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1. GRAVEYARD OF EMPIRES: THE CASE FOR WITHDRAWAL FROM AFGHANISTAN

It started out as a necessary reaction to the events of 9/11 -- destroying the enemy that attacked us and shutting down their operations. That mission was accomplished. Today, however, the ongoing war in Afghanistan benefits no one - not the American people and certainly not the Afghan people. Please join my partner and me in affirming that The United States Federal Government should substantially reform its foreign military presence and/or foreign military commitments.

OBSERVATION 1. We offer the following DEFINITIONS

**Substantial**: “3 *a* **:** possessed of means **:** well-to-do *b* **:** considerable in quantity **:** significantly great <earned a *substantial* wage>” *(Merriam-Webster Online Dictionary 2012.* [*http://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/substantially*](http://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/substantially)*)*

**Reform:** “2**:** to put an end to (an evil) by enforcing or introducing a better method or course of action” *(Merriam-Webster Online Dictionary 2012.* [*http://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/reform*](http://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/reform) *(parentheses in original))*

**Military:** “2 : ARMED FORCES” (Merriam-Webster Online Dictionary 2012. parentheses in original, <http://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/military>)

**Commitment**: “1 *[mass noun]* the state or quality of being dedicated to a cause, activity, etc.:” *(Oxford Dictionary online 2012. Oxford University Press,* [*http://oxforddictionaries.com/definition/commitment?q=commitment*](http://oxforddictionaries.com/definition/commitment?q=commitment)*)*

**Presence:** “*[mass noun]* the state or fact of existing, occurring, or being present” *(Oxford Dictionary online 2012. Oxford University Press,* [*http://oxforddictionaries.com/definition/presence?q=presence*](http://oxforddictionaries.com/definition/presence?q=presence)*, brackets in original)*

OBSERVATION 2. INHERENCY, the conditions of the Status Quo.

FACT 1. Large US military presence in Afghanistan today

NEW YORK TIMES 2012. (journalists HELENE COOPER and ERIC SCHMITT) 13 March 2012 “U.S. Officials Debate Speeding Afghan Pullout” <http://www.nytimes.com/2012/03/13/world/asia/us-officials-debate-speeding-up-afghan-pullout.html?pagewanted=all>

The United States now has just under 90,000 troops in Afghanistan, with 22,000 of them due home by September. There has been no schedule set for the withdrawal of the remaining 68,000 American troops, although Mr. Obama said last year that the drawdown would continue “at a steady pace” until the United States handed over security to the Afghan forces in 2014.

FACT 2. 25,000 US troops will remain in Afghanistan after 2014

Tom Bowman 2012. (journalist) National Public Radio, “About 25,000 Troops May Be Needed In Afghanistan After 2014, Planners Say” 2 May 2012 <http://www.npr.org/blogs/thetwo-way/2012/05/02/151854753/about-25-000-troops-may-be-needed-in-afghanistan-after-2014-planners-say>

When President Obama on Tuesday signed a 10-year security agreement with Afghan President Karzai, it wasn't announced how many U.S. troops would remain in Afghanistan past 2014 — the year Afghans are supposed to take over full responsibilty for security there. American military officials say that the planning figure is 25,000 troops, commanded by a three-star general. They would include trainers as well as thousands of Green Berets and other special operations troops who would work with Afghans on counter-terror missions. NATO would be asked to contribute troops, but it's likely that the U.S. would contribute the bulk of those forces.

OBSERVATION 3. HARMS, or reasons why current policies are bad.

HARM 1. American Lives & Money Lost. American lives and money are lost pursuing an unattainable goal.

Doug Bandow 2012. ( J.D. (law degree) from Stanford Univ; senior fellow at the Cato Institute, specializing in foreign policy and civil liberties; worked as special assistant to President Reagan) 6 Mar 2012 Why Are We Still in Afghanistan? <http://www.cato.org/publications/commentary/why-are-we-still-afghanistan>

The initial U.S. intervention in Afghanistan was necessary to break al Qaeda and punish the Taliban for hosting terrorists. But those objectives were achieved a decade ago. Since then Washington has been attempting to establish competent and honest governance in Kabul. Along the way Americans have sacrificed more than 1,900 lives (U.S. allies have lost another 1,000) and $507 billion. However, the latest example of deadly intolerance in Afghanistan suggests that America's attempt at nation-building is a chimera, unattainable at least at reasonable cost in reasonable time.

HARM 2. Failed Strategy. Our counterinsurgency strategy is failing and only breeds more terrorism

Dr. Leon Hadar 2010. (MA degrees from the schools of journalism and international affairs and the Middle East Institute at Columbia University; Ph.D in international relations from American Univ.) 28 July 2010 What Happens If U.S. Troops Leave Afghanistan? Not the End of the World As We Know It, <http://www.cato.org/publications/commentary/what-happens-us-troops-leave-afghanistan-not-end-world-we-know-it>

But the COIN strategy that General Petraeus and his Australian mate and their disciples in Washington think tanks which the U.S. failed to implement in Vietnam will certainly not work in Afghanistan. Indeed, the notion that the U.S. has the power and the will — not to mention the interest — to engage in a long and costly process of building a nation-state in Afghanistan — — rebuilding, remaking, restructuring, reconstructing, and reforming this failed state and its mishmash of ethnic, religious, and tribal groups — the Pashtun and Tajik, Uzbek and Hazara, and the Aimak and the Turkmen and the Baloch people, its underdeveloped economy, nonexistent military, and "civil society" — is nothing more than a fantasy. In reality, it could create — it is creating! — a series of "blowbacks" that could end-up igniting more and not less anti-American terrorism.

HARM 3. Incompetence & corruption. US-supported Afghan government is incompetent and corrupt

Chris Mason 2012. (Navy veteran and retired foreign service officer who served in combat in 2005 in Paktika Province, Afghanistan; currently an analyst, counterinsurgency instructor and senior fellow at the Center for Advanced Defense Studies in Washington) 3 Apr 2012 The Lesson of Vietnam: Out Now , NEW YORK TIMES, <http://www.nytimes.com/roomfordebate/2012/04/03/should-the-us-leave-afghanistan-now/learn-the-lessons-of-vietnam-out-now>

Afghanistan is Vietnam redux. Again the U.S. has never lost a battle and again that is irrelevant. As in Vietnam, the puppet government is incompetent, corrupt and illegitimate. It is a myth that the war was lost by invading Iraq. It was lost in the C.I.A. stage production called the “Bonn Process,” where a non-entity named Hamid Karzai was foisted on astonished Afghan leaders. When 75 percent of the delegates at the Loya Jirga petitioned to make the king the interim head of state, C.I.A. shenanigans and millions of dollars in bribes killed the indigenous process.

OBSERVATION 4. We have a PLAN. Congress and the President will take the following actions through any necessary constitutional means:

1. Withdrawal of all US military forces from Afghanistan over the next 4 months.

2. Plan takes effect the day after an Affirmative ballot.

3. Enforcement through the President and the commanders of the military services.

4. Funding within existing Defense Department budgets, and Congress cuts off all funding for any military activity not in compliance with the plan.

5. Affirmative speeches may clarify the Plan as needed.

OBSERVATION 5. Experts endorse our Plan because it produces ADVANTAGES

ADVANTAGE 1. Lives & Money Saved

Prof. Stephen Walt 2012. (professor of international affairs at Harvard University) 3 Apr 2012 “Don’ t Prolong the Inevitable” NEW YORK TIMES, <http://www.nytimes.com/roomfordebate/2012/04/03/should-the-us-leave-afghanistan-now/there-is-no-need-to-prolong-the-inevitable>

The United States should send soldiers in harm's way only when vital interests are at stake. The outcome in Afghanistan will have little impact on United States security and it makes no sense to squander more blood and treasure there. Our NATO allies have figured this out and are heading for the exits. We should join them.

ADVANTAGE 2. Pathway to greater stability. US disengagement would lead to regional spheres of influence and greater stability in Afghanistan

Dr. Leon Hadar 2010. (MA degrees from the schools of journalism and international affairs and the Middle East Institute at Columbia University; Ph.D in international relations from American Univ.) 28 July 2010 What Happens If U.S. Troops Leave Afghanistan? Not the End of the World As We Know It, <http://www.cato.org/publications/commentary/what-happens-us-troops-leave-afghanistan-not-end-world-we-know-it>

My guess is that a U.S. military disengagement would probably ignite a similar kind of civil war in Afghanistan as the largest ethnic group, the Pashtun fight with the Tajiks, Uzbeks and Hazaras (the three groups that dominated the victorious Northern Alliance) as outside regional powers led by Pakistan, India, Russia and China providing support for their clients. Contrary to the dire warnings of members of Washington's War Party such a process could actually help create some level of stability in Afghanistan as Pakistan and India help establish sphere of influence there: Pakistan will maintain its influence in the so-called Pashtun-belt in the south where a the Taliban could emerge as the major local player, while India exert its own influence in the north of Afghanistan. In fact, the expectation for U.S. military pull-out from Iraq has helped produce similar incentives for regional powers like Turkey, Iran and the Sunni Arab states to establish a certain balance of power in that country, with Turkey establishing friendly ties with the Kurds in the North while cooperating with Iran to prevent the emergence of an independent Kurdish state. Similarly, Iran and the Saudis have a common interest in averting a full-blown military confrontation between the Shiites and the Sunnis. There is no reason why India and Pakistan would not cooperate in controlling their clients in Afghanistan in order to avoid a regional military conflagration.

ADVANTAGE 3. Afghan self-determination. It’s better to let Afghans decide the future of their country for themselves. We see this in 2 subpoints:

A. The Link: Accelerated troop withdrawal allows Afghanistan to develop on its own terms. In fact, Afghanistan is going to develop on its own terms anyway, it’s only a question of how many lives we will sacrifice while getting in the way. Doug Bandow explains in 2012:

Doug Bandow 2012. ( J.D. (law degree) from Stanford Univ; senior fellow at the Cato Institute, specializing in foreign policy and civil liberties; worked as special assistant to President Reagan) 16 Mar 2012 Leave Afghanistan to the Afghans <http://www.cato.org/publications/commentary/leave-afghanistan-afghans>

Afghanistan may eventually end up with a reasonably liberal society and effective government, but only on its own accord. There are, in fact, many Afghans, particularly women, who desire liberty and equality. However, the U.S. cannot turn Afghanistan into a modern nation-state, at least at reasonable cost in reasonable time. It is time for the Obama administration to recognize this and stop sacrificing American lives. Washington should accelerate its troop withdrawal.

B. The Impact: Blocking self-determination stirs anti-American violence and rejection of democracy.

Malou Innocent 2012. (Masters in International Relations, U of Chicago; member of the International Institute for Strategic Studies) 27 Feb 2012 It’s Time to Cut Our Losses in Afghanistan <http://www.cato-at-liberty.org/its-time-to-cut-our-losses-in-afghanistan/>

As I argued months ago, “Recent events in Afghanistan should be a wake-up call to how our 10-year occupation is actually being perceived. Rather than winning ‘hearts and minds,’ America’s civilizing mission has become increasingly associated with a Western cultural invasion.” Many Afghans see outsiders constantly changing their mayors, their governors, and their customs. They are told how to dress their women, what is culturally acceptable, and what is culturally repugnant. Americans are infuriated when their politicians redistribute their taxes, yet they ignore how intrusive their own military and civilian planners have become to foreign peoples. It’s no surprise that a report published last May by the Kabul-based Afghanistan Research and Evaluation Unit concluded that negative sentiments about democracy emerge from “the stated distaste among respondents for ‘Western culture’ and the potential threat it poses to ‘Afghan culture,’ traditional norms or values, and an Islamic identity.” None of this should imply that the Quran burning or the grisly violence meted out against innocent people was justified. But the fact remains that America is widely scorned throughout the region—in both Afghanistan and Pakistan.

2. NO BLOOD FOR OIL: THE CASE FOR REVOKING THE CARTER DOCTRINE

A policy of US military commitment that began over 30 years ago during the Carter Administration has cost our nation dearly in blood and treasure ever since, in addition to making the problem worse that it was supposed to solve. Getting out of this misguided policy should be one of our nation’s top priorities, and that’s why my partner and I are happy to affirm that: The United States Federal Government should substantially reform its foreign military presence and/or foreign military commitments.

OBSERVATION 1. We offer the following DEFINITIONS

**Substantial**: “3 *a* **:** possessed of means **:** well-to-do *b* **:** considerable in quantity **:** significantly great <earned a *substantial* wage>” *(Merriam-Webster Online Dictionary 2012.* [*http://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/substantially*](http://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/substantially)*)*

**Reform:** “2**:** to put an end to (an evil) by enforcing or introducing a better method or course of action” *(Merriam-Webster Online Dictionary 2012.* [*http://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/reform*](http://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/reform)*)*

**Military:** “2 : ARMED FORCES” *(Merriam-Webster Online Dictionary 2012.* [*http://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/military*](http://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/military)*)*

**Commitment**: “2 a **:** an agreement or pledge to do something in the future;” *(Merriam-Webster Online Dictionary 2012.* [*http://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/commitment*](http://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/commitment)*)*

OBSERVATION 2. INHERENCY. The Status Quo is committed to the “Carter Doctrine” of military intervention in the Middle East to protect oil.

Realize A. Doctrine Established. President Carter established the US military commitment to protect Persian Gulf oil in his State of the Union Address on January 23, 1980:

President Jimmy Carter, State of the Union Address, 23 Jan 1980. <http://www.jimmycarterlibrary.gov/documents/speeches/su80jec.phtml>

The region which is now threatened by Soviet troops in Afghanistan is of great strategic importance: It contains more than two-thirds of the world's exportable oil. The Soviet effort to dominate Afghanistan has brought Soviet military forces to within 300 miles of the Indian Ocean and close to the Straits of Hormuz, a waterway through which most of the world's oil must flow. The Soviet Union is now attempting to consolidate a strategic position, therefore, that poses a grave threat to the free movement of Middle East oil. This situation demands careful thought, steady nerves, and resolute action, not only for this year but for many years to come. It demands collective efforts to meet this new threat to security in the Persian Gulf and in Southwest Asia. It demands the participation of all those who rely on oil from the Middle East and who are concerned with global peace and stability. And it demands consultation and close cooperation with countries in the area which might be threatened. Meeting this challenge will take national will, diplomatic and political wisdom, economic sacrifice, and, of course, military capability. We must call on the best that is in us to preserve the security of this crucial region. Let our position be absolutely clear: An attempt by any outside force to gain control of the Persian Gulf region will be regarded as an assault on the vital interests of the United States of America, and such an assault will be repelled by any means necessary, including military force.

Realize B. Doctrine Continues. Military intervention for Persian Gulf oil remains our foreign policy today.

Dr. Michael T. Klare 2012 (PhD, professor of Peace and World Security Studies at Hampshire College) “Hormuz-Mania“ <http://www.tomdispatch.com/post/175496/tomgram%3A_michael_klare%2C_no_exit_in_the_persian_gulf/>

If oil lay at the root of Washington’s domineering role in the Gulf, over time that role evolved into something else: a powerful expression of America’s status as a global superpower. By becoming the military overlord of the Gulf and the self-appointed guardian of oil traffic through the Strait of Hormuz, Washington said to the world: "We, and we alone, are the ones who can ensure the safety of your daily oil supply and thereby prevent global economic collapse." Indeed, when the Cold War ended -- and with it an American sense of pride and identity as a bulwark against Soviet expansionism in Europe and Asia -- protection of the flow of Persian Gulf oil became America’s greatest claim to superpowerdom, and it remains so today.

OBSERVATION 3. FAILURES: The Carter Doctrine has been a colossal failure.

FAILURE 1. Open-ended war in the Middle East. Professor Andrew Bacevich explained the massive negative impact of the Carter Doctrine in 2010:

Prof. Andrew J. Bacevich 2010. (PhD; Prof of international relations and history at Boston Univ; graduated from the US Military Academy in 1969, later serving in Vietnam, Germany, El Salvador, and the Persian Gulf; Ph.D. in American diplomatic history from Princeton Univ) WORLD AFFAIRS JOURNAL 1 Apr 2010 “The Carter Doctrine at 30” <http://www.worldaffairsjournal.org/blog/andrew-j-bacevich/carter-doctrine-30>

To an extent that few have fully appreciated, the Carter Doctrine has had a transformative impact on U.S. national security policy. Both massive and lasting, its impact has also been almost entirely pernicious. Put simply, the sequence of events that has landed the United States in the middle of an open-ended war to determine the fate of the Greater Middle East begins here.

FAILURE 2. Increased Instability. While the Carter Doctrine was supposed to enhance regional stability, it has in fact done just the opposite.

Prof. Andrew J. Bacevich 2010. (PhD; Prof of international relations and history at Boston Univ; graduated from the US Military Academy in 1969, later serving in Vietnam, Germany, El Salvador, and the Persian Gulf; Ph.D. in American diplomatic history from Princeton Univ) WORLD AFFAIRS JOURNAL 1 Apr 2010 “The Carter Doctrine at 30” <http://www.worldaffairsjournal.org/blog/andrew-j-bacevich/carter-doctrine-30>

The Carter Doctrine was intended to secure U.S. interests in a region of ostensibly great strategic importance. Those who have applied the Carter Doctrine have assumed that the presence of U.S. forces and the periodic application of American hard power serve to enhance regional stability. Yet the record of the past 30 years suggests just the opposite: The U. S. military presence and activities have served only to promote greater instability. Our exertions, undertaken at great cost to ourselves and others, are making things not better, but worse.

FAILURE 3. Colossal expenditures for no results.

Dr. Michael T. Klare 2009. (PhD, professor of Peace and World Security Studies at Hampshire College) 23 Jan 2009 “Repudiate the Carter Doctrine” Foreign Policy In Focus, <http://www.fpif.org/articles/repudiate_the_carter_doctrine>

This policy has done little to ensure us uninterrupted access to oil, and cost us great pain, misery, and expense. Despite the $600 billion or so we have already spent on the Iraq War (on the way to an estimated $2-$3 trillion, when all associated and follow-up costs are included), Iraq today is producing less oil today than it did when U.S. troops invaded the country six years ago. And despite the mammoth U.S. military presence in the Gulf area, Iran emerged as a major regional power amidst a rise in piracy and militant Islam. When all is said and done, conventional military force is an ineffective tool for protecting far-flung, highly vulnerable oil facilities and trade routes.

FAILURE 4. Islamic Radicals. US military presence in the region inflames anti-American Islamic radicals

Dr. Ivan Eland 2009. (PhD public policy,Georgetown U.; senior fellow with the Independent Institute; spent 15 years working for Congress on national security issues, including stints as an investigator for the House Foreign Affairs Committee and Principal Defense Analyst at the Congressional Budget Office) 27 Aug 2009 “Fallacies in U.S. oil policy” <http://www.pittsburghlive.com/x/pittsburghtrib/opinion/s_640203.html>

A second fallacy is that the U.S. military presence in the Persian Gulf increases the security of oil supplies. In fact, America is seen in that part of the world as an "infidel" -- and our military presence on Islamic soil riles radical Islamists, increasing instability. While the Saudis want the U.S. security umbrella, they understand this threat. That's why they sent most U.S. troops packing before the U.S. invaded Iraq. They want the security as long as the U.S. provides it from offshore.

OBSERVATION 4. We have a PLAN.

1. The President repudiates the Carter Doctrine.

2. All US military oil-security activities in the Middle East are canceled and all future commitments abandoned.

3. Plan takes effect immediately upon an Affirmative ballot

4. Funding is a net reduction in federal expenditures thanks to reduced military operations

5. Enforcement through the President and the Joint Chiefs of Staff. Congress will vote to cut off funds for any military operation in violation of the mandates.

