his presidency apart -- and, in the worst scenario, turn him into a new Jimmy Carter. Obama's long deliberation over the war in Afghanistan is a case study in presidential schizophrenia: After 94 days of internal discussion and debate, he ended up splitting the difference -- rushing in more troops as his generals wanted, while calling for their departure to begin in July 2011 as his liberal base demanded. It was a sober compromise that suggests a man struggling to reconcile his worldview with the weight of inherited problems. Like many of his predecessors, Obama is not only buffeted by strong political headwinds, but also pulled in opposing directions by two of the major schools of thought that have guided American foreign-policy debates since colonial times.

And, obama’s military strategy faces opposition- he must be perceived as strong

Mead 10 (Walter Russell, he Henry A. Kissinger senior fellow for U.S. foreign policy at the Council on Foreign Rel, *Foreign Policy*, http://www.foreignpolicy.com/articles/2010/01/04/the\_carter\_syndrome , Jan/Feb 10) ET

Yet as Obama is already discovering, any president attempting such a Jeffersonian grand strategy in the 21st century faces many challenges. In the 19th-century heyday of Jeffersonian foreign policy in American politics, it was easier for U.S. presidents to limit the country's commitments. Britain played a global role similar to that of the United States today, providing a stable security environment and promoting international trade and investment. Cruising as a free rider in the British world system allowed Americans to reap the benefits of Britain's world order without paying its costs.

Aff- Generic- Links to Politics

And Obama’s deliberations on foreign policy draws in criticism from both sides- counterplan links to politics

Mead 10 (Walter Russell, he Henry A. Kissinger senior fellow for U.S. foreign policy at the Council on Foreign Rel, *Foreign Policy*, http://www.foreignpolicy.com/articles/2010/01/04/the\_carter\_syndrome , Jan/Feb 10) ET

The widespread criticism of Obama's extended Afghanistan deliberations is a case in point. To a Jeffersonian president, war is a grave matter and such an undesirable course that it should only be entered into with the greatest deliberation and caution; war is truly a last resort, and the costs of rash commitments are more troubling than the costs of debate and delay. Hamiltonians would be more concerned with executing the decision swiftly and with hiding from other powers any impression of division among American counsels. But Obama found harsh critics on all sides: Wilsonians recoiled from the evident willingness of the president to abandon human rights or political objectives to settle the war. Jacksonians did not understand what, other than cowardice or dithering," could account for his reluctance to support the professional military recommendation. And the most purist of the Jeffersonians -- neoisolationists on both left and right -- turned on Obama as a sellout. Jeffersonian foreign policy is no bed of roses.

Obama’s indecisiveness forced by counterplan will bring republican attack- empirical proof

Mead 10 (Walter Russell, he Henry A. Kissinger senior fellow for U.S. foreign policy at the Council on Foreign Rel, *Foreign Policy*, http://www.foreignpolicy.com/articles/2010/01/04/the\_carter\_syndrome , Jan/Feb 10) ET

In recent history, Jeffersonian foreign policy has often faced attacks from all the other schools of thought. Kissinger's policy of détente was blasted on the right by conservative Republicans who wanted a stronger stand against communism and on the left by human rights Democrats who hated the cynical regional alliances the Nixon Doctrine involved (with the shah of Iran, for example). Carter faced many of the same problems, and the image of weakness and indecision that helped doom his 1980 run for re-election is a perennial problem for Jeffersonian presidents. Obama will have to leap over these hurdles now, too.

