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### Israel

#### The routine killing of innocent Palestinians is sanctioned by US military assistance

**Kane 17** Alex Kane [New York-based freelance journalist who writes on U.S. foreign policy in the Middle East], 5-12-2017, "Inside Sources Say the State Dept Refuses To Trace Whether Israel Is Using U.S. Military Aid Illegally," In These Times, <http://inthesetimes.com/features/israel-palestine-killings-us-aid-military-weapons.html> // ash

The young man’s name was Sabaa Obeid, a 22-year-old from Salfit, a town about 13 miles north. He, too, had been throwing stones. Shot by one of the Israeli soldiers, he was declared dead later that day.

Witnesses to the confrontation say the armed soldiers were never in life threatening danger from the stones, which were flung from hundreds of feet away. No Israeli soldier has been killed by a Palestinian stone-thrower at a protest in the past 18 years, according to statistics compiled by Israeli human rights group B’Tselem. (The Israeli military did not return requests for information.) “Stone-throwing poses little or no serious risk to Israeli soldiers, who are generally too far away for the stone-throwers to have any chance of hitting them,” wrote Amnesty International in a 2014 report. “Israeli forces frequently respond to such stone-throwing protests using grossly excessive force.”

The soldier who killed Obeid used a Ruger sniper rifle, a weapon manufactured by Sturm, Ruger & Co., the third biggest gun company in the United States. U.S. taxpayer dollars likely paid for it. Israel must spend roughly 75 percent of its annual military aid from the United States on U.S.-made weapons.

The shooting of Obeid with a U.S.-made weapon was not an isolated incident. Human rights groups have recorded dozens of incidents of the Israeli military using U.S.-made weapons in unlawful ways to injure and kill Palestinian civilians. During weekly demonstrations in Gaza last spring, for example, Amnesty International documented Israeli snipers injuring unarmed Palestinian protesters using weapons manufactured by Remington, the U.S.’s second largest gun corporation.

Taken together, witness testimony, video evidence and human-rights reports paint a picture of U.S. arms flowing to an Israeli army that recklessly uses live ammunition on civilians who pose little threat, in apparent violation of international law.

“Theoretically, you’re only allowed to use live ammunition in very extreme cases of grave danger to life,” says Sarit Michaeli, the international advocacy officer for B’Tselem. “The [Israeli] army has a much broader definition, [with] all of these specific descriptions—but none of them apply to a demonstration where some youth are throwing stones.”

Israel’s army has long deployed U.S. weapons to kill Palestinian civilians.

An In These Times survey of detailed reports published by the United Nations, Israeli human rights group B’Tselem, Human Rights Watch and Amnesty International reveals that, since 2009, at least 272 Palestinians appear to have been killed by U.S.-made weapons used by Israeli forces.

Fourteen of these killings occurred during law enforcement situations (outside of an active war zone), such as during demonstrations. Some of these incidents have been captured on video. In one video from 2016, for example, an Israeli soldier, armed with a U.S.-made M4 assault rifle, executed an injured Palestinian who was lying still on a Hebron street after he stabbed a soldier.

The full death toll of Palestinians killed by U.S. weapons is likely far higher, since many reports are not able to identify the weapon used.

It’s not supposed to be this way. U.S. arms exports to Israel (and other countries) are governed by laws placing restrictions on sales to nations that abuse human rights. Campaigns to cut U.S. military aid to Israel have latched onto a particular measure, known as the Leahy Law. The law prohibits U.S. assistance or training from flowing to foreign military units that have committed a gross violation of human rights, unless the foreign government has held that unit accountable.

But interviews with human rights advocates, congressional aides and former and current U.S. officials reveal that enforcement of the Leahy Law in Israel is lax, with no tracking of which army units receive U.S. weapons.

Human rights advocates say they have brought the State Department evidence of specific crimes committed by soldiers who clearly used U.S. weapons, only to have that evidence brushed off. A current U.S. official, who asked for anonymity because they are not authorized to speak to the press and could be fired as a result, told In These Times that they are not aware of any time when an Israeli unit was cut off from U.S. assistance under the Leahy Law.

This lack of enforcement allows Israel to get away with extrajudicial executions of Palestinians, human rights advocates say.

#### Lack of political willpower prevents cutting aid now – the plan increases Palestinian protections and holds the US accountable.

**Kane 17** Alex Kane [New York-based freelance journalist who writes on U.S. foreign policy in the Middle East], 5-12-2017, "Inside Sources Say the State Dept Refuses To Trace Whether Israel Is Using U.S. Military Aid Illegally," In These Times, <http://inthesetimes.com/features/israel-palestine-killings-us-aid-military-weapons.html> // ash

Because the Leahy Law is narrow—it only bars assistance to particular military units that commit rights violations, rather than the entire foreign army—Palestinian rights advocates working in Washington see enforcement against Israel as an achievable goal that could curb civilian deaths.

“The Leahy Law being implemented would not end violations, but I think it would seriously constrain [them],” says Brad Parker, international advocacy officer and staff attorney at Defense for Children International-Palestine. “Israeli officials would have to scrutinize military decisions and the use of force in a way that would ultimately increase protection for Palestinian civilians.”

