Negative Brief: Poland Base

By Rebecca Sumner

***Resolved: The United States federal government should substantially reform its foreign aid.***

The Affirmative case will accept Poland’s offer to give us $2 billion in exchange for building and staffing a permanently manned military base in their country. The idea is to better defend Poland against potential Russian aggression, possibly threatened by recent Russian moves against Georgia and the Crimean region of Ukraine. Negative team will argue that in addition to being untopical, the plan will backfire and increase instability and risk of war with Russia. And it wouldn’t work anyway because of the lack of available troops to commit to Poland and the unworkability of the basing arrangements.
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Negative: POLAND BASE

NEGATIVE PHILOSOPHY / OPENING QUOTES

AFF plan is bound to anger Russia and will be looked at with skepticism by European allies wanting to improve relationships with Russia

Edyta Żemła and Kamil Turecki 2018 (contributors to POLITICO) 27 May 2018 **updated** 30 May 2018, “Poland offers US up to $2B for permanent military base,” <https://www.politico.eu/article/nato-poland-offers-us-up-to-2-billion-for-permanent-american-military-base/>

Coming just over a month before NATO leaders gather in Brussels for a summit, the Polish initiative is bound to anger Russia, and will be looked at with skepticism by European allies that want to improve relations with Moscow, such as Italy and at times Germany.

Putting a base in Poland is unnecessary and ill-advised

Dr. Daniel Larison 2018 (Senior editor at The American Conservative; PhD in history from the University of Chicago) 18 Sept 2018, “There Is No Need for a U.S. Military Base in Poland,” <https://www.theamericanconservative.com/larison/there-is-no-need-for-a-u-s-military-base-in-poland/>

Putting a new base in Poland doesn’t make sense for the U.S., it adds nothing to NATO’s security, and it would be yet another irritant in an already troubled relationship with Moscow. It’s unnecessary and ill-advised, so it is more likely than not that the president will end up supporting it.

All a base in Poland would do is antagonize Russia, create a rift in NATO, and create one more overseas military installation the U.S. doesn’t need

Dr. Daniel Larison 2018 (Senior editor at The American Conservative; PhD in history from the University of Chicago) 18 Sept 2018, “There Is No Need for a U.S. Military Base in Poland,” <https://www.theamericanconservative.com/larison/there-is-no-need-for-a-u-s-military-base-in-poland/>

Putting a U.S. base in Poland isn’t necessary for European security, and it would very likely create a rift within NATO. It would further antagonize Russia, and it would create one more overseas military installation that the U.S. doesn’t need to have. Trump is often accused of wanting to “retreat” from the world, but his willingness to entertain this proposal shows that he doesn’t care about stationing U.S. forces abroad so long as someone else is footing most of the bill.

The Poland base would be costly and would almost certainly anger Moscow

Christopher Woody 2018 (reporter and editor at Business Insider. He graduated from Virginia Tech with a Bachelor of Arts in International/Global Studies, summa cum laude) 16 August 2018, “Poland really wants the US Army there permanently to 'scare away' Russia, and it's willing to pay for it,” <https://www.businessinsider.com/poland-wants-permanent-us-military-presence-to-scare-away-russia-2018-8>

Local media reported at the time that Poland was willing to spend up to $2 billion to finance a permanent deployment. The US has yet to respond to the request. Such a deployment would be costly and would almost certainly anger Moscow, which has sharply criticized NATO's recent deployments and military exercises in Eastern Europe.

TOPICALITY

1. Not aid

Link: Aid is something *given* by one nation to another

**Foreign Aid:** “economic, technical, or military aid given by one nation to another for purposes of relief and rehabilitation, for economic stabilization, or for mutual defense.” *(Dictionary.com, copyright 2018,* [*https://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/foreign%20aid*](https://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/foreign%20aid)*)*

**Give:** “to present voluntarily and without expecting compensation; bestow” *(Dictionary.com, copyright 2018,* [*https://www.dictionary.com/browse/give?s=t*](https://www.dictionary.com/browse/give?s=t)*)*

Violation: Poland is paying the U.S. for this base

In order to fall under the presented definition of foreign aid, the aid must be *given* from one country to the other. If Poland is paying the U.S. tons of money to build and maintain a military base, then the plan to accept that deal would not qualify as ‘aid’, because the Affirmative team is not presenting Poland with a military base ‘without expecting compensation’.