And, attempts to listen to other nations when determining foreign policy undermines Obama’s legitimacy worldwide

Mead 10 (Walter Russell, he Henry A. Kissinger senior fellow for U.S. foreign policy at the Council on Foreign Rel, *Foreign Policy*, http://www.foreignpolicy.com/articles/2010/01/04/the\_carter\_syndrome , Jan/Feb 10) ET

It is not only Americans who will challenge the new American foreign policy. Will Russia and Iran respond to Obama's conciliatory approach with reciprocal concessions -- or, emboldened by what they interpret as American weakness and faltering willpower, will they keep pushing forward? Will the president's outreach to the moderate majority of Muslims around the world open an era of better understanding, or will the violent minority launch new attacks that undercut the president's standing at home? Will the president's inability to deliver all the Israeli concessions Arabs would like erode his credibility and contribute to even deeper levels of cynicism and alienation across the Middle East? Can the president execute an orderly reduction in the U.S. military stake in Iraq and Afghanistan without having hostile forces fill the power vacuum? Will Venezuelan leader Hugo Chávez be so impressed with American restraint under Obama that he moderates his own course and ceases to make anti Yanquismo a pillar of his domestic and international policy? Will other countries heed the president's call to assume more international responsibility as the United States reduces its commitments -- or will they fail to fulfill their obligations as stakeholders in the international system? A Jeffersonian policy of restraint and withdrawal requires cooperation from many other countries, but the prospect of a lower American profile may make others less, rather than more, willing to help the United States.

Aff- Generic- Links to Politics

And, obama must back up his foreign policy goals or be viewed as a liar

Mead 10 (Walter Russell, he Henry A. Kissinger senior fellow for U.S. foreign policy at the Council on Foreign Rel, *Foreign Policy*, http://www.foreignpolicy.com/articles/2010/01/04/the\_carter\_syndrome , Jan/Feb 10) ET

Obama may well believe what he said in his inaugural speech -- "we reject as false the choice between our safety and our ideals" -- but as any president must he is already making exactly those tradeoffs. Why else refuse to meet the Dalai Lama? Why else pledge support to the corrupt regime of President Hamid Karzai in Afghanistan or aid Pakistan despite the dismal track record of both the civil and military arms of the Pakistani government when it comes to transparent use of U.S. resources? Did the administration not renew its efforts to build a relationship with the regime in Tehran even as peaceful democratic protesters were being tortured and raped in its jails? Is Obama not taking "incentives" to Khartoum, a regime that has for more than a decade pursued a policy in Darfur that the U.S. government has labeled genocidal?

And obama must abandon his compromising ways or risk political opposition

Mead 10 (Walter Russell, he Henry A. Kissinger senior fellow for U.S. foreign policy at the Council on Foreign Rel, *Foreign Policy*, http://www.foreignpolicy.com/articles/2010/01/04/the\_carter\_syndrome , Jan/Feb 10) ET

 It is hard to reconcile the transcendent Wilsonian vision of America's future with a foreign policy based on dirty compromises with nasty regimes. If the government should use its power and resources to help the poor and the victims of injustice at home, shouldn't it do something when people overseas face extreme injustice and extreme peril? The Obama administration cannot easily abandon a human rights agenda abroad. The contradiction between the sober and limited realism of the Jeffersonian worldview and the expansive, transformative Wilsonian agenda is likely to haunt this administration as it haunted Carter's, most fatefully when he rejected calls to let the shah of Iran launch a brutal crackdown to remain in power. Already the Wilsonians in Obama's camp are muttering darkly about his failure to swiftly close the Guantánamo prison camp, his fondness for government secrecy, his halfhearted support for investigating abuses of the past administration, and his failure to push harder for a cap-and-trade bill before the Copenhagen summit.

And, lack of strong action by obama will cause discontent

Mead 10 (Walter Russell, he Henry A. Kissinger senior fellow for U.S. foreign policy at the Council on Foreign Rel, *Foreign Policy*, http://www.foreignpolicy.com/articles/2010/01/04/the\_carter\_syndrome , Jan/Feb 10) ET

Over time, these rumblings of discontent will grow, and history will continue to throw curveballs at him. Can this president live with himself if he fails to prevent a new round of genocide in the Great Lakes region of Africa? Can he wage humanitarian war if all else fails? Can he make these tough decisions quickly and confidently when his closest advisors and his political base are deeply and hopelessly at odds?