The State Department did not answer questions from In These Times about whether any Israeli army units have been barred from receiving U.S. weapons under the Leahy Law or whether the State Department has acted on specific evidence of Israeli soldiers misusing U.S. arms. A State Department official told In These Times in a statement that the department “continues to apply the Leahy Law across the board, including in Israel, as it has for years. … We take seriously any credible information of a gross violation of human rights, and we review alleged violations utilizing standardized criteria worldwide.”

This statement is disputed by Bill Harper, chief of staff to Rep. Betty McCollum (D-Minn.), who has emerged as the leading congressional critic of Israeli human rights abuses. “They cannot credibly make the claim that they enforce the law equally,” Harper says. “We enforce it where we want and ignore it where we don’t.”

In a February 2016 letter, Leahy wrote to Secretary of State John Kerry about his concerns that the State Department is not adequately monitoring the use of U.S. military aid to Israel, and asked for an investigation into whether Israel committed extrajudicial executions with U.S. weapons. “There have been a disturbing number of reports of possible gross violations of human rights by security forces in Israel or Egypt—incidents that may have involved recipients, or potential recipients, of U.S. military assistance,” Leahy wrote. Israeli Prime Minister Benjamin Netanyahu responded that Israeli soldiers “are not murderers” and act in a “moral manner.”

In meetings and conversations with the State Department from 2012 to 2015, Mike Coogan, then the legislative coordinator for the U.S. Campaign to End the Israeli Occupation, says he brought up a 2009 Human Rights Watch report on U.S.-supplied white phosphorus that killed Palestinians in Gaza. He also communicated with officials about a 2014 Amnesty International report documenting U.S.-made tear gas canisters killing Palestinian protesters.

“State said we’ll look into it and we’ll get back to you,” Coogan says. “But they never got back to us.”

Brad Parker told In These Times that, in meetings about the Leahy Law during the Obama administration’s second term, State Department officials said they do not track where weapons go once they are sent to Israeli units, making it difficult to assess whether the weapons are being misused.

One former U.S. official familiar with how the Leahy Law is implemented (who requested anonymity out of concern about losing their current job, which involves working with State Department officials), says that the State Department doesn’t “have much of a record of understanding where material assistance flows.”

The former official believes that an unwillingness to challenge Israel is one reason the broader lack of monitoring goes unaddressed. “Getting more fidelity on specific instances of assistance to, say, Nigeria or Kenya … raises the defenses of a number of different pockets of support for Israel, who are concerned that our support for Israel will be in question or at risk.”

Support for Israel on Capitol Hill is driven by a multi-pronged machine: the weapons industry, which makes money from U.S. military aid to Israel; donors, who give to pro-Israel politicians, both Democrats and Republicans; Christian evangelicals, who see support for Israel as part of biblical prophecy and make up a large part of the Republican base; and Israel’s lobbyists, who continually push Washington to ramp up support.

The current State Department official interviewed for this story also describes a general reluctance to confront allies: “We never want to deliver bad news to them. ... The implementation of the Leahy Law is where you see the downsides of that.”

UNDER THE TRUMP ADMINISTRATION, which has fully thrown its support behind Israel’s right-wing government, resistance to enforcing the Leahy Law remains.

In leaked emails published by Politico in June 2018, U.S. Ambassador to Israel David Friedman (who, before his appointment, fundraised millions of dollars for Israeli settlements) pushed back against State Department efforts to improve how U.S. military aid to Israel is monitored. According to Politico, Friedman wrote in October 2017 that he did “not believe we should extend” these efforts, in the form of guidelines on how to better vet military aid, “to Israel at this time.” Friedman went on to say that “Israel is a democracy whose army does not engage in gross violations of human rights” and that limiting U.S. military aid to Israeli units would be “against national interests.”

While the rhetoric against enforcing the Leahy Law more strictly against Israel may have hardened under Trump, there has been no policy change from Obama to Trump, according to Raed Jarrar, an expert on the Leahy Law.

“The difference is the mask has fallen, like many other things with Trump,” Jarrar says. “When it comes to the policies on the ground … there’s no difference. There was no attempt to hold Israel accountable in the past, and there is no attempt to hold Israel accountable now, either.”

Meanwhile, as the Israeli occupation grinds on and Congress continues to sign off on U.S. aid to Israel, Palestinians are left to fume at the fact that U.S. weapons companies, purchased with U.S. taxpayer cash, are supplying Israel with the arms that are killing civilians.

“I hope they taste the same pain we feel for our children,” says Asmaa Shaheen, Sabaa Obeid’s mother. “They’re responsible for the blood that’s shed.”

#### Kills ppl
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**Johnson 18** Emma C. Johnson [A writer and artist from Midland, who recently described her Middle East delegation travels in a presentation at Creative 360], 2-5-2018, "We should stop military aid to Israel," Midland Daily News, [https://www.ourmidland.com/opinion/voices/article/We-should-stop-military-aid-to-Israel-12551246.php //](https://www.ourmidland.com/opinion/voices/article/We-should-stop-military-aid-to-Israel-12551246.php%20//) ash

Midland could have an extra $8.6 million in its budget but, instead, our city contributes $8,634,511 in aid to Israel every year. This $8.6 million pays for weapons to bomb Palestinian civilians, including women and children, and subsidizes new Israeli settlements that are illegal according to international law.