Poland has offered to pay the U.S. $2 billion for the military base

Jeremy Diamond 2018 (CNN White House Reporter based in Washington, D.C., graduated from the George Washington University, Elliott School of International Affairs, with a Bachelor of Arts in International Affairs) 19 Sept 2018, “'Fort Trump'? Polish President urges US to consider opening base,” <https://www.cnn.com/2018/09/18/politics/fort-trump-andrzej-duda-poland/index.html>

Polish President Andrzej Duda urged President Donald Trump on Tuesday during a joint news conference to deploy more US troops and military equipment to Poland, even suggesting the US establish a permanent military base and name it "Fort Trump." "I invite you to post more American military troops in Poland," Duda said, calling a US presence a "guarantor of security." Duda suggested building a permanent US base in Poland and said he would name it "Fort Trump." "I firmly believe that this is possible," Duda said, saying it would be both in US and Polish interests. Trump said he is considering Poland's request to establish a permanent US base in that country but added that Poland "would pay the United States." Trump said Duda had offered the US more than $2 billion to set up a base in Poland.

Impact: Resolution not justified.

Because the Affirmative team is not dealing with foreign *aid* in the plan, they presented to you today, they are not topical. This means that you—as the judge—can feel free to vote Negative, even if their plan sounds like a really good idea, just because it’s not foreign aid that they are reforming. The point of having a resolution is to limit what the Affirmative team can talk about. Once they fall outside of those bounds, it makes the resolution meaningless, providing a very difficult round for the Negative team, who now has to research things that are outside of the debate resolution. The best way to teach Affirmatives not to do that is with a Negative ballot.

INHERENCY

1.The U.S. has enough military bases

The United States maintains almost 800 military bases in over 70 countries

Akhilesh “Akhi” Pillalamarri 2018 (Fellow at Defense Priorities. An international relations analyst, editor and writer, he studied international security at Georgetown University), 6 June 2018, “Why the US shouldn’t build more foreign bases,” <https://www.defensenews.com/opinion/commentary/2018/06/06/why-the-us-shouldnt-build-more-foreign-bases/>

The United States maintains almost 800 military bases in over 70 countries, which far exceeds our modern day security requirements. American troops are already positioned to respond to any threat anywhere in the world, yet most of our allies want more American troops and bases because that would force us to play the first responder to any threat against those countries.

2.Poland security guaranteed just fine in Status Quo

Base is unnecessary: The U.S. has already guaranteed Poland’s security through other methods

Akhilesh “Akhi” Pillalamarri 2018 (Fellow at Defense Priorities. An international relations analyst, editor and writer, he studied international security at Georgetown University), 6 June 2018, “Why the US shouldn’t build more foreign bases,” <https://www.defensenews.com/opinion/commentary/2018/06/06/why-the-us-shouldnt-build-more-foreign-bases/>

Such a move would be unwise and unnecessary for the United States, especially when we already have guaranteed Poland’s security through its membership in NATO as well as the presence of thousands of American soldiers in neighboring Germany. The Polish government’s desire for American troops in its country is essentially the equivalent of obtaining human shields for itself.

3.Exercises & Deployments are solving for Russian threat

The U.S. and other troops from NATO have carried out a variety of exercises in Eastern Europe

Christopher Woody 2018 (reporter and editor at Business Insider. He graduated from Virginia Tech with a Bachelor of Arts in International/Global Studies, summa cum laude) 16 August 2018, “Poland really wants the US Army there permanently to 'scare away' Russia, and it's willing to pay for it,” <https://www.businessinsider.com/poland-wants-permanent-us-military-presence-to-scare-away-russia-2018-8>

US forces and troops from other NATO members have carried out a variety of exercises in Eastern Europe in recent months, as the alliance works to deter Russian aggression. Those exercises have focused on established capabilities that had fallen out of use after the Cold War — like maneuvering and interoperability between units — as well as new practices to fend off Russian tactics, like cyberattacks and hacking.

A base would be unnecessary due to the current exercise and deployment program

Retired Lt. Gen Ben Hodges 2018 (retired lieutenant general in the U.S. Army. He commanded United States Army Europe from 2014 to 2017. He is currently the Pershing chair in strategic studies at the Center for European Policy Analysis) 4 June 2018, **updated** 6 June 2018, “Don’t put US bases in Poland,” <https://www.politico.eu/article/dont-put-us-bases-in-poland/>

Second, a base in Eastern Europe is unnecessary. The current exercise and deployment program and other important measures — including the placement of equipment needed for armored brigades in pre-positioned stocks — are part of a robust effort to ensure an adequate deterrent against a possible Russian attack. NATO’s adaptation initiative, which is designed to provide the alliance with more flexible response capabilities, is expected to be adopted at the July NATO summit in Brussels and will further improve this effort.

