

---

# West Coast Publishing

---

## Arms Sales 2019-20 Affirmative

**Edited by Jim Hanson**

Researchers

Angie Tinker, Eric Robinson, Jonathan Shane, Kinny Torre, Matt Stannard,  
Serena Fitzgerald, Shelby Pryor, William James Taylor

Thanks for using our Policy, LD, Public Forum, and Extemp Materials.

**Please don't share this material with anyone  
outside of your school**

including via print, email, dropbox, google drive, the web, etc.

*We're a small non-profit; please help us continue to provide our products.*

**Contact us at [jim@wcdebate.com](mailto:jim@wcdebate.com)**

**[www.wcdebate.com](http://www.wcdebate.com)**

**Resolved: The United States federal government should substantially reduce Direct Commercial Sales and/or Foreign Military Sales of arms from the United States.**

# AFFIRMATIVE EVIDENCE FILE INTRO

## ARMS SALES 2019-2020 WEST COAST AFFIRMATIVE

**Resolved: The United States federal government should substantially reduce Direct Commercial Sales and/or Foreign Military Sales of arms from the United States.**

### Finding Arguments in this File

Use the table of contents on the next pages to find the evidence you need or the navigation bar on the left. We have tried to make the table of contents as easy to use as possible. You'll find scenario/impacts, affirmatives, disadvantages, counterplans, and kritiks listed alphabetically in their categories.

### Using the Arguments in this File

We encourage you to be familiar with the evidence you use. Highlight (underline) the key lines you will use in the evidence. Cut evidence from our files, incorporate your and others' research and make new files. File the evidence so that you can easily retrieve it when you need it in debate rounds. Practice reading the evidence out-loud; Practice applying the arguments to your opponents' positions; Practice defending your evidence in rebuttal speeches.

### Use West Coast Evidence as a Beginning

We hope you enjoy our evidence files and find them useful. In saying this, we want to make a strong statement that we make when we coach and that we believe is vitally important to your success: **DO NOT USE THIS EVIDENCE AS A SUBSTITUTE FOR YOUR OWN RESEARCH.** Instead, let it serve as a beginning. Let it inform you of important arguments, of how to tag and organize your arguments, and to offer citations for further research. Don't stagnate in these files--build upon them by doing your own research for updates, new strategies, and arguments that specifically apply to your opponents. In doing so, you'll use our evidence to become a better debater.

### Copying and Sharing West Coast Evidence?

Our policy gives you the freedom to use our evidence for educational purposes without violating our hard work.

- You may print and copy this evidence for those on your team.
- **You may not electronically share nor distribute this evidence with anyone other than those on your team unless you very substantially change each page of material that you share.**

For unusual situations, you can e-mail us at [jim@wcdebate.com](mailto:jim@wcdebate.com) and seek our consent.

### Ordering West Coast Materials

1. Visit the West Coast Web Page at [www.wcdebate.com](http://www.wcdebate.com)
2. E-mail us at [jim@wcdebate.com](mailto:jim@wcdebate.com)
3. Fax us at 877-781-5058

Copyright 2018. West Coast Publishing. All Rights Reserved.

**Visit our web page!  
[www.wcdebate.com](http://www.wcdebate.com)**

*We're a small non-profit. Please don't share this file with those who have not paid including via dropbox, google drive, the web, printed copies, email, etc. Visit us at [www.wcdebate.com](http://www.wcdebate.com)*

# TABLE OF CONTENTS

Resolved: The United States federal government should substantially reduce Direct Commercial Sales and/or Foreign Military Sales of arms from the United States.....	2
AFFIRMATIVE EVIDENCE FILE INTRO.....	3
TABLE OF CONTENTS.....	4
Topic Overview .....	15
Resolved: The United States federal government should substantially reduce Direct Commercial Sales and/or Foreign Military Sales of arms from the United States.....	16
Affirmative Strategies .....	18
Aff General Military Aid/Arms Sales .....	20
Military aid creates ISIS and terrorism.....	21
Aid supports authoritarianism .....	24
Aid supports the military industrial complex.....	28
Aid does not support US interests .....	32
Aid supports Human Rights violations .....	37
Aid worsens terrorism.....	39
Military aid is linked to worse institutional outcomes and more terrorism.....	40
Military aid increases anti-American sentiment in non-democratic countries .....	41
Counterterrorism aid leads to more terrorism.....	42
US military stabilization fails .....	46
U.S. military aid has failed to do its job in Saudi Arabia, Egypt and more.....	47
Military aid fails to stabilize regions .....	48
Military aid fails; we need violence reduction plans .....	49
US arms are ending up in the hands of ISIS .....	50
The United States has a moral duty to promote democracy and promote human rights world wide .....	51
Continued support for human rights is vital.....	52
Terrorism.....	53
Arms sales gone wrong - ISIS has the same weapons that we are selling to foreign governments in the region.....	54
The united states arms are ending up in the hands of ISIS.....	55
Response to “Aid reduces terrorism” .....	56

Response to “Aid increases soft power” .....	58
Military aid increases anti-American sentiment among the citizens of recipient countries .....	59
Military aid from the US decreases cooperation .....	60
Response to “Aid stops state failure” .....	61
Response to “Aid stops drug trafficking” .....	62
Response to “Aid key to check China” .....	64
Response to “Aid to Egypt is good” .....	66
Response to “The Leahy Amendment works” .....	68
Response to “Aid leads to democratization” .....	70
Aff arming insurgents.....	72
Arms provision weakens rebel groups.....	73
Arms end up with the wrong people .....	75
Arming insurgents hurts international law .....	77
Rebuttal to Rebel groups are vetted.....	80
Rebuttal to Let locals deal with it directly .....	81
Rebuttal to Arms provision shortens conflicts.....	83
Rebuttal to Arms provision defeats ISIS/terrorism.....	85
Rebuttal to Rebels need the arms .....	87
Aff Egypt.....	89
Egypt 1AC 1/8.....	90
1AC 2/8.....	91
1AC 3/8.....	92
1AC 4/8.....	93
1AC 5/8.....	94
1AC 6/8.....	95
1AC 7/8.....	96
1AC 8/8.....	97
Topicality/Inherency: Arms Sales Process .....	98
Inherency .....	99
Inherency .....	100
Solvency .....	101
Solvency .....	102
Human Rights-Driven Decisionmaking is Key to Peace.....	103

Human Rights-Driven Decisionmaking is Key to Peace.....	104
Human Rights Impacts .....	105
Soft Power Uniqueness.....	106
Soft Power Good .....	107
Soft Power Good .....	108
Egypt Violates Human Rights .....	109
Egypt Violates Human Rights .....	110
Egypt Violates Human Rights .....	111
Shunning is Good .....	112
Shunning Good.....	113
Answers to "Human Rights = Imperialism/Intervention" Arguments .....	114
Answers to Conditional Aid Counterplan.....	115
Answers to "China Soft Power Better" Arguments.....	116
Answers to "Shift to China" Arguments.....	117
Answers to Egyptian Military Readiness Arguments .....	118
Answers to Russia Disadvantage.....	119
Answers to Russia Disadvantage.....	120
Answers to "Cutting Aid Hurts Egyptians" and "Don't Shun Without Request from People" Arguments.....	121
Answers to Egypt-U.S. Security Arguments .....	122
Palestine-Israel Conflict Answers.....	123
Palestine-Israel Conflict Answers.....	124
Answers to "Arms Markets Good" Arguments .....	125
Aff Israel .....	126
Israel 1AC .....	127
Inherency .....	128
Plan.....	129
Solvency .....	130
AD 1 – Palestine/human rights .....	131
AD 2 – Iran/Israel war .....	135
Israel is dependent on the US for arms .....	138
Israeli settler colonialism .....	139
Violence against Palestinians .....	143