How was the $8.6 million figure calculated?

In 2007, the U.S. pledged $30 billion in m

ilitary aid to Israel. Statistics from the IRS provide the data needed to calculate the percentage each state contributed toward federal taxes. To estimate each city's contribution, figures from the U.S. Census Bureau's 2006-2008 estimates were used. Multiplying the city's population by its per capita income in the past 12 months (in 2008 inflation-adjusted dollars) showed the percentage of each city's contribution to its state's share of federal taxes.

In May, I went on a delegation to Palestine/Israel and saw used tear gas canisters littering the ground. I saw how our money erected the wall and checkpoints that divide families, make it difficult for students to attend university, and render commerce nearly impossible for Palestinians. Our taxes pay for bulldozers to demolish Palestinian homes, leaving Palestinians homeless so Israeli settlers can move in. There I was 6,000 miles away and my tax money had arrived well before me.

While attending a meeting at the United Nations in East Jerusalem, I couldn't count the number of times the presenter said that Israel was in violation of international law. When asked what practical steps were being taken for reform, she said that the international community has not imposed any systems of accountability onto Israel, despite its repeated disregard for the Geneva Convention.

So, why do we send Israel so much money in aid?

Some argue that Israel is the only democracy in the Middle East. However, granting citizens rights contingent on race and religion is not democracy. Others say it is for oil and natural gas; all the more reason to invest in green energy! Still others say we need to maintain our "special relationship" with Israel for stability. But are we safer when we increase income inequality and disenfranchise populations, in this case the Palestinians?

To find the real answer, follow the money and see where it goes.

Last year President Barack Obama pledged $38 billion to Israel over the next 10 years. Although this was contingent on stopping new settlement construction, a week later they resumed anyway. We didn't even admonish Israel and the settlements continue to be built.

Settlers are provided private security by the Israeli government for free, but it isn't the Israeli military that's protecting over 550,000 settlers. Instead, the Israeli government uses the private contractor Blackwater, while Hewlett-Packard provides the computer software and cards used at checkpoints to control flows in and out of the area. Magal constructs the wall on the West Bank. In fact, 75 percent of weapons Israel uses with our aid must be purchased from the U.S. (New legislation is phasing the requirement to 100 percent.)

Occupation is big business.

Lobbyists for the military-industrial complex, which President Dwight D. Eisenhower warned about, make large campaign contributions to the U.S. Congress to uphold the status quo. Israel perpetuates the myth that Arabs and Muslims are terrorists to justify the weapons contracts. And Israel has been good at upholding the narrative, in tandem with the U.S. media, which perpetuates the Eurocentric point of view that labels Middle Easterners as "other," and therefore not worthy of as many rights. This xenophobia serves to justify the unjustifiable.

#### Their conflation of anti-Zionism and anti-Semitism is ahistorical

**Peled 9/13** Miko Peled, 9-13-2018, "Conflating Anti-Zionism with Anti-Semitism," MintPress News, <https://www.mintpressnews.com/conflating-anti-zionism-with-anti-semitism-a-dangerous-and-useful-ploy/249293/> // ash

JERUSALEM — (Analysis) According to the Merriam-Webster dictionary, anti-Semitism is defined as “hostility toward or discrimination against Jews as a religious, ethnic, or racial group.” This is also how anti-Semitism is understood by people in general. However, the state of Israel and Zionist organizations around the world do not want the term to be defined as only racism against Jewish people but also to include criticism and rejection of Zionism.

Jewish rejection of Zionism

The Zionist movement had no concern for God or Jewish law because the Zionist leaders were secular and their vision was to create a secular state. They claimed that Jews were a nation just like any other, even though clearly that is not the case. Jews in Yemen, in Iraq, in Poland or in the Holy Land itself had and continue to have their own distinct customs, clothing, culture and language. The only common thing that Jewish people around the world possess is their religion. This is true even today, when many Jewish people see themselves as secular. Jews in America have a distinct culture that is different from that of Jews in France or Iran or in occupied Palestine.

The Zionists secularized the Old Testament, treating it as though it was a historical document, which it very clearly is not; and, finally, the Zionists claimed that Palestine is the Land of Israel and that it is the land of the Jewish people and therefore they have a right to take it, even by force. They invented and spread the motto, “A Land without a People for a People without a Land,” even though clearly there were people on the land, the Palestinian Arabs. These people, in the eyes of Western colonizers, being non-European and not white, were just insignificant and invisible.