4.Forward battle groups

NATO has demonstrated commitment to deterrence with forward battle groups in the Baltics & Poland already there

Retired Lt. Gen Ben Hodges 2018 (retired lieutenant general in the U.S. Army. He commanded United States Army Europe from 2014 to 2017. He is currently the Pershing chair in strategic studies at the Center for European Policy Analysis) 4 June 2018, updated 6 June 2018, “Don’t put US bases in Poland,” <https://www.politico.eu/article/dont-put-us-bases-in-poland/>

The deployment of enhanced forward presence battlegroups into Estonia, Latvia, Lithuania, and Poland in early 2017, just months after the NATO summit in Warsaw, demonstrated real commitment to deterrence. The speed with which they were deployed showed NATO’s decisiveness, and their multinational makeup — including contributions from Italy, Spain and Croatia — reflect the alliance-wide commitment.

5.Germany & Canada

Germany and Canada are committed to Baltic defense / Russia deterrence

Retired Lt. Gen Ben Hodges 2018 (retired lieutenant general in the U.S. Army. He commanded United States Army Europe from 2014 to 2017. He is currently the Pershing chair in strategic studies at the Center for European Policy Analysis) 4 June 2018, **updated** 6 June 2018, “Don’t put US bases in Poland,” <https://www.politico.eu/article/dont-put-us-bases-in-poland/>

Particularly noteworthy was the decision by Germany to take responsibility as the framework nation for the battlegroup deployed to Lithuania. It was the first to do so and the first to deploy. This was a strong signal to Russia, as well as to other NATO allies. The return of Canada to the European continent, as a framework nation for the battlegroup in Latvia, was another strong strategic message of commitment.

Example: Saber Strike 18 exercise. This will further strengthen the effectiveness in the Baltics& Poland

Retired Lt. Gen Ben Hodges 2018 (retired lieutenant general in the U.S. Army. He commanded United States Army Europe from 2014 to 2017. He is currently the Pershing chair in strategic studies at the Center for European Policy Analysis. He writes here in a personal capacity) 4 June 2018, updated 6 June 2018, “Don’t put US bases in Poland,” <https://www.politico.eu/article/dont-put-us-bases-in-poland/> (brackets added)

Continued improvements to this deployment has strengthened its coherence and effectiveness. The Saber Strike 18 exercise, about to get underway in all four countries [Estonia, Latvia, Lithuania, and Poland], with troops coming from Germany and the newly-arrived rotational armored brigade combat team from the U.S., will strengthen it further.

SOLVENCY

1.Troops not available

Base in Eastern Europe unfeasible: would require expansion of the Army – which won’t happen

Retired Lt. Gen Ben Hodges 2018 (retired lieutenant general in the U.S. Army. He commanded United States Army Europe from 2014 to 2017. He is currently the Pershing chair in strategic studies at the Center for European Policy Analysis) 4 June 2018, updated 6 June 2018, “Don’t put US bases in Poland,” <https://www.politico.eu/article/dont-put-us-bases-in-poland/>

Third, from a practical standpoint, permanently placing an armored brigade combat team in Eastern Europe is simply unfeasible. It would require an expansion of the U.S. Army that does not appear likely to happen. Otherwise the Army would have to move one of the existing combat teams from their current home in Texas, Kansas or Colorado — a change that would encounter strong congressional resistance from those states’ delegations. And due to decisions made six years ago, there are no longer any armored brigade combat teams already based in Germany that could be repositioned further east.

The main problem is it’s hard to know where those additional forces would come from

Jon Shelton quoting Heather Conley in 2018 (**Shelton**—journalist for Deutsche Welle (Germany’s international broadcaster). Conley—senior vice president for Europe, Eurasia, and the Arctic and director of the Europe Program at Center for Strategic and International Studies; former executive director of the Office of the Chairman of the Board at the American National Red Cross; former deputy assistant secretary of state in the Bureau for European and Eurasian Affairs ; formerly with Bureau of Political-Military Affairs at the U.S. Department of State,served as special assistant to the coordinator of U.S. assistance to the newly independent states of the former Soviet Union;M.A. in international relations from Johns Hopkins University School of Advanced International Studies) 19 September 2018, “Fort Trump: Is a new US military base in Poland a realistic option?” [brackets added] <https://www.dw.com/en/fort-trump-is-a-new-us-military-base-in-poland-a-realistic-option/a-45567231>

[Heather] Conley, however, sees another issue as a potential impediment to realizing the proposal. “The other big question is: Where would those additional forces come from? What would the global footprint be if the US would decide to move additional capabilities farther to NATO's eastern flank? The global picture will be a very big constraint on any further US decision,” she said.