6. Affirmative may clarify the plan in future speeches.

OBSERVATION 5. ADVANTAGES

ADVANTAGE 1: American lives saved. Repudiating the Carter Doctrine ends blood for oil

Dr. Michael T. Klare 2009. (PhD, professor of Peace and World Security Studies at Hampshire College) 23 Jan 2009 “Repudiate the Carter Doctrine” Foreign Policy In Focus, <http://www.fpif.org/articles/repudiate_the_carter_doctrine>

President Obama has promised to make a substantial investment in oil alternatives. Such efforts are expected to be a major component of his economic stimulus package and deserve strong public backing. But this is only half of the problem. To overcome what he calls the "tyranny of oil," he must also repudiate the Carter Doctrine and reject the use of military force to ensure access to Middle Eastern petroleum. Only in this way can we be certain that the Iraq War will be the last time U.S. soldiers shed their blood for oil.

ADVANTAGE 2. Money saved

Dr. Mark A. Delucchi & Dr. James J. Murphy 2008. (Delucchi - PhD, research scientist at the Institute of Transportation Studies at Univ of Californa-Davis; Murphy - PhD, prof. of economics, Univ. of Alaska ) “US military expenditures to protect the use of Persian Gulf oil for motor vehicles” ENERGY POLICY Apr 2008 <http://www.google.com/url?sa=t&rct=j&q=&esrc=s&frm=1&source=web&cd=8&cts=1331330882950&ved=0CGEQFjAH&url=http%3A%2F%2Fpubs.its.ucdavis.edu%2Fdownload_pdf.php%3Fid%3D1165&ei=oXpaT4S2EdC1hAflu4ipBA&usg=AFQjCNF28qcISuuixWz_7p5LbiTzMlSLsA&sig2=nXjSMvkLcbl1oMjMSe7qkw>

We estimate that were there no oil in the Persian Gulf, then US combined peacetime and wartime defense expenditures might be reduced in the long run by roughly $27–$73 billion per year (in 2004 dollars), of which roughly $6–$25 billion annually ($0.03–$0.15 per gallon or $0.01–$0.04 per liter) is attributable to motor-vehicle use.

ADVANTAGE 3. Reduced Terrorism.

Dr. Jeffrey Miron 2010. (PhD economics, M.I.T.; teaches at Harvard University, Senior Lecturer and Director of Undergraduate Studies in Harvard's Economics Department ) “Leave Mideast, End Terrorism,” 28 Jan 2010 <http://www.cato.org/publications/commentary/leave-mideast-end-terrorism>

Ending US interference in the Middle East is a necessary condition for reducing terrorism against the US because Islamic resentment results directly from this interference. The fact that virtually all terrorist attacks against the US since 9/11 have targeted US forces in the Middle East, rather than targets on US soil, suggests the crucial objective is getting the US to leave. Of course, terminating US intrusions in the Middle East will not eliminate antipathy to the US. Some Muslims, just like some non-Muslims, hate the US merely because it is rich and powerful. But ending US interference – which is not mild or occasional but pervasive and severe – would help achieve a significant reduction in the demand for terrorist acts against us. Numerous examples illustrate this view; terrorist attacks against Britain, for example, were concentrated historically against targets in the Middle East and India, but ceased when the British departed. US withdrawal from the Middle East must, of course, proceed slowly enough to safeguard US troops and equipment, and avoid putting locals in harm's way. And this withdrawal may initially increase violence and instability, as the remaining factions attempt to consolidate power.

3. ATTACK OF THE DRONES: THE CASE FOR REFORMING DRONE WARFARE

A few years ago it was the dream of science fiction: armed machines operated by remote control, fighting our nation’s wars in place of soldiers, sailors and airmen. Today it’s a foreign policy nightmare and a constitutional travesty. Please consider carefully the case my partner and I are presenting today as we explain why: The United States Federal Government should substantially reform its foreign military presence and/or foreign military commitments.

OBSERVATION 1. We offer the following DEFINITIONS

**Substantial**: “3 *a* **:** possessed of means **:** well-to-do *b* **:** considerable in quantity **:** significantly great <earned a *substantial* wage>” *(Merriam-Webster Online Dictionary 2012.* [*http://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/substantially*](http://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/substantially)*)*

**Reform:** “2**:** to put an end to (an evil) by enforcing or introducing a better method or course of action” *(Merriam-Webster Online Dictionary 2012.* [*http://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/reform*](http://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/reform)*, parentheses in original)*

**Military:** “1 a: of or relating to soldiers, arms, or war.” *(Merriam-Webster Online Dictionary, 2012* [*http://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/military*](http://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/military)*)*

**Commitment**: “1 [mass noun] the state or quality of being dedicated to a cause, activity, etc.:” *(Oxford Dictionary online 2012. Oxford University Press,* [*http://oxforddictionaries.com/definition/commitment?q=commitment*](http://oxforddictionaries.com/definition/commitment?q=commitment)*, brackets in original)*

**Presence:** “[mass noun] the state or fact of existing, occurring, or being present” *(Oxford Dictionary online 2012. Oxford University Press,* [*http://oxforddictionaries.com/definition/presence?q=presence*](http://oxforddictionaries.com/definition/presence?q=presence)*, brackets in original)*

OBSERVATION 2. INHERENCY: Drones are the new American way of war

A. The US has thousands of drones engaged in unmanned warfare in other countries

Dr. Peter W. Singer 2012. (PhD in government, Harvard; Senior Fellow and Director of the 21st Century Defense Initiative at the Brookings Institution; served as coordinator of the Obama 2008 campaign’s defense policy task force) 22 Jan 2012 “Do Drones Undermine Democracy?” <http://www.brookings.edu/opinions/2012/0122_drones_singer.aspx>

Just 10 years ago, the idea of using armed robots in war was the stuff of Hollywood fantasy. Today, the United States military has more than 7,000 unmanned aerial systems, popularly called drones. There are 12,000 more on the ground. Last year, they carried out hundreds of strikes — both covert and overt — in six countries, transforming the way our democracy deliberates and engages in what we used to think of as war.

B. CIA and Air Force drone strikes are increasing

Prof. Afsheen J. Radsan & Prof. Richard Murphy 2011. (Radsan - Professor of Law, William Mitchell College of Law; former assistant general counsel at the Central Intelligence Agency; Murphy - Prof. of Law, Texas Tech Univ. School of Law ) MEASURE TWICE, SHOOT ONCE: HIGHER CARE FOR CIA-TARGETED KILLING, ILLINOIS LAW REVIEW, <http://illinoislawreview.org/wp-content/ilr-content/articles/2011/4/Murphy.pdf>

The use of drones to target and kill leaders of Al Qaeda and the Taliban (collectively, AQ/T) began under the Bush administration. The Air Force has controlled these operations in the clear war zones of Afghanistan and Iraq. Elsewhere, in northwest Pakistan, Yemen, and Somalia, the CIA controls operations. The number of CIA drone strikes has soared since the Obama administration took office, making targeted killing a key to the administration’s counterterrorism efforts.

C. Legal training and justification are lacking

Scott Horton 2011. (New York attorney known for his work in emerging markets and international law, especially human rights law and the law of armed conflict; lectures at Columbia Law School; chair of NY City Bar Association’s Committee on International Law) 1 Dec 2011 “Blair Addresses the CIA, Drones and Pakistan,” HARPER’S MAGAZINE, <http://www.harpers.org/archive/2011/12/hbc-90008329> (brackets added)

As [former National Intelligence Director for President Obama, Navy Admiral Denis] Blair points out, the CIA ended up running a military campaign that has entailed hundreds of strikes, often linked to hostilities in Afghanistan, over a period of seven years. The agency developed targets, operated strikes, and performed post-strike assessments, all using covert assets on Pakistani soil. The scope of this campaign amounts to a de facto militarization of the CIA — minus the training, procedures, and public justification that Blair notes must accompany military action.

OBSERVATION 3. Our current drone warfare policy creates HARMS

HARM 1. Americans murdered

A. Link: Drones target and kill Americans overseas

Philip Dore 2011. (JD Candidate) Louisiana State University Paul M. Hebert Law Center “Greenlighting American Citizens: Proceed with Caution,” LOUISIANA LAW REVIEW Vol 72 [http://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract\_id=1951963##](http://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract_id=1951963)

Name-calling is hurtful. But when the Obama Administration labeled Anwar al-Awlaki as a “global terrorist,” it was a death sentence. According to various media reports, the Obama Administration has authorized the C.I.A. to use lethal force against al-Awlaki, a dual U.S.-Yemeni citizen. A U.S. drone attack targeted but missed al-Awlaki in May 2011. Approximately four months later, armed drones operated by the C.I.A. fired a barrage of Hellfire missiles at a car carrying him and at least one other person. Al-Awlaki and another American citizen, Samir Khan, were killed.

B. Impact: Criminal responsibility for murder

Philip Dore 2011. (JD Candidate) Louisiana State University Paul M. Hebert Law Center “Greenlighting American Citizens: Proceed with Caution,” LOUISIANA LAW REVIEW Vol 72 (brackets added) [http://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract\_id=1951963##](http://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract_id=1951963)

The Supreme Court in Medellin has established that treaties are presumptively non-self-executing. Because Article 4 of the 1949 Geneva Convention III is devoid of affirmative evidence that the U.S. intended it to have immediate effect as domestic law, Article 4 acquires domestic-law status only through its incorporation in separate legislation. It is unlikely, however, that Article 4 has been incorporated either in the UCMJ [Uniform Code of Military Justice] or the AUMF [Authorization for Use of Military Force, a law passed by Congress in 2001]. Thus, the President may not invoke the laws of war regarding legal combatants to justify his actions domestically, which creates an unavoidable tug-of-war between the AUMF and the foreign-murder statute. And because the AUMF cannot reasonably be interpreted to repeal the foreign-murder statute, it is difficult to avoid the conclusion that any C.I.A. operative that executed President Obama’s order to kill al-Awlaki is guilty of murder under the foreign-murder statute. An equally unavoidable conclusion is that certain high-ranking executive officials, including the President, would share in that criminal culpability.

HARM 2. Unintended deaths. Because the CIA is untrained and unqualified to carry out these military missions, lots of other people get killed besides the actual target of the drone.

Prof. Mary Ellen O’Connell 2010. (prof. of law, Univ. of Notre Dame law school) “Unlawful Killing with Combat Drones A Case Study of Pakistan, 2004-2009” Notre Dame Law School Legal Studies Research Paper No. 09-43 <http://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract_id=1501144>

Another issue in drone use is the fact that strikes are carried out by joint operations. The heavy involvement of the CIA and CIA contractors in the decisions to strike may alone account for the high-unintended death rate. CIA operatives are not trained in the law of armed conflict. They are not bound by the Uniform Code of Military Justice to respect the laws and customs of war. This fact became abundantly clear during the revelation of U.S. use of interrogation methods involving torture and cruel, inhuman and degrading treatment. Given the impact of that unlawful conduct it is difficult to fathom why the Obama Administration is using the CIA to carry out drone attacks. Under the law of armed conflict, only lawful combatants have the right to use force during an armed conflict. Lawful combatants are the members of a state‘s regular armed forces. The CIA is not part of the U.S. armed forces.

HARM 3. Constitution Violated. By authorizing drone attacks inside countries the US is not at war with, the President takes us down the wrong path. We see this in 2 subpoints:

A. The Link: Drone attacks violate Constitutional safeguards requiring Congress to authorize war

Dr. Peter W. Singer 2012. (PhD in government, Harvard; Senior Fellow and Director of the 21st Century Defense Initiative at the Brookings Institution; served as coordinator of the Obama 2008 campaign’s defense policy task force) 22 Jan 2012 “Do Drones Undermine Democracy?” <http://www.brookings.edu/opinions/2012/0122_drones_singer.aspx>

A deep deliberation on war was something the framers of the Constitution sought to build into our system. Yet on Tuesday, when President Obama talks about his wartime accomplishments during the State of the Union address, Congress will have to admit that its role has been reduced to the same part it plays during the president’s big speech. These days, when it comes to authorizing war, Congress generally sits there silently, except for the occasional clapping. And we do the same at home. Last year, I met with senior Pentagon officials to discuss the many tough issues emerging from our growing use of robots in war. One of them asked, “So, who then is thinking about all this stuff?” America’s founding fathers may not have been able to imagine robotic drones, but they did provide an answer. The Constitution did not leave war, no matter how it is waged, to the executive branch alone.

B. The Impact: Lives and money wasted on reckless military adventures

War Powers Initiative Committee of The Constitution Project, Co-Chaired by former Representative Mickey Edwards and former Representative David Skaggs, 2005. (Mickey Edwards - Lecturer, Woodrow Wilson School of Public and International Affairs, Princeton Univ.; former Member of Congress (R-OK); David Skaggs - former Member of Congress (D-CO): Member of the Appropriations Committee and Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence; Peter Raven-Hansen - professor of law, George Washington Univ.; Louis Fisher - Senior Specialist in Separation of Powers, Congressional Research Service, Library of Congress; Thomas Franck - Professor of Law Emeritus at N.Y. Univ School of Law; Michael J. Glennon - Prof. of International Law, Fletcher School of Law & Diplomacy at Tufts Univ.; Dr. Morton Halperin, former high-level official in the National Security Council, State Department, and Defense Department; Harold Hongju Koh, former Assistant Sec. of State for Democracy, Human Rights & Labor; Dr. Susan E. Rice, former Assistant Secretary of State for African Affairs; James R. Sasser - Former senator from Tenn.; Jane Stromseth - Prof. of law at Georgetown Univ.; Patricia M. Wald - former Chief Judge, US Court of Appeals for the D.C. Circuit; Don Wallace Jr. - Prof of law, Georgetown Univ.; R. James Woolsey - former director of the CIA; Michael K. Young - former Dean of the George Washington Univ. Law School), FORCE ABROAD: WAR POWERS in a System of CHECKS AND BALANCES, <http://www.constitutionproject.org/pdf/28.pdf>

The framers shared the view that an absolute monarch would be prone to squandering his subjects’ lives and money on reckless military adventures. “Absolute monarchs,” John Jay wrote in The Federalist Papers, “will often make war when their nations are to get nothing by it, but for purposes and objects merely personal, such as thirst for military glory, revenge for personal affronts, ambition, or private compacts to aggrandize or support their particular families or partisans.” The best precaution against unilateral war-making by the executive was to require a collective decision to go to war. “It will not be in the power of a single man, or a single body of men, to involve us in such distress; for the important power of declaring war is vested in the legislature at large,” James Wilson later explained to the Pennsylvania ratifying convention. Moreover, vesting this power in the whole Congress meant that the popularly-elected House, the body most directly responsive to the voters, had to act and so helped to assure the widest possible political consensus for war. The Senate — originally chosen by state legislatures — could not alone provide this assurance. Since the people could not be asked directly whether the nation should go to war, requiring the assent of the House as well as the Senate was the next best thing. If presidents bent on war could not persuade the Congress, they presumably could not persuade the people either and would therefore lack the consensus required to assume the costs and risks of war.

OBSERVATION 4. Our PLAN of reform, to apply to all combat operations of drones outside the United States. Congress and the President will carry out the following plan through any necessary constitutional means:

1. Complete uniformed military services control of all missions.

2. No targeting of American citizens.

3. President must have Congressional vote of authorization before initiating missions in any country not already approved by Congress.

4. Funding through existing Defense Department budget.

5. Enforcement: a) Federal employees in violation will be disciplined or fired. b) Anyone targeting and killing a US citizen will be prosecuted for murder. c) Congress will impeach and remove from office any President ordering combat missions without authorization and will vote to cut off funds for any unauthorized missions.

6. Plan takes effect 1 day after an Affirmative ballot.

7. All Affirmative speeches may clarify the plan as needed.

OBSERVATION 5. Our Plan creates ADVANTAGES

ADVANTAGE 1. Better protection of civil liberties

Vincent Warren 2011. (attorney; Executive Director of the Center for Constitutional Rights; former national senior staff attorney with the American Civil Liberties Union; former criminal defense attorney for Legal Aid Society, Brooklyn) 30 Sept 2011 “CCR Condemns Targeted Assassination of U.S. Citizen Anwar Al-Awlaki” <http://ccrjustice.org/newsroom/press-releases/ccr-condemns-targeted-assassination-of-u.s.-citizen-anwar-al-awlaki>

“The assassination of Anwar Al-Awlaki by American drone attacks is the latest of many affronts to domestic and international law,” said Vince Warren, Executive Director of the Center for Constitutional Rights. “The targeted assassination program that started under President Bush and expanded under the Obama Administration essentially grants the executive the power to kill any U.S. citizen deemed a threat, without any judicial oversight, or any of the rights afforded by our Constitution. If we allow such gross overreaches of power to continue, we are setting the stage for increasing erosions of civil liberties and the rule of law.”

ADVANTAGE 2. Better mission safeguards. Military control over drones is the answer to lack of CIA accountability

Kenneth Roth 2011. ( executive director of Human Rights Watch; has investigated human rights abuses around the globe; former federal prosecutor for the U.S. Attorney's Office for the Southern District of N.Y.) 16 Dec 2011 “Letter to President Obama: Targeted Killings by the US Government” (brackets in original) <http://www.hrw.org/news/2011/12/16/letter-president-obama-targeted-killings-us-government>

Human Rights Watch believes that so long as the US government cannot demonstrate a readiness to hold the CIA to international legal requirements for accountability and redress, the use of drones in targeted killings should be exclusively within the command responsibility of the US armed forces. This would be consistent with the findings of the independent 9/11 Commission, which in 2004 specifically recommended that “[l]ead responsibility for directing and executing paramilitary operations, whether clandestine or covert, should shift to the Defense Department.” Such a recommendation has been made more recently by former director of national intelligence Dennis Blair, among others.

ADVANTAGE 3. Better wartime decision-making. Congressional approval means better decision-making about going to war

War Powers Initiative Committee of The Constitution Project, Co-Chaired by former Representative Mickey Edwards and former Representative David Skaggs, 2005. (Mickey Edwards - Lecturer, Woodrow Wilson School of Public and International Affairs, Princeton Univ.; former Member of Congress (R-OK); David Skaggs - former Member of Congress (D-CO): Member of the Appropriations Committee and Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence; Peter Raven-Hansen - professor of law, George Washington Univ.; Louis Fisher - Senior Specialist in Separation of Powers, Congressional Research Service, Library of Congress; Thomas Franck - Professor of Law Emeritus at N.Y. Univ School of Law; Michael J. Glennon - Prof. of International Law, Fletcher School of Law & Diplomacy at Tufts Univ.; Dr. Morton Halperin, former high-level official in the National Security Council, State Department, and Defense Department; Harold Hongju Koh, former Assistant Sec. of State for Democracy, Human Rights & Labor; Dr. Susan E. Rice, former Assistant Secretary of State for African Affairs; James R. Sasser - Former senator from Tenn.; Jane Stromseth - Prof. of law at Georgetown Univ.; Patricia M. Wald - former Chief Judge, US Court of Appeals for the D.C. Circuit; Don Wallace Jr. - Prof of law, Georgetown Univ.; R. James Woolsey - former director of the CIA; Michael K. Young - former Dean of the George Washington Univ. Law School), FORCE ABROAD: WAR POWERS in a System of CHECKS AND BALANCES, <http://www.constitutionproject.org/pdf/28.pdf>

In short, the framers insisted on a collective judgment for war because it was likely that a collective judgment would be superior to an individual judgment, would help assure that the United States would not go to war without a political consensus, and, by requiring a President to persuade Congress, would effectively make him or her explain why war was necessary to the public who would ultimately bear its cost. These reasons for insisting on a collective judgment for war are still valid today.