Jewish opposition to Zionism was swift and fierce and is well documented. The leading Rabbis of the Ultra-Orthodox community were very clear in their opposition and the points they made were as relevant in the early 20th century as they are today. According to Jewish law, the Jewish people are forbidden from claiming sovereignty in the Land of Israel. They were expelled by Divine decree as a result of their own rejection of God’s laws and are not permitted to return until such time as God sends His messenger to grant them permission to return. To claim, as many Zionist do, that God gave The Land of Israel to the Jewish people and therefore they are permitted to live there, and force another nation into exile in the process, contravenes the commands of the very God that they claim gave them the land.

God’s promise of the land to the Jewish people was conditioned upon their obedience to His laws. Having failed to so obey, they cannot simply claim it back. Furthermore, there is a prohibition on taking the land by force, dying for the land, or taking a life of another human being. Jewish law commands its followers to be loyal citizens in whatever country they happen to live.

Furthermore, in a book named Or Layesharim or Light for the Truthful, published in the year 1900, the rabbis of the early twentieth century warned of four major inevitable consequences should the Zionist movement be allowed to accomplish its goal of a so-called “Jewish state” in Palestine.

Unprecedented violence to the Holy Land;

Unprecedented tensions between Jews and the Palestinian Arabs;

Jeopardizing the relations between Jews and Muslims;

Casting doubt as to the loyalty of Jewish people in the countries in which they reside around the world.

Sadly, no one listened to the rabbis and, as things turned out, every one of their warnings became true.

Conflating anti-Semitism with rejection of Zionism

From early on, the Zionist movement and then the State of Israel have had a tense relationship with the Ultra-Orthodox community because of its clear anti-Zionist stance. Having grown up in Jerusalem I can recall how each year on particular days, including the Israeli Day of Independence, there would be processions at the Ultra-Orthodox neighborhoods where the Israeli flag would be burned.

The Anti-Defamation League, or ADL, which claims to be a civil-rights organization but is in reality a Zionist watchdog, maintains that “Anti-Zionism is a prejudice against the Jewish movement for self-determination and the right of the Jewish people to a homeland in the State of Israel.” This is an interesting twist on Zionism and what it means to oppose it.

To begin with it is not prejudice to oppose Zionism. The Zionist movement has been around for over a century and has a clear track record of racism and extreme violence. Nor is it prejudice against the right of Jewish people to live in Palestine. The creation of the state of Israel came at an enormous cost and included genocide, ethnic cleansing, and the establishment of an apartheid regime. That is enough reason to oppose any movement.

The ADL also claim that BDS — the Palestinian call for a boycott, divestment, sanctions campaign against Israel — is anti-Semitic. On its website, it says that “ADL believes that the founding goals of the BDS movement and many of the strategies used by BDS campaigns are anti-Semitic.” It goes on to say that “the [BDS] campaign is founded on a rejection of Israel’s very existence as a Jewish state. It denies the Jewish people the right to self-determination.”

### Child soldiers

#### US funds child soldiers

**Carey 17** Jesse Carey, 12-23-2017, "Why Are American Taxes Funding Child Soldiers?," Relevant Magazine, <https://relevantmagazine.com/culture/why-are-american-taxes-fund/> // ash

Right now, an estimated 300,000 children globally are being robbed of childhoods. They do not go to school. They don’t spend their days playing with friends. Many no longer see their families.

These hundreds of thousands of children are soldiers, and they are fighting on the front lines of some of the world’s most deadly conflicts.

Across parts of North Africa, the Middle East and Asia, children are frequently recruited—or kidnapped—and forced to fight. According to Human Rights Watch, they are frequently sexually abused and are often subjected to some of the harshest conditions and most dangerous missions—including being used as human shields.

In 2008, the United States decided to take dramatic measures to prevent the spread of the use of child soldiers. As part of the William Wilberforce Trafficking Victims Protection Reauthorization Act of 2008—named for the famous British Christian abolitionist responsible for the Abolition of the Slave Trade Act of 1807—Congress passed the Child Soldiers Prevention Act (CSPA). It was a revolutionary piece of legislation that placed real consequences on countries preying on the most vulnerable.

The law says that no country that uses child soldiers may receive U.S. military aid.

The intention of the law is twofold: Primarily, it attempts to serve as a deterrent from using child soldiers—after all, the U.S. spends billions assisting other countries in a variety of military campaigns across the world. But the law also ensures that American taxpayer money isn’t used for buying weapons or equipment that will end up in the hands of children forced to fight in conflicts around the globe.

In theory, the law strikes a major blow to the recruitment of child soldiers.

But starting in 2010 under President Obama and as recently as September 2017 under President Trump, the United States government has done something that’s flown under the radar of many activists fighting to end child slavery: intentionally ignored its own law. R MAR-APR 060 2018

As a result, American taxpayer money is currently supporting the use of child soldiers in several countries, and the highest levels of Congress, the State Department and White House all know about it.

A Dangerous Precedent

Every year, the State Department issues the “Trafficking in Persons Report,” a document that tracks human trafficking, slavery, the use of child soldiers and other human rights violations across the world. The report itself says it “is the U.S. Government’s principal diplomatic tool to engage foreign governments on human trafficking.”