\*\*Aff- Afghanistan\*\*

Aff- Afghanistan- Says NO

And the US will say no- they will withdraw when and only when they want to

BreitBart 9 (*BreitBart,* july 8, 2009, http://www.breitbart.com/article.php?id=080708173950.vpy06uxo&show\_article=1 ) ET

The United States on Tuesday rejected a demand from Iraq for a specific date for pullout of US-led foreign troops from the country, saying any withdrawal will be based on conditions on the ground. "The US government and the government of Iraq are in agreement that when we, the US government, we want to withdraw, we will withdraw. However, that decision will be conditions-based," State Department spokesman Gonzalo Gallegos said. Iraq said on Tuesday it will reject any security pact with the United States unless it sets a date for the pullout of US-led troops. "We will not accept any memorandum of understanding if it does not give a specific date for a complete withdrawal of foreign troops," national security advisor Muwaffaq al-Rubaie told reporters in the holy city of Najaf. The controversial demand from Baghdad's Shiite-led government underlines Iraq's new hardened stand in complex negotiations aimed at striking a security deal with Washington.

\*\*Aff- Iraq\*\*

Aff- Iraq- Says No- Democrats

We’ll say no- democrats are way opposed to withdrawal

Theisen 7 (Kenneth, organizer with the World Can't Wait, *The World Can’t Wait*, 10-2-7, http://www.worldcantwait.net/index.php?option=com\_content&task=view&id=4351&Itemid=220 ) ET

In a number of articles on this site we have emphasized that the leading Democratic contenders for president will keep U.S. troops in Iraq for many years and will not end the war there. This was reinforced during the Democratic presidential debate on September 26, 2007 At the beginning of the debate, debate moderator Tim Russert asked Senators Hillary Clinton and Barack Obama, as well as former Senator John Edwards whether they would promise to have all U.S. troops out by January 2013. All three refused to make such a promise even though that is more than five years from now. Obama responded, "We would get combat troops out of Iraq. The only troops that would remain would be those that have to protect U.S. bases and U.S. civilians, as well as to engage in counterterrorism activities in Iraq." He failed to mention that this would allow tens of thousands of troops, if not more, to remain in Iraq for the indefinite future. Clinton echoed Obama when she stated, "I will drastically reduce our presence there to the mission of protecting our embassy, protecting our civilians, and making sure that we're carrying out counterterrorism activities there." Clinton claimed that the only combat missions she would permit would be those aimed at "eradicating al Qaeda in Iraq." John Edwards also refused to pledge withdrawal while attacking Clinton. He said her stand allows "a continuation of the war. I do not think we should continue combat missions in Iraq." But he did not explain how he would stop the war if he refuses to withdraw troops in the next five plus years. I guess we are just supposed to believe him when he says, "I believe this war needs to come to an end." Relying on the democrats to end the war crimes of the Bush regime is clearly an illusion. They have repeatedly shown that they will continue the Iraq war. Only you, and millions like you, can end this war and all the crimes of the Bush regime. Do it now!

Aff- Iraq- Says No

And, Iraq has demanded withdrawal of presence- US ignores- counterplan will say no

CNN July 1st (*CNN News*, 7.1.10, http://www.cnn.com/2009/WORLD/meast/07/01/iraq.kirkuk.bombing/index.html ) ET