2. Insufficient basing facilities

U.S. Army Secretary says:Poland base is not sufficient in terms of size or terrain

John Bowden 2018 (journalist; graduated from Elon University with a Bachelor’s Degree in Broadcast Journalism) 19 September 2018, “Army chief: Poland doesn’t have space for ‘Fort Trump’,” <https://thehill.com/policy/defense/407519-army-chief-poland-doesnt-have-space-for-fort-trump>

U.S. Army Secretary Mark Esper told Agence France-Presse on Wednesday that the space and terrain proposed by Poland's President Andrzej Duda did not offer enough room for facilities meant to train U.S. troops. “It was not sufficient in terms of size and what we could do in the maneuver space and certainly on the ranges,” Esper said, according to AFP. “You need a lot of range space to do tank gunnery, for example.” The terrain, he added, is “maybe not robust enough to really allow us to maintain the level of readiness we would like to maintain.”

The space proposed by Poland for the military base doesn’t have enough room for training

John Bowden 2018 (journalist; graduated from Elon University with a Bachelor’s Degree in Broadcast Journalism) 19 September 2018, “Army chief: Poland doesn’t have space for ‘Fort Trump’,” <https://thehill.com/policy/defense/407519-army-chief-poland-doesnt-have-space-for-fort-trump>

The space proposed by Poland's government for a U.S. military base in the country may not be enough to allow U.S. forces to construct a permanent facility that Poland's president offered to name "Fort Trump." U.S. Army Secretary Mark Esper told Agence France-Presse on Wednesday that the space and terrain proposed by Poland's President Andrzej Duda did not offer enough room for facilities meant to train U.S. troops.

DISADVANTAGES

1. Angering Russia

Link 1: A U.S. military base in Poland would give Moscow an opportunity to claim NATO is an aggressor

Retired Lt. Gen Ben Hodges 2018 (retired lieutenant general in the U.S. Army. He commanded United States Army Europe from 2014 to 2017. He is currently the Pershing chair in strategic studies at the Center for European Policy Analysis) 4 June 2018, updated 6 June 2018, “Don’t put US bases in Poland,” <https://www.politico.eu/article/dont-put-us-bases-in-poland/>

**To begin with, many of our allies** would see the establishment of a U.S. military base in Poland — or anywhere else in Central or Eastern Europe — as unnecessarily provocative. It would give Moscow an easy opportunity to claim that NATO is an aggressor and to somehow respond to protect Russian sovereignty.

Link 2: Moscow would see it as a violation of the 1997 NATO-Russia Founding Act

Retired Lt. Gen Ben Hodges 2018 (retired lieutenant general in the U.S. Army. He commanded United States Army Europe from 2014 to 2017. He is currently the Pershing chair in strategic studies at the Center for European Policy Analysis) 4 June 2018, updated 6 June 2018, “Don’t put US bases in Poland,” <https://www.politico.eu/article/dont-put-us-bases-in-poland/>

Unlike the current program of rotational forces, which cycle in and out over limited periods and then return to their home base in the U.S., a permanent base would require U.S. installations, families, schools, shops and all the other infrastructure that comes with it. Some would see this as a violation of the 1997 NATO-Russia Founding Act, the road map for security cooperation between the two entities. Moscow certainly would.

Moscow would consider such a force a breach of the 1997 NATO-Russia Founding Act

Jane Dalton 2018 (writer at the Independent. She graduated with a B.A. in Languages from the University of Cambridge) 1 June 2018, “Poland asks Trump to establish military base on Russian border to deter Moscow,”<https://www.independent.co.uk/news/world/europe/us-russia-trump-military-base-poland-moscow-soldiers-defence-europe-a8378161.html>

Moscow would consider the establishment of such a force in Poland a breach of the 1997 Nato Russia Founding Act, through which Nato agreed not to deploy permanent forces in eastern Europe.

Even diplomats have expressed concerns about it being a violation of the NATO-Russia Foundation Act

David M. Herszenhorn 2018 (Chief Brussels correspondent of POLITICO; worked for more than 20 years at The NY Times, as a reporter, Washington correspondent and foreign correspondent based in Moscow. Jacopo Barigazzi contributed reporting) 30 May 2018 updated 1 June 2018, “Warsaw to Trump: Let’s make a military deal (without NATO),” <https://www.politico.eu/article/warsaw-poland-andrzej-duda-to-donald-trump-lets-make-a-military-deal-without-nato/>

Publicly, diplomats declined to comment on Poland’s idea, but privately some expressed concerns about it as a potential violation of the NATO-Russia Foundation Act, and for setting a precedent for independent action on Russia policy. There is also some annoyance at the way the Poles have played to Trump’s demands for increased military spending.