The reason why it could be so effective in preventing these types of abuses is because of the potential, significant consequences for countries that violate human rights. Within the report each year is a list of countries the State Department has identified “as having governmental armed forces or government-supported armed groups that recruit and use child soldiers.” If a country lands on the report, that means, according to the law, they should not receive any military support from the United States. Currently, eight countries—Democratic Republic of the Congo, Mali, Nigeria, Somalia, South Sudan, Sudan, Syria and Yemen—are on the list.

“In theory, under [the CSPA], the U.S. government is supposed to be able to block military aid that otherwise would have gone to the states on the basis of their child recruitment,” explains Tim Molyneux, the Child Rights Program Manager at Child Soldiers International, an international advocacy group that works to end the use of child soldiers.

Molyneux says that the CSPA could be a powerful tool to end child slavery, however, he says, “The law has never really been used to its full effect.”

One of the major flaws of the law is that it grants a single person—the sitting president— the authority to issue waivers to any country that uses child soldiers if it is deemed to be in the U.S.’s “national interest” to do so. And since 2008, nearly all of the penalties meant to be levied on countries that use child soldiers have been waived.

At times, Molyneux says, partially waiving these penalties, can make sense. “We have sometimes recommended the use of partial waivers tied very much to efforts to reduce recruitments of children and to prioritize initiatives that are seeking to do that,” he says. In other words, if a country is making significant strides in reducing the use of child soldiers, Molyneux suggests that not entirely withholding military support might be appropriate. But in the last decade, both Trump and Obama have issued wide-ranging waivers via executive order.

During Obama’s time, almost all of the restrictions were waived, Molyneux says. And though Trump hasn’t issued waivers as broadly, he, too, has given most of the countries on the list a pass.

Part of the problem is the idea of “national interest” is so broad. Many of the countries on the list use U.S. military support to fight radical Islamic insurgencies.

In the view of the president, even if those governments are using child soldiers to fight the terrorists, it may be in the “interest” of the U.S. to essentially ignore our own law.

But it also implicates the United States—and its taxpayers—in their recruitment.

“U.S. military aid is obviously this really broad term that applies to all kinds of material aid that the U.S. might give to another country,” Molyneux says. “So it might include arms sales and equipment sales and literally, you know, giving guns to other countries. Militaries that use child soldiers or [use children for] training or supportfor peacekeeping operations and so on and so forth … In many cases, we’re not actually talking about arms sales, it may just be training and other stuff.”

But no matter what the military assistance functionally looks like in individual countries, by ignoring the CSPA by issuing waivers to governments that knowingly recruit child soldiers, the purpose of the law is defeated.

Because of the waivers issued by President Trump, this year the eight countries the U.S. State Department says use child soldiers will receive $140 million in U.S. military assistance. That’s money the law says they shouldn’t be able to have.

#### Plan solves

**Becker 16** Jo Becker, 6-30-2016, "Children on the Front Lines, With U.S. Dollars," POLITICO Magazine, <https://www.politico.com/magazine/story/2016/06/children-soldiers-jo-becker-214003> // ash

The United States has a powerful tool to pressure foreign countries to crack down on these abuses. But so far during his presidency, President Barack Obama has failed to use it effectively. By the end of September, Obama will have one final chance to address this alarming trend and demonstrate that the U.S. will not stand idly by while countries exploit children.

Under a landmark law adopted in 2008, the Child Soldiers Prevention Act, the U.S. prohibits giving certain categories of U.S. military training and assistance to countries that use child soldiers in their official armed forces or support paramilitaries or militias that do. The law sends foreign governments a powerful message: if you want U.S. military aid, you need to stop recruiting children.

Afghanistan, which gets billions of dollars in U.S. military aid each year, is conspicuously absent from the list of offenders, despite clear evidence that Afghan Local Police units, like 10-year-old Wasil’s, use child soldiers for military operations that are paid for in large part by U.S. military funding. To exempt Afghanistan from military sanctions, State Department lawyers have implausibly argued that the units fall in a gray zone between the Afghan armed forces and government-supported non-state militias and therefore are not covered by the law.

Too often, even countries included on the list get a free pass. In more than three-quarters of the cases where the law’s sanctions could be applied, President Obama has used his presidential authority to waive military sanctions for listed governments, in the name of “national interest.” As a result, countries like Somalia, South Sudan, and Yemen have received hundreds of millions of dollars in U.S. military assistance, despite continued—and even escalating—use of child soldiers.

In a handful of cases, the Obama administration has used the law to dramatic positive effect. One example is the Democratic Republic of Congo, where at the height of the country’s conflict, an estimated 30,000 children fought on all sides. In 2012, the Obama administration announced that it was withholding military training and foreign military financing from Congo because of its continued use of child soldiers. The UN had tried—and failed—for seven years to get the Congolese government to sign an action plan to end its child recruitment. But only five days after the US announcement, Congo signed the plan. In 2014, the UN documented only two cases of child recruitment by Congo’s national army—a huge decrease—and illustration of the law’s enormous potential.