The ongoing presence of U.S. troops in Iraq "shows that the (Iraqi) government and the occupation are not serious about the withdrawal," a key Shiite cleric in the country said Wednesday. A crowd gathers Tuesday after a deadly bombing in the northern Iraqi city of Kirkuk. Muqtada al-Sadr made the statement on his Web site a day after U.S. forces withdrew from Iraqi cities and towns in accordance with the security agreement between the United States and Iraq. About 131,000 American troops remain in the country, on bases and in outposts outside of population centers. "The withdrawal should include all the occupation forces: army, intelligence, militias, and security companies and others. Otherwise, the withdrawal will be uncompleted and useless," al-Sadr said. "We want a withdrawal and stopping the interference with Iraqi political, social and economic affairs," the statement said. Al-Sadr commands the loyalty of the Mehdi Army, one of the largest independent militias in the country. His agreement to a cease-fire with the government and its allies is considered a key factor in reducing the level of violence in the country. But he seemed to suggest Wednesday that Iraqis had the right to attack foreign forces in the country -- if not Iraqi security forces. "If the occupation forces violate this claimed withdrawal, even with a government cover, then the people of Iraq will have all the right to express their opinion in a peaceful way, and the right to self-defense on condition of not harming the Iraqi people and the security forces," he said.

\*\* Aff- Japan\*\*

Aff- Japan- Says No

US would say no- alliance talks prove

Kajita 10 (Takehiko, Kyodo News Editor, *Japan Today*, http://www.japantoday.com/category/commentary/view/course-unclear-for-japan-us-alliance , 10) ET

Despite last week’s accord between Foreign Minister Katsuya Okada and U.S. Secretary of State Hillary Clinton to further deepen the Japan-U.S. alliance, it is unclear what will actually be achieved in light of a disagreement over a U.S. military air base that has strained bilateral relations. Both the top Japanese and U.S. diplomats spoke highly of the bilateral alliance, saying it has underpinned security in the Asia-Pacific region for the past 50 years. They formally agreed to launch talks to further deepen the alliance, with foreign and defense ministers from the two nations holding a meeting in the first half of this year for a midterm review and seeking a final conclusion in November. Noting that this year marks the 50th anniversary of the current bilateral security arrangements, Clinton said, ‘‘It is an opportunity to mark the progress we have achieved together for our people and for the people of the region and the world.’‘ Okada said he hopes the upcoming talks will result in a new document replacing the 1996 Japan-U.S. security declaration, which expanded the scope of the bilateral alliance from one configured for the Cold War era to one encompassing the entire Asia-Pacific region. But questions arise on whether the project will proceed as hoped for, in light of the tension spawned by the bickering over where the U.S. Marine Corps’ Futenma Air Station in Okinawa Prefecture should be relocated. Prime Minister Yukio Hatoyama of the Democratic Party of Japan has delayed the decision on the relocation issue until May, indicating that Tokyo could renege on the previously agreed plan to transfer Futenma’s helicopter functions to another site in Okinawa by 2014. There is no guarantee, however, that the Tokyo government and the ruling coalition can reach a decision by then because the Social Democratic Party, a minor coalition partner, insists that the air base facility be moved off the southernmost island prefecture entirely. Hatoyama appears determined to keep the three-way coalition intact, which also includes the People’s New Party, another small party, as the DPJ lacks a majority in the House of Councillors even though it is an overwhelmingly dominant force in the more powerful House of Representatives.

There is large resentment over Okinawa and US still won’t leave- proves cp fails

Kajita 10 (Takehiko, Kyodo News Editor, *Japan Today*, http://www.japantoday.com/category/commentary/view/course-unclear-for-japan-us-alliance , 10) ET

 Another reason for doubts is Okinawa’s lingering resentment about what its residents see as an unfair burden in maintaining the Japan-U.S. alliance. Okinawa hosts about half the 47,000 U.S. military personnel in Japan. While the city of Nago has offered to be home to the facility to Futenma, a mayoral election there on Jan 24 could turn the tide. In the election, an incumbent who accepts the relocation plan under a 2006 bilateral deal will face off with a contender who is opposed to it. Should the central government decide to go ahead with the Nago plan by the election, it would face difficulties in carrying it out because environmental assessment procedures at the planned transfer site in a coastal area will likely be disturbed by local protests. ‘‘I’m afraid the net result of what the Hatoyama government is doing would be that the Futenma base will remain put permanently,’’ said a Japanese government official who requested anonymity. Apart from the Futenma dispute, there is another source of doubt about the alliance talks—why it is necessary at this point and in which direction Japan wants to navigate them. The Hatoyama government has pledged to deal with the United States on a more ‘‘equal’’ basis, while emphasizing closer relations with China. After the talks with Clinton, Okada was vague about what will be among major elements to be considered to strengthen the alliance. He said security environments in East Asia, including China’s moves, should be scrutinized, but admitted it is difficult to predict how the talks will evolve. Asked about his own vision for a future alliance with the United States, he said only, ‘‘It may be better for you to pose the question to the prime minister.’’