The Text of the 1997 NATO-Russia Founding Act says NATO will seek to prevent any build-up of conventional forces in Central and Eastern Europe

North Atlantic Treaty Organization 2009 (NATO is a treaty among several allies. They are committed to the principle that an attack against one or several of its members is considered as an attack against all.) 27 May 1997 last updated 12 Oct 2009, “Founding Act on Mutual Relations, Cooperation and Security between NATO and the Russian Federation signed in Paris, France,” <https://www.nato.int/cps/en/natohq/official_texts_25468.htm> (CFE–Treaty on Conventional Armed Forces in Europe)

In addition, in the negotiations on the adaptation of the CFE Treaty, the member States of NATO and Russia will, together with other States Parties, seek to strengthen stability by further developing measures to prevent any potentially threatening build-up of conventional forces in agreed regions of Europe, to include Central and Eastern Europe.

Brink: Russia will retaliate if such a move were to be made

David M. Herszenhorn 2018 (Chief Brussels correspondent of POLITICO; worked for more than 20 years at The NY Times, as a reporter, Washington correspondent and foreign correspondent based in Moscow. Jacopo Barigazzi contributed reporting) 30 May 2018 updated 1 June 2018, “Warsaw to Trump: Let’s make a military deal (without NATO),” <https://www.politico.eu/article/warsaw-poland-andrzej-duda-to-donald-trump-lets-make-a-military-deal-without-nato/>

The Kremlin, meanwhile, has voiced mild annoyance. “In general, when we consider the gradual expansion of NATO’s military structure towards our borders, the immediate approximation of NATO’s military structure to our borders — this, of course, in no way contributes to the security and stability on the Continent,” Russian President Vladimir Putin’s spokesman, Dmitry Peskov, said, according to Russian news services. Peskov acknowledged Poland’s sovereign right to invite American forces to be stationed on its territory, but he added, “If such decisions are made, the consequences for the overall security atmosphere on the Continent are, of course, obvious.”

Brink:Russia has threatened retaliation if we do a base in Poland

Ben Wolfgang 2018 (Contributor who covers the Pentagon and foreign affairs for The Washington Times. Previously, he covered energy and the environment, Hillary Clinton's presidential campaign in 2016, and also spent two years as a White House correspondent during the Obama administration. Before coming to The Times in 2011, he worked as political reporter at The Republican-Herald) 28 May 2018, “Russia seething: Poland wants permanent U.S. military base, willing to pay $2 billion for it,” <https://www.washingtontimes.com/news/2018/may/28/poland-wants-permanent-us-military-base-willing-pa/>

Russia threatened retaliation Monday after news that Poland wants a permanent U.S. military base within its borders and is willing to pay up to $2 billion for the facility. The proposal for an American base touched off a rhetorical firestorm between Moscow and Warsaw, as leaders from both sides traded threats and cast a fresh spotlight on simmering tensions in Eastern Europe. U.S. officials had no immediate comment on the Polish plan, but Moscow seized the opportunity Monday — on an otherwise quiet Memorial Day in Washington — to push back hard against potential attempts by the Trump administration to bolster the U.S. military presence in the region.

West European defense ministry official: We shouldn’t even be proposing a base in Poland – it increases tensions with Russia

David M. Herszenhorn 2018 (Chief Brussels correspondent of POLITICO; worked for more than 20 years at The NY Times, as a reporter, Washington correspondent and foreign correspondent based in Moscow. Jacopo Barigazzi contributed reporting) 30 May 2018 updated 1 June 2018, “Warsaw to Trump: Let’s make a military deal (without NATO),” <https://www.politico.eu/article/warsaw-poland-andrzej-duda-to-donald-trump-lets-make-a-military-deal-without-nato/>

Asked about the possibility of provoking the Kremlin by establishing a permanent base in the former Eastern Bloc, a defense ministry official from a Western European nation expressed alarm. “We try to avoid the question — not even proposing it,” the official said. The Polish proposal not only breaks that taboo but also disputes the legal basis of the 1997 NATO-Russia Founding Act, an agreement intended to ease tensions and bolster cooperation among the former Cold War rivals.