The US' actions regarding Palestine are key .....	147
Arms sales lead to conflict .....	150
Iran/Israel tensions high now .....	152
Iran/Israel conflict leads to nuclear war .....	155
AT: US pullout makes war more likely .....	157
Iran is not a threat.....	160
Iran expansion is good .....	162
AT: Economy DA.....	163
AT: Cap K .....	164
AT: Arms sales necessary to combat terror .....	166
Aff South Korea .....	169
1AC.....	170
Contention One: North Korea.....	171
Contention Two: China .....	174
North Korea Extensions .....	178
No Risk .....	179
Diplomacy Solves .....	182
Timeframe.....	184
Economy Add-on.....	185
Miscalc Impacts.....	187
China Extensions .....	188
China Cooperation .....	189
Chinese Heg Not Coming .....	192
Concessions Solve .....	193
US Arms Cause China Backlash .....	194
Poverty Impacts .....	197
Systemic Violence Impacts.....	201
Solvency Extensions .....	203
Arms Sales.....	204
South Korea Domestic Arms Industry .....	206
South Korea Military Independence .....	208
Answers to: Korean Politics DA.....	209
Plan Popular In Korea.....	210

Answer to: Peace Treaty Counterplan .....	212
Aff Vietnam .....	213
Plan—The United States federal government should ban the sale of military arms from the United States to the Socialist Republic of Vietnam. ....	214
Advantage 1—South China Sea .....	215
Advantage 2—China Containment .....	221
Add-On—Human Rights.....	229
Code of Conduct solves SCS now .....	234
Arms sales inflame SCS conflict .....	238
China will retaliate against containment .....	240
Arms sales hurt US-China relations.....	245
US arms sales cause China-Russia alliance .....	247
Engagement with China is better.....	248
Vietnam won't use US arms.....	251
Arms sales won't replace Russia.....	253
Arms sales won't improve military cooperation.....	255
Arms sales hurt export controls.....	260
Arms sales don't solve the economy .....	261
Indian arms sales solve now .....	263
Arms sales won't deter China .....	264
SCS Free Trade Impact .....	266
No threat to Vietnam .....	269
Answer to Politics links .....	270
Responses to East Asia DA .....	271
Answers To: Uniqueness.....	272
China .....	273
North Korea.....	275
Answers To: Links.....	278
South Korea.....	279
Vietnam.....	282
No Arms Race.....	283
South China Sea .....	285
Answers To: Impacts .....	286

No Econ Collapse.....	287
No China War .....	288
No North Korea War .....	291
Responses to Economy DA.....	292
Saudi arms sales don't solve economy .....	293
Regional power arms sales don't solve economy.....	297
Arm sales regulations won't hurt the economy .....	298
Arms manufacturing isn't good for the econmy.....	299
Arms manufacturing doesn't create jobs .....	305
Arms sector is declining now .....	310
Humanitarian concerns outweigh.....	313
Economic decline now .....	314
Jobs/wages decline now .....	318
Responses to Russia DA .....	321
Uniqueness Answers.....	322
Russia Up.....	323
Link Answers .....	324
General.....	325
Middle East .....	327
Egypt .....	328
Saudi Arabia .....	329
Impact Answers.....	332
Impact Turn: Chinese Heg.....	333
Impact Turn: Terror.....	335
Answer to: Russian Economy.....	336
Answer to: Arctic Sea .....	338
Answer to: US Hegemony .....	340
Answer to: Russian Heg .....	341
Responses to Saudi Prolif DA .....	342
A/T Saudi's Can't Aquire the Bomb.....	343
A/T Saudi's Can't Aquire the Bomb.....	344
A/T Saudi's Can't Build the Bomb – Facility Restrictions .....	345
A/T Saudi's Can't Build the Bomb .....	347

A/T “They’ll Buy Elsewhere” .....	348
A/T “They’ll Buy Elsewhere” .....	349
A/T Human Rights Violations .....	350
A/T “They’ll Buy Elsewhere” .....	351
A/T Arms Sales → Proliferation .....	353
***AFF*** .....	354
UNIQUENESS ANSWERS.....	355
No UQ— Saudi Prolif Now .....	356
No UQ—Saudi Prolif Now .....	357
No UQ – Bipartisan Opposition .....	358
No UQ – Bipartisan Opposition .....	359
No UQ – Shutdown .....	360
No UQ – Allies Not Assured Now .....	361
A/T Trump Loves Saudi .....	363
***LINK ANSWERS*** .....	364
No Link – Other Sellers.....	365
No Link – Other Sellers.....	366
No Link – Other Sellers.....	367
No Link – Russian Sellers.....	368
No Link – China Sellers .....	369
A/T Internal Checks .....	370
Link Turn – Instability .....	371
Link Turn—Proxy Wars.....	372
Link Turn—Causes Instability.....	374
Link Turn.....	375
Link Turn – Terrorism .....	376
Link Turn – Laundry List .....	378
A/T Restrictions Check .....	379
***IMPACT ANSWERS*** .....	380
Saudi Won’t Proliferate.....	381
Saudi Won’t Proliferate.....	382
Saudi Won’t Proliferate.....	383
Saudi Prolif Inevitable .....	384

***IMPACT CALC*** .....	385
Low Risk to DA—Predictions.....	386
Impact Defense—Constraints .....	387
Saudi Prolif is Slow .....	388
Saudi Prolif is Slow—Takes a Decade.....	389
Responses to US Heg DA.....	391
Non-unique – US hegemony is low now .....	392
Link turn – Arms sales hurt soft power .....	396
Link turn – Arms sales increase terror .....	398
Link turn – Arms sales increase multipolarity.....	399
Link turn – Deterrence fails, causes arms races.....	400
Link turn – Checking China increases conflict.....	403
No link – Arms sales do not increase US influence .....	406
AT Internal link – China does not pose a threat.....	408
AT Internal link – Soft power key.....	410
No impact.....	412
Responses to UN Arms Trade Treaty CP .....	414
ATT process will fail.....	415
No enforcement extension .....	419
Domestic rollback extension.....	422
ATT only legitimizes corporate arms sales.....	425
ATT threatens US hegemony .....	428
HR promotion bad.....	433
ATT will be used violate sovereignty.....	438
Links to politics.....	442
Responses to India CP .....	443
India Says No.....	444
No Solvency – Diversification.....	445
India Will Say No – Strategic Partnership .....	446
India Says No/A2 US Sanctions Solve.....	447
SQ Solves – Pakistan .....	448
SQ Solves – Russia Pulling Back.....	449
A/T Iranian Oil.....	450

Responses to Saudi CP .....	452
No Solvency—Shift Buyers.....	453
No Solvency—No Pressure .....	454
Disad to the CP—Saudi Arms Sales Bad—Terrorism .....	455
Disad to the CP—Saudi Arms Sales Bad—Terrorism .....	456
Disad to CP—Oil Weapon—It’s Real .....	457
Disad to CP—Oil Weapon .....	458
Disad to CP—Oil Weapon .....	459
Responses to Turkey CP .....	461
Turkey—Say No—No Back Down.....	462
Turkey—Say No—No Back Down.....	463
Turkey—Say No—Relations .....	464
Turkey—Say No—Relations .....	466
Turkey—A/T S-400 Condition—Say No.....	467
Turkey—A/T S-400 Condition—Say No.....	468
Turkey—Shift Buyers.....	469
Responses to Egypt CP .....	470
No Solvency – Diversification.....	472
No Solvency – Egypt Will Buy From Russia .....	473
No Solvency – Egypt Will Buy Elsewhere .....	474
No Solvency – Egypt Will Buy Elsewhere .....	475
Say No – Regime Corruption Key to Sustainability .....	476
Say No – Muslim Bro Issue.....	477
A2 NB – Human Rights Condition .....	478
Responses to Fem IR Kritik.....	479
Arms Control Link Turns (Permutation Helpers).....	480
Permutation – Do Both (Feminist Foreign Policy).....	482
No solvency / Turns - Women at the Center Fails .....	484
Women in War Turn .....	486
Gender Binaries Turns.....	487
Gender Binaries Turns.....	489
Gender Binaries Turns.....	491
Gender Binaries Turns.....	493