4. LET MY PEOPLE GO: THE CASE FOR REFORMING MILITARY AID TO EGYPT

**(Note: Due to the rapidly changing situation in Egypt, be sure to do more research before running this case, to ensure you have the latest information.)**

Egypt was long a military client of the US, receiving billions of dollars of military aid beginning in the 1970s. When despised Egyptian dictator Hosni Mubarak was overthrown in 2011, many thought it would open the door to a new era of human rights and democracy in that country. Unfortunately, the Egyptian military is suppressing human rights and promoting anti-American propaganda, even as they accept our aid! To stop helping a new generation of oppressors with our military support, we will show you the comparative advantages of affirming that: The United States Federal Government should substantially reform its foreign military presence and/or foreign military commitments.

OBSERVATION 1. We offer the following DEFINITIONS

**Substantial**: “3 *a* **:** possessed of means **:** well-to-do *b* **:** considerable in quantity **:** significantly great <earned a *substantial* wage>” *(Merriam-Webster Online Dictionary 2012.* [*http://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/substantially*](http://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/substantially)*)*

**Reform:** “2**:** to put an end to (an evil) by enforcing or introducing a better method or course of action” *(Merriam-Webster Online Dictionary 2012.* [*http://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/reform*](http://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/reform)*, parentheses in original)*

**Military:** “2 : ARMED FORCES” *(Merriam-Webster Online Dictionary 2012.* [*http://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/military*](http://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/military)*)*

**Commitment**: 2 “1 [mass noun] the state or quality of being dedicated to a cause, activity, etc.:” *(Oxford Dictionary online 2012. Oxford University Press,* [*http://oxforddictionaries.com/definition/commitment?q=commitment*](http://oxforddictionaries.com/definition/commitment?q=commitment)*)*

OBSERVATION 2. ...is our INHERENCY, or the conditions of the Status Quo. We see this in three FACTS:

FACT 1. The US has a military relationship commitment with Egypt

CNN 2011. “U.S. defense secretary heads to Israel, then Egypt,” 2 Oct 2011 (brackets added) <http://articles.cnn.com/2011-10-02/politics/politics_panetta-trip_1_palestinian-leaders-middle-east-quartet-qualitative-military-edge/2?_s=PM:POLITICS>

[U.S. Secretary of Defense Leon] Panetta will meet with Field Marshal Mohamed Hussein Tantawi, head of Egypt's Supreme Council of the Armed Forces, as well as Prime Minister Essam Sharaf, according to the U.S. military press service. He said Sunday that he intends to reaffirm the U.S. commitment to a strong, long-term military relationship with Egypt. The U.S. secretary thanked Tantawi for his quick response in September, after the Israeli embassy attack.

FACT 2. US military aid. The US gives military aid to Egypt and overrides Congressional rules about progress towards democracy.

Andrew Quinn 2012. (journalist) REUTERS news service, 23 Mar 2012, “U.S. approves Egypt military aid despite rights fears” <http://www.reuters.com/article/2012/03/23/us-egypt-usa-aid-idUSBRE82M0UG20120323>

The Obama administration on Friday formally released $1.3 billion in military aid for Egypt despite Cairo's failure to meet pro-democracy goals, saying U.S. national security required continued military assistance. U.S. Secretary of State Hillary Clinton waived congressional conditions imposed late last year that tied U.S. aid to progress in Egypt's transition to democracy following the ouster of longtime President Hosni Mubarak.

FACT 3. Human rights abuses. The Egyptian military abuses human rights and hijacks the democracy movement

David J. Kramer 2012. (president of Freedom House, an international human rights non-profit advocacy group; former Deputy Assistant Secretary of State for European and Eurasian Affairs; former Assistant Secretary of State for Democracy, Human Rights, and Labor) testimony before the United States House Committee on Foreign Affairs: “Egypt at a Crossroads” 16 Feb 2012 <http://foreignaffairs.house.gov/112/HHRG-112-FA-WState-DKramer-20120216.pdf>

The protests last January and February that led to the resignation of Hosni Mubarak reflected Egyptians’ pent-up frustration with endless human rights abuses, rigged elections and lack of real economic opportunity; they offered hope to the Egyptian people for the first time in decades. The Supreme Council of the Armed Forces (SCAF) assumed control of the country and earned early praise for its relative restraint amid the massive protests in downtown Cairo. The high regard in which the military was held in Egypt gave hope that it would empower civilian rule and oversee a transition to genuine democracy. Its close relationship with the U.S. military gave us confidence that we could assist this process. It was not long, however, before human rights abuses became commonplace once again with brutal attacks against demonstrators; increased religious tensions between Muslims and Coptic Christians; prosecution of regime critics in military tribunals; and assaults on female protesters, including through the infamous “virginity tests.” The SCAF also maintained the much-hated “emergency law” under which Mubarak had ruled for three decades and even when they suspended parts of it, they left in provisions against “thuggery”, whatever that means. Essentially, in the minds of many Egyptians, the military has hijacked the revolution and what it represented.

OBSERVATION 3. FAILURES. What’s wrong with current policies:

FAILURE 1. We subsidize abuse. US military aid subsidizes and encourages Egyptian military human rights abuses

David J. Kramer 2012. (president of Freedom House, an international human rights non-profit advocacy group; former Deputy Assistant Secretary of State for European and Eurasian Affairs; former Assistant Secretary of State for Democracy, Human Rights, and Labor) “Waiver on Egypt Aid Undercuts Support for Democracy” FREEDOM HOUSE, <http://www.freedomhouse.org/article/waiver-egypt-aid-undercuts-support-democracy>

“The decision to waive the conditions on military aid sends the wrong message to the Egyptian government—that U.S. taxpayers will subsidize the Egyptian military while it continues to oversee the crackdown on civil society and to commit human rights abuses,” said David J. Kramer, president of Freedom House. “A resumption of military aid at this point also sends the wrong message to the Egyptian people—that we care only about American NGO workers, not about the aspirations of the Egyptian people to build democracy.”

FAILURE 2. We aid our enemies. The Egyptian military is anti-American

Shadi Hamid 2012. (Director of Research at the Brookings Institution’s Doha Center and a Fellow at the Saban Center for Middle East Policy; former Director of Research at the Project on Middle East Democracy and a Hewlett Fellow at Stanford Univ Center on Democracy, Development, and the Rule of Law; master’s degree from Georgetown Univ. School of Foreign Service) Apr 2012 “BEYOND GUNS AND BUTTER: A U.S.-EGYPTIAN RELATIONSHIP FOR A DEMOCRATIC ERA” <http://www.brookings.edu/~/media/Files/rc/papers/2012/04_egypt_hamid/04_guns_butter_hamid1.pdf>

While Egypt has long had extremely high levels of anti-Americanism, since the fall of Mubarak, it has gotten worse. Despite receiving $1.3 billion in annual U.S. aid, Egypt’s military rulers have routinely stoked anti-Americanism both to distract from their mismanagement of the transition and to solidify their nationalist credentials.

FAILURE 3. We Lose Influence. The United States loses its influence both with Egypt and with other countries by dropping human rights considerations for military aid

Shadi Hamid 2012. (Director of Research at the Brookings Institution’s Doha Center and a Fellow at the Saban Center for Middle East Policy; former Director of Research at the Project on Middle East Democracy and a Hewlett Fellow at Stanford Univ Center on Democracy, Development, and the Rule of Law; master’s degree from Georgetown Univ. School of Foreign Service) Apr 2012 “BEYOND GUNS AND BUTTER: A U.S.-EGYPTIAN RELATIONSHIP FOR A DEMOCRATIC ERA” <http://www.brookings.edu/~/media/Files/rc/papers/2012/04_egypt_hamid/04_guns_butter_hamid1.pdf>

The administration set a dangerous precedent by releasing military aid after the Americans were allowed to leave Egypt, with none of the fundamental issues having been resolved. The military’s suspicions were confirmed: that, in the end, the United States will buckle under pressure. Other parties, including the Muslim Brotherhood, have learned that there is no real consequence not just for anti-American rhetoric (which is their right), but also for directly undermining American interests and attacking American citizens. Other countries will probably come to similar conclusions, that even when explicit conditions are attached to aid, those conditions are not taken seriously by the United States government, and should, therefore, not be taken seriously by recipient governments.

OBSERVATION 4. We offer a simple PLAN, to be implemented by Congress, the President, and the Secretary of State.

1. All US military aid to Egypt is cut off until Egypt genuinely meets the criteria of human rights established by Congress as a condition for the aid, with no waiver for any reason. Any future regression on human rights will trigger another military aid cutoff.

2. Enforcement through the Secretary of State, who will provide transparent and documented reporting to Congress on human rights conditions in Egypt. Government officials’ compliance enforced through normal disciplinary means. Congress cuts off all funding for anything not in compliance with the Plan.

3. Funding through existing budgets for military aid, with budgeted funds and military equipment held in reserve until the conditions are met.

4. Plan takes effect the day after an Affirmative ballot

5. All Affirmative speeches may clarify the plan.

OBSERVATION 5. The Plan Works. Experts recommend our PLAN because suspending Egyptian military aid is the only way to get their attention

David J. Kramer 2012. (president of Freedom House, an international human rights non-profit advocacy group; former Deputy Assistant Secretary of State for European and Eurasian Affairs; former Assistant Secretary of State for Democracy, Human Rights, and Labor) testimony before the United States House Committee on Foreign Affairs: “Egypt at a Crossroads” 16 Feb 2012 <http://foreignaffairs.house.gov/112/HHRG-112-FA-WState-DKramer-20120216.pdf>

Senior U.S. officials, including President Obama and many Members of Congress, have weighed in with their Egyptian counterparts in an effort to persuade the authorities in Cairo to change course, so far without success. Unfortunately, I believe that only the suspension of U.S. military assistance will get the Egyptian government’s attention. Suspending aid is not meant to punish the Egyptian people and if done correctly, it won’t; instead, it will make clear to the authorities that attacks against civil society and against U.S.-funded NGOs do not come without a serious price.

OBSERVATION 6. The Plan produces ADVANTAGES

ADVANTAGE 1. Restored leverage for democracy in Egypt

Shadi Hamid 2012. (Director of Research at the Brookings Institution’s Doha Center and a Fellow at the Saban Center for Middle East Policy; former Director of Research at the Project on Middle East Democracy and a Hewlett Fellow at Stanford Univ Center on Democracy, Development, and the Rule of Law; master’s degree from Georgetown Univ. School of Foreign Service) Apr 2012 “BEYOND GUNS AND BUTTER: A U.S.-EGYPTIAN RELATIONSHIP FOR A DEMOCRATIC ERA” <http://www.brookings.edu/~/media/Files/rc/papers/2012/04_egypt_hamid/04_guns_butter_hamid1.pdf>

To lay the groundwork for enhanced ties, the United States will need to elevate support for Egyptian democracy as a key criterion for U.S. financial support. Establishing consistency in this regard will help the United States restore its leverage and credibility in the country, and enable it to more effectively advance a range of interests with the help of the Egyptian government.

ADVANTAGE 2. Promote democracy worldwide. Linking military aid to human rights in Egypt encourages human rights and democracy worldwide by sending a message to other nations.

David J. Kramer 2012. (president of Freedom House, an international human rights non-profit advocacy group; former Deputy Assistant Secretary of State for European and Eurasian Affairs; former Assistant Secretary of State for Democracy, Human Rights, and Labor) testimony before the United States House Committee on Foreign Affairs: “Egypt at a Crossroads” 16 Feb 2012 (in context where he says it “seems unlikely” that a waiver of the human rights concerns would be granted, this was written a few weeks before Obama actually did, in fact, grant the waiver and allow US arms to go to Egypt despite human rights problems.) <http://foreignaffairs.house.gov/112/HHRG-112-FA-WState-DKramer-20120216.pdf>

The implications for U.S. interests are significant and extend beyond the American-Egyptian relationship. That is because regimes around the world are following very closely what the Egyptian authorities are able to get away with in their efforts to rein in civil society and go after American-funded non-governmental organizations. How we respond will have an impact on the ability of organizations like mine to operate elsewhere, and we already are starting to see signs of this. If we essentially are shut down or left in a state of legal limbo in Egypt, we could face similar fates in other countries. Thus, it is critical that we do all we can to protect and preserve civil society in Egypt and the possibilities for Egyptian organizations and foreign ones like Freedom House to maintain a presence and conduct effective programs that Egyptians want. The international community — the United States in particular — must respond aggressively to the Egyptian authorities’ human rights abuses and appalling treatment of civil society. U.S. assistance to Egypt — which totals $1.3bn to the military alone, about a fifth of Egypt's military budget — depends on the Administration’s being able to certify to Congress that the Egyptian government is taking steps to move toward civilian government and protect civil liberties; recent developments simply make such certification impossible. Absent a waiver by the Administration (and one seems unlikely), this will trigger a suspension in American military aid to Cairo. It is hard to understand how the United States could provide taxpayer assistance to an Egyptian military leadership that prevents NGOs from implementing democracy and human rights projects supported by those same U.S. taxpayers.

5. WITH FRIENDS LIKE THESE: THE CASE FOR REFORM IN HONDURAS

The Central American nation of Honduras had 27 years of uninterrupted democratic government when a military coup in 2009 overthrew elected President José Manuel Zelaya. After an interim regime ran the country for a few months, current president Porfirio Lobo took office. The US has had a long military relationship with Honduras, going back decades. But the current situation there compels us to affirm that the United States Federal Government should substantially reform its foreign military presence and/or foreign military commitments.

OBSERVATION 1. We offer the following DEFINITIONS

**Substantial**: “3 *a* **:** possessed of means **:** well-to-do *b* **:** considerable in quantity **:** significantly great <earned a *substantial* wage>” *(Merriam-Webster Online Dictionary 2012.* [*http://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/substantially*](http://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/substantially)*)*

**Reform:** “2**:** to put an end to (an evil) by enforcing or introducing a better method or course of action” *(Merriam-Webster Online Dictionary 2012.* [*http://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/reform*](http://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/reform) *(parentheses in original))*

**Military:** “2 : ARMED FORCES” *(Merriam-Webster Online Dictionary 2012. parentheses in original,* [*http://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/military*](http://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/military)*)*

**Commitment**: “1 [mass noun] the state or quality of being dedicated to a cause, activity, etc.:” *(Oxford Dictionary online 2012. Oxford University Press, brackets in original;* [*http://oxforddictionaries.com/definition/commitment?q=commitment*](http://oxforddictionaries.com/definition/commitment?q=commitment)*)*

**Presence:** “[mass noun] the state or fact of existing, occurring, or being present” *(Oxford Dictionary online 2012. Oxford University Press,* [*http://oxforddictionaries.com/definition/presence?q=presence*](http://oxforddictionaries.com/definition/presence?q=presence)*, brackets in original)*

OBSERVATION 2. INHERENCY: Some facts about the conditions of the Status Quo

FACT 1. Military Presence & Commitment. The US has a military troop presence and military cooperation commitment with Honduras

US Embassy in Honduras, Press Release 2011. U.S. Army Secretary John McHugh Meets with President Lobo, 11 Jan 2011 <http://honduras.usembassy.gov/pr-01-11-11-eng.html>

In a meeting today with President Lobo and Honduran military leaders, U.S. Army Secretary John McHugh, accompanied by Ambassador Hugo Llorens, reaffirmed the strong alliance between both countries. The U.S. and Honduras reiterated their commitments to support democracy, human rights, the rule of law, and civilian and constitutional control over security forces. The Secretary emphasized the United States' commitment to cooperation with Honduran armed forces to promote regional security, especially in the fight against drug trafficking. Secretary McHugh also demonstrated his support of continued efforts to provide humanitarian and medical assistance to help improve the lives of the Honduran people. As part of his first official visit to the region, Mr. McHugh also spoke to U.S. troops to support their work in the country.

FACT 2. Obama wants increased military aid to Honduras

Dr. Mark Weisbrot 2012. (Ph.D. in economics from the University of Michigan; has testified before Congressional committees several times) 22 Mar 2012 “Democrats press Obama over US complicity with Honduras' dirty war” (parentheses in original) <http://www.guardian.co.uk/commentisfree/cifamerica/2012/mar/22/democrats-press-obama-us-complicity-honduras>

Worse, in fact, the Obama administration has increased requested military aid for Honduras for fiscal year 2012 – one of only two increases in the region (the other being Mexico). The excuse, of course, is the infamous "war on drugs."

FACT 3. Human rights workers are calling on us to stop. Honduran human rights workers are begging the US to stop aiding the Honduran military

Prof. Adrienne Pine 2012. (assistant professor of anthropology at American University) 29 Feb 2012 “U.S. foreign policy backs abusive Honduran state” SAN FRANCISCO CHRONICLE (brackets added) <http://www.sfgate.com/cgi-bin/article.cgi?f=/c/a/2012/02/28/EDOV1NDFHK.DTL>

Because of the coup - which Lobo supported and inherited - the homicide rate has shot up to 82 per 100,000, making Honduras the most dangerous country in the world. The solution, [Univ of Calif-Santa Cruz history professor Dana] Frank concluded, lies not in funding repressive institutions, but in respecting proposals coming from Honduran human rights defenders who daily risk their lives in their fight for justice, dignity and life. Honduran human rights workers assert that justice requires accountability at the highest levels for the Comayagua fire and all other human rights violations. They demand the implementation of due process for prisoners and a reworking of the penal code by a publicly accountable judiciary. And they call on the United States to withdraw military and police aid to the Honduran government.

OBSERVATION 3. We have a PLAN, to be implemented by Congress and the President through any necessary constitutional means:

1. All US military presence in Honduras is ended

2. All US military commitments to Honduras, including military aid, training, drug interdiction and any other military cooperation, are ended.

3. Enforcement through the President and the commanders of the military services, through normal administrative discipline.

4. Congress cuts off all funding for any activities not in compliance with the mandates.

5. Plan is phased in over the next 60 days after an Affirmative ballot.

6. All Affirmative speeches can clarify the plan as needed.

OBSERVATION 4. There are multiple compelling JUSTIFICATIONS for the Plan:

JUSTIFICATION 1. Endorsing Repression. The US is wrong for supporting the repressive government in Honduras. Dr. Mark Weisbrot said in 2012 QUOTE:

Dr. Mark Weisbrot 2012. (Ph.D. in economics from the University of Michigan; has testified before Congressional committees several times) 22 Mar 2012 “Democrats press Obama over US complicity with Honduras' dirty war” <http://www.guardian.co.uk/commentisfree/cifamerica/2012/mar/22/democrats-press-obama-us-complicity-honduras>

Hondurans are still suffering from the effects of the June 2009 military coup that overthrew the democratically elected government of President Manuel Zelaya. The coup has unleashed a wave of violence against political opposition, journalists, small farmers and others, with impunity for the security forces that have been implicated in these killings. This is exactly what those who opposed the coup regime – and its consolidation of power with marred "elections" in November 2009 – feared would happen. On the wrong side of this fight was the Obama administration, which – after some hesitation – made some statements against the coup but went on do quite a bit to help the coup government succeed. Nearly three years and hundreds of political murders later, it seems that this administration is still on the side of repression and denial of Hondurans' basic human rights.

UNQUOTE. Unfortunately, it gets worse. Not only are we endorsing Honduran abuse but we see in...