The construction of a base would risk provoking Russia

Justin Sink 2018 (writes about the White House for Bloomberg. He’s contributed to or was cited by Bloomberg News, The Washington Post, MSN, Bloomberg Newsweek, the Los Angeles Times, Time Magazine, Fox News, The Independent, Money Magazine, Bloomberg Markets Magazine, Chicago Tribune, and more) 18 September 2018, “Poland Offers ‘Fort Trump’ as Name If U.S. Builds Military Base,” <https://www.bloomberg.com/news/articles/2018-09-18/trump-says-looking-very-seriously-at-permanent-poland-base>

After Russia seized Crimea from Ukraine during President Barack Obama’s administration, the U.S. and NATO allies established a constant, but fluctuating, rotation of troops in Poland. Poland has argued for a permanent, costlier plan, including a headquarters. The construction of a base would risk provoking Russian President Vladimir Putin even as Trump has gone to lengths to improve relations with the Kremlin.

Brink: Russia doesn’t hesitate to retaliate

Mike Eckel 2018 (Senior correspondent for RadioFreeEurope/RadioLiberty (RFE/RL) based in Washington) 11 Apr 2018 “What, U.S. Worry? Russia Threatens Retaliation For Latest Sanctions,” <https://www.rferl.org/a/russia-us-threats-retaliation-latest-sanctions/29159065.html>

In the past, Moscow has shown no hesitation to punching back hard and fast. Russia has kicked out U.S. diplomats in response to similar U.S. measures, including the closure or seizure of U.S. properties. In March, Russia kicked out the British Council, a government-backed cultural organization, after London expelled dozens of diplomats following the nerve-agent poisoning of a Russian former double agent in England. When the United States showed its solidarity with Great Britain by expelling 60 Russian diplomats and closing Russia's consulate in Seattle, Russia kicked out an equal number of U.S. diplomats and ordered the closure of the U.S. Consulate in St. Petersburg.

Impact: Poland in greater danger of attack. Reverses the advantages of the AFF plan!

Ben Wolfgang 2018 (Contributor who covers the Pentagon and foreign affairs for The Washington Times. Previously, he covered energy and the environment, Hillary Clinton's presidential campaign in 2016, and also spent two years as a White House correspondent during the Obama administration. Before coming to The Times in 2011, he worked as political reporter at The Republican-Herald) 28 May 2018, “Russia seething: Poland wants permanent U.S. military base, willing to pay $2 billion for it,” <https://www.washingtontimes.com/news/2018/may/28/poland-wants-permanent-us-military-base-willing-pa/>

U.S. officials had no immediate comment on the Polish plan, but Moscow seized the opportunity Monday — on an otherwise quiet Memorial Day in Washington — to push back hard against potential attempts by the Trump administration to bolster the U.S. military presence in the region. “These expansionist steps, certainly, result in counteractions of the Russian side to balance the parity which is violated every time this way,” Kremlin spokesperson Dmitry Peskov told reporters in Moscow. A key Russian senator went further, suggesting Poland would make itself a target if the plan for a permanent American base comes to fruition. Poland will become “the object of a retaliatory strike,” said Vladimir Dzhabarov, who serves on the Russian Federation Council’s Foreign Affairs Committee, according to Russian media.

Impact: Risk of war with Russia

Akhilesh “Akhi” Pillalamarri 2018 (Fellow at Defense Priorities. An international relations analyst, editor and writer, he studied international security at Georgetown University), 6 June 2018, “Why the US shouldn’t build more foreign bases,” <https://www.defensenews.com/opinion/commentary/2018/06/06/why-the-us-shouldnt-build-more-foreign-bases/>

But in the case that hostilities do escalate, the U.S. could be drawn into a major confrontation with a great power, over what may have otherwise been relatively minor and manageable scuffles. Unfortunately, this is part of a trend in which U.S. military power is being used in lieu of diplomacy, backed up by military strength, in resolving issues. We know from the example of Syria how dangerous it is to have American and Russian military personnel within the same country, as it is only a matter of time before their soldiers collide. Earlier this year, American planes reportedly killed up to 100 Russian mercenaries in Syria; such incidents cannot occur without retaliation forever, as it would be unacceptable for domestic reasons in both Russia and the United States to not seek vengeance after a certain point.

A permanent U.S. military base would create risk of war with Russia

Alex Ward 2018 (Staff writer covering international security and defense issues, as well as a co-host of Vox's "Worldly" podcast. Before joining Vox, he was an associate director in the Atlantic Council's Brent Scowcroft Center on International Security where he worked on military issues and US foreign policy. He also wrote the #NatSec2016 newsletter for War on the Rocks where he covered the 2016 presidential election and the candidates's views on national security) 18 September 2018, “Poland’s president wants Trump to open a US base in his country — and name it “Fort Trump”,” <https://www.vox.com/2018/9/18/17875518/poland-trump-military-base-fort-trump>