Aff- Japan- Says No

Japanese want the US off- they refuse- counterplan can’t solve

France24 June 5th ( *France24- International news service*, http://observers.france24.com/en/content/20100506-american-soldier-japan-only-minority-think-we-monsters-okinawa-futenma , 6.5.10) ET

I want to put US military on Torishima! That way we can really know if depleted uranium is healthy or not. The US says it is ok but is it really? US military should build a base on Torishima to prove it to us Okinawans. We know US military is liars. Just a few weeks ago they launched dangerous prohibited scud missiles into our ocean. Okinawa is famous for high cancer rate. No wonder, right? Who is to blame? The US military know we are indigenous peoples of Japan and they know that Japan doesn't care about us. So, the US military also know they can get away with hurting us. We don't hate the average Americans who are innocent from this knowledge. We know you are not to blame. But the ones to blame are the ones playing the game. (US military) We have helicopters crashing into my university. When we tried taking pictures the soldiers stole our cellphones and broke them so the crash took time to get to the press. They tried hiding the information. This is when I began wondering …Are these guys really here to protect us? The old Japanese Army didn’t protect us either. How can these US military protect us? (common knowledge that they cannot) They are crashing into our university! They are hurting us and our nature and playing games with our human rights, mammal rights, and natural rights. We have the right to be happy but we are not happy. We do not have a happy environment. This Constitutional right is taken away from Okinawans by US military and Japan. Organized crime of US soldiers are very deep. Just a few weeks ago in Okinawa there was a US marine who injured a taxi driver with a knife and stole about 300 dollars from this taxi driver. This US soldier told authorities that his motive was to be in the Green Berets so he committed the crime to impress his commander. This is clear organized crime. Who is to blame? Yes, US military. This commander still hasn't been prosecuted. The Japanese would never prosecute the commander because the Japanese don't care about Okinawans. The US military is just playing the game to find new ways to hurt innocent Okinawans.

Aff- Japan –Says No

And, local Okinawans have been pleading the military to leave and they refuse- counterplan fails

France24 June 5th ( *France24- International news service*, http://observers.france24.com/en/content/20100506-american-soldier-japan-only-minority-think-we-monsters-okinawa-futenma , 6.5.10) ET

The US military said they would catch but nothing was done. The US military say they are protecting us. But are they? Will they? They can’t protect two little girls in 2008 and in 1995. Both raped. Just a few months ago, a woman was driving home on her bike and US military children put a rope across a street. The poor women was choked into critical condition. She is still hospitalized. The US military children’s parents were watching what their kids did but didn’t stop them, because we don’t matter, right? We Okinawans are humans to. We have human rights. We have families with dreams we have expectations in longevity. We do matter! We really do matter. We are just like you. The blame is simple, it is not the average American people but the nasty US Defense Department that cannot defend us, they hurt us Okinawans. We know US military organized crime cannot defend us because you just abuse us. The US military is not a hero but an invader. You US military organized crime say: "We are in Okinawa to protect Japan and your government wants us there". But we Okinawans never asked you US military to be on our island. You just stole the land. You just force yourselves on Okinawans. We want US military to leave. US military does not protect Okinawans. US soldiers are rapists and baby killers. US soldiers are educated to be natural born killers. Good average Americans please, lobby and rally to get US military off our island and make the US military go home to America. I'm sure these soldiers would be more comfortable and return to their original average good Americans in the US. Your country is a good country but your soldiers are crooked. Only apple pie can make them better. You should remove US military off of Okinawa and have your boys return to US. This is the best way. All we Okinawans need is peace. Please give us peace and freedom. We want liberty.