JUSTIFICATION 2. We *sponsor* the abuse. US aid to the Honduran military pays for repression and abuse

Prof. Dana Frank 2011. (professor of history at the Univ of California, Santa Cruz ) 11 Jan 2011 “In Honduras, the Holiday Season Brings Repression” <http://www.commondreams.org/view/2011/01/11-3>

On September 15, in San Pedro Sula, the city's second largest city, troops tear gassed and invaded Radio Uno, an opposition Radio Station, and then broke up a concert, and tear gassed and beat up protesters at a large, peaceful demonstration by the opposition. Yet in the entire year and a half since the coup, almost no one has been charged or prosecuted for any of this. Complete impunity reigns. In the words of Eduardo David Ardón, writing in the Honduran daily El Tiempo last week, "State terrorism has a green light, to exercise every kind of violence and commit crimes of every sort from right to left, without being judged or investigated." Meanwhile, five judges and magistrates who protested the coup remain fired, despite outcries by the international justice community. And our United States government is paying the bills. U.S. aid to the Honduran military and ongoing coup government, only briefly and very partially curtailed after the coup, now flows freely.

JUSTIFICATION 3. More violence and less democracy. US military presence and support contributes to violence in Honduras and works against democracy

Open letter to military contractors, signed by over 20 college professors and 15 religious leaders and institutions 2011. 26 May 2011 open letter to: “Contractors and bidders on contracts for U.S. construction on military bases in Honduras” <http://www.nlginternational.org/report/Ltr2HondurascontractorsMay2011-signers.pdf> (list of names is at the end of the 2A brief)

Defense Department spending in Honduras on contracts has more than doubled since 2007, and violence and drug trafficking in the country has also spiraled during the same period. Following the coup, as a result of growing insecurity, including killings carried out by the military and military‐trained police forces, Honduras has among the highest murder rates in the world (more than five times the Iraq rate). Whether or not the U.S. military presence is contributing to the violence, it certainly is not reducing it. We recognize that U.S. forces in Honduras have been used to respond to emergencies produced by seasonal hurricanes. Yet no act of good will changes the essential mission ofmilitary forces to wage war and to use or threaten to use violent force. Responses to hurricane disasters do not require a U.S. military presence in Honduras, as the U.S. General Accounting Office has reported. No person of conscience seeks to profit from the suffering of others, nor cause violence and destruction to civilians who are peacefully advocating a better society. By supporting antidemocratic, violent and wealthy sectors in Honduran society, the U.S. military is contributing to such violent outcomes.

JUSTIFICATION 4. Drug war paradox. US military cooperation in Honduras is actually being used to support violence committed by a known drug dealer. It’s astonishing, but listen to Professor Dana Frank in 2011:

Prof. Dana Frank 2011. (professor of history at the Univ of California, Santa Cruz ) WikiLeaks Honduras: US Linked to Brutal Businessman, 21 Oct 2011 <http://www.thenation.com/article/164120/wikileaks-honduras-us-linked-brutal-businessman>

Since 2009, beneath the radar of the international media, the coup government ruling Honduras has been collaborating with wealthy landowners in a violent crackdown on small farmers struggling for land rights in the Aguán Valley in the northeastern region of the country. More than forty-six campesinos have been killed or disappeared. Human rights groups charge that many of the killings have been perpetrated by the private army of security guards employed by Miguel Facussé, a biofuels magnate. Facussé’s guards work closely with the Honduran military and police, which receive generous funding from the United States to fight the war on drugs in the region. New Wikileaks cables now reveal that the US embassy in Honduras—and therefore the State Department—has known since 2004 that Miguel Facussé is a cocaine importer. US “drug war” funds and training, in other words, are being used to support a known drug trafficker’s war against campesinos.

Professor Frank goes on elsewhere in the same context to say QUOTE:

**“**This summer seventy members of Honduras’ Fifteenth Batallion received a special thirty-three-day training course from the US Rangers. According to the Honduras Solidarity Network, members of the Xatruch Special Forces group in the Aguán Valley, in a September meeting, “confirmed that they had received training from the United States military in special operations, which include sniper and anti-terrorism training.” Eyewitnesses informed Rights Action they saw US Rangers also training Facussé’s security guards.”

6. BLOWING THE HORN: THE CASE FOR DISENGAGEMENT FROM THE HORN OF AFRICA

During the Cold War, the US supported brutal Somali dictator Mohammed Siad Barre. When his government collapsed in ‘91, Somalia fractured into warring clans. The US tried to intervene -- and if you saw or heard about the movie Black Hawk Down, you know how that turned out: BADLY. The US pulled out, but later we supported an Ethiopian invasion to defeat an Islamic faction that was growing in power. Somalis backlashed against the foreign invasion. The Islamic group Al Shabab rose up, defeated the Ethiopians and began growing. Meanwhile, a “Transitional Federal Government” TFG - supported by outside aid - tries to govern, but does not actually run much of the country. The US pursues a policy of fighting Al Shabab and supporting the TFG, but today we’ll show you why America’s attempt to impose a military solution in Somalia is a serious foreign policy mistake, as we affirm that The United States Federal Government should substantially reform its foreign military presence and/or foreign military commitments.

OBSERVATION 1. We offer the following DEFINITIONS

**Substantial**: “3 *a* **:** possessed of means **:** well-to-do *b* **:** considerable in quantity **:** significantly great <earned a *substantial* wage>” *(Merriam-Webster Online Dictionary 2012.* [*http://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/substantially*](http://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/substantially)*)*

**Reform:** “2**:** to put an end to (an evil) by enforcing or introducing a better method or course of action” *(Merriam-Webster Online Dictionary 2012.* [*http://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/reform*](http://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/reform) *(parentheses in original))*

**Military:** “2 : ARMED FORCES” *(Merriam-Webster Online Dictionary 2012. parentheses in original,* [*http://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/military*](http://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/military)*)*

**Commitment**: “1 [mass noun] the state or quality of being dedicated to a cause, activity, etc.:” *(Oxford Dictionary online 2012. Oxford University Press,* [*http://oxforddictionaries.com/definition/commitment?q=commitment*](http://oxforddictionaries.com/definition/commitment?q=commitment)*)*

**Presence:** “[mass noun] the state or fact of existing, occurring, or being present” *(Oxford Dictionary online 2012. Oxford University Press,* [*http://oxforddictionaries.com/definition/presence?q=presence*](http://oxforddictionaries.com/definition/presence?q=presence)*, brackets in original)*

OBSERVATION 2. INHERENCY, some important facts about our current military presence and commitments in the Horn of Africa.

FACT 1. The US Air Force is expanding the war in Somalia from a base in Ethiopia

Craig Whitlock 2011. (journalist) 27 Oct 2011 WASHINGTON POST “US drone base in Ethiopia is operational” <http://www.washingtonpost.com/world/national-security/us-drone-base-in-ethiopia-is-operational/2011/10/27/gIQAznKwMM_story.html>

The Air Force has been secretly flying armed Reaper drones on counterterrorism missions from a remote civilian airport in southern Ethiopia as part of a rapidly expanding U.S.-led proxy war against an al-Qaeda affiliate in East Africa, U.S. military officials said. The Air Force has invested millions of dollars to upgrade an airfield in Arba Minch, Ethiopia, where it has built a small annex to house a fleet of drones that can be equipped with Hellfire missiles and satellite-guided bombs. The Reapers began flying missions earlier this year over neighboring Somalia, where the United States and its allies in the region have been targeting al-Shabab, a militant Islamist group connected to al-Qaeda.

FACT 2. The Obama Administration is expanding military involvement with other nations in the Horn of Africa

Senator Kay Hagan and Assistant Secretary of Defense Mike Sheehan 2012. U.S. SENATE, SUBCOMMITTEE ON EMERGING THREATS AND CAPABILITIES, COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES, 27 Mar 2012 HEARING TO RECEIVE TESTIMONY ON THE DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE’S ROLE IN THE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE NATIONAL STRATEGY FOR COUNTERTERRORISM AND THE NATIONAL STRATEGY TO COMBAT TRANSNATIONAL ORGANIZED CRIME IN REVIEW OF THE DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION REQUEST FOR FISCAL YEAR 2013 AND THE FUTURE YEARS DEFENSE PROGRAM, (brackets added) <http://armed-services.senate.gov/Transcripts/2012/03%20March/12-21%20-%203-27-12.pdf>

Senator HAGAN. This will be my last question, and then we will go to Senator Portman. But let me ask about specifically Yemen and East Africa. In last year’s defense authorization bill, it included the two authorities permitting the Department to expand its capacity building activities in East Africa and Yemen. And it permitted the Department of Defense to spend up to $150 million to provide equipment, training, supplies, minor military construction, and we are talking about the countries Ethiopia, Djibouti, Kenya, and any nation that would contribute to the African Union mission in Somalia, as well as Yemen’s ministry of interior counterterrorism unit. If you could explain to me whether DOD [Department of Defense] intends to use these authorities, and particularly the minor military construction authority and the authority to support militaries deploying to Somalia. If you could expand on that issue. Mr. SHEEHAN. Yes, Madam Chair. We do intend to use those authorities in those areas. Obviously in Yemen we had a little difficulty in delays in that because of the political strife that was there. But we do want to move forward in both of those areas with those authorities.

OBSERVATION 3. HARMS

HARM 1. Risk with no benefit. We put American lives at risk against no credible threat

*Sean Naylor 2011. (journalist) ARMY TIMES, “The Secret War: Africa ops may be just starting” 5 Dec 2011*

<http://www.armytimes.com/news/2011/12/army-africa-mission-may-be-just-starting-120511w/>

No U.S. military personnel have died in combat in the Horn since 9/11, which the senior intelligence official described as “amazing.” But despite the low cost in American blood, some special operators question whether the U.S. effort there has been worth the risk. “I never thought any of the African targets were important,” said a special operations officer. “They don’t show a direct threat to the homeland. They don’t have the ability to project.” He dismissed the argument that Somali immigrants to the U.S. who have returned to fight for al-Shabaab represent a threat to the homeland. “Can you show me intelligence that shows that that network is posing a direct threat to the United States or its allies?” he asked, emphasizing that he was referring to a current threat, not past attacks such as al-Qaida’s 1998 bomb attacks on two U.S. embassies in East Africa.

HARM 2. Fueling Terrorism. Military intervention actually strengthens Islamic radicals in Somalia

Dr. Alex de Waal 2012. (doctorate in social anthropology; executive director of the World Peace Foundation at the Fletcher School, Tufts Univ.; formerly with African Union mediation team for Darfur and served as senior adviser to the African Union High-Level Implementation Panel for Sudan) 21 Feb 2012, Getting Somalia Right This Time, NEW YORK TIMES, <http://www.nytimes.com/2012/02/22/opinion/getting-somalia-right-this-time.html?pagewanted=2&ref=somalia>

For the West, Somalia is first and foremost a security problem, and the solution to it is to defeat the terrorists and let the politics follow. This approach has repeatedly backfired, antagonizing and radicalizing Somalis who have turned to Islam as a framework for rebuilding a moral order. Fundamentalists were struggling to gain a foothold in Somalia until foreign military interventions handed them the banner of nationalist resistance.

HARM 3. Supporting failure. The US provides military support for Somalia’s Transitional Federal Government, an abusive and corrupt failure

John Norris & Bronwyn Bruton 2011. ( Norris - Executive Director of the Sustainable Security and Peacebuilding Initiative at Center for American Progress; former chief of political affairs for the UN Mission in Nepal ; former Washington chief of staff for the International Crisis Group, conducting extensive field work and senior-level advocacy for resolving conflicts in South Asia, Africa, and the Balkans; former director of communications for U.S. Deputy Secretary of State Strobe Talbot. Bruton - served as a program manager on the Africa team of the U.S. Agency for International Development's Office of Transition Initiatives; masters in public policy from UCLA) 14 Sept 2011 Twenty Years of Collapse and Counting - The Cost of Failure in Somalia <http://www.americanprogress.org/issues/2011/09/somalia.html>

Today, the United States, in pursuit of its modern counterterror objectives, provides continuous indirect financial and military support to Somalia’s Transitional Federal Government despite its proven record of corruption, rampant and admitted use of child soldiers, and frequent inability to maintain control of territory. In fact, the TFG’s record of governance is probably worse than Siad Barre’s in many regards.

OBSERVATION 4. That’s why we offer a PLAN, to be implemented by Congress and the President through any necessary Constitutional means:

1. All US military presence and activities in the Horn of Africa directed at intervening in the conflict inside the borders of Somalia are withdrawn and canceled.

2. All military support, aid, and cooperation with the African Union and Horn of Africa countries intervening in Somalia is canceled to the extent that the support is used for involvement in Somalia.

3. US military attacks on terror suspects in Somalia will be replaced with widespread publicity in the region and globally of their names and identities.

4. Funding from existing Defense Department budget, and Congress cuts off all funding for anything not in compliance with the Plan.

5. Enforcement by the President and commanders of the military services through normal administrative discipline.

6. Plan takes effect 30 days after an Affirmative ballot.

7. All Affirmative speeches may clarify as needed.

OBSERVATION 5. Experts recommend our Plan because it produces ADVANTAGES over the Status Quo.

ADVANTAGE 1. Somali terrorists neutralized

Dr. Alex de Waal 2012. (doctorate in social anthropology; executive director of the World Peace Foundation at the Fletcher School, Tufts Univ.; formerly with African Union mediation team for Darfur and served as senior adviser to the African Union High-Level Implementation Panel for Sudan) 21 Feb 2012, Getting Somalia Right This Time, NEW YORK TIMES, <http://www.nytimes.com/2012/02/22/opinion/getting-somalia-right-this-time.html?pagewanted=2&ref=somalia>

The simplest way of rooting out suspected backers of terrorism in Somalia is to publish their names. Once fingered, the men can’t hide, or send or receive money. Somalia is an open society with a thriving business class linked to the rest of the world; it’s impossible to be anonymous there. And so better to work with the grain of Somali culture rather than through distrusted foreign intermediaries. Rather than close down hawala companies and force money transfers underground, better to cooperate with them in order to monitor the remittances from the Somali diaspora (as the U.S. government finally seems to be doing).

ADVANTAGE 2. Stability and democracy. Somalis generally don’t want a central government, and in the areas where they have been left alone to pursue their own path, they have achieved stability and democracy.

Dr. Alex de Waal 2012. (doctorate in social anthropology; executive director of the World Peace Foundation at the Fletcher School, Tufts Univ.; formerly with African Union mediation team for Darfur and served as senior adviser to the African Union High-Level Implementation Panel for Sudan) 21 Feb 2012, Getting Somalia Right This Time, NEW YORK TIMES, <http://www.nytimes.com/2012/02/22/opinion/getting-somalia-right-this-time.html?pagewanted=2&ref=somalia>

Somali society has functioned for centuries without a state, on the basis of kinship, customary law and Islam. These traditions survive. The best results of such politics are most visible in the northern half of Somalia, far from the international community’s gaze. There, Somali elders and businessmen have created a functioning democratic state (the Republic of Somaliland) and, next door to it, an effective self-governing region (Puntland). They did this by turning their communities’ dynamic business sectors and traditional values — the clan system and Islam — into forces for stability. Partly because neither Somaliland nor Puntland is internationally recognized, they don’t get official foreign aid or military cooperation. But they’ve done pretty well relying on themselves. In Somaliland, there have been two peaceful changes in government following free and fair elections in 2003 and 2010. Yet rather than seek a solution in Somalia’s traditions and proven successes, Western policy has favored pursuing direct action against suspected terrorist threats, recreating a central government based on power sharing among the factions and establishing formal state institutions to solidify security — all Sisyphian tasks.

ADVANTAGE 3. Fragmenting Al Shabaab. By our disengagement from the conflict, support for Al Shabaab will be reduced and our enemy is more likely to fragment and fail.

Bronwyn E. Bruton 2010. (democracy and governance specialist with extensive experience in Africa; former international affairs fellow in residence at the Council on Foreign Relations; born in Swaziland and spent most of her childhood in Botswana; served as a program manager on the Africa team of the U.S. Agency for International Development's Office of Transition Initiatives; masters in public policy from UCLA) March 2010 “Somalia - A New Approach” download from: <http://www.cfr.org/somalia/somalia/p21421>

What can be termed “constructive disengagement” may appear to be a counterintuitive approach, but doing less is better than doing harm, and there are good reasons to believe that the results will be more successful. The Shabaab is an alliance of convenience and its hold over territory is weaker than it appears. Under the right conditions, it will fragment. Somali fundamentalists—whose ambitions are mostly local—are likely to break ranks with al-Qaeda and other foreign operatives as the utility of cooperation diminishes. The United States and its allies must encourage these fissures to expand. They can do that most quickly and easily by disengaging from any effort to pick a winner in Somalia, and by signaling a willingness to coexist with any Islamist group or government that emerges, as long as it refrains from acts of regional aggression, rejects global jihadi ambitions, and agrees to tolerate the efforts of Western humanitarian relief agencies in Somalia.

7. PIE IN THE SKY: THE CASE FOR CANCELING NATO MISSILE DEFENSE

It's expensive, it doesn't work, it disrupts our foreign relations, and it increases risks to our country. And the Pentagon says we're going to do more of it. Join us in seeking the comparative advantages of reduced risks and reduced costs to our nation by affirming that the United States Federal Government should substantially reform its foreign military presence and/or foreign military commitments.

OBSERVATION 1. We offer the following DEFINITIONS

**Substantial**: “3 *a* **:** possessed of means **:** well-to-do *b* **:** considerable in quantity **:** significantly great <earned a *substantial* wage>” *(Merriam-Webster Online Dictionary 2012.* [*http://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/substantially*](http://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/substantially))

**Reform**: “2: to put an end to (an evil) by enforcing or introducing a better method or course of action” *(Merriam-Webster Online Dictionary 2012.* [*http://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/reform*](http://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/reform) *(parentheses in original))*

**Military**: “2 : ARMED FORCES” *(Merriam-Webster Online Dictionary 2012. parentheses in original,* [*http://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/military*](http://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/military)*)*

**Commitment**: “1 [mass noun] the state or quality of being dedicated to a cause, activity, etc.:” *(Oxford Dictionary online 2012. Oxford University Press, brackets in original;* [*http://oxforddictionaries.com/definition/commitment?q=commitment*](http://oxforddictionaries.com/definition/commitment?q=commitment)*)*

**Presence**: “[mass noun] the state or fact of existing, occurring, or being present” *(Oxford Dictionary online 2012. Oxford University Press,* [*http://oxforddictionaries.com/definition/presence?q=presence*](http://oxforddictionaries.com/definition/presence?q=presence)*, brackets in original)*

OBSERVATION 2. INHERENCY, the conditions of the Status Quo. The US is committed to missile defense in Europe as part of NATO

Armed Forces Press Service 2012. (written by journalist Army Sgt. 1st Class Tyrone C. Marshall Jr.) 13 Jan 2012 Pentagon: Commitment to NATO, Europe is ‘Unshakeable’ (brackets added) <http://www.defense.gov/news/newsarticle.aspx?id=66794>

[Pentagon spokesman Navy Capt. John] Kirby also reaffirmed the Defense Department’s commitment to missile defense systems being developed in Europe and said he wasn’t aware of any changes to commitments in the region. “We remain 100-percent committed to the missile defense system that we’ve been developing there for Europe and for the defense of our allied partners there,” Kirby said. “We’re very comfortable with the capabilities that we have and will be able to maintain in Europe to contribute to the NATO alliance and the defense of our allies.”