Similarly, in 2013, the U.S. withheld foreign military financing and military training from Rwanda because of its support for the M23, an armed group that forcibly recruited large numbers of children as soldiers and brutally abused civilians in eastern Congo. Only a few weeks later, the M23 surrendered and laid down its weapons. Although part of the M23’s defeat was due to UN-backed Congolese military operations, mounting pressure on Rwanda to stop supporting the M23 played a crucial role.

Similarly, in 2013, the U.S. withheld foreign military financing and military training from Rwanda because of its support for the M23, an armed group that forcibly recruited large numbers of children as soldiers and brutally abused civilians in eastern Congo. Only a few weeks later, the M23 surrendered and laid down its weapons. Although part of the M23’s defeat was due to UN-backed Congolese military operations, mounting pressure on Rwanda to stop supporting the M23 played a crucial role.

Rwanda was taken off the list in 2015, but reappeared this year after Rwandan forces recruited at least six Burundian children from the Mahama refugee camp in eastern Rwanda last year and trained them for combat. President Obama should again threaten the suspension of military aid to ensure that Rwanda takes immediate action to bring its forces in line.

To be sure, the U.S. has foreign policy interests in many of the countries on the list, including partnerships to counter terrorism. But Obama has been far too quick to squander the law’s power through the use of waivers. In the vast majority of cases, the assistance that can be sanctioned under the Child Soldiers Prevention Act is only a small portion of overall US assistance. Withholding it until governments address their child soldier use seems like a no-brainer—an easy way to raise concerns and give abusive countries incentives to change their practices.

Obama has one more chance before he leaves office to get it right. By the end of September, he will need to decide whether to exempt any of the governments listed this year from military sanctions. He should use the full force of the law and make clear that countries will not receive the full amount of U.S. military aid until they end their use of child soldiers. He should apply the same principle to Afghanistan. Even though it’s not listed this year, he should condition a portion of U.S. aid to Afghanistan on concrete steps to curb child recruitment. He needs to be clear: “If you use child soldiers, there’s no free pass.”

### Saudi

#### Child soldiers

**Sakuma 12/30** Amanda Sakuma, 12-30-2018, "Saudi Arabia is reportedly outsourcing its war in Yemen to child soldiers," Vox, [https://www.vox.com/2018/12/30/18161667/saudi-arabia-outsourcing-yemen-war-child-soldiers //](https://www.vox.com/2018/12/30/18161667/saudi-arabia-outsourcing-yemen-war-child-soldiers%20//) ash

Saudi Arabia is reportedly outsourcing its war in Yemen to be fought by child soldiers from Sudan.

According to an investigation from the New York Times’s David Kirkpatrick, the Saudis are dipping into their deep pockets to bankroll a militia of Sudanese fighters — many of them children — to fight on the front lines against Yemen’s Houthi rebels, insulating the kingdom from casualties and the political blowback they could cause. Many of the Sudanese fighters come from the region of Darfur, where violent conflict consumed the countryside for more than a decade. Across the Red Sea in Yemen, they face a steep risk of death again:

At any time for nearly four years as many as 14,000 Sudanese militiamen have been fighting in Yemen in tandem with the local militia aligned with the Saudis, according to several Sudanese fighters who have returned and Sudanese lawmakers who are attempting to track it. Hundreds, at least, have died there.

The conditions in Yemen were already bleak. The war there, led by Saudi Crown Prince Mohammed bin Salman, has by some estimates claimed the lives of nearly 50,000 people. The conflict has spurred a massive humanitarian crisis, leaving more than 12 million people on the brink of starvation and in desperate need of assistance.

Kirkpatrick reports that some families in Sudan are so desperate for money from Riyadh, they bribe militia officers to allow their children to fight, some as young as 14 years old. While estimates vary and Saudi Arabia denied employing child soldiers, the Times reports that minors make up anywhere from 20 percent to 40 percent of the Sudanese fighters in a unit:

“People are desperate. They are fighting in Yemen because they know that in Sudan they don’t have a future,” said Hafiz Ismail Mohamed, a former banker, economic consultant and critic of the government. “We are exporting soldiers to fight like they are a commodity we are exchanging for foreign currency.”

Congress has made a halfhearted attempt to curtail the violence in Yemen

The US government as a whole — from Congress to President Donald Trump — so far has done little to meaningfully put an end to hostilities in Yemen. The US currently sells weapons to the Saudi-backed coalition in Yemen and provides them with some intelligence support. And while the US indicated in November that it will stop refueling the coalition’s aircraft used in the conflict, which potentially limits the Saudis’ ability to carry out bombing campaigns, calls are growing for Congress to do more.

When Saudi journalist Jamal Khashoggi was murdered in October, momentum built — briefly. Lawmakers made preliminary moves to cut America’s ties to the three-year conflict, with the Senate passing a historic resolution to cut military aid to Saudi Arabia related to the war in Yemen.

But as Vox’s Tara Golshan explains, the resolution was thrown back to square one after House Democrats helped Republicans stall any action on Yemen until at least the new Congress comes into session.

Meanwhile, the White House has pushed back against efforts to end aid and done little more than turn a blind eye to Riyadh’s range of troubling actions — including the crown prince’s likely involvement in Khashoggi’s murder.