Gender Binaries Turns.....	494
Gender Mainstreaming Bad – Authoritarian Cooptation .....	495
Gender Mainstreaming Bad – No Solvency .....	496
Post-Positivist Feminism Turn.....	497
Realism Good – Compatible with Feminism .....	498
Realism Good – Best for Decision Making .....	499
Realism Good – Best for Decision Making .....	500
Realism Good – Best for Decision Making .....	502
Answers to “Ontology Comes First” .....	503
No Solvency (Intersectionality) .....	505
Answers to Tickner.....	506
Responses to Securitization Kritik.....	507
No link – We are not that “Security” .....	508
No link – China Threat is Real .....	509
No link – Russia Threat is Real .....	510
No Link – Rape / Sexual Violence.....	512
Permutation – Do Both .....	513
A2: Burke / Security Cosmopolitanism (needs materialism) .....	515
A2: Burke / Security Cosmopolitanism (impact turns).....	516
A2: Burke / Security Cosmopolitanism (impact turns).....	517
A2: Burke / Security Cosmopolitanism (no solvency) .....	518
A2: Burke / Security Cosmopolitanism (no solvency) .....	520
A2: Burke / Security Cosmopolitanism (no solvency) .....	522
A2: Burke / Security Cosmopolitanism (no solvency) .....	524
A2: Burke / Security Cosmopolitanism (no solvency) .....	525
A2: Burke / Security Cosmopolitanism (ethics answers) .....	526
A2: Discourse Analysis of Security .....	527
Focusing on Securitization is Counterproductive .....	528
Focusing on Securitization is Counterproductive .....	529
A2: Ontology .....	530
A2: IR shift to “everydayness”.....	532
Realism Good – Cosmopolitanism Cannot Overcome .....	533



# Topic Overview

## **Resolved: The United States federal government should substantially reduce Direct Commercial Sales and/or Foreign Military Sales of arms from the United States.**

### **Overview of Words**

This topic is centered around a fundamental question: do arms sales promote prosperity—both in the sense of security as well economy—or do they serve as a destabilizing force across the globe? Many of the words in the topic are rather straight forward and therefore omitted from this discussion, in this section we will analyze the meanings of “substantially,” “Direct Commercial Sales”, and “Foreign Military Sales.”

#### Substantially

As one of the limiting words in the resolution, the generic nature of the word often limits its utility; however, from a quantitative perspective, the current administration has been ramping up arms sales and the literature does offer some guidance.

Substantial seems to be over 40%--at least that is how people are reacting to Trump’s arms deal with the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia. This bright line does offer some utility for (dis)advantages that largely hinge on perception. But this definition also mandates that affirmatives not isolate specific arms—regardless of their depravity—unless those arms sales make up at least 40% of total arms sales.

Qualitatively, the definitions are more vague e.g. “a large amount,” because of the subjectivity that is innate within the definition. But the benefit of this definition is that it opens the affirmatives to discussing particular arms that would otherwise be excluded by quantitative understandings of the topic. A different definition could be “without condition” this prevents the affirmative from conditioning arms sales which provides ground for conditions counterplans for the negative.

#### Direct Commercial Sales and Foreign Military Sales

FMS are government to government sales. The US DoD negotiates with the other country and there are no needs for licensing since the contract happens in house. Financial assistance is available through the Foreign Military Financing (FMF) program which provides grants and loans on a case-by-case basis.

DCS in its simplest sense refers to an US contractor selling to a foreign country, corporation, or even individuals. The US government is not directly involved in the transaction but there are some regulatory checks in place; in other words, the negotiating of the terms of the contract e.g. pay, production dates, etc., happen between the two parties, while the government regulates the sales through the approval of export licenses. With the exclusion of ten countries i.e. Israel, Egypt, Jordan, Morocco, Tunisia, Turkey, Portugal, Pakistan, Yemen, and Greece, customers are not eligible for FMF.

It’s important to note that DCS and FMS are not in competition with one another; both are utilized by the federal government to advance *American* interests. From the stabilizing effects of arms sales to the

***We’re a small non-profit. Please don’t share this file with those who have not paid including via dropbox, google drive, the web, printed copies, email, etc. Visit us at [www.wcdebate.com](http://www.wcdebate.com)***

economic benefit, policy makers, for better or worse, have utilized the American manufacturing to advance American hegemony in direct and indirect methods.

#### Direct Commercial Sales and Foreign Military Sales: Arms

A quick note: the word “arms” in the resolution is contoured by the parameters of Direct Commercial Sales (DCS) and Foreign Military Sales (FMS). The Arms Control Export Act of 1976 (ACEA) gives the President authority to control the import and/or export of “defense articles and services.” This was implemented through the International Transfer Regulation of Arms Regulations (ITAR) which defines defense articles as listed in the US Munitions List. Essentially, an item is a defense article if it can meet either of these criteria:

1. The item was designed, developed, or adapted for military application and does not have a predominant civil application
2. Can have significant military intelligence applications.

While the selling of arms is not new to the US, arms sales have increased under the Trump administration and are predicted to have steady growth. The US is already the top exporter of arms and under Trump’s first year of sales were 5.7 billion higher than Obama’s last year. Moreover, with the US sending arms to 98 countries with some of the most notable countries (in terms of sales) being Saudi Arabia, the United Kingdom, Israel, Iraq, UAE, Qatar, Taiwan, Japan, and South Korea.

What’s also interesting about the defense articles is that it would also include technical data that is necessary for the use of arms i.e. surveillance technology. This opens the debate to arguments about the surveillance state in terms of human rights but also the ecological effects of devices such as the impact of sonar upon whale populations.

Finally, there should a discussion of artificial intelligence; AI is being heavily invested in by global superpowers and there is a chance that this technology could be sold in a way that creates a terminator-esque scenario or for the negative, the chance of regional power balancing.

#### Direct Commercial Sales and Foreign Military Sales: Defense Services

This file discusses the parameters of “arms” above but what is also implied and imbedded in this debate is the contracting of “defense services”. Defense services mean to provide assistance through the expertise of people which can include training to a foreign person abroad or within the US in the manufacture, installation, repair, or operation of a defense articles. They also include the collaboration and interchanges concerning technical data.

Therefore, there is some wiggle room for the expansion of this debate from strictly arms, to the use of Americans for the training as well as the data gather that is necessary for the proper use of these arms. The literature would indicate that it is rather difficult to separate the selling of arms with the training to utilize those arms effectively; moreover, the collaboration between Americans and foreign entities is one of the ways that America utilizes arms sales for the building of relationships.

# Affirmative Strategies

Since 2002 the US has sold more than \$197 billion of major conventional weapons to 167 countries and Trump is making arms deals at a record pace. Since 2002 the US has repeatedly sold weapons to nations in deadly conflicts, who admonish human rights, and on multiple occasions, US soldiers have fought opponents who were armed with American weapons. Considering the scope of this topic, this section is meant to serve as survey of the major affirmative cases organized by prominent countries as well as salient weapons.

Regardless of the type of affirmative you pursue, you must be able to answer a fundamental question: why are *arm sales* key to the solvency of the affirmative? The resolution doesn't mandate a decrease in the American military budget, nor does it require a withdrawal of forces so many of the kritikal arguments would require a robust understanding of the spillover effect of the affirmative.

## Specific Plans: Country

Israel: For more than half a century the US has backed Israel in Middle East against much of the Arab world. The rise of Israel has coincided with the containment of Iran and the stealing of land from and the genocide of Palestine. More recently, Israel has stepped up its efforts towards limited access to clean water as well as trade into Palestine. Arguments about access to water definitely lends itself to affirmatives based with arguments stemming either from Settler Colonialism as well as human rights. These types of affirmatives also leave open the possibility of deescalating tensions within Iran and resolve hostile relations within the two countries. The Human Rights Watch has documented on multiple occasions the Israeli use of white phosphorus shells over densely populated areas of Gaza. To be clear, this use of chemical warfare is a war crime that the Israeli state initially denied until they were faced with mounting evidence.