OBSERVATION 3. RISKS. European missile defense creates risks

RISK 1. Relations with Russia. NATO missile defense hurts relations with Russia and risks their withdrawal from the New START treaty

Tom Collina 2012. (over 20 years of Washington experience in arms control and global security; has held senior leadership positions such as Executive Director of the Institute for Science and International Security, Director of Global Security at the Union of Concerned Scientists, and Senior Research Analyst at the Federation of American Scientists; has testified before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee and regularly briefs congressional staff; degree in International Relations from Cornell Univ) Apr 2012 NATO to Declare Missile System Ready <http://www.armscontrol.org/act/2012_04/NATO_to_Declare_Missile_System_Ready>

Last November, Moscow openly threatened to boycott the NATO summit and take other retaliatory measures, such as deploying short-range missiles in its Kaliningrad enclave to destroy NATO interceptors and withdrawing from the New Strategic Arms Reduction Treaty (New START). U.S. and NATO officials said their plans to deploy a missile interceptor system in Europe under the Phased Adaptive Approach would proceed regardless of Moscow’s concerns.

RISK 2. Weaker national and global security.

Dr George N. Lewis & Dr. Theodore Postol 2010. (Lewis - Ph.D. in experimental physics; associate director of the Peace Studies Program at Cornell Univ. Postol - PhD nuclear engineering; professor of science, technology, and national security policy at Massachusetts Institute of Technology and a former scientific adviser to the chief of naval operations) A Flawed and Dangerous U.S. Missile Defense Plan May 2010 <http://www.armscontrol.org/act/2010_05/Lewis-Postol>

The central conundrum of midcourse missile defense remains that while it creates incentives for adversaries and competitors of the United States to increase or modernize their missile stockpiles, it offers no credible defense against this weaponry. The planned Block II interceptors in the latter phases of the PAA threaten to provoke Russia’s exit from New START, in addition to possibly restarting a nuclear arms race – while providing no credible defense against possible future Iranian or North Korean missiles hosting simple countermeasures. Russia and China might increase their arsenals, end future arms reductions talks with the United States, and decrease their assistance with worldwide counter-proliferation efforts. Such a result would diminish U.S. – and global – security and would be at odds with President Obama’s vision of a nuclear-weapons-free world.

RISK 3. Wasted Money. European missile defense is a waste of resources and should be canceled

Dr. Thomas Barnett 2012. (MA in Regional Studies: Russia, Eastern Europe and Central Asia; Ph.D in Political Science from Harvard; former Senior Strategic Researcher and Professor in the Warfare Analysis & Research Department, Center for Naval Warfare Studies, U.S. Naval War College) Apr 2012 The New Rules: Obama's Missile Defense Fantasy a Pentagon Dream Come True, WORLD POLITICS REVIEW, <http://www.worldpoliticsreview.com/articles/11795/the-new-rules-obamas-missile-defense-fantasy-a-pentagon-dream-come-true>

Soon after taking office, President Obama did the right thing by canceling George W. Bush’s misguided plan for permanent, land-based missile defense in Eastern Europe. Since then, however, he’s allowed all manner of Pentagon backsliding, now formally enshrined in the strategic “pivot” to Asia. Pursued in such an unthinking manner, this will become a colossal waste of resources and strategic attention that could easily drag on for decades.

OBSERVATION 3. We offer the following PLAN, to be implemented by Congress and the President through any necessary constitutional means:

1. US European missile defense program is canceled.

2. Enforcement by the President and the commanders of the armed services through normal administrative means.

3. Congress cuts off all funding for European missile defense.

4. Plan takes effect 30 days after an Affirmative ballot

5. Affirmative may clarify the plan as needed

OBSERVATION 4. The Plan produces ADVANTAGES

ADVANTAGE 1. Cost savings: $8 billion. Representative Michael Turner of the House Armed Services Committee explained in 2012 the cost of the European missile defense program in the upcoming fiscal years 2013 to 2017, saying QUOTE:

Rep. Michael Turner 2012. (R-Ohio; chairman, Strategic Forces Subcommittee, under the House Armed Services Committee) 6 Mar 2012 “Fiscal Year 2013 National Defense Authorization Budget Request for Missile Defense” (brackets added; parentheses in original) <http://armedservices.house.gov/index.cfm/hearings-display?ContentRecord_id=fae9b8df-ac5c-459e-9ce1-18fac7338483&Statement_id=c999d3d6-4870-458f-8da6-c170feec0294&ContentType_id=14f995b9-dfa5-407a-9d35-56cc7152a7ed&Group_id=41030bc2-0d05-4138-841f-90b0fbaa0f88&MonthDisplay=3&YearDisplay=2012>

“Let me caveat to say that everyone of these slides comes right from MDA [Missile Defense Agency] or MDA numbers, other than slide 6 which we put together based on the MDA Budget Outline breakdowns for FY[fiscal year]13. I note the so-called “hedge” we see on slide 5 is the IIB and PTSS [Precision Tracking Space System] systems, which the MDA Budget Outline for FY13 labels an EPAA regional contributor. As we know, the Administration is “contributing” the EPAA [European Phased Adaptive Approach] to NATO free-of-charge. Such a contribution could cost the U.S. as much as $8.5 billion over the course of the FYDP [future years defense program] (FY [fiscal years] 13-17). Possibly more.” [UNQUOTE]

ADVANTAGE 2. Reduced risk of costly nuclear miscalculations

Dr. Yousaf Butt 2010. (PhD in nuclear physics; physicist in the High-Energy Astrophysics Division at the Harvard-Smithsonian Center for Astrophysics. Previously a fellow in the Committee on International Security and Arms Control at the National Academy of Sciences) 8 May 2010 The myth of missile defense as a deterrent BULLETIN OF THE ATOMIC SCIENTISTS <http://www.thebulletin.org/web-edition/features/the-myth-of-missile-defense-deterrent>

The long-range plans appear to be unencumbered by any realistic testing requirements. Unfounded claims of missile defense's effectiveness create a serious risk that political leaders might be misled into mistakenly believing that missile defenses actually work. And if they incorrectly think that missile defense has secured the country by neutralizing the threat of ballistic missile attack, policy makers might be emboldened to stake out riskier and more aggressive regional policies than in the absence of missile defense. A similar mistaken confidence in overwhelming U.S. conventional firepower misled Washington into the Iraq War debacle; nuclear miscalculations would be much more costly.

ADVANTAGE 3. Preserving the New START treaty. New START is good because it improves US security and defense

Steven Pifer and Strobe Talbott 2010. (Pifer - Senior Fellow, Foreign Policy, Center on the United States and Europe. Talbott - President, The Brookings Institution; former Deputy Secretary of State) 29 Mar 2010 Judging the New START Treaty <http://www.brookings.edu/opinions/2010/0329_start_treaty_pifer_talbott.aspx>

The new treaty will cut the current number of Russian strategic weapons that could target the United States by 30-40 percent. That’s a good thing. Russia does not pose the kind of nuclear threat that the Soviet Union did during the Cold War, but the safety and security of Americans will be improved when the nuclear potential of our nearest peer competitor is reduced. Moreover, by capping Russian strategic forces for the next decade, the agreement will make the U.S.-Russian nuclear relationship more predictable. That’s also a good thing. Washington will know more about Russian nuclear forces with the treaty than without it. So it will be able to make smarter decisions when it decides how to allocate defense dollars between strategic forces and other pressing military needs.

8. LETHAL LEGACY: THE CASE FOR REMOVING TACTICAL NUCLEAR WEAPONS FROM EUROPE

**(Jonathan Edelblut contributed some of the evidence in this case)**

During the Cold War, the US deployed hundreds of tactical nuclear weapons at bases in Europe to be used against a Soviet invasion that never came. Today, this lethal legacy remains, even though its usefulness has long since vanished, and the risks posed by these obsolete weapons compel my partner and me to affirm that The United States Federal Government should substantially reform its foreign military presence and/or foreign military commitments.

**Substantial**: “3 *a* **:** possessed of means **:** well-to-do *b* **:** considerable in quantity **:** significantly great <earned a *substantial* wage>” *(Merriam-Webster Online Dictionary 2012.* [*http://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/substantially*](http://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/substantially))

**Reform**: “2: to put an end to (an evil) by enforcing or introducing a better method or course of action” *(Merriam-Webster Online Dictionary 2012.* [*http://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/reform*](http://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/reform) *(parentheses in original))*

**Military**: “2 : ARMED FORCES” *(Merriam-Webster Online Dictionary 2012. parentheses in original,* [*http://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/military*](http://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/military)*)*

**Commitment**: “1 [mass noun] the state or quality of being dedicated to a cause, activity, etc.:” *(Oxford Dictionary online 2012. Oxford University Press, brackets in original;* [*http://oxforddictionaries.com/definition/commitment?q=commitment*](http://oxforddictionaries.com/definition/commitment?q=commitment)*)*

**Presence**: “[mass noun] the state or fact of existing, occurring, or being present” *(Oxford Dictionary online 2012. Oxford University Press,* [*http://oxforddictionaries.com/definition/presence?q=presence*](http://oxforddictionaries.com/definition/presence?q=presence)*, brackets in original)*

Tactical Nuclear Weapons

Dr. Nikolai Sokov, 2002. (Ph.D. from the University of Michigan; Candidate of Historical Sciences degree from the Institute of World Economy and International Relations; Senior Research Associate at CNS) “Tactical Nuclear Weapons (TNW)”Published by the Monterey Institute of International Studies in May 2002 (parentheses in original) <http://www.nti.org/e_research/e3_10a.html>

“Tactical (nonstrategic) nuclear weapons (TNWs) typically refer to short-range weapons, including land-based missiles with a range of less than 500 km (about 300 miles) and air- and sea-launched weapons with a range of less than 600 km (about 400 miles).”

OBSERVATION 2. INHERENCY. Two key facts about the Status Quo

FACT 1. Nuclear Legacy. The US maintains 200 nuclear bombs in 5 European countries

Andre de Nesnera 2012. (journalist) Voice of America, “Future of US, Russian Short-Range Nuclear Weapons Could Be on Negotiating Table” 4 Apr 2012 <http://www.voanews.com/english/news/europe/US-Russian-Short-Range-Nuclear-Weapons-Could-be-on-Negotiating-Table-146122895.html>

But analysts estimate Russia has between 2,000 and 4,000 tactical nuclear weapons. Not all are available for operational use. Some are in deep storage bunkers and others are slated to be dismantled. The United States is estimated to have about 200 short-range nuclear missiles, mainly located in five European countries: Germany, Italy, Turkey, Belgium and The Netherlands.

FACT 2. Poor security. The weapons are not secure

General Sir Hugh Beach 2010. lead author (former deputy commander-in-chief of United Kingdom Land Forces; Ph.D. from the University of Kent) with the Acronym Institute for Disarmament Diplomacy, ‘Tactical’ Nuclear Weapons: A dangerous anachronism <http://www.acronym.org.uk/npt/npt2010%20B5%20-%20Tactical%20NWs.pdf>

“The new US Nuclear Posture Review, published on 6 April 2010, commits the US to retain the “capability to forward-deploy US nuclear weapons on tactical fighter-bombers and heavy bombers, and proceed with full-scope life extension for the B-61 bomb including enhancing safety, security and use control”. This will also mean establishing a nuclear delivery capability for the F-35 when the F-16 is phased out by 2017. In Germany the nuclear capable Tornado aircraft is also due to be phased out. Its planned Eurofighter replacement is apparently not appropriate for carrying nuclear weapons. There is an even more urgent issue over security. According to a US Government report most storage sites still require significant additional resources to meet Department of Defense security requirements. Difficulties, including the short training regimen for nuclear security teams - in some cases as little as nine months - and the impossibility of performing no-notice security checks as a result of host nation/NATO requirements, create a hazardous situation in which weapons designed to defend NATO might themselves become targets. Peace activists frequently enter the nuclear bases in symbolic acts of protest, and it is chilling to imagine what an armed gang might achieve. Just this year nonviolent Belgian activists breached a double-fenced security barrier at Kleine Brogel air base and reached the aircraft shelters near where the nuclear bombs are stored.”

OBSERVATION 3. US Nuclear Weapons in Europe Cause Multiple HARMS

HARM 1. Increased probability of nuclear war. This happens because a conventional war could escalate into a nuclear war if TNWs are readily available

Pomper, Potter and Sokov 2009. Miles A. Pomper (Senior Research Associate with James Martin Center for Nonproliferation Studies; master's degree in international affairs from Columbia Univ) Dr. William Potter (PhD; Professor of Nonproliferation Studies and Director of the James Martin Center for Nonproliferation Studies at the Monterey Institute of International Studies) and Dr. Nikolai Sokov (worked at the Ministry for Foreign Affairs of the Soviet Union and later Russia, and participated in START I and START II negotiations; Ph.D. from the University of Michigan) Dec 2009 The James Martin Center for Nonproliferation Studies, " Reducing and Regulating Tactical (Nonstrategic) Nuclear Weapons in Europe" <http://cns.miis.edu/opapers/pdfs/tnw_europe.pdf>

Furthermore, employment of TNW is closely associated with conventional forces: both the American extended deterrence and the Russian "de-escalation" strategies foresee conflicts that start as conventional ones that more or less quickly transcend the threshold into limited use of nuclear weapons. The theoretical scenarios of employment of TNW argue for the pre-delegation of launch authority to combatant commanders in the early stages of or perhaps even in the run-up to a conventional war with further decrease of crisis stability, diminished control by political leaders, and the lowering of the nuclear threshold. Thus, in a very direct and tangible way the continued existence of TNW in national arsenals enhances the probability of nuclear war, whether intentional or by accident, and represents a threat to international security.

HARM 2. Risk of nuclear terrorism. Tactical nuclear weapons in Europe are a terrorist’s dream

Sam Nunn 2010. (co-chairman of the Nuclear Threat Initiative and a former U.S. Senator from Georgia) “NATO, Nuclear Security and the Terrorist Threat” NEW YORK TIME S Nov 2010 <http://www.nytimes.com/2010/11/17/opinion/17iht-ednunn.html?pagewanted=2&_r=3&ref=global>

“Despite these positive developments, the two largest powers in the region — the United States and Russia — still possess thousands of nuclear weapons each, and over 90 percent of the world’s nuclear inventory. Many of these nuclear arms remain deployed or designed for use within the Euro-Atlantic region, including small tactical nuclear weapons — a terrorist’s dream — deployed in numerous states throughout the Euro-Atlantic zone. The reduction and elimination of this Cold War nuclear infrastructure is the largest piece of unfinished business from a bygone era, and should be moved to the policy front burner. Today, urgent security steps relating to nuclear weapons security are essential for both NATO and Russia. If we don’t address this issue with urgency, we may wake up one day to a 1972 Munich-Olympics scenario, with a masked terrorist waving a gun outside of a nuclear warhead bunker somewhere in Europe. This time the hostages could be millions of people living close by.”

HARM 3. Wasted money. We spend $200 million per year per European air base - that’s over a billion dollars total - for no military value.

Prof. Tom Sauer 2010. (Ph.D. in International Relations Katholieke Universiteit Leuven; assistant professor in international politics at the Universiteit Antwerpen in Belgium; research fellow at the Belfer Center for Science and International Affairs at Harvard Univ and a visiting fellow at the European Union Institute of Security Studies in Paris) “U.S. tactical nuclear weapons: A European perspective” Published by the Bulletin of Atomic scientists in October 2010: <http://bos.sagepub.com/content/66/5/65.full> (ellipses in original)

“The United States spends $200 million a year per European air base to maintain its tactical nuclear weapons (Rabaey, 2008). An unnamed U.S. military official stated, “We pay a king’s ransom for these things and … they have no military value” (Secretary of Defense Task Force on DoD Nuclear Weapons Management, 2008: 59). In February 2004, the Defense Science Board, a team of appointed civilian experts who advise the Defense Department, recommended that the defense secretary “consider eliminating the nuclear role for Tomahawk cruise missiles and for forward-based, tactical, dual-capable aircraft” because “there is no obvious need for these systems, and eliminating the nuclear role would free resources that could be used to fund strategic strike programs of higher priority” (Meier, 2006).”

OBSERVATION 4. We offer the following PLAN to be implemented by Congress, the President and the Defense Department

1. The United States permanently dismantles and removes all US nuclear weapons from Europe in a transparent manner, with inspection open to representatives of any government.

2. Plan takes effect 30 days after an Affirmative ballot.

3. Funding from money saved by eliminating maintenance of these weapons and normal Defense Department budgets. Congress cuts off all funding for any activity not in compliance with the mandate.

4. Enforcement through the President, Secretary of Defense, and military commanders through normal administrative discipline.

5. Affirmative speeches may clarify the plan as needed.

OBSERVATION 5. We gain ADVANTAGES

ADVANTAGE 1. Global nuclear threat reduction. Removing nuclear weapons from Europe would significantly reduce world nuclear threat thanks to improved non-proliferation

Bob van der Zwaan and Prof. Tom Sauer 2009. (Zwaan - senior scientist at the Energy Research Center of the Netherlands and Columbia University’s Earth Institute, previous research associate at Harvard University’s Managing the Atom Project and Energy Technology Innovation Policy research group; council member of the Pugwash Conferences on science and world affairs. Sauer - former research fellow at Harvard’s International security program; assistant prof. of international politics at the Univ. of Antwerpen in Belgium.) “Time to reconsider U.S. nuclear weapons in Europe,” Bulletin of Atomic Scientists, Nov 2009 (brackets added) [www.thebulletin.org/web-edition/op-eds/time-to-reconsider-us-nuclear-weapons-europe](http://www.thebulletin.org/web-edition/op-eds/time-to-reconsider-us-nuclear-weapons-europe)

“For all of these reasons, the withdrawal of U.S. tactical nuclear weapons from Europe is long overdue. Better still, their removal would provide a clear signal that nuclear weapon states shouldn't deploy their weapons in other countries and that Washington takes seriously its commitment to disarm under Article VI of the NPT [Nuclear non-proliferation treaty]. (It would be a major boon to the upcoming NPT Review Conference if the United States decided to withdraw its bombs from Europe in the next couple of months.) Best of all, it would bolster global security by devaluing the status of nuclear weapons, reducing the world's nuclear threat significantly.”

ADVANTAGE 2. Keep nukes out of the wrong hands. Hans Kristensen explained the urgency of adopting our plan when he described in 2010 the adventures of a handful of unarmed activists at Kleine Brogel Air Base in Belgium, where some US nuclear weapons are stationed. He said QUOTE:

Hans Kristensen 2010. Hans Kristensen (director of the Nuclear Information Project at the Federation of American Scientists) 4 Feb 2010 "US Nuclear Weapons Site in Europe Breached" <http://www.fas.org/blog/ssp/2010/02/kleinebrogel.php>

The activists climbed the outer base fence (1), breached the inner double-fence (2), tagged a nuclear aircraft shelter (3), walked across the tarmac (4), before being arrested (5) after more than one hour inside the base. The numbers on the images correspond to the location of the numbers on the map above.

UNQUOTE. Kristensen continues later in the same context, saying QUOTE:

The activists will likely be charged with trespassing a military base but they should actually get a medal for having exposed security problems at Kleine Brogel. And this follows two years of the Air Force creating new nuclear command structures and beefing up inspections and training to improve nuclear proficiency following the embarrassing incident at Minot Air Force Base in 2007. Despite that, the activists not only made their way deep into the nuclear base but also discovered that the double-fence around the nuclear storage area had a hole in it! “We’re not the first,” one of the activists said. NATO needs to get over its obsession with nuclear weapons and move out of the Cold War and the Obama administration’s upcoming Nuclear Posture Review needs to bring those weapons home before the wrong people try to do what the peace activists did.