But as new harrowing stories come to light detailing the atrocities being carried out in Yemen, the conflict — and the US’s complicity in the violence — may become harder to ignore.

### AT Terror

#### Game models show military aid provides an incentive for host states to avoid directly combatting terror.

**Bapat 11** Bapat, N. A. (2011). Transnational terrorism, US military aid, and the incentive to misrepresent. Journal of Peace Research, 48(3), 303–318. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0022343310394472> OHS-AT

The model suggests several interesting implications regarding the effectiveness of military aid in fighting terrorism. Although military aid appears intended to defeat terrorist groups, we see that military aid may actually give host states an incentive not to terminate their conflicts with terrorist groups. Terminating the conflict would result in a loss of aid. By contrast, simply using the aid as a deterrent decreases the risk that the terrorist group will directly challenge the center, though it allows the terrorist group to remain active. This insight might explain why military aid appears ineffective against terrorism: it provides host states with a disincentive to remove their terrorism problem.

However, we see an additional consequence. If hosts have no incentive to fully disarm their terrorists in order to receive military aid, these groups may strengthen their organizational and military capabilities over time. This newfound capability may induce the groups to make greater demands of the center in negotiation. At some point in the conflict, the demands of the terrorist group may become so great that the host can no longer consider negotiation as a viable option. Once this happens, the host will be essentially dependent on the U.S. to keep it in power. This suggests that while hosts can initially blackmail the U.S., they eventually become entrapped into fighting their terrorist movements, and therefore become dependent on the U.S. to sustain them.

### Africom

#### Perm do both

**Baraka 12/15** Ajamu Baraka, 12-15-2018, "Radical Black organization calls on U.S. government to shut down U.S. Africa Command (AFRICOM)," San Francisco Bay View, <https://sfbayview.com/2018/10/radical-black-organization-calls-on-u-s-government-to-shut-down-u-s-africa-command-africom/> OHS-AT

We say AFRICOM is the flip side of the domestic war being waged by the same repressive state structure against Black and poor people in the United States. In the U.S. Out of Africa!: Shut Down AFRICOM campaign, we link police violence and the domestic war waged on Black people to U.S. interventionism and militarism abroad.

“Not only does there need to be a mass movement in the U.S. to shut down AFRICOM, this mass movement needs to become inseparably bound with the movement that has swept this country to end murderous police brutality against Black and Brown people,” says Netfa Freeman, of Pan-African Community Action (PACA) and the Institute for Policy Studies (IPS). Freeman represents PACA, a BAP member organization, on BAP’s Coordinating Committee. “The whole world must begin to see AFRICOM and the militarization of police departments as counterparts.”

It costs $267 million to fund AFRICOM in 2018, according to Vanessa Beck, BAP research team lead and Coordinating Committee member.

“That money is stolen from Africans/Black people in the U.S. to terrorize and steal resources from our sisters and brothers on the African continent,” Beck said. “Instead, that money should be put toward meeting our human needs in the U.S. and toward reparations for people in every African nation affected by U.S. imperialism.”

### Congo

#### The US utilizes military aid as a political tool for exploiting the resources of the Great Lakes – that sustains the genocide in Congo, ensures cycles of violence, and breeds instability

**Jackson 17** D. Amari Jackson [D. Amari Jackson is a media specialist, published author and an award-winning journalist with two decades of national experience. He is a former recipient of the George Washington Williams Fellowship, a national project of the Independent Press Association], November 7, 2017, "Democratic Republic of Congo Humanitarian Crisis Brings History of Western Interference and Internal Strife Into Focus," Atlanta Black Star, <https://atlantablackstar.com/2017/11/07/democratic-republic-congo-humanitarian-crisis-brings-history-western-interference-internal-strife-focus/> OHS-AT

When it comes to the Democratic Republic of Congo (DRC), it’s hard to imagine things could get any worse. Over the past two decades, an estimated 6 million people have perished in the DRC due to war, foreign invasion, internal conflict, regional violence and international exploitation. Nonetheless, the United Nations’ recent activation of its highest level of emergency, Level 3 (L3), reveals just how dire a crisis still exists in the resource-rich nation that sits at the heart of the African continent. The L3 designation, which mobilizes additional funding and resources to meet emergency needs, puts the DRC in the same crisis category as such international emergencies as Iraq, Syria and Yemen.

Sadly, the worst may be far from over. “As many as 250,000 children could starve in Kasai in the next few months unless enough nutritious food reaches them quickly,” said David Beasley, executive director of the World Food Program, returning from a four-day mission to Kasai. “We need access to those children, and we need money — urgently.”

While political violence had mostly been relegated to the eastern Great Lakes region where natural resources are abundant, it recently intensified in Kasai as a result of president Joseph Kabila’s repression of unrest stemming from his rejection of his constitutionally-mandated two-term limit, which ended in December 2016. The government has yet to authorize new elections as the president has claimed both a lack of national preparation and a priority for putting down rebel groups in the East. In a recent and rare interview with SPIEGEL magazine, the embattled Kabila offered, “We are not going to finance elections when we need to fight to win back occupied territory.”