Saudi Arabia: One cannot discuss US arms sales to Saudi Arabia without discussing the role that Saudi Arabia plays in the civil war in Yemen. In essence, the Yemeni civil war is a proxy war between two regional hegemonies; the Sunni state of Saudi Arabia and the Shia state of Iran. In addition to destruction of the country's critical infrastructure, the Human Rights Watch has categorized the Yemeni famine as the worst famine in the century with 15 million people being food insecure. While the majority of the international community has criticized Saudi Arabia's role in the Yemen civil war for indiscriminate bombing of civilian areas and have since decreased arm sales to the kingdom, America has signed onto a deal to increase arm sales to the country. Moreover, since America supplies 60% of Saudi Arabian arms, it is clear that America plays a pivotal role in the conflict in Yemen. As a result, arguments ranging from the refugee crisis, to ideological claims about supporting democracies are all fair game in these debates.

South Korea: US arms sales to South Korea have been pivotal in its containment strategy of China as well as North Korea. Most recently, the State Department approved two possible arms deals worth a combined \$2.6 billion. The majority of which, \$2.1 billion, is for 6 P-8A Patrol Aircraft and related equipment. The other lesser half is for 64 Patriot Advanced Capability-3 missiles for the Patriot missile defense system. Therefore, many of the arguments from the affirmative would stem from a demilitarization of Southeast Asia and perhaps the rise of actors that are currently not the ally of the US.

***We're a small non-profit. Please don't share this file with those who have not paid including via dropbox, google drive, the web, printed copies, email, etc. Visit us at [www.wcdebate.com](http://www.wcdebate.com)***

Immediate war scenarios would be the Senkaku-Diaoyu Island disputes as well as on the Korean peninsula.

#### Impact Areas:

**Militarism:** The military industrial complex can be understood as the integration of military into the economy as the (sole) means of economic growth. Understanding a vast portion of the literature in favor of arms sales assumes that the growth of foreign powers is only beneficial insofar as it benefits American Hegemony. From reliance upon American Firms such as Boeing and Lockheed Martin as American jobs providers, towards the hinging of trade upon arms sales, this topic is beginning for a discussion of ethical governance in age of globalization. Moreover, FMS and DCS are the literal embodiment of corporations working with the government in order to maximize profits.

**Hegemony:** Discussions of hegemony will most likely be a focal point of the debate. DCS and FMS sales have been utilized for offshore balancing and a flexible foreign policy. Therefore, affirmatives must be prepared to defend at the very least, isolationism, if not a case that was against American hegemony.

**Colonialism:** The innovation of arms sales requires its testing and maintenance of weapons. From sound pollution to leaking of radioactive waste, the use of arms would further the colonial project. Moreover, the arming of states has primarily been done to directly improve relations with countries to further US influence over particular states but also to contain countries that are viewed as irrational. Finally, with the Trump administration considering the selling of nuclear technology to Saudi Arabia opens a debate about nuclear colonialism as well.

**Terrorism:** The Carnegie Endowment for International Peace has catalogued the history of US arms sales to Saudi Arabia and the UAE. Both countries have violated the rules prohibiting the transfer of US arms to third parties; specifically, al-Qaeda. The arming of groups to further individual state interests would lend itself to debate about nonstate actors, the rise of terrorism abroad, and general debates about security. Let alone the theft of arms from foreign groups—such as ISIS's theft of American arms.

**International Credibility:** Anti-American sentiment has been linked to the US propping up regimes through arms sales. For instance, the arming of Saudi Arabia despite international outcry, has tanked the perception of the US. Moreover, Russia and China have both critiqued the US use of arms sales as a method to conduct surveillance of countries—specifically, THAAD's deployment in South Korea.

**Environment:** Arms sales within the context of FMS and DCS could include surveillance tech that we sell to other countries. This opens the affirmative to discussing the negative impacts involved in sonar and other sound-based surveillance tech that destroys marine and ecosystems. This provides the link to general cases about anthropocentrism as well as environmental managerialism.

# Aff General Military Aid/Arms Sales

## Military aid creates ISIS and terrorism

### **US military aid to regimes like Iraq and Afghanistan in the war on terror helping to create aggression in the region and new terrorist groups**

A. Trevor **Thrall**, A senior fellow for the Cato Institute's Defense and Foreign Policy Department. Thrall is an associate professor at George Mason University's Schar School of Policy and Government., Erik **Goepner**, An adjunct scholar in the Cato Institute's Defense and Foreign Policy Department. A retired colonel from the U.S. Air Force, his military assignments included unit commands in Afghanistan, Iraq, and the Pacific region. June 26, 2017

"Step Back Lessons for U.S. Foreign Policy from the Failed War on Terror", *Policy Analysis – Cato Institute*, <https://object.cato.org/sites/cato.org/files/pubs/pdf/pa-814.pdf> (date accessed: 7/19/18)

In the wake of the terrorist attacks of September 11, 2001, the United States launched an international war on terrorism defined by military intervention, nation building, and efforts to reshape the politics of the Middle East. As of 2017, however, it has become clear that the American strategy has not delivered the intended results. After 15 years of considerable strategic consistency during the presidencies of George Bush and Barack Obama, Donald Trump now takes the reins, having made a more aggressive approach to ISIS a central plank first of his campaign and, potentially, of his presidency. Noting that America faces a "far greater threat than the people of our country understand," he has vowed to "bomb the sh— out of ISIS"<sup>1</sup> and promised to defeat "Radical Islamic Terrorism, just as we have defeated every threat we have faced in every age before."<sup>2</sup> At the same time, however, Trump has also broken sharply from Republican orthodoxy on Iraq and Afghanistan. He refers to "our current strategy of nation-building" as a "proven failure." Additionally, he has downplayed the role of democracy promotion, suggesting, for example, that the Obama administration "should never have attempted to build a democracy in Libya."<sup>3</sup> Whatever President Trump decides to do, a dispassionate evaluation of the War on Terror to date should inform his policies. In this policy analysis, we argue that the War on Terror has been a failure. This failure has two fundamental—and related—sources. The first is the inflated assessment of the terrorist threat facing the United States, which led to an expansive counterterrorism campaign focused on a series of actions that have very little to do with protecting Americans from terrorist attacks. The second source of failure is the adoption of an aggressive strategy of military intervention. This is due in large part to the faulty assessment of the terrorism challenge. But it also stems from the widespread belief among Washington, D.C., elites in the indispensable nature of American power and the utility of military force in international politics. Together, these factors have produced an American strategy that is both ineffective and counterproductive. The inescapable conclusion of our analysis is that the staggering costs of the War on Terror have far outweighed the benefits. A recent study by Neta Crawford at Brown University puts the cost of the War on Terror (both money spent to date and required for future veterans' benefits) at roughly \$5 trillion—a truly astonishing number.<sup>4</sup> Even if one believes American efforts have made the nation marginally safer, the United States could have achieved far greater improvements in safety and security at far less cost through other means. It is not hyperbole to say that the United States could have spent its money on almost any federal program aimed at saving lives and produced a vastly greater return on investment.<sup>5</sup> A careful reading of the lessons from the past 15 years indicates that the United States should abandon the existing strategy in the Middle East for three reasons. First, military intervention and nation building efforts, even at current "light footprint" levels, cause more problems than they solve, including spawning more anti American sentiment and creating, rather than diminishing, the conditions that lead to terrorism.<sup>6</sup> Second, in contrast to the dire picture painted by many observers, including President Trump, the terrorism threat is too small to justify either the existing strategy or more military intervention. Finally, given the first two arguments, the costs of a forward-deployed strategy to fight terrorism are simply too high.<sup>7</sup> Our analysis proceeds in four parts. In the first section we review the main objectives of the War on Terror and the key components of U.S. strategy designed to achieve them.<sup>8</sup> In section two we document the failure of U.S. policies to achieve the goals articulated by both Presidents Bush and Obama. In section three we explain why War on Terror policies may have yielded the results they did, producing a set of important lessons learned to inform future policy. We conclude by arguing that the United States should ramp down its War on Terror, and we outline the principles of a "step back" strategy regarding ISIS and Islamistspired terrorism.