ADVANTAGE 3. Foreign Policy Benefits. We improve relations with Russia and improve global nuclear security

Hans M. Kristensen 2005. [independent nuclear weapons policy analyst; 20 years researching nuclear weapons policy and operations]: “U.S. Nuclear Weapons in Europe” Published by the Natural Resource Defense Council in February 2005: <http://www.nrdc.org/nuclear/euro/euro.pdf>

“The military and political justifications given by the United States and NATO for U.S. nuclear weapons in Europe are both obsolete and vague. Long-range weapons in the United States and Britain supplant the unique role the weapons once had in continental Europe, yet it seems NATO officials have been unwilling or unable to give them up. The deployment irritates efforts to improve relations with Russia and undercuts global efforts – and those of the United States and Europe – to persuade rogue nations from developing nuclear weapons. The Bush administration and the NATO alliance should address this issue as a matter of global nuclear security, and the United States should withdraw all of its nuclear weapons from Europe.”

9. AUREVOIR: THE CASE FOR LEAVING NATO

The US commitment to the military defense of Europe was a powerful ship driving our foreign policy. A generation ago, that is. Today the US commitment to the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, NATO, is merely a useless boat anchor that ties us down and weakens those we were supposed to protect. Please join my partner and me as we explain the comparative advantages of affirming that: The United States Federal Government should substantially reform its foreign military presence and/or foreign military commitments.

OBSERVATION 1. We offer the following DEFINITIONS

**Substantial**: “3 *a* **:** possessed of means **:** well-to-do *b* **:** considerable in quantity **:** significantly great <earned a *substantial* wage>” *(Merriam-Webster Online Dictionary 2012.* [*http://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/substantially*](http://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/substantially))

**Reform**: “2: to put an end to (an evil) by enforcing or introducing a better method or course of action” *(Merriam-Webster Online Dictionary 2012.* [*http://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/reform*](http://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/reform) *(parentheses in original))*

**Military**: “2 : ARMED FORCES” *(Merriam-Webster Online Dictionary 2012. parentheses in original,* [*http://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/military*](http://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/military)*)*

**Commitment**: “1 [mass noun] the state or quality of being dedicated to a cause, activity, etc.:” *(Oxford Dictionary online 2012. Oxford University Press, brackets in original;* [*http://oxforddictionaries.com/definition/commitment?q=commitment*](http://oxforddictionaries.com/definition/commitment?q=commitment)*)*

OBSERVATION 2. INHERENCY: Obama is committed to NATO. The Obama administration is pursuing the hopeless task of bolstering European military cooperation with the US within the structure of NATO.

Doug Bandow 2012. (law degree from Stanford Univ.; senior fellow at Cato Institute, specializing in foreign policy and civil liberties; worked as special assistant to Pres. Reagan) 2 Jan 2012 NATO and Libya: It's Time to Retire a Fading Alliance <http://www.cato.org/publications/commentary/nato-libya-its-time-retire-fading-alliance>

Obama administration officials, desperately attempting to protect America's bloated defense budget — double the real spending levels of just a decade ago — acknowledge facing similar financial pressures. Still, Washington continues to lobby Europe to do more. Explained National Security Adviser Tom Donilon: "We know that allies need more advanced intelligence, surveillance and reconnaissance capabilities. They face shortages in helicopters and transport aircraft. They need to make greater investments in the precision munitions and unmanned systems that are critical on today's battlefields and will be even more important in the future. As President Obama prepares to host the next NATO summit in Chicago in May, he is asking the alliance to ensure that it has cutting-edge capabilities." Good luck.

OBSERVATION 2. FAILURES of current policy

FAILURE 1. Liabilities without benefits. NATO gives us allies with military liabilities and little or no military benefits

Dr. Ted Galen Carpenter 2011. (PhD in US diplomatic history, U. of Tex.; senior fellow for defense and foreign policy studies at the Cato Institute) 13 June 2011 “NATO: The Potemkin Alliance” <http://www.cato.org/publications/commentary/nato-potemkin-alliance>

Washington needs to ask what the purpose is of having allies. This country should not be simply a security partner collector — acquiring allies for the sake of having allies. The NATO "partners" now seem to fit that description. They bring less and less to the table in terms of security assets, and some of them, because of their own disputes with neighboring states, bring along the serious liability of potentially entangling the United States in unnecessary conflicts. NATO has become a Potemkin alliance — an impressive façade, but little substance. There is a big difference between having capable security allies and having a collection of weak security dependents. It is long past time for Washington to conduct that "agonizing reappraisal."

FAILURE 2. Missions hindered. Activating a 28-member alliance actually hinders our ability to accomplish military missions

Prof. Stephen M. Walt 2011. ( international relations at Harvard University) [Gates to NATO: Drop dead?](http://walt.foreignpolicy.com/posts/2011/06/13/gates_to_nato_drop_dead) 13 June 2011 FOREIGN POLICY <http://walt.foreignpolicy.com/posts/2011/06/13/gates_to_nato_drop_dead>

To give U.S. interventions a veneer of legitimacy and to give itself something to do, in recent years NATO has tried to transform itself into some sort of global expeditionary force. Unfortunately, not only is a multilateral alliance with twenty-eight members a very ungainly structure for conducting this sort of operation, the campaigns in Iraq and Afghanistan have exposed the folly of this sort of global policeman role. Iraq was not a NATO operation, of course, but a lot of NATO countries participated in the debacle and all of them came away with a dim view of occupation and little desire to do more nation-building. Similarly, the repeated difficulties encountered in Afghanistan -- where NATO has had an official mission -- have reinforced the conclusion that occupying failed states is costly, difficult, and probably unnecessary. If this sort of activity has become NATO's main *raison d'etre,* you can understand why the alliance is in some trouble.

FAILURE 3. Unnecessary Wars. NATO involves the US in unnecessary wars, and we should drop out. Doug Bandow explained in 2011 why he advocates our plan when he said:

Doug Bandow 2011. (law degree from Stanford Univ.; senior fellow at the Cato Institute, specializing in foreign policy and civil liberties; worked as special assistant to President Reagan) 25 July 2011 “NATO: An Alliance That Divides Rather Than Unites,” <http://www.cato.org/publications/commentary/nato-alliance-divides-rather-unites> (brackets added)

He [US Secretary of Defense Robert Gates] spoke with apparent regret of the "dwindling appetite and patience" of Americans "to expend increasingly precious funds on behalf of nations that are apparently unwilling to devote the necessary resources or make the necessary changes to be serious and capable partners in their own defense." But such indigestion and impatience are long overdue. Washington should leave NATO to the Europeans (and Canada, if it desires). They have an obvious incentive to work together on shared continental security concerns. These interests reach across the Mediterranean. It should be up to the Europeans to judge the geopolitical dangers and build the necessary military forces in response. The U.S. should maintain close economic and political ties with Europe; Americans, certainly, would lose none of their affinity for what for many remain their ancestral homes. And the shared values and histories would encourage close cooperation on many issues. But on military issues Washington should work when necessary with countries which wish to act as security partners, dealing with shared international concerns. Washington should stop collecting defense wards in the name of creating and expanding a military alliance. Alliances should be a means rather than an end. During the Cold War NATO helped maintain the peace. Today NATO involves the U.S. in unnecessary wars. Libya demonstrates how the trans-Atlantic military alliance has outlived its usefulness. Washington should put it out of its misery.

OBSERVATION 4. We have a PLAN to do just that. Congress and the President will carry out the following PLAN through any necessary constitutional means:

1. The US today gives 1 year’s notice of its intent to drop out of NATO.

2. One year from now, the US drops out of NATO and all US troops are withdrawn from NATO countries.

3. Funding is through normal Defense budgets and money saved by no longer participating in NATO

4. Affirmative speeches may clarify the plan as needed.

OBSERVATION 5. SOLVENCY. We can drop out of NATO with 1 year’s notice.

Text of the 1949 North Atlantic Treaty at NATO’s official website. <http://www.nato.int/cps/en/natolive/official_texts_17120.htm>

Article 13 - After the Treaty has been in force for twenty years, any Party may cease to be a Party one year after its notice of denunciation has been given to the Government of the United States of America, which will inform the Governments of the other Parties of the deposit of each notice of denunciation.

OBSERVATION 6. Dropping out of NATO gives several ADVANTAGES

ADVANTAGE 1. Promote Peace. We give peace a chance by reversing the attempted militarization of Europe for external power projection through NATO.

Prof. Andrew J. Bacevich 2010. (professor of history and international relations at Boston University) FOREIGN POLICY Mar/Apr 2010 “Let Europe Be Europe” <http://www.foreignpolicy.com/articles/2010/02/22/let_europe_be_europe>

Yet even if reigniting an affinity for war among the people of, say, Germany and France *were* possible, why would any sane person even try? Why not allow Europeans to busy themselves with their never-ending European unification project? It keeps them out of mischief. Washington, however, finds it difficult to accept this extraordinary gift -- purchased in part through the sacrifices of U.S. soldiers -- of a Europe that has laid down its arms. Instead, successive U.S. administrations have pushed, prodded, cajoled, and browbeaten European democracies to shoulder a heavier share of responsibility for maintaining world order and enforcing liberal norms. In concrete terms, this attempt to reignite Europe's martial spirit has found expression in the attempted conversion of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) from a defensive alliance into an instrument of power projection. Washington's aim is this: take a Cold War-inspired organization designed to keep the Germans down, the Russians out, and the Americans in, and transform it into a post-Cold War arrangement in which Europe will help underwrite American globalism without, of course, being permitted any notable say regarding U.S. policy.

ADVANTAGE 2. Better European defense. US exit from NATO would better focus Europe on its own defense.

Prof. Andrew J. Bacevich 2009. (professor of history and international relations at Boston University) 2 Apr 2009 LOS ANGELES TIMES “How do we save NATO? We quit” <http://articles.latimes.com/2009/apr/02/opinion/oe-bacevich2>

However counterintuitive, the best prospect for restoring NATO's sense of purpose and direction lies in having the U.S. announce its intention to exit the alliance. Salvaging NATO requires reorienting the alliance back to its founding purpose: the defense of Europe. This remains a worthy mission. Although Vladimir Putin's Russia hardly compares with Josef Stalin's Soviet Union, and although current Russian military capabilities pale in comparison with those of the old Red Army, the fact is that Europe today does face a security threat to its east. Having been subjected (in its own eyes at least) to two decades of Western humiliation, authoritarian Russia is by no means committed to the status quo. Given the opportunity, the Kremlin could well give in to the temptation to do mischief. NATO's priority must be to ensure that no such opportunity presents itself, which means demonstrating an unquestioned capacity for self-defense.

ADVANTAGE 3. Increased security and reduced danger for America. Our foreign policy danger is reduced because we reduce the risk of being drawn into peripheral conflicts and because our allies will start taking more responsibility.

Doug Bandow 2012. (law degree from Stanford Univ.; senior fellow at the Cato Institute, specializing in foreign policy and civil liberties; worked as special assistant to President Reagan) 2 Jan 2012 NATO and Libya: It's Time to Retire a Fading Alliance <http://www.cato.org/publications/commentary/nato-libya-its-time-retire-fading-alliance>

The only way to get Europe to do more is for America to do less. Ira Straus denounced this idea as "a dark form of American nationalism." But expecting allies to do their share on their behalf is simply good sense — and in this case essential to protecting U.S. security and prosperity. During the Cold War it was necessary for Washington to prevent an antagonistic hegemonic rival from dominating both Europe and Asia. Today no such threat exists. The principal danger facing America in Europe today is being drawn into useless peripheral operations at the behest of allies.

10. UNPAK: THE CASE FOR ENDING THE ALLIANCE WITH PAKISTAN

Only three years after establishing the US military alliance with Pakistan, President Eisenhower in 1957 said it was QUOTE “perhaps the worst kind of a plan and decision we could have made. It was a terrible error...”\* UNQUOTE. Time has proven him right, and today my partner and I will show you why: The United States Federal Government should substantially reform its foreign military presence and/or foreign military commitments.

[\*quoted by Dr George Perkovich, 6 Sept 2011 “U.S. Policy Toward Pakistan,” <http://carnegieendowment.org/files/pakistan_dysfunction.pdf>]

OBSERVATION 1. We offer the following DEFINITIONS

**Substantial**: “3 *a* **:** possessed of means **:** well-to-do *b* **:** considerable in quantity **:** significantly great <earned a *substantial* wage>” *(Merriam-Webster Online Dictionary 2012.* [*http://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/substantially*](http://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/substantially))

**Reform**: “2: to put an end to (an evil) by enforcing or introducing a better method or course of action” *(Merriam-Webster Online Dictionary 2012.* [*http://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/reform*](http://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/reform) *(parentheses in original))*

**Military**: “2 : ARMED FORCES” *(Merriam-Webster Online Dictionary 2012. parentheses in original,* [*http://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/military*](http://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/military)*)*

**Commitment**: “1 [mass noun] the state or quality of being dedicated to a cause, activity, etc.:” *(Oxford Dictionary online 2012. Oxford University Press, brackets in original;* [*http://oxforddictionaries.com/definition/commitment?q=commitment*](http://oxforddictionaries.com/definition/commitment?q=commitment)*)*

OBSERVATION 2. INHERENCY. The US military alliance with Pakistan.

Realize A. The US and Pakistan have a military alliance going back to the 1950s

Dr George Perkovich 2011. (PhD; vice president for studies and director of the Nuclear Policy Program at the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace; adviser to the International Commission on Nuclear Non-proliferation and Disarmament and a member of the Council on Foreign Relations' Task Force on U.S. Nuclear Policy) 6 Sept 2011 “U.S. Policy Toward Pakistan,” Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, <http://carnegieendowment.org/files/pakistan_dysfunction.pdf> (brackets in original)

In 1954, the United States and Pakistan completed a mutual security agreement, making Pakistan an official ally. But American officials worried that Pakistan could not sustain the military it was building. By 1956, according to declassified U.S. government files summarized by historian Robert MacMahon, “the Eisenhower administration found itself supporting not a true nation in any meaningful sense but a ruling group, and one whose base of support remained as shaky as it was narrow. The gulf between rulers and ruled, not an unknown phenomenon in the developing world, assumed staggering dimensions in Pakistan.” The American ambassador did not see how “we end up with [a] military establishment useful [to] United States objectives [in] this area and substantially within [the] ability of [the] Pakistanis to support.” The plot of the story has changed little in the intervening fifty-five years.

Realize B. We need to get out.

Malou Innocent 2011. (Masters in International Relations, U of Chicago; member of the International Institute for Strategic Studies) 4 May 2011 “Pakistan, America’s Feckless Ally,” (brackets added) <http://www.cato.org/publications/commentary/pakistan-americas-feckless-ally>

Many experts, such as venerated foreign policy expert Michael O'Hanlon, explain away this disquieting reality by arguing in a circle: they insist America needs Pakistan for its operations in Afghanistan by assuming that America's presence in Afghanistan is critical to America's security. Mr. [Michael] O'Hanlon recently justified the necessity of maintaining ties with Pakistan, even as he equated bilateral relations to a bad marriage both parties can't get out of. He argued, "the right approach is to try even harder to make it work." There seems to be more and more evidence, however, that it is worthwhile for America to file for divorce.

OBSERVATION 3. We offer a PLAN to do just that. Congress and the President will take any necessary steps to carry out the following:

1. The US drops its military alliance with Pakistan.

2. The US ends all military aid to, military presence in and military cooperation with Pakistan.

3. Funding from money saved by ending these activities.

4. Plan takes effect 30 days after an Affirmative ballot.

5. Enforcement through the President and the Joint Chiefs of Staff through normal military discipline. Congressional cutoff of funding for any activities not in compliance with the mandates.

6. Affirmative speeches may clarify the plan as needed.

OBSERVATION 4. JUSTIFICATIONS. There are several reasons why ending the Pakistan alliance deserves your vote in today’s debate round.

JUSTIFICATION 1. End Support for Terrorism.

Robert Spencer 2011. (Masters degree in religious studies, UNC-Chapel Hill; has led seminars on Islam and jihad for the United States Central Command, United States Army Command and General Staff College, the U.S. Army's Asymmetric Warfare Group, the FBI, the Joint Terrorism Task Force, and the U.S. intelligence community) 3 May 2011 FRONT PAGE MAGAZINE “Pakistan: The Ally That Isn’t” <http://frontpagemag.com/2011/05/03/pakistan-the-ally-that-isnt/#bio>

It was illustrative of where Pakistan stands in the fight against the global jihad, and where it has stood since September 11, 2001. The U.S. has paid billions to Pakistan since then in order to aid the Pakistani government’s fight against al-Qaeda and the Taliban; it has been revealed, however, that much of that money has gone to those same organizations, and that the ISI, Pakistan’s spy service, has significant ties with al-Qaeda.

JUSTIFICATION 2. Collateral damage. US operations have caused death and destruction inside Pakistan

Gen. Imran Malik 2012. (retired Pakistan Army brigadier general, former defence advisor in Australia and New Zealand; graduate of the Command & Staff College, Pakistan and the US Army War College, Pennsylvania) US-Pakistan: Alliance interrupted! 17 Jan 2012 THE NATION <http://www.nation.com.pk/pakistan-news-newspaper-daily-english-online/columns/17-Jan-2012/us-pakistan-alliance-interrupted>

Consequent to 9/11, President Bush announced the global war on terror (GWOT) and literally bullied President General Pervez Musharraf into joining it. Blatant, unwritten, unilateral deals were struck and the US went wild chasing the militants all over Pakistan, hunting and killing them (and “collateral damage” Pakistanis) at will. This ruthless exploitation of Pakistani President’s political vulnerability led to thousands of Pakistani deaths, the destruction of its infrastructure, the ruination of its economy and the extreme polarisation of its society! Unfortunately, it still goes on!

JUSTIFICATION 3. Pak troops help America’s enemies. Our NATO commander in the field says Pakistani troops are actually aiding Afghan insurgent attacks on Americans.

Spencer Ackerman 2011. (journalist) WIRED, “Top General: Pakistani Military Aids Rocket Attacks on U.S. Troops” <http://www.wired.com/dangerroom/2011/10/pakistan-rockets-us-troops/>

Frontline Pakistani troops aid and abet lethal insurgent attacks on American forces across the Afghan border, according to the day-to-day commander of the NATO war effort. It’s a big reason why rocket and mortar attacks have quadrupled since 2010. “You’ll see what just appears to us to be a collaboration or was a collaboration or, at a minimum, looking the other way when insurgents conducted rocket or mortar fire in what we believe to be visual sight of one of their posts,” Lt. Gen. Curtis Scaparrotti told Pentagon reporters on Thursday morning.

JUSTIFICATION 4. Mutual Mistrust.

A. The Link: US and Pakistan military don’t trust each other, and thus don’t cooperate well

Associated Press 2011. “Pakistan army rejects US findings on border attack” 23 Dec 2011 <http://www.guardian.co.uk/world/2011/dec/23/pakistan-army-rejects-us-findings> (brackets added)

He [Brigadier General Stephen Clark, US Air Force special operations officer] acknowledged that the US had not informed Pakistan that American and Afghan commandos were conducting an overnight operation in Afghanistan on 25-26 November when the attack occurred. US and Nato commanders believed that some of their military operations had been compromised when they had given details and locations to the Pakistanis, he said. There was "an overarching lack of trust between the two sides" that keeps them from giving each other specific details on troops or combat outpost locations, Clark said, as he went through a blow-by-blow account of the incident.