Despite mounting international pressure — recently represented by the October Congo visit of U.S. Ambassador to the United Nations Nikki Haley — the Kabila regime has continued to stall the elections process as government security forces, state-backed militias and local armed groups have killed an estimated 5000 people in Kasai since August 2016, with 600 schools attacked, 1.4 million people displaced, and 90 mass graves. In March, two United Nations investigators, one American, one Swedish, were executed while examining human rights violations in Kasai, and their four Congolese escorts went missing. A subsequent Human Rights Watch and Radio France Internationale investigation suggested government responsibility for the murders.

Given the United States’ longtime support of the violently repressive and undemocratic Kabila — and given Kabila has not adhered to previous diplomatic agreements or even massive monetary payments to get him to step down — some have little faith in American pressure.

“You can understand why the Congolese people basically feel like the U.S. is playing with us and that they’re not serious,” said Maurice Carney, co-founder and executive director of the Friends of the Congo. A longtime advocate for the DRC, Carney started the Washington DC-based nonprofit in 2004. “They sent one ambassador in 2016, they sent another in 2017, and all we know is that Kabila is still in power, elections are not organized, and we don’t have the opportunity to choose our own leaders.” In the meantime, noted Carney, “The country, for all intensive purposes, is on fire.”

The crisis in Kasai is the latest in a nation consumed by suffering. To the east, in the DRC’s mineral-rich Kivu region where armed groups both foreign and local war for gold, coltan, tin, copper and tungsten, civilian massacres, widespread rape, and the forced recruitment of child soldiers continues with impunity. And, just this week, the African Commission on Human and Peoples’ Rights was informed a cholera epidemic has spread across the country as famine is expected to affect 7.7 million people.

Still, Carney clarifies what’s ultimately behind such immense suffering and inhumanity. “At its root, the crisis is not a humanitarian one, it’s a political one.” Consistent with the murderous politics that have historically provoked humanitarian nightmares in the country, Carney noted how many children in the formerly peaceful Kasai are facing starvation after government security forces killed an aspiring local chief and his family who were opposed to Kabila. “What that did was spur a response from the followers of the chief, and the Congolese government responded, in turn, in a heavy-handed way,” explained Carney, noting how this facilitated the violence and displacement that has plagued Kasai since August 2016.

Such heavy-handed violence plagued the Congo even before it was a country. From 1885 to its 1908 colonization by Belgium, King Leopold II brutally dominated the region as his own private property, slaughtering an estimated 10 to 15 million natives during his extraction of the region’s excessive natural wealth. With its independence from European colonialism a half-century later in 1960, the Congo was thwarted by violence again as international and local interests conspired to subsequently remove from office and assassinate its first democratically elected prime minister, Patrice Lumumba.

Upon the Rwandan genocide of 1994 — when as many as one million Tutsis were wiped out over 100 days in a mass slaughter led by the Hutu majority against their ethnic minority neighbors — hundreds of thousands of Hutus fled Rwanda and an advancing Tutsi-led fighting force to seek shelter in refugee camps in the eastern part of what was then known as Zaire. The Tutsi forces pursued the Hutus across the border, resulting in more killing and regional instability. In 1997, with the backing of Rwanda and Uganda, rebel leader Laurent Desire Kabila wrested power away from longtime dictator Mobutu Sese Sekou and reverted the country’s name to the Democratic Republic of the Congo. A year later, Rwanda attempted to remove Kabila from office, triggering a regional war involving nine African nations, including the DRC, Rwanda and Uganda.

In January 2001, Kabila was assassinated and his son, the current president, assumed power. Although the war was officially declared over in 2003, the prized eastern or Kivu region of the country has remained unstable as Congolese natives are massacred, raped and exploited at the hands of violent local and internationally-backed factions bent on profiting from its wealth of natural resources. And while the United Nations has had a peacekeeping presence in the DRC for almost two decades, its role in curbing the conflict has ranged from ineffective to complicit in an ongoing and tragic saga heavily influenced by Western interests.

“President Kabila, who has caused this crisis in the Congo today, is a product of the United States,” said Congolese activist and journalist, Kambale Musavuli, in a December 2016 interview upon the violent crackdown on those protesting delayed elections in Kasai and elsewhere. Musavuli noted that the United States was one of the first nations to support and legitimize the presidency of Kabila in the highly-questionable Congolese elections of 2006 and 2011. Despite widespread fraud and intimidation, American taxes are still funding militarized police and government-backed repression in the DRC, as they have for five decades.

Carney points to the exponential expansion of the military footprint on the African continent through AFRICOM over the past decade as being enacted “ostensibly to protect U.S. strategic interests” like oil and minerals vital to US aerospace, military, technology and communications industries including “Congo’s copper, cobalt and coltan or, in the case of Niger, uranium.”

“So you have the U.S. supporting regimes like Paul Kagame’s in Rwanda by providing them military equipment, intelligence and financial support with the understanding they are going to be in alignment with U.S. interests on the African continent,” said Carney, noting that “when they commit mass crimes, kill people and violate human rights, the U.S. runs interference on the international level to provide them political and