***We're a small non-profit. Please don't share this file with those who have not paid including via dropbox, google drive, the web, printed copies, email, etc. Visit us at [www.wcdebate.com](http://www.wcdebate.com)***

## US “conflict resolution” in the middle east helped to start ISIS

Seumas **Milne**, Seumas Milne is Labour's director of strategy and communications. He is a former Guardian columnist and associate editor, Wed 3 Jun 2015,

“Now the truth emerges: how the US fuelled the rise of Isis in Syria and Iraq”, *The Guardian*, <https://www.theguardian.com/commentisfree/2015/jun/03/us-isis-syria-iraq> (date accessed: 7/19/18)

A revealing light on how we got here has now been shone by a recently declassified secret US intelligence report, written in August 2012, which uncannily predicts – and effectively welcomes – the prospect of a “Salafist principality” in eastern Syria and an al-Qaida-controlled Islamic state in Syria and Iraq. In stark contrast to western claims at the time, the Defense Intelligence Agency document identifies al-Qaida in Iraq (which became Isis) and fellow Salafists as the “major forces driving the insurgency in Syria” – and states that “western countries, the Gulf states and Turkey” were supporting the opposition’s efforts to take control of eastern Syria. Raising the “possibility of establishing a declared or undeclared Salafist principality”, the Pentagon report goes on, “this is exactly what the supporting powers to the opposition want, in order to isolate the Syrian regime, which is considered the strategic depth of the Shia expansion (Iraq and Iran)”. American forces bomb one set of rebels while backing another in Syria Which is pretty well exactly what happened two years later. The report isn’t a policy document. It’s heavily redacted and there are ambiguities in the language. But the implications are clear enough. A year into the Syrian rebellion, the US and its allies weren’t only supporting and arming an opposition they knew to be dominated by extreme sectarian groups; they were prepared to countenance the creation of some sort of “Islamic state” – despite the “grave danger” to Iraq’s unity – as a Sunni buffer to weaken Syria. That doesn’t mean the US created Isis, of course, though some of its Gulf allies certainly played a role in it – as the US vice-president, Joe Biden, acknowledged last year. But there was no al-Qaida in Iraq until the US and Britain invaded. And the US has certainly exploited the existence of Isis against other forces in the region as part of a wider drive to maintain western control. The calculus changed when Isis started beheading westerners and posting atrocities online, and the Gulf states are now backing other groups in the Syrian war, such as the Nusra Front. But this US and western habit of playing with jihadi groups, which then come back to bite them, goes back at least to the 1980s war against the Soviet Union in Afghanistan, which fostered the original al-Qaida under CIA tutelage. It was recalibrated during the occupation of Iraq, when US forces led by General Petraeus sponsored an El Salvador-style dirty war of sectarian death squads to weaken the Iraqi resistance. And it was reprised in 2011 in the Nato-orchestrated war in Libya, where Isis last week took control of Gaddafi’s home town of Sirte. In reality, US and western policy in the conflagration that is now the Middle East is in the classic mould of imperial divide-and-rule. American forces bomb one set of rebels while backing another in Syria, and mount what are effectively joint military operations with Iran against Isis in Iraq while supporting Saudi Arabia’s military campaign against Iranian-backed Houthi forces in Yemen. However confused US policy may often be, a weak, partitioned Iraq and Syria fit such an approach perfectly. What’s clear is that Isis and its monstrosities won’t be defeated by the same powers that brought it to Iraq and Syria in the first place, or whose open and covert war-making has fostered it in the years since. Endless western military interventions in the Middle East have brought only destruction and division. It’s the people of the region who can cure this disease – not those who incubated the virus.

## **Continued support for regimes like Iraq and Afghanistan will create stronger terrorist groups, like ISIS, and create ongoing violence**

A. Trevor **Thrall**, A senior fellow for the Cato Institute's Defense and Foreign Policy Department. Thrall is an associate professor at George Mason University's Schar School of Policy and Government., Erik **Goepner**, An adjunct scholar in the Cato Institute's Defense and Foreign Policy Department. A retired colonel from the U.S. Air Force, his military assignments included unit commands in Afghanistan, Iraq, and the Pacific region. June 26, 2017

"Step Back Lessons for U.S. Foreign Policy from the Failed War on Terror", *Policy Analysis – Cato Institute*, <https://object.cato.org/sites/cato.org/files/pubs/pdf/pa-814.pdf> (date accessed: 7/19/18)

Indirect military intervention, on the other hand, involves providing various kinds of support (intelligence, military equipment, advising, money, and training) to facilitate the use of military force by a third party. The effort to arm and train Syrian rebel groups to fight the Islamic State is one example of indirect military intervention. U.S. intelligence, arms sales, and logistical support for the Saudi intervention in Yemen is another. Both forms of military intervention, in turn, are distinct from the wide variety of 4 "The central purposes of American military intervention have been to kill terrorists, destroy their organizations, and eliminate their ability to conduct terrorist operations, and served as a deterrent against future terrorism and as a critical tool to prop up weak governments." nonmilitary tools available to the United States. Those tools can be noninterventionist, as in the case of economic sanctions, diplomacy and negotiations, and freezing terrorist groups' financial assets. Others, however, such as nation building and democracy promotion, are certainly forms of intervention in the sense that they either require American military involvement (such as in Afghanistan and Iraq) or they feature a steady dose of American political pressure and financial assistance aimed at shaping outcomes in another nation. Although it has taken several forms, the central purposes of American military intervention—direct and indirect—have remained consistent since 2001. First and most simply, of course, the goal of military intervention has been to kill terrorists, destroy their organizations, and eliminate their ability to conduct terrorist operations. A critical foundation of this strategy was the belief that the United States could no longer wait until the threat was fully formed. Instead, the United States needed to begin preemptively striking with military force. Beginning with the 2002 National Security Strategy, the Bush administration put forth a doctrine of preventive action against terror threats, even if those threats were not yet imminent.<sup>13</sup> As Bob Woodward reported, "Many in the Bush administration felt President Clinton's prior responses to terror attacks had been weak and inadvertently emboldened terrorists. There would, therefore, be no Clintonian 'reflexive pullback' this time."<sup>14</sup> Instead, the Bush administration set the United States on an offensive path, seeking to destroy and defeat terror groups overseas so, as President Bush said, "we do not have to face them in the United States."<sup>15</sup> Second, U.S. officials have viewed the use of military force as a deterrent against future terrorism. Beyond the effort to destroy al Qaeda, the invasion of Afghanistan also served as punishment for the Taliban for harboring the terrorist group and a warning to other state sponsors of terrorism. Similarly, despite the fact that Iraq was not an al Qaeda sponsor, the Bush administration clearly viewed the invasion of Iraq as an important opportunity to show resolve in the "central front in the war on terror."<sup>16</sup> Third, officials have viewed military intervention as a critical tool to prop up weak governments and to prevent terrorist groups from taking territory and staking out safe harbors in weak states. The United States and its European allies have sought to help the newly formed National Unity Government in Libya by conducting air strikes against ISIS, for example. And in Yemen, the United States has conducted drone strikes against al Qaeda in the Arabian Peninsula since 2010 but more recently has provided military and intelligence assistance to Saudi Arabia as it intervenes in support of the embattled Yemeni government.<sup>17</sup> It is important to note that the election of Barack Obama provoked little change at the strategic level. In addition to the continued fight against the Taliban and other jihadist groups in Afghanistan and the major efforts against ISIS in Syria and Iraq, the United States under Obama conducted drone strikes, air strikes, and Special Forces operations in Pakistan, Syria, Libya, Somalia, and Yemen.<sup>18</sup> It is true that Obama pulled U.S. troops out of Iraq, a move that would later be criticized for spurring the rise of ISIS. But this was not inconsistent with the Bush approach. In the Status of Forces agreement that he signed with Iraq in 2008, Bush committed to withdraw all U.S. troops by 2011.