It’s safe to say that Russia won’t be happy with the Trump-Duda press conference. Poland, which borders a Russian enclave known as Kaliningrad, was once a satellite state of the Soviet Union. The country was bound to Moscow by something called the Warsaw Pact. But Poland has slowly westernized and moved out of Moscow’s orbit. The country is now a member of the European Union and NATO, and continually works to strengthen its relationship with Washington. Russia doesn’t like the fact that Poland regularly hosts thousands of US and NATO troops, since this puts them extremely close to Russian territory and parts of Europe the Soviet Union once controlled. A permanent US military base there would only make Russia angrier, some experts say. “It would give Moscow an easy opportunity to claim that NATO is an aggressor and to somehow respond to protect Russian sovereignty,” retired Lt. Gen. Ben Hodges, who until December 2017 led the US Army in Europe, wrote for Politico in June. That means there would be a chance — not a big one, but a chance — of a fight breaking out near or in Poland over the base decision.

2. Weakens NATO

Link: Poland base plan undermines NATO military alliance unity and shouldn’t be done for that reason

Retired Lt. Gen Ben Hodges 2018 (retired lieutenant general in the U.S. Army. He commanded United States Army Europe from 2014 to 2017. He is currently the Pershing chair in strategic studies at the Center for European Policy Analysis) 4 June 2018, updated 6 June 2018, “Don’t put US bases in Poland,” <https://www.politico.eu/article/dont-put-us-bases-in-poland/>

What makes NATO the most successful military alliance in history is the cohesion of its members. Any policy that risks undermining that should be examined with a highly critical eye. Establishing a permanent U.S. military presence in Poland, as has been reportedly requested by the Polish government, is exactly one of those cases. Such a move should only be taken if consensus can be achieved among all our allies that it would enhance deterrence and improve the overall security situation for NATO. That is unlikely to happen — and with good reason.

Brink: European allies oppose Poland base idea

Justin Sink 2018 (writes about the White House for Bloomberg. He’s contributed to or was cited by Bloomberg News, The Washington Post, MSN, Bloomberg Newsweek, the Los Angeles Times, Time Magazine, Fox News, The Independent, Money Magazine, Bloomberg Markets Magazine, Chicago Tribune, and more) 18 September 2018, “Poland Offers ‘Fort Trump’ as Name If U.S. Builds Military Base,” <https://www.bloomberg.com/news/articles/2018-09-18/trump-says-looking-very-seriously-at-permanent-poland-base>

The idea of permanently basing U.S. troops in Poland may also meet opposition among European allies chagrined by the country’s turn toward autocracy, including a revamping of the judiciary that critics say will remove judges who won’t take orders from politicians.

Link: This would shake a European system (NATO) that’s a crucial safeguard of security

David M. Herszenhorn 2018 (Chief Brussels correspondent of POLITICO; worked for more than 20 years at The NY Times, as a reporter, Washington correspondent and foreign correspondent based in Moscow. Jacopo Barigazzi contributed reporting) 30 May 2018 updated 1 June 2018, “Warsaw to Trump: Let’s make a military deal (without NATO),” <https://www.politico.eu/article/warsaw-poland-andrzej-duda-to-donald-trump-lets-make-a-military-deal-without-nato/>

But the same aspects of the plan that may prove irresistible to the self-styled dealmaker-in-chief make it fraught for NATO and EU allies. On Russia, they have carefully coordinated policy, including military deployments and economic sanctions, to show a united Western response since Moscow’s invasion and annexation of Crimea in 2014. More broadly, the prospect of Trump suddenly cutting bilateral military deals threatens to shake a European system that has viewed its multilateral framework as a crucial safeguard since the end of World War II.

Impact:Weakening NATO is bad because today’s transatlantic community is indispensable for managing multiple world problems.

Philip H. Gordon 2012. (Assistant Secretary, Bureau of European and Eurasian Affairs) Remarks at theInternational Institute for Strategic Studies, Washington, DC March 1, 2012“The United States and Europe: Meeting Global Challenges**”** https://2009-2017.state.gov/p/eur/rls/rm/2012/185064.htm

The agenda that is still before us, most urgently the rapidly deteriorating security situation in Syria, clearly remains daunting. And of course there are many many other issues that I haven’t had time here to address, from helping North Africa and the Middle East in its democratic transition, the question of China’s emerging power, new leadership in North Korea, climate change, the threat posed by Somali pirates off the Horn of Africa and many many others. But I think by talking a little bit about the extensive list of areas where we are cooperating extraordinarily closely, and contrasting it, if you will, to previous periods, and I don’t mean just the previous years but even decades before that, I think it says a lot about the approach that the President brought to this relationship, what we’ve been trying to do over the past three years, and what we intend to do in the future. On every single one of the issues I mentioned, close transatlantic cooperation is an indispensable starting point. To retain an effective working relationship, countries on both sides of the Atlantic must continue, as we have done, to engage in frank dialogue, smart defense spending, and cooperative policy-making. Secretary Clinton could not have summed it up more succinctly than she did in a joint appearance with Secretary of Defense Panetta in Munich just last month when she said, “Today's transatlantic community is not just a defining achievement of the century behind us. It is indispensable to the world we hope to build together in the century ahead.”