Japanese have called for troop withdrawal before- America will refuse- counterplan fail

Leonard 8 (John, *Filipino Expats Qatar*, http://qa.filipinoexpats.com/ofw-group-backs-japanese-activists-call-us-troop-withdrawal , 2-28-8) ET

Amid allegations of rape and abuse of women by US servicemen in Okinawa, a group of overseas Filipino workers (OFWs) based in the Middle East echoed the calls of Japanese activists for the immediate pull out of US bases which they claimed has brought “mayhem" in the east-Asian country. Migrante Middle East (Migrante-ME) sought the exit of US troops stationed in Japan after a report that a 21-year-old Filipino was raped by an American soldier in Okinawa, just two days after her departure from the Philippines. “We strongly condemn in the strongest possible terms this atrocious act committed by US military servicemen, who after the crimes have been committed, can simply and freely leave Japan without paying the crimes they have committed against the victims," John Leonard Monterona, Migrante-ME regional coordinator, said on Thursday. Prior to the incident involving the Filipina, a 14-year-old Japanese schoolgirl was allegedly raped by 38-year-old Marine staff sergeant Tyrone Luther Hadnott in a parked car. The soldier has denied the accusation but has admitted to forcibly kissing the girl. He has not been charged. “We are in solidarity and supporting the calls of Japanese citizens and activists in their legitimate demand address to the Bush administration to immediately pull out its military bases and troops which has been staying in Japan for quite sometime and bringing mayhem to the Japanese citizens in their own homeland," Monterona said.

Aff- Japan- Says No

And Japan has demanded forces will leave before- empirically denied

AFRICOM 8 (http://africaagainstafricom.org/article.php?story=ustrooprape , Feb 18,8, *AFRICOM)* ET

Japan's southern island of Okinawa on Thursday demanded the US military rein in the thousands of troops stationed there after a US Marine was arrested for allegedly raping a girl. The prefectural assembly of Okinawa unanimously adopted a resolution asking the US military to take action to improve ethical training for its forces.

US will say no- resolution after resolution proves

AFRICOM 8 (http://africaagainstafricom.org/article.php?story=ustrooprape , Feb 18,8, *AFRICOM)* ET

But opposition assembly members demanded that Nakaima, a government ally, demand tougher action, noting that the US government has promised tighter discipline before. The Okinawa police have reported to an assembly committee that 14 rapes allegedly by US soldiers have occurred in the tiny province since 1995. "He has not shown enough anger," opposition assembly member Chosei Taira told AFP. "We have adopted resolutions of protest over and over again, but they hardly have made any changes," Taira said. "We demand the entire withdrawal of the US military. Unless all Marines go, we wouldn't be rid incidents like this no matter how many times we protest." Nakaima was elected in 2006 promising to improve the island's troubled economy and signalling a more conciliatory policy towards the US military and its global realignment plan.

\*\*Aff- S Korea\*\*

Aff- S Korea- Backlash @ Pres

And, south Koreans want troops there- counterplan causes backlash against leader

ROK Drop 10 ( Mar 5-10, *ROK Drop- Korea from North to South*, http://rokdrop.com/2010/03/05/are-us-troops-still-needed-in-south-korea/ ) ET

Generally South Koreans think the US presence is needed,’ Cheong says, though he adds the 2000 summit between then South Korean President Kim Dae-jung and North Korean leader Kim Jong-il made people ‘rethink the necessity of US soldiers in Korea.’ He also says that feelings toward troops reflect overall sentiment towards the US government, and that attitudes have turned more positive since Barack Obama’s inauguration as US president. And as with the controversy surrounding US military stationing in Japan’s Okinawa, Cheong acknowledges there’s still significant concern here about environmental degradation caused by bases and crimes committed by US soldiers.