***We're a small non-profit. Please don't share this file with those who have not paid including via dropbox, google drive, the web, printed copies, email, etc. Visit us at [www.wcdebate.com](http://www.wcdebate.com)***

## Aid supports authoritarianism

### **Military aid allows authoritarian leaders to label dissidents as “terrorists” to attract international support and maintain power**

Tobias **Hagmann**, professor of international development at Roskilde University, and Filip **Reyntjens**,

**2016**. “Aid and Authoritarianism in Africa.” Africa Now.

<https://repository.uantwerpen.be/docman/irua/63000f/131944.pdf> (accessed 12/7/18)

**Rwanda, Uganda and Ethiopia have all been major recipients of military assistance and training programmes. Yet, Rwandan society is becoming increasingly militarized** (Reyntjens, 2011; Beswick, 2014), **Ethiopia has suppressed opposition parties and journalists by branding them ‘terrorists’** (Human Rights Watch, 2010), while Museveni has linked the Lord’s Resistance Army to the war on terror and al-Qaeda in order to attract foreign assistance (Fisher, 2012). **Other countries, like Mauritania and Guinea, have arrested alleged ‘Islamists’, ‘warlords’, and other transnational ‘subversive threats’ in an effort to frame their domestic and foreign policies in ways that resonate with international discourses and thereby obtain either more support from Western states or lower their democratization pressure (or both) (Jourde, 2007: 481).** In **Kenya, the Anti-Terrorism Police Unit, established with US assistance in 2003, has been** accused of **targeting Muslims, especially ethnic Somalis, and for using extreme tactics** (Howell & Lind, 2009; Patinkin, 2014). Operation Usalama Watch, launched in April 2014 as part of **Kenya’s counter-terrorism strategy, has been found to target Somalis in the name of national security, and widespread police abuse, arbitrary arrests, forced encampment, as well as the deportation of nearly 400 people to Somalia have been documented** (Amnesty International, 2010).

### **Aid supports authoritarian regimes by supplying political legitimacy**

David **Wickstrom** professor at Lunds Universitet, 23 May **2006**. “How Foreign Aid Hinders Democracy: A Multivariate Analysis in Development Studies.” Lund University.

<http://lup.lub.lu.se/luur/download?func=downloadFile&recordId=1326057&fileId=1326058> (accessed 12/7/18)

Whether it is humanitarian, developmental, or **military aid**, the mere presence of foreign aid **often supports authoritarian regimes or makes democratic reform less essential. The first** type of **hindrance** caused by foreign aid **for democratization is the political legitimacy it supplies. During the Cold War** foreign aid regime, authoritarian governments **were often propped up by** bilateral donors (mainly **the United States** and Soviet Union) **for political and security motives**. Friendly regimes, be they democratic or not, were supplied copious amounts of aid in order to maintain their regime domestically and secure their loyalty to the donor. **This type of patrimonial aid was an obstacle to democratic development in many countries** (Brown, 2005). In the contemporary foreign aid regime, this practice has become less common with the end of the Cold War. Nevertheless, foreign aid continues to be used as a foreign policy tool.

## **In Colombia, increased military aid led to less political participation and undermined the government's monopoly on force**

Oeindrila **Dube**, Professor of Global Conflict Studies at the University of Chicago, **and** Suresh **Naidu**. January **2010**. "Bases, Bullets, and Ballots: The Effect of U.S. Military Aid on Political Conflict in Colombia." Center for Global Development. <http://citeseerx.ist.psu.edu/viewdoc/download?doi=10.1.1.622.2394&rep=rep1&type=pdf> (accessed 12/1/18)

Turning to the implications for Colombian politics, we first document that there are more paramilitary homicides during election periods when U.S. military aid is high in base regions, **and** that this aid shock leads to differential paramilitary assassinations of politicians and community leaders in election periods relative to non-election periods. As before, we find no corresponding increase in guerilla political assassinations. We also find that voter turnout falls more in base municipalities when U.S. military assistance rises, which we interpret as a consequence of increased paramilitary capacity to intimidate voters and reduce electoral participation. Consistent with this interpretation, the fall in turnout is larger in base municipalities that were previously contested either militarily or electorally, which are the regions where armed actors benefit the most from having an allied elected official, or where the return from intimidating voters is greatest for achieving political control. Though we focus on Colombia, our results speak to broad questions in political development and international assistance. Military aid is sometimes proposed as a cure for the weak state, as it is presumed to enhance the government's repressive capacity, and facilitate its ability to secure a "monopoly on the legitimate use of violence." Yet our results suggest that, in environments such as Colombia, where there is collusion between the military and illegal armed groups, international military assistance can strengthen armed non-state actors, who rival the government over the use of violence. Our findings also document a channel through which foreign military aid can undermine formal democratic institutions, namely, by equipping organizations that use violence to manipulate elections.

## **Military aid solidifies dictators and hurts ordinary citizens**

Christopher J. **Coyne**, professor of Economics at West Virginia University, **and** Matt E. **Ryan**, October **2008**. "With Friends Like These, Who Needs Enemies? Aiding the World's Worst Dictators." <http://citeseerx.ist.psu.edu/viewdoc/download?doi=10.1.1.483.3127&rep=rep1&type=pdf> (accessed 12/4/18)

There is little evidence that this aid does good and clear indications that it can do real harm. Despite this, the governments of developed countries continue to provide aid to the worst of the worst. If the goal of developed countries is to foster liberal economic, political, and social institutions abroad, they should cease providing aid to the world's worst dictators. Development 24 assistance and military aid solidifies dictators in their position of power and contributes to conflict through the politicization of daily life. The associated costs fall mainly on the ordinary citizens living in these countries.

## Aid legitimizes authoritarian regimes and damages democratization

David **Wickstrom** professor at Lunds Universitet, 23 May **2006**. “How Foreign Aid Hinders Democracy: A Multivariate Analysis in Development Studies.” Lund University.  
<http://lup.lub.lu.se/luur/download?func=downloadFile&recordId=1326057&fileId=1326058> (accessed 12/7/18)

Throughout the four foreign aid regimes presented in this paper, **foreign aid has hindered democratization across the developing world.** The contemporary regime has seen greater emphasis on democracy-oriented aid and political conditionality. **Donor-recipient relations continue to be characterized by their inequality.** Whether directly or indirectly, bilateral and multilateral **aid programs help authoritarian regimes gain and consolidate power. Foreign aid provides autocratic elites with international legitimacy and can discourage opposition by its mere presence. Corrupt governments are able to use aid flows to subsidize extensive political patronage systems in order to gain and consolidate power. Political conditionality and donor designed economic reforms can create instability, which is detrimental to fledgling democracies.** Finally, donor interests may compromise peaceful democratic progress and restrict beneficial, domestic political and economic reform. As this paper has presented, these effects are not uncommon and have been especially damaging to a number of democratic experiments in Sub-Saharan Africa, Latin America and Asia.