3. Increased conflicts

Link: More bases mean more conflicts

Akhilesh “Akhi” Pillalamarri 2018 (Fellow at Defense Priorities. An international relations analyst, editor and writer, he studied international security at Georgetown Univ), 6 June 2018, “Why the US shouldn’t build more foreign bases,” <https://www.defensenews.com/opinion/commentary/2018/06/06/why-the-us-shouldnt-build-more-foreign-bases/>

Bottom line: The more countries we base our troops in, the more conflicts we must be a direct party to, instead of functioning as a balancing military power that uses force as a last resort. As is the case with any entrenched program or bureaucracy, once military bases are established, new reasons to justify their continued existence will be sought out, even in regions outside of East Asia and Europe that are irrelevant in maintaining U.S. prosperity and security. Almost any local problem, any ungoverned space that could be used by militants and terrorists, has now taken on the characteristics of being an immediate threat to America’s national security, justifying all sorts of first responses and military operations.

Example: Niger. U.S. soldiers at a base were killed in an ambush, which only lead to the U.S. increasing their military presence across West Africa

Akhilesh “Akhi” Pillalamarri 2018 (Fellow at Defense Priorities. An international relations analyst, editor and writer, he studied international security at Georgetown University), 6 June 2018, “Why the US shouldn’t build more foreign bases,” <https://www.defensenews.com/opinion/commentary/2018/06/06/why-the-us-shouldnt-build-more-foreign-bases/>

Take, for example, the African country of Niger, where some 800 U.S. soldiers are now based at a large new base in the Saharan town of Agadez. On Oct. 4, 2017, four U.S. soldiers in an advisory role were killed in an ambush in Niger. The attackers were linked to the Islamic State group. Subsequently, our military presence across West Africa has increased. But this will merely ensure that our military will be involved in yet more operations, some of which will could lead to casualties and then spiral to an escalation by U.S. forces ― a recipe for constant conflict.

Impact: Higher risk of US troops getting killed

Akhilesh “Akhi” Pillalamarri 2018 (Fellow at Defense Priorities. An international relations analyst, editor and writer, he studied international security at Georgetown University), 6 June 2018, “Why the US shouldn’t build more foreign bases,” <https://www.defensenews.com/opinion/commentary/2018/06/06/why-the-us-shouldnt-build-more-foreign-bases/>

More U.S. soldiers stationed throughout the world, in places such as Poland, the Baltics or the Gulf, merely ensures that we will continue to be entangled as first-line troop providers to our allies and partners, regardless of our national interests. Our allies, too, will be disincentived from seeking their own solutions, as long as they can continue to use American troops as cannon fodder for their security.

4.Weaker US military preparation

Link:Status Quo uses rotational forces moved in and out of Poland

It’s in the Affirmative’s inherency evidence, it’s what we’re doing now instead of a permanent base.

Link:Rotational policy is BETTER for military preparedness than permanent basing

Retired Lt. Gen Ben Hodges 2018 (retired lieutenant general in the U.S. Army. He commanded United States Army Europe from 2014 to 2017. He is currently the Pershing chair in strategic studies at the Center for European Policy Analysis) 4 June 2018, **updated** 6 June 2018, “Don’t put US bases in Poland,” <https://www.politico.eu/article/dont-put-us-bases-in-poland/>

Finally, the Army and therefore U.S. European Command, benefits from the increased readiness that comes from the use of rotational combat teams. A rotational team deploys from its home station via rail to Beaumont, Texas, travels by ship to a European port and then overlands again by rail or convoy to assembly areas in western Poland. This is the exact process it would need to take in a real crisis, and thus invaluable practice for all of us, as we relearn what we used to know during the Cold War. Furthermore, this combat team will spend nine months constantly in the field or moving between training areas and across international boundaries, conducting more than twice as much gunnery as it would do in a typical 12-month training year back in the U.S. The benefits of working daily with NATO allies is also a significant training benefit.

Impact: Turn the Affirmative’s advantages, they get worse, not better

Obviously if US military preparedness in Eastern Europe is weaker with the AFF plan, then whatever impacts their plan has will be reversed, not improved.
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