B. The Impact: Soldiers die. The Associated Press goes on in the same article to explain the awful impact of the mistrust that led to the disastrous November 2011 air raid, saying QUOTE:

Associated Press 2011. “Pakistan army rejects US findings on border attack” 23 Dec 2011 <http://www.guardian.co.uk/world/2011/dec/23/pakistan-army-rejects-us-findings>

The Pakistani army has rejected a US investigation that concluded mistakes on both sides led to US air strikes last month that killed 24 Pakistani soldiers and severely damaged the already strained relationship between the two countries.

UNQUOTE.

JUSTIFICATION 5. Billions of dollars saved.

Robert Spencer 2011. (Masters degree in religious studies, UNC-Chapel Hill; has led seminars on Islam and jihad for the United States Central Command, United States Army Command and General Staff College, the U.S. Army's Asymmetric Warfare Group, the FBI, the Joint Terrorism Task Force, and the U.S. intelligence community) 3 May 2011 FRONT PAGE MAGAZINE “Pakistan: The Ally That Isn’t” <http://frontpagemag.com/2011/05/03/pakistan-the-ally-that-isnt/#bio>

The death of Osama bin Laden in this fortress in a Pakistani military town suggests that the Pakistani government’s involvement with al-Qaeda is far deeper and more extensive than a few rogue elements of the ISI. Indeed, if Pakistan was sheltering bin Laden for ten years, whether in this particular safe house or in others, then this protection stretches back into Musharraf’s tenure as Pakistani President. Musharraf himself almost certainly knows about it, and has for quite some time – and yet is posturing in the international media today about a deplorable “lack of trust” that the Americans have demonstrated by declining to involve the Pakistanis in the operation against bin Laden. It is long past time to end the fantasy-based policymaking that has counted Pakistan as a U.S. ally for so many years. Imagine the boost to the U.S. economy that could be occasioned by cutting off all aid to Pakistan today, thereby saving billions annually. In that event, the United States would no longer be in the position of being played for a fool by a Pakistani government that is more obviously than ever in league with our enemies, and of funding our own demise.

JUSTIFICATION 6. Stop supporting dysfunctional government in Pakistan

A. The Link: US support enables the Pakistani military’s dysfunctional behavior

Dr George Perkovich 2011. (PhD; vice president for studies and director of the Nuclear Policy Program at the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace; adviser to the International Commission on Nuclear Non-proliferation and Disarmament and a member of the Council on Foreign Relations' Task Force on U.S. Nuclear Policy) 6 Sept 2011 “U.S. Policy Toward Pakistan,” Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, <http://carnegieendowment.org/files/pakistan_dysfunction.pdf>

In 1957, only several years after heavy U.S. involvement in Pakistan began, President Eisenhower remarked that the military commitment to Pakistan was “perhaps the worst kind of a plan and decision we could have made. It was a terrible error, but we now seem hopelessly involved in it.” Fifty-four years later, little has happened that would persuade Eisenhower to revise this conclusion. With good intentions, successive administrations and Congresses have colluded with the Pakistani army and intelligence services to maintain their oversized, dysfunctional roles in Pakistan and South Asia. There is no evidence that U.S. blandishments or threats will motivate this security establishment to change its mindset and provide space and resources for Pakistani civilians to create a national identity around internal reconciliation, justice, development, and democratization.

B. The Impact: Pakistan is dangerously dysfunctional, thanks to us. Dr Perkovich summarizes the Affirmative case later in the same article in 2011 when he said:

Dr George Perkovich 2011. (PhD; vice president for studies and director of the Nuclear Policy Program at the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace; adviser to the International Commission on Nuclear Non-proliferation and Disarmament and a member of the Council on Foreign Relations' Task Force on U.S. Nuclear Policy 6 Sept 2011 “U.S. Policy Toward Pakistan,” Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, <http://carnegieendowment.org/files/pakistan_dysfunction.pdf>)

“As the United States begins to look to the end of its heavy fighting role in Afghanistan, it needs to confront the more important question of Pakistan’s future. The United States has been a major player there for sixty years; if Pakistan is dangerously dysfunctional, Washington helped enable it to get this way.”

11. DEAL WITH THE DEVIL: THE CASE FOR REFORMING THE ALLIANCE WITH SAUDI ARABIA

Some call it a “Faustian Bargain,” in other words, a deal with the Devil. President Franklin D. Roosevelt initiated an alliance in 1945, and every President since has maintained it. But our “ally” acts more like an enemy, and commits terrible abuses against its own people. It’s long past time for us to affirm that The United States Federal Government should substantially reform its foreign military presence and/or foreign military commitments. Today we’ll be talking about reforming the US military commitment to the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia.

OBSERVATION 1. We offer the following DEFINITIONS

**Substantial**: “3 *a* **:** possessed of means **:** well-to-do *b* **:** considerable in quantity **:** significantly great <earned a *substantial* wage>” *(Merriam-Webster Online Dictionary 2012.* [*http://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/substantially*](http://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/substantially))

**Reform**: “2: to put an end to (an evil) by enforcing or introducing a better method or course of action” *(Merriam-Webster Online Dictionary 2012.* [*http://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/reform*](http://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/reform) *(parentheses in original))*

**Military**: “2 : ARMED FORCES” *(Merriam-Webster Online Dictionary 2012. parentheses in original,* [*http://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/military*](http://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/military)*)*

**Commitment**: “1 [mass noun] the state or quality of being dedicated to a cause, activity, etc.:” *(Oxford Dictionary online 2012. Oxford University Press, brackets in original;* [*http://oxforddictionaries.com/definition/commitment?q=commitment*](http://oxforddictionaries.com/definition/commitment?q=commitment)*)*

OBSERVATION 2. The GOAL: Promotion of Human Rights. Roberta Cohen of Georgetown University explained in 2008 why human rights should be upheld in our foreign policy:

Roberta Cohen 2008. Roberta Cohen (MA with distinction from the Johns Hopkins School of Advanced International Studies; specialist in human rights and humanitarian issues, is Senior Associate at the Institute for the Study of International Migration at Georgetown University ) Lecture at the Foreign Service Institute, 2008 INTEGRATING HUMAN RIGHTS IN US FOREIGN POLICY: THE HISTORY, THE CHALLENGES, AND THE CRITERIA FOR AN EFFECTIVE POLICY <http://isim.georgetown.edu/Publications/CohenPubs/Cohen%20-%20Integrating%20Human%20Rights%20into%20US%20Policy.pdf>

To conclude, let me leave the audience with this thought: what the United States is known and appreciated for around the world is not just its strong economy and military capability. It is its democratic way of life and commitment to the observance of human rights. Our nation defines itself by the Constitution and Bill of Rights, the ending of slavery and segregation, the promotion of equal rights for women, the struggle to end racial and minority discrimination, and the defense of free speech, press, and civil liberties. In its dealings with foreign governments and countries, it must necessarily reflect this identity.

OBSERVATION 3. INHERENCY, our current policies. The US has a military alliance with Saudi Arabia

Donna Miles with American Forces Press Service 2012. (journalist), “F-15 sale to Saudi Arabia part of broader effort,” 3 Jan 2012, official web site of the US AIR FORCE, <http://www.af.mil/news/story.asp?id=123284931> (brackets added)

More broadly, the U.S.-Saudi military-to-military alliance is a central feature of regional security," he [Pentagon Press Secretary George Little] said. Little noted the U.S. Military Training Mission in Saudi Arabia, which was established in 1953 and remains a cornerstone of the U.S.-Saudi military-to-military relationship. U.S. and Saudi defense departments cooperate regularly at the highest levels through established bilateral planning forums like the Strategic Joint Planning Commission and the Military Joint Planning Commission, he said.

OBSERVATION 4. FAILURES. Our military support for Saudi Arabia is a bad policy

FAILURE 1. Abuses overlooked. Current policy is that we don’t promote human rights in Saudi Arabia

Doug Bandow 2011. (J.D. (law degree) from Stanford Univ; senior fellow at the Cato Institute, specializing in foreign policy and civil liberties; worked as special assistant to President Reagan ) 21 Mar 2011 Riyadh Scores One for Tehran <http://www.cato.org/publications/commentary/riyadh-scores-one-tehran> (“gerontocrats” = elderly rulers)

Unfortunately, Riyadh also is essentially a totalitarian theocracy. A handful of feeble gerontocrats rule and 7,000 princes mulct a nation of 27 million. There are no elections or civil liberties and non-Muslims cannot even freely worship at home. The Saudi government underwrites fundamentalist Islam around the world and Saudi citizens have provided substantial financial support for terrorism. Yet U.S. officials say little to encourage the Saudi royals to adopt democratic reforms.

FAILURE 2. Abuses encouraged. US military support encourages bad behavior

Prof. Toby C. Jones 2011. (assistant professor of history at Rutgers Univ) 22 Dec 2011 Don't Stop at Iraq: Why the U.S. Should Withdraw From the Entire Persian Gulf, THE ATLANTIC <http://www.theatlantic.com/international/archive/2011/12/dont-stop-at-iraq-why-the-us-should-withdraw-from-the-entire-persian-gulf/250389/>

Less obvious, the United States' military posture has also emboldened its allies, sometimes to act in counterproductive ways. Saudi Arabia and Bahrain justify their brutal crackdown of Bahrain's pro-democracy movement by falsely claiming Iranian meddling. While American policymakers support democratic transitions in the Middle East rhetorically, their unwillingness to confront long-time allies in the Gulf during the Arab Spring is partly the product of the continued belief that the U.S. needs to keep its military in the Gulf, something that requires staying on good terms with Gulf monarchies. The result is that Saudi Arabia and its allies have considerable political cover to behave badly, both at home and abroad.

FAILURE 3. US security threatened. The Saudis threaten our security by supporting terrorism and promoting jihad, even within the United States.

Dr. Mitchell Bard 2012. (Ph.D. in political science from UCLA; master’s degree in public policy from U of Calif-Berkeley) Uneven exchange with Saudis <http://www.mitchellbard.com/articles/uneven.html> (ellipses in original)

Third, the Saudis threaten our security. Saudis have helped fund terrorists from the PLO, Hamas and al-Qaeda. Undersecretary of the Treasury for Terrorism and Financial Intelligence Stuart Levey said, “If I could somehow snap my fingers and cut off the funding from one country, it would be Saudi Arabia.” In addition to directly sponsoring terrorists, the Saudis are educating the next generation of Muslims to become jihadists through the radical teachings they propagate through mosques and schools. The Washington Post reported a few years ago about a Saudi textbook “after the intolerance was removed,” that had the following statements: “Every religion other than Islam is false,” “The apes are Jews…while the swine are the Christians” and “jihad in the path of God…is the summit of Islam.” Similar teachings appear in textbooks distributed around the world, and appeared also in a Saudi-funded school in Fairfax, Virginia.

OBSERVATION 5. We have a PLAN. Congress and the President will enact the following PLAN through any necessary constitutional means:

1. No US military cooperation, military support, military assistance, or military security guarantees until Saudi Arabia meets the following conditions:

A) Undersecretary of the Treasury for Terrorism and Financial Intelligence certifies that Saudi Arabia is no longer a significant sponsor of terrorism

B) Complete freedom of religion is allowed

C) Open democratic elections are held and an elected government takes power.

D) No funding for jihadi propaganda abroad

E) Equal civil rights for women

F) Accept peace with Israel

2. Funding within normal Defense budgets, with net reduction of expenditures until conditions are met.

3. Enforcement through the President by normal administrative means. Congress votes to end all funding for any activities not in compliance.

4. Plan takes effect the day after an Affirmative ballot.

5. Affirmative speeches may clarify the plan as needed.

OBSERVATION 6. We create comparative ADVANTAGES by achieving the Goal.

ADVANTAGE 1. Leverage for reform. We see this in 2 subpoints:

A. Now is the time for the US to use its leverage to demand reforms in Saudi Arabia

Dr. Mitchell Bard 2011. (Ph.D. in political science from UCLA; master’s degree in public policy from U of Calif-Berkeley) Why Doesn't Obama Call for Democracy In Saudi Arabia? <http://www.mitchellbard.com/articles/obamasaudis.html>

Rather than reassure the Sauds, now is an ideal time to, for the first time since Kennedy, insist on changes in the regime. Democratization is only one important step. The U.S. should demand an end to support for terrorist groups and the financing of radical Islamic schools and mosques. Obama should insist on ending the apartheid policy toward women and other human rights abuses. Finally, he should pressure them to take measures to demonstrate their willingness to make peace with Israel. It has always been the case the Saudis needed us more than we needed them and this is a unique opportunity to use the political, economic and military leverage we have to insist that they show a commitment to our values and interests for the benefit of their people and our security.

B. Ending security guarantees means increased leverage to promote human rights

Prof. Toby C. Jones 2011. (assistant professor of history at Rutgers Univ) 22 Dec 2011 Don't Stop at Iraq: Why the U.S. Should Withdraw From the Entire Persian Gulf, THE ATLANTIC <http://www.theatlantic.com/international/archive/2011/12/dont-stop-at-iraq-why-the-us-should-withdraw-from-the-entire-persian-gulf/250389/>

Given its global reach, the United States will always retain the capacity to project military power, but the terms should be limited. The challenge is less about finding friendly ports to station personnel than it is about charting clearer and more effective terms of political engagement with allies and rivals. And this requires a new strategic doctrine, one that makes clear to regional actors that the era of open security guarantees -- which have proven so dear to both Americans and to the hundreds of thousands who have died since the United States began its military build-up -- is over. This would not mean the loss of leverage or influence, but in fact the opposite. Once it is clear that the United States is not solely committed to preserving the status quo, regional states will no longer believe they can ignore American calls for reform, restraint, and respect for human rights.

ADVANTAGE 2. Right side of history. The Saudi regime is doomed, and the US would be better off supporting people who want democracy instead of propping up the doomed oppressors. We see this in 2 subpoints:

A. Saudi’s days are numbered. The Saudi regime is in trouble with its own people because of corruption and disrespect for human rights

Erick Stakelbeck 2012. (journalist) 5 Mar 2012 Why the Saudis' Downfall Could Impact America , CBN NEWS, <http://www.cbn.com/cbnnews/world/2012/March/Why-the-Saudis-Downfall-Could-Impact-America/>

Then, after governments fell in Tunisia and Egypt, the Saudi royals moved to appease their own restless subjects with billions of dollars in new welfare and housing programs. "It is absolutely bribery. That's what it is. When this uprising started, they started getting nervous," said Dr. Ali Alyami, of the Washington-based Center for Democracy and Human Rights in Saudi Arabia. Alyami believes the Royal Family's days are numbered. "The Saudi people suffer from corruption, lack of political freedom, lack of religious freedom, lack of press freedom, injustice, no accountability, no transparency," he told CBN News. "So the same problems that led all of these Arabs to take to the streets are in Saudi Arabia," Alyami said. "So regardless of all the bribes -- they know it, actually -- they are not going to be spared the wrath of the people."

B. The US will pay a price for our military alliance with the oppressors, when a reform regime takes over

Prof. Toby C. Jones 2011. (assistant professor of history at Rutgers Univ) 22 Dec 2011 Don't Stop at Iraq: Why the U.S. Should Withdraw From the Entire Persian Gulf, THE ATLANTIC <http://www.theatlantic.com/international/archive/2011/12/dont-stop-at-iraq-why-the-us-should-withdraw-from-the-entire-persian-gulf/250389/>

The Middle East is moving to an era of mass politics, in which mobilized publics demand greater rights and greater influence. While many observers believe that the oil states are less susceptible to such pressures, this seems far from certain. In fact, Saudi Arabia, the world's most important oil producer, shares many of social and political-economic characteristics of its beleaguered neighbors, including high unemployment, widespread poverty, popular disillusion with corruption, and an increasingly sophisticated network of grassroots organizations committed to political change. Even flush with considerable oil revenue and the capacity to throw money at its many internal problems, Saudi Arabia has still been forced to unleash its police and security forces to quell unrest. The United States, because of its relationship with Saudi Arabia and Bahrain and its apparent preference for preserving the political status quo in the Gulf, is increasingly seen by the region's citizens as conflated with the violent forces of counterrevolution. Should revolutionaries and would-be revolutionaries in the Gulf force political transitions in the future, the United States could pay a political price for its long-standing military entanglements.

12. LESS IS MORE: THE CASE FOR WITHDRAWAL FROM SOUTH KOREA

In 1950, the United States came to the rescue of the people of South Korea when they were overrun by an invasion from communist North Korea. But the conflict ended in 1953, and times have changed. While the Korean peninsula is still a dangerous place, the best way to reduce that tension and promote peace is to affirm that The United States Federal Government should substantially reform its foreign military presence and/or foreign military commitments.

OBSERVATION 1. We offer the following DEFINITIONS

**Substantial**: “3 *a* **:** possessed of means **:** well-to-do *b* **:** considerable in quantity **:** significantly great <earned a *substantial* wage>” *(Merriam-Webster Online Dictionary 2012.* [*http://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/substantially*](http://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/substantially))

**Reform**: “2: to put an end to (an evil) by enforcing or introducing a better method or course of action” *(Merriam-Webster Online Dictionary 2012.* [*http://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/reform*](http://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/reform) *(parentheses in original))*

**Military**: “2 : ARMED FORCES” *(Merriam-Webster Online Dictionary 2012. parentheses in original,* [*http://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/military*](http://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/military)*)*

**Commitment**: “1 [mass noun] the state or quality of being dedicated to a cause, activity, etc.:” *(Oxford Dictionary online 2012. Oxford University Press, brackets in original;* [*http://oxforddictionaries.com/definition/commitment?q=commitment*](http://oxforddictionaries.com/definition/commitment?q=commitment)*)*

**Presence**: “[mass noun] the state or fact of existing, occurring, or being present” *(Oxford Dictionary online 2012. Oxford University Press,* [*http://oxforddictionaries.com/definition/presence?q=presence*](http://oxforddictionaries.com/definition/presence?q=presence)*, brackets in original)*

OBSERVATION 2. INHERENCY, some important facts about our current policies.

FACT 1. Military presence. The US has 28,000 troops in South Korea

Army Sergeant 1st Class Tyrone Marshall Jr. with American Forces Press Service 2012. “Obama Praises U.S. Troops’ Legacy in South Korea” published by US Dept of Defense, 25 Mar 2012 <http://www.defense.gov/news/newsarticle.aspx?id=67675>

About 28,000 U.S. troops are stationed in South Korea today. “And the contrast between South Korea and North Korea could not be clearer, could not be starker, both in terms of freedom, but also in terms of prosperity,” Obama said.

FACT 2. Irritating China. Later in this speech I’ll show you why China’s cooperation is essential to Korean stability. For now, understand that our status quo approach irritates China, and makes cooperation less likely

Mark E. Manyin 2012. (specialist in Asian Affairs, Congressional Research Service) 11 Jan 2012 “Kim Jong-il’s Death: Implications for North Korea’s Stability and U.S. Policy” <http://www.fas.org/sgp/crs/row/R42126.pdf>

A weakness of the aggressive pressure approach is that China would likely be able to neutralize it by increasing its aid and support to Pyongyang, unless leaders in Beijing make a dramatic shift and at least tacitly allow the imposition of economic and diplomatic penalties on North Korea. China has long seen stability on the Korean Peninsula as its primary interest, and therefore been loathe to apply too much pressure on the regime. A dramatic Chinese turnabout on North Korea policy may have become less likely due to the Obama Administration’s announcement of a “rebalancing” of U.S. foreign policy and military priorities toward the Pacific. Many Chinese leaders believe that this so-called “pivot” is aimed at containing Chinese ambitions, and therefore could become more suspicious of U.S. intentions with North Korea.