## Stopping aid will successfully lead to change – Pakistan proves

Aqil **Shah**, Postdoctoral Fellow at the Society of Fellows at Harvard University, May / June **2011**. “Getting the Military Out of Pakistani Politics.” Foreign Affairs.  
[https://www.jstor.org/stable/23039409?seq=1#metadata\\_info\\_tab\\_contents](https://www.jstor.org/stable/23039409?seq=1#metadata_info_tab_contents) (accessed 12/9/18)

But **by continuing to treat the Pakistani military as a state above the state, the United States only reinforces the military’s exaggerated sense of indispensability and further weakens civilian rule. If the United States had stood its ground, the Pakistani military would have eventually backed down. It is dependent on the United States for military aid and high-tech armaments,** including upgrading its aging fleet of f-16 fighters. And although the military has leverage over Washington since it controls U.S. supply routes into landlocked Afghanistan, its bargaining position has weakened over time. **Although Washington generally remains reluctant to pressure the Pakistani military, appropriately using sticks has not necessarily meant losing the generals’ cooperation in fighting terrorism.** For example, **the U.S. Congress warned that it would cut off U.S. aid in response to Pakistan’s detention of a cia contractor,** Raymond **Davis**, who was arrested in January for fatally shooting two Pakistanis in the eastern city of Lahore. **In the end, Davis was released from jail** in March—the families of the victims agreed to pardon him after receiving compensation. His release would not have been possible without military complicity.

## **Military aid can prolong conflict and is diverted from intended goals**

ANDREAS **KRIEG**, political risk analyst at King's College London, **2016**. "Externalizing the burden of war: the Obama Doctrine and US foreign policy in the Middle East." International Affairs.  
[https://www.chathamhouse.org/sites/default/files/publications/ia/INTA92\\_1\\_05\\_Krieg.pdf](https://www.chathamhouse.org/sites/default/files/publications/ia/INTA92_1_05_Krieg.pdf) (accessed 12/9/18)

Third, surrogates bear the risk of prolonging the conflict by either escalating the situation or merely tipping the balance of power in the wrong direction.<sup>83</sup> **Money**, commodities and arms **provided by the patron, particularly to non-state surrogates, might be diverted into the hands of individual strongmen, tribal, rebel or ideological leaders attempting to strengthen their personal standing** vis-à-vis partners and competitors. Widespread corruption fuels war economies, where the primary interests of key local actors might not be a swift solution of the conflict but power and control over resources. For example, US lethal and non-lethal aid to the Syrian National Council and FSA has been diverted to build institutional patrimonies rather than translated into operational effectiveness on the ground.<sup>84</sup> Much of the US military aid provided to Egypt or Yemen has been used by regimes to bolster authoritarian control by paying off key protégés in the military, with little actually spent on enhancing capability.<sup>85</sup> Hence, by escalating existing conflicts or indirectly fueling underlying causes of conflict, support for surrogates can bring the risk of the United States having to get involved militarily itself to stop a conflict that an unsuccessful policy of surrogate warfare has exacerbated. The US policy of backing the regime in Baghdad in its fight against ISIS and Sunni insurgency meant that Iranian-backed militias have de facto become indirect tacit surrogates of Obama's Iraq policy. Not only have these surrogates exacerbated the conflict on the ground, they have caused the US to gradually augment its troop presence in Iraq—thereby causing the patron to get sucked back into the war.<sup>86</sup>

## Aid supports the military industrial complex

### **Military aid fuels the military industrial complex**

Medea **Benjamin**, co-founder of CODEPINK: Women for Peace, **and** Nicolas J.S. **Davies**, September 26, **2018**. “In Yemen and Beyond, U.S. Arms Manufacturers Are Abetting Crimes against Humanity.” Foreign Policy in Focus. <https://fpif.org/in-yemen-and-beyond-u-s-arms-manufacturers-are-abetting-crimes-against-humanity/> (accessed 12/7/18)

Pope Francis has publicly blamed the “industry of death” for fueling a “piecemeal World War III.” **The U.S. military-industrial complex wields precisely the “unwarranted influence” over U.S. foreign policy that President Eisenhower warned Americans against in his farewell address in 1961. The U.S. wars on Afghanistan and Iraq and the “global war on terror” served as cover for a huge increase in U.S. military spending. Between 1998 and 2010, the U.S. spent \$1.3 trillion on its wars, but even more, \$1.8 trillion, to buy new warplanes, warships, and weapons, most of which were unrelated to the wars it was fighting. Five U.S. companies — Raytheon, Northrop Grumman, Lockheed Martin, Boeing, and General Dynamics — dominate the global arms business, raking in \$140 billion in weapons sales in 2017, and export sales make up a growing share of their business, about \$35 billion in 2017. In a new report for Code Pink and the Divest from the War Machine campaign, we have documented how Saudi Arabia, Israel, and Egypt have systematically used weapons produced by these five U.S. companies to massacre civilians, destroy civilian infrastructure, and commit other war crimes. The bombing of the school bus was only the latest in a consistent pattern of Saudi massacres and air strikes on civilian targets, from hospitals to marketplaces, and U.S. arms sales to Israel and Egypt follow a similar pattern.**

### **Military assistance draws away from other, better investments**

Andrew **Miller**, scholar for Carnegie’s Middle East Program, **and** Richard **Sokolsky**, February 27, **2018**. “What Has \$49 Billion in Foreign Military Aid Bought Us? Not Much.” Carnegie Endowment for International Peace. <https://carnegieendowment.org/2018/02/27/what-has-49-billion-in-foreign-military-aid-bought-us-not-much-pub-75657> (accessed 12/7/18)

Under existing conditions, **U.S. interests and taxpayers are not the primary beneficiaries of military assistance and arms sales. Instead, it is U.S. defense contractors and regional militaries that often prioritize domestic political influence over operational capabilities. In recent years, the U.S. arms industry has registered record profits, a pattern likely to continue given President Trump’s initiative to expedite government approval of weapons sales.** Indeed, the State Department cleared a record number of arms sales in Fiscal Year 2017 (\$75.9 billion). **While champions of the U.S. arms industry defend it as an engine of job growth, economists have found that investments in other industries are more efficient job generators.**

## **Competing for resources by providing military aid supports crony capitalism and risks war**

Michael T. **Klare**, professor of peace and world security studies at Hampshire College, May 1, **2008**. "The New Geopolitics of Energy." The Nation.

[http://www.jmhinternational.com/news/news/selectednews/files/2008/05/20080501\\_Nation\\_%20TheNewGeopoliticsOfEnergy.pdf](http://www.jmhinternational.com/news/news/selectednews/files/2008/05/20080501_Nation_%20TheNewGeopoliticsOfEnergy.pdf) (accessed 12/9/18)

This risk is made all the greater because **intensified production of oil, natural gas, uranium and minerals is itself a source of instability, acting as a magnet for arms deliveries and outside intervention. The nations involved are largely poor, so whoever controls the resources controls the one sure source of abundant wealth. This is an invitation for the monopolization of power by greedy elites who use control over military and police to suppress rivals. The result, more often than not, is a wealthy strata of crony capitalists kept in power by brutal security forces and surrounded by disaffected and impoverished masses, often belonging to a different ethnic group--a recipe for unrest and insurgency.** This is the situation today in the Niger Delta region of Nigeria, in Darfur and southern Sudan, in the uranium-producing areas of Niger, in Zimbabwe, in the Cabinda province of Angola (where most of that country's oil lies) and in numerous other areas suffering from what's been called the "resource curse." **The danger, of course, is that the great powers will be sucked into these internal conflicts.** This is not a far-fetched scenario; the United States, Russia and China are already providing arms and military-support services to factions in many of these disputes. The United States is arming government forces in Nigeria and Angola, China is aiding government forces in Sudan and Zimbabwe, and so on. An even more dangerous situation prevails in Georgia, where the United States is backing the pro-Western government of President Mikhail Saakashvili with arms and military support while Russia is backing the breakaway regions of Abkhazia and South Ossetia. Georgia plays an important strategic role for both countries because it harbors the Baku-Tbilisi-Ceyhan (BTC) pipeline, a US-backed conduit carrying Caspian Sea oil to markets in the West. There are US and Russian military in both areas, in some cases within visual range of each other. **It is not difficult, therefore, to conjure up scenarios in which a future blow-up between Georgian and separatist forces could lead, willy-nilly, to a clash between American and Russian soldiers, sparking a much greater crisis. It is essential that America reverse the militarization of its dependence on imported energy and ease geopolitical competition with China and Russia over control of foreign resources. Because this would require greater investment in energy alternatives, it would also lead to an improved energy economy at home (with lower prices in the long run) and a better chance at overcoming global warming.**

## Militarism hurts economic development – Pakistan proves

Aqil **Shah**, Postdoctoral Fellow at the Society of Fellows at Harvard University, May / June **2011**. “Getting the Military Out of Pakistani Politics.” Foreign Affairs.