Aff- S Korea- Says No

US will say no- empirics and secretary of defense proves

Flemming 9 (*Reuters*, Staffwriter, http://www.inreview.com/archive/topic/767.html) ET

The United States for half a century has maintained a stabilizing military presence in South Korea, since the Korean War.New South Korean President Roh Moo-hyun has asked the United States to study the bilateral relationship. The presence of American troops has become increasingly controversial in the past year, with some critics in South Korea saying the Bush administration has hindered closer ties with North Korea. There also is concern in South Korea about alleged crimes committed by U.S. troops. White House and defense officials last month said the United States was considering shifts in global military deployments, including the thousands of U.S. troops in Europe. About 70,000 of the nearly 110,000 U.S. troops in Europe are in Germany, a vocal foe of a possible U.S.-led war against Iraq. Rumsfeld did not state when a decision would be made, but said the Pentagon is "almost through the process of looking at our force structure" around the world. He added that whatever changes would not change that "we are engaged in the world (and) we care about assisting our friends and allies."

And, south korea has asked for american troops to leave in the past- they say no

Johnson 4 ( Chalmers, author of *Sorrow of the Empire*, *History News Network* , http://hnn.us/articles/2867.html , 1-5-4) ET

In the months since Japan and the U.S. gave up on the SOFA, there have been endless rumors that the United States is planning a substantial reform of its basing policies in East Asia. In South Korea, possibly the most anti-American democracy on earth today, there have been major street demonstrations calling for a revised SOFA or, more pointedly, for all American forces to leave the country. Secretary of Defense Donald Rumsfeld announced plans to move the U.S.'s Yongsan Base from the old Japanese military headquarters in downtown Seoul to some remote area and to relocate the 2nd Infantry Division, based close to the demilitarized zone with North Korea, to undisclosed locations south of the Han River. Senator Daniel Inouye (D.-Hawaii) hinted to a delegation of LDP politicians that the U.S. might move some Okinawa-based Marines to Hawaii as a way of revitalizing the Hawaiian economy. Many consultations between the Ministry of Foreign Affairs and U.S. Deputy Secretary of State Richard Armitage have dwelt on "streamlining the U.S. military presence in Okinawa." The Japanese press has observed that in the past this subject was usually brought up by the Japanese side in a pro-forma way but that after the United States declared its "war on terror" and invaded Afghanistan and Iraq, it has shown greater interest in doing something about it

Aff- S Korea- Says No

South korea doesn’t want us there- if we were going to say yes we would have

Stanton 10 (Josh, the new ledger staff writer, *CBS News,* http://www.cbsnews.com/stories/2010/04/11/opinion/main6386737.shtml ) ET

The South Korean people do not appreciate the security our soldiers provide. The way some of them treat our soldiers ought to be a national scandal. Many off-post businesses don’t even let Americans through their front doors. The degree of anti-Americanism in South Korea is sufficient to be a significant force protection issue in the event of hostilities. South Korea does not have our back. South Korea made much of the fact that it sent 3,000 soldiers to Iraq, where they sat behind concrete barriers in a secure Kurdish area of Iraq, protected by peshmerga, making no military contribution and taking no combat casualties. Their contribution to the effort in Afghanistan has been negligible, which is more than can be said of their contribution to the Taliban (previous President Roh Moo Hyun reportedly paid them a ransom of up to $20 million in 2007 to free South Korean hostages who took it upon themselves to charter a shiny new bus to bring Christianity to Kandahar). South Korea has been an equally unsteady ally against China. The American security blanket has fostered a state of national adolescence by the South Korean public. Too many of them (some polls suggest most) see America as a barrier to reunification with their ethnic kindred in the North. Maybe nothing short of a North Korean attack on the South can encourage more sober thinking by South Koreans about their own security, but I suspect a greater sense of self-reliance and even vulnerability might.