OBSERVATION 3. We offer a PLAN. Congress and the President will take any necessary steps to carry out the following:

1. All U.S. military forces are withdrawn from South Korea one year after an Affirmative ballot.

2. The Yongsan Relocation Plan and Land Partnership Plan are canceled immediately

3. US military commitment to South Korea is canceled one year after an Affirmative ballot except for nuclear retaliation in case of nuclear attack.

4. Funding is money saved by reduced US military costs

5. Enforcement through the President and commanders of the military services through normal means.

6. Affirmative speeches may clarify the plan as needed.

OBSERVATION 4. COMPARATIVE ADVANTAGES

ADVANTAGE 1. Billions of dollars saved. We save $13 billion for troop redeployments in Korea

*US Senate Committee on Armed Services 2011. Report on NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION*

ACT FOR FISCAL YEAR 2012, published 22 June 2011 (grammatical error “relocations was originally scheduled” was in original) <http://thomas.loc.gov/cgi-bin/cpquery/?&sid=cp112TtjuH&r_n=sr026.112&dbname=cp112&&sel=TOC_827886&>

The first, the Yongsan Relocation Plan (YRP), envisions the transfer of a large percentage of the 9,000 U.S. military personnel and their families at the Yongsan base in Seoul to U.S. Army Garrison (USAG) Humphreys, which is about 40 miles south of Seoul, so the land can be returned to South Korea. The plan calls for the Government of South Korea to fund much of the construction costs for this initiative, with the exception of the construction of replacement housing for military members and their families, which will be the funding responsibility of the United States government. U.S. Forces Korea (USFK) estimates that it will cost South Korea about $6.3 billion and the United States approximately $2.0 billion in construction costs through fiscal year 2016. The second initiative, the Land Partnership Plan (LPP), will withdraw about 10,000 troops of the Second Infantry Division from areas near the Demilitarized Zone to relocate them to Camp Humphreys so the land they vacate can also be returned to South Korea. The total estimated construction costs for this plan are approximately $4.0 billion with the United States share approximately $3.4 billion. The end result of YRP/LPP is a reduction of the 104 different USFK's sites held in 2002 to just 48 with the majority of forces clustered in two main locations, or `hubs'--Osan Air Base/USAG Humphreys and USAG Daegu--that contains five `enduring sites.' The relocations to Camp Humphreys was originally scheduled to be complete in 2008, but there have been several postponements and delays. New cost estimates for these projects exceed $13.0 billion.

ADVANTAGE 2. Reduced risk of war. Withdrawal of US troops from South Korea means reduced risk of our involvement in needless war

Benjamin Friedman and Dr. Christopher Preble 2010. (Friedman - research fellow in defense and homeland security studies, Cato Institute; Preble - PhD history, Temple Univ., former Navy officer; vice president for defense and foreign policy studies at the Cato Institute ) 14 June 2010 LOS ANGELES TIMES, “Defense cuts: start overseas” <http://articles.latimes.com/2010/jun/14/opinion/la-oe-0614-preble-militarycuts-20100614>

The Cold War is over. While we were defending our allies in Europe and Asia, they got wealthy. The new status quo is that we offer them perpetual security subsidies — and risk being drawn into wars that do not serve our security interests. The recent trouble regarding the sinking of a South Korean naval ship by Pyongyang is illustrative. Odious as North Korea is, we have no obvious interest in fighting for South Korea, which has grown far richer and militarily capable than its northern rival. South Korea can defend itself.

ADVANTAGE 3. Chinese engagement. Our plan gets China involved in restraining North Korea’s dangerous behavior. We see this in 3 subpoints:

A. The Link: US disengagement would force China to confront the North Korea problem

Doug Bandow 2010. (J.D. (law degree) from Stanford Univ; senior fellow at the Cato Institute, specializing in foreign policy and civil liberties; worked as special assistant to President Reagan ) 1 Nov 2010 “U.S. Should Get Out of Korean Peninsula” <http://www.cato.org/publications/commentary/us-should-get-out-korean-peninsula>

It is a nasty situation. But why are Americans expected to sort out the mess? Rather than treating North Korea as a U.S. problem, Washington should turn the issue back to Pyongyang's neighbors. Any map demonstrates that the DPRK is primarily an issue for South Korea, Japan and China, not America. Only the South is vulnerable to a traditional conventional assault, and it is well able to protect itself. Japan is conceivably at risk from a North Korean missile attack, but the government of that wealthy, high-tech society could do far more in its own defense. The North isn't likely to attack the People's Republic of China, but any instability emanating from Pyongyang will affect the PRC. American disengagement would force the Chinese government to confront the North Korean "problem."

B. The Solvency: Chinese cooperation is essential to preventing North Korean nuclear proliferation

Council on Foreign Relations, Independent Task Force 2010. (Charles L. Pritchard and John H. Tilelli Jr., Chairmen; Scott A. Snyder, Project Director; CFR is an independent, nonpartisan membership organization, think tank, and publisher. Pritchard - former aide to Pres. Bush in negotiations with N. Korea; former US Representative to Korean Peninsula Energy Development Org. Tilelli - retired US Army 4-star general, former commander of US forces in Korea) “U.S. Policy Toward the Korean Peninsula” June 2010 <http://iis-db.stanford.edu/pubs/22935/Korean_PeninsulaTFR64-1.pdf>

Chinese cooperation is essential to the success of denuclearization on the Korean peninsula and to ensuring regional stability. Sino-U.S. cooperation to prevent proliferation of weapons of mass destruction (WMD) is in the mutual interests of both countries and will be a critical proving ground for the relationship. Failure to make progress toward denuclearization of the Korean peninsula would be a significant setback for efforts to promote a cooperative approach to regional security in Northeast Asia. The level of China’s cooperation and involvement is the main factor that will determine whether it is possible to achieve a strategy that goes beyond containment and management of North Korea’s nuclear and missile aspirations to rollback.

C. The Impact: North Korean nuclear proliferation is an urgent threat

Council on Foreign Relations, Independent Task Force 2010. (Charles L. Pritchard and John H. Tilelli Jr., Chairmen; Scott A. Snyder, Project Director; CFR is an independent, nonpartisan membership organization, think tank, and publisher. Pritchard - former aide to Pres. Bush in negotiations with N. Korea; former US Representative to Korean Peninsula Energy Development Org. Tilelli - retired US Army 4-star general, former commander of US forces in Korea) “U.S. Policy Toward the Korean Peninsula” June 2010 <http://iis-db.stanford.edu/pubs/22935/Korean_PeninsulaTFR64-1.pdf>

The urgency of the threat is undeniable. North Korea possesses nuclear-weapon and missile capabilities, has threatened its neighbors, and has been willing to sell nuclear materials and technology to the highest bidder. Its reclusive leadership is unpredictable, something yet again underscored by the unprovoked destruction of the Cheonan, a South Korean naval vessel, by a North Korean torpedo in late March 2010.

13. TUG OF WAR: THE CASE FOR REFORMING WAR POWERS

The Founding Fathers originally made a clear separation of war powers in the Constitution. They gave Congress the power to decide to commit American troops to foreign combat, and they gave the President the power to command the troops to carry out the objectives Congress voted for. Unfortunately, in the two centuries since, that balance of power is now out of balance, with serious implications for our country and the troops we send into harm’s way. Please join my partner and me as we affirm that: The United States Federal Government should substantially reform its foreign military presence and/or foreign military commitments. Our case today will not be about indicting any one particular President or party, nor any particular war. Instead we will be looking at reform of the institutional process to restore respect for what the Constitution says about our foreign military commitments so that our future military engagements and their outcomes will be improved.

OBSERVATION 1. We offer the following DEFINITIONS

**Substantial**: “3 *a* **:** possessed of means **:** well-to-do *b* **:** considerable in quantity **:** significantly great <earned a *substantial* wage>” *(Merriam-Webster Online Dictionary 2012.* [*http://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/substantially*](http://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/substantially))

**Reform**: “2: to put an end to (an evil) by enforcing or introducing a better method or course of action” *(Merriam-Webster Online Dictionary 2012.* [*http://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/reform*](http://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/reform) *(parentheses in original))*

**Military**: “2 : ARMED FORCES” *(Merriam-Webster Online Dictionary 2012. parentheses in original,* [*http://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/military*](http://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/military)*)*

**Commitment**: “1 [mass noun] the state or quality of being dedicated to a cause, activity, etc.:” *(Oxford Dictionary online 2012. Oxford University Press, brackets in original;* [*http://oxforddictionaries.com/definition/commitment?q=commitment*](http://oxforddictionaries.com/definition/commitment?q=commitment)*)*

**Presence**: “[mass noun] the state or fact of existing, occurring, or being present” *(Oxford Dictionary online 2012. Oxford University Press,* [*http://oxforddictionaries.com/definition/presence?q=presence*](http://oxforddictionaries.com/definition/presence?q=presence)*, brackets in original)*

OBSERVATION 2. INHERENCY: The balance of power between Congress and the President.

Realize A. WPA fails. The War Powers Act fails, and Presidents start wars without Congress

Dr. Steve Frank 2011. (Ph.D. in American history from the Univ of Michigan, National Constitution Center’s Vice President of Education & Exhibits) The Fog of the War Powers Act: Why We Should Embrace the Constitution’s Ambiguity, <http://blog.constitutioncenter.org/the-fog-of-the-war-powers-act-why-we-should-embrace-the-constitutions-ambiguity/>

In the aftermath of the Vietnam War, the country and Congress engaged in a loud debate about the issue, which led to the War Powers Act of 1973. The measure was designed to give Congress more say about whether to commit troops to the battlefield, but it’s generally considered a failure. No president, Democrat or Republican, has accepted its constitutionality, and Congress hasn’t tried to enforce it. Numerous U.S. military actions since – including Grenada in 1983, Panama in 1989, Bosnia in 1995, and now Libya and Yemen – have been conducted without express congressional approval.

Realize B. Constitutional balance upset. In a reversal of the Constitution’s original war powers, today Presidents start wars, and we wait in vain for Congress to stop them. Dr. James Lindsay explained in 2011:

Dr. James M. Lindsay 2011. (PhD from Yale; senior vice president, director of studies, and Maurice R. Greenberg chair at the Council on Foreign Relations; former director of the Robert S. Strauss Center for International Security and Law at Univ of Texas at Austin) 5 Apr 2011 Is Operation Odyssey Dawn Constitutional? Part V (ellipses in original) <http://blogs.cfr.org/lindsay/2011/04/05/is-operation-odyssey-dawn-constitutional-part-v/>

The effect of the Court’s reticence in recent years, however, is to turn the constitutional structure the Framers created on its head. At least it does if you agree with Alexander Hamilton that “the Legislature have a right to make war” and that “it is…the duty of the Executive to preserve Peace till war is declared.” How so? The Framers put the burden of effort in going to war on presidents. Presidents could not act *until* they had persuaded Congress to agree. That meant assembling winning coalitions in both the House and Senate. As I noted in an earlier post, some nineteenth century presidents tried and failed to secure congressional approval for hostilities they hoped to initiate. By contrast, if presidents are free to act *unless* Congress stops them—as the judge suggested in *Dellums v. Bush—*then the burden of effort shifts to the other end of Pennsylvania Avenue. Congress can stop the president only by passing a law that commands him to do so. But that law is subject to a presidential veto. As long as a president can get thirty-four senators to back him, and almost every president can, he carries the day even if the other 501 members of Congress are opposed. Facing those daunting odds, most members of Congress don’t see the point in challenging the White House. Why waste valuable legislative energy tilting at windmills? Moreover, political incentives reinforce the urge that lawmakers have to head to the sidelines. After all, laying oneself open to charges of refusing to support U.S. troops in the field is hardly a recipe for electoral success. So the war power gravitates to the White House, in practice if not in law.

OBSERVATION 3. We have a PLAN. Congress will adopt the following plan through any necessary constitutional means:

1. Both houses of Congress change their procedural rules to set a default 2-year limit on all authorizations for the use of military force if no other deadline is specified in the legislation. All war funding authorization automatically expires at the same time as the force authorization, except for money needed to withdraw forces from any military engagement for up to 1 year after the authorization expires.

2. Enforcement through the federal courts to issue injunctions ordering the President to comply and Congressional impeachment for any President not in compliance.

3. Funding through existing budgets, no increase needed.

4. Plan takes effect the day after an Affirmative ballot.

5. All Affirmative speeches may clarify the plan.

OBSERVATION 4. Experts recommend our PLAN because it solves the Constitutional imbalance.

A. Congress takes control of war funding

Prof. Bruce Ackerman & Prof. Oona Hathaway 2011. (Ackerman - Professor of Law and Political Science, Yale Law School; Hathaway - Professor of International Law, Yale Law School) LIMITED WAR AND THE CONSTITUTION: IRAQ AND THE CRISIS OF PRESIDENTIAL LEGALITY, MICHIGAN LAW REVIEW Vol 109, Feb 2011 <http://www.michiganlawreview.org/assets/pdfs/109/4/ackermanhathaway.pdf>

The new rules will work proactively through a three-stage process. The rules first require all new authorizations for the use of force to state clearly whether they contemplate an open-ended conflict or a limited war. In the absence of a clear statement, the rules will create a presumption for limited war; they will presume a two-year sunset unless the House or Senate specifies a different time period. Second, the rules permit the House or Senate to reauthorize the war for another period before the expiration date arrives. If the two houses fail to take affirmative action, the third and final stage kicks into operation: the rules prohibit all further appropriations for the conflict once the time limit has elapsed, with the exception of a one-year appropriation of funds for the orderly withdrawal of troops and other forces from the battle zone. During this withdrawal period, the president remains free to try to convince Congress and the public that a more extended war is in the national interest. But there is only one way for him to press onward: he must gain the explicit consent of both houses to another military authorization, which once again will be governed by a two-year sunset unless Congress provides otherwise. In the meantime, withdrawal must proceed in a responsible fashion. Congress has ample authority to take these steps. The Constitution gives each house the power to “determine the Rules of its Proceedings.” Because the Constitution grants the House and Senate the sole authority to make their rules, each chamber can act without the threat of a presidential veto.

B. Congress regains power over war decisions

Prof. Bruce Ackerman & Prof. Oona Hathaway 2011. (Ackerman - Professor of Law and Political Science, Yale Law School; Hathaway - Professor of International Law, Yale Law School) LIMITED WAR AND THE CONSTITUTION: IRAQ AND THE CRISIS OF PRESIDENTIAL LEGALITY, MICHIGAN LAW REVIEW Vol 109, Feb 2011 <http://www.michiganlawreview.org/assets/pdfs/109/4/ackermanhathaway.pdf>

To sum up: The operation of the rules during Period Two generates negligible risks but promises two very large constitutional gains: enhancing the power of Congress and forcing greater deliberation. These two features are analytically independent of one another. Presidents will tend to collaborate with Congress even if the reauthorization debate turns out to be a shouting match. And in the unlikely event that the president cuts the House and Senate out of key decisions, Congress may still succeed in catalyzing a broad ranging public debate over the war. Nevertheless, power-enhancing and deliberation-forcing will typically reinforce one another. The president’s need to win future roll-call votes will induce him to reach out to congressional leaders beforehand. And once members of Congress have greater access and influence, they will be in a better position to lead a more informed debate on the presidential requests for reauthorization.

OBSERVATION 5. We offer several JUSTIFICATIONS for restoring the Constitutional balance of war powers

JUSTIFICATION 1. Human rights and human lives. The expansion of Presidential war power has had a staggering human cost.

Center for Constitutional Rights 2009. (non-profit legal and educational organization, includes attorneys who litigate for civil rights issues. The material in this quote was written by: Annette Warren Dickerson, Qa’id Jacobs, C. Lynne Kates, Jules Lobel, Sara Miles, Nicholas Modino, Jen Nessel, Alison Roh Park, Michael Ratner, Vincent Warren (national senior staff attorney with the American Civil Liberties Union ; monitored South Africa's historic Truth and Reconciliation Commission hearings and worked as a criminal defense attorney for the Legal Aid Society in Brooklyn) and Peter Weiss) “Restore. Protect. Expand. Amend the War Powers Resolution” <http://ccrjustice.org/files/CCR_White_WarPowers.pdf>

The last 8 years saw an expansion of executive power unprecedented in American history. The consequences for constitutional rights and our system of government are grave. But in no area have the consequences been more devastating than in the area of war-making. The cost in lives, human rights and long-term strategic interests is staggering.

JUSTIFICATION 2. Better decision-making. Congressional approval means better decision-making about going to war

War Powers Initiative Committee of The Constitution Project, Co-Chaired by former Representative Mickey Edwards and former Representative David Skaggs, 2005. (Mickey Edwards - Lecturer, Woodrow Wilson School of Public and International Affairs, Princeton Univ.; former Member of Congress (R-OK); David Skaggs - former Member of Congress (D-CO): Member of the Appropriations Committee and Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence; Peter Raven-Hansen - professor of law, George Washington Univ.; Louis Fisher - Senior Specialist in Separation of Powers, Congressional Research Service, Library of Congress; Thomas Franck - Professor of Law Emeritus at N.Y. Univ School of Law; Michael J. Glennon - Prof. of International Law, Fletcher School of Law & Diplomacy at Tufts Univ.; Dr. Morton Halperin, former high-level official in the National Security Council, State Department, and Defense Department; Harold Hongju Koh, former Assistant Sec. of State for Democracy, Human Rights & Labor; Dr. Susan E. Rice, former Assistant Secretary of State for African Affairs; James R. Sasser - Former senator from Tenn.; Jane Stromseth - Prof. of law at Georgetown Univ.; Patricia M. Wald - former Chief Judge, US Court of Appeals for the D.C. Circuit; Don Wallace Jr. - Prof of law, Georgetown Univ.; R. James Woolsey - former director of the CIA; Michael K. Young - former Dean of the George Washington Univ. Law School), FORCE ABROAD: WAR POWERS in a System of CHECKS AND BALANCES, <http://www.constitutionproject.org/pdf/28.pdf>

In short, the framers insisted on a collective judgment for war because it was likely that a collective judgment would be superior to an individual judgment, would help assure that the United States would not go to war without a political consensus, and, by requiring a President to persuade Congress, would effectively make him or her explain why war was necessary to the public who would ultimately bear its cost. These reasons for insisting on a collective judgment for war are still valid today.

JUSTIFICATION 3. Better protection of civil rights

Prof. Seth Weinberger 2009. (Associate Professor of Politics and Government at the Univ of Puget Sound) Restoring the Balance: War Powers in an Age of Terror, <http://books.google.fr/books?id=Risls8Z-dMsC&pg=PA47&lpg=PA47&dq=restore+%22balance+of+power%22+congress+president+%22war+powers%22&source=bl&ots=T1wKP6RMx1&sig=RZ2TBIqqgtoMGcUI7yQXLCAPXjc&hl=en&sa=X&ei=jXtrT8nCKsWwhAfqsciyBw&redir_esc=y#v=onepage&q=restore%20%22balance%20of%20power%22%20congress%20president%20%22war%20powers%22&f=false>

Thus, it is clear that the congressional power to declare war stands as a powerful and meaningful check on presidential war powers, even if it does not include control over the initiation of conflict or the deployment of troops. The greatest potential threat to civil liberties and democracy is the potential for the chief executive, in times of national emergency, to claim powers normally forbidden to him in a manner that upsets the fragile balance of government. Understanding the relevance and import of a declaration of war prevents this from happening. While the mechanism must exist by which the president can see his powers expanded to deal with a war that threatens the survival of the nation, the decision of when to activate that mechanism cannot be up to the president alone.