[https://www.jstor.org/stable/23039409?seq=1#metadata\\_info\\_tab\\_contents](https://www.jstor.org/stable/23039409?seq=1#metadata_info_tab_contents) (accessed 12/9/18)

Still, **Pakistan’s civilian government must stabilize the economy to bolster public confidence in democratic institutions. It must invest in Pakistan’s long-term economic development and create opportunities for the country’s rapidly growing population.** It may even need a long-term, multibillion-dollar Marshall Plan to help build civilian institutional capacity, rebuild areas hit by last year’s floods, invest in public-sector and infrastructure projects, and plug the energy shortages that have all but crippled the manufacturing sector, especially its top-exporting textile industry. Of course, such a plan should come with proper controls to fight corruption and waste. It is worth noting that **Pakistan’s economic difficulties are the result not just of bad luck and poor management, and therefore they cannot be fixed with development aid alone. They are rooted in fundamental structural problems as well: military expenditures dwarf spending on development. Pakistan has one of the world’s largest out-of-school populations, yet it spends seven times as much on the military every year as on education, an investment with a higher national security payoff in the long run.**

## Money spent on the military does environmental damage

Brett **Clark**, assistant professor in the Department of Sociology and Anthropology at North Carolina State University, Andrew K. Jorgenson, and Jeffrey Kentor, Summer **2010**. “Militarization and Energy Consumption.” International Journal of Sociology.

[https://www.researchgate.net/profile/Andrew\\_Jorgenson2/publication/250173698\\_Militarization\\_and\\_Energy\\_Consumption\\_A\\_Test\\_of\\_Treadmill\\_of\\_Destruction\\_Theory\\_in\\_Comparative\\_Perspective/links/541894fb0cf2218008bf4105.pdf](https://www.researchgate.net/profile/Andrew_Jorgenson2/publication/250173698_Militarization_and_Energy_Consumption_A_Test_of_Treadmill_of_Destruction_Theory_in_Comparative_Perspective/links/541894fb0cf2218008bf4105.pdf) (accessed 12/9/18)

This research evaluates structural relationships between national militaries and energy consumption. We extend the treadmill of destruction theory beyond its domestic conception to the international comparative level, following the logic of the theory that military expansion generates environmental degradation independent of economic factors. **The results of cross-national panel analyses reveal that high-tech militarization in the form of military expenditures per soldier increases the scale of energy consumption.** Additionally, **total energy consumption is positively associated with the relative size of military troops. The expansion and development of high-tech equipment and vehicles has increased the energy demands of the military, as enormous quantities of fossil fuels are required to operate the planes, ships, tanks, helicopters, and vehicles of the armed forces.** This equipment allows militaries to travel around the world much faster. It also helps connect the expansive web of military bases within nations and around the globe. In regard to soldiers, they must be trained, housed, fed, and clothed. Overall, **militarization expands energy consumption, given the resources that are needed to sustain and support its infrastructure, equipment, soldiers, and support personnel.**

## Militarization damages the environment

Brett **Clark**, assistant professor in the Department of Sociology and Anthropology at North Carolina State University, Andrew K. Jorgenson, and Jeffrey Kentor, Summer **2010**. "Militarization and Energy Consumption." International Journal of Sociology.

[https://www.researchgate.net/profile/Andrew\\_Jorgenson2/publication/250173698\\_Militarization\\_and\\_Energy\\_Consumption\\_A\\_Test\\_of\\_Treadmill\\_of\\_Destruction\\_Theory\\_in\\_Comparative\\_Perspective/links/541894fb0cf2218008bf4105.pdf](https://www.researchgate.net/profile/Andrew_Jorgenson2/publication/250173698_Militarization_and_Energy_Consumption_A_Test_of_Treadmill_of_Destruction_Theory_in_Comparative_Perspective/links/541894fb0cf2218008bf4105.pdf) (accessed 12/9/18)

The environmental impacts of militaries are not simply a matter of high-tech equipment. Militaries also involve troops and support personnel, who must be fed, housed, armed, trained, clothed in specialized uniforms, and transported around the world. Thus, **in order to support military operations an extensive network of industrial production is necessary to maintain soldiers on every front, requiring extensive supplies of raw materials. The military must stockpile a ready supply of munitions, spare parts, fossil fuels, and other ancillary equipment to sustain its operations.** Overall, **the military infrastructure influences the scale and intensity of its energy usage, which entails numerous environmental demands.** The treadmill of destruction perspective provides an avenue for understanding the relationship between the military and environment, especially in regard to energy consumption. **Geopolitical competition often drives arms races** (which includes the sale of arms) as well as concomitant technological advances, infrastructural development, and growth in troop size (Hooks and Smith 2005). **For developed nations, the environmentally damaging capabilities of militarization** are often partly a function of technological developments of weaponry and other machinery as well as the specialized training of soldiers and support personnel, all of which **involve the use of nonrenewable energy.**

## Aid does not support US interests

### **Military aid is often inimical to US interests**

Andrew **Miller**, scholar for Carnegie's Middle East Program, **and** Richard **Sokolsky**, February 27, **2018**.

"What Has \$49 Billion in Foreign Military Aid Bought Us? Not Much." Carnegie Endowment for International Peace. <https://carnegieendowment.org/2018/02/27/what-has-49-billion-in-foreign-military-aid-bought-us-not-much-pub-75657> (accessed 12/7/18)

But access should not be confused with influence—and "relationship maintenance" should not be treated as an end in itself. Washington has become so fixated on doling out billions of dollars for this purpose that it often forgets what this assistance is for in the first place: securing U.S. interests. More often than not, our allies and client states take the money and use their weapons in pursuit of policies inimical to U.S. interests or kvetch about American unreliability. Saudi Arabia, which has used American-supplied weapons to visit ruin on Yemen and strengthen Jihadist groups there, is a poster child for this phenomenon. So, too, is the UAE, which is an accomplice in Riyadh's immoral and strategically disastrous campaign in Yemen and used American-supplied weapons in Libya in support of a renegade general.

### **Military aid is a form of surrogate warfare**

ANDREAS **KRIEG**, political risk analyst at King's College London, **2016**. "Externalizing the burden of war: the Obama Doctrine and US foreign policy in the Middle East." International Affairs.

[https://www.chathamhouse.org/sites/default/files/publications/ia/INTA92\\_1\\_05\\_Krieg.pdf](https://www.chathamhouse.org/sites/default/files/publications/ia/INTA92_1_05_Krieg.pdf) (accessed 12/9/18)

A more direct form of surrogate warfare has been the US military assistance delivered to Arab allies in the Middle East, most notably Egypt, Jordan and the Gulf states. While the US policy of training, equipping and advising militaries in the Middle Eastern context is decades old, the Obama administration is the first to have relied directly on Arab military capability to contain regional threats. During the NATO-led Libya campaign, the United States provided key capabilities to its allies in the air. At the same time it granted the Qatari and UAE armed forces its tacit approval to train and equip Libyan rebel forces on the ground to operate in conjunction with coalition air power.<sup>59</sup> The same is true in Syria: Gulf states have been involved in training and equipping Syrian rebel forces in their fight against the Assad regime since 2012.<sup>60</sup> Here, the Gulf states acted as Washington's surrogate in liaising with the opposition. In the case of Yemen, it was regional allies that carried out Operation Decisive Storm in April 2015, bringing their military capability to bear, with the United States merely providing logistical and intelligence support.<sup>61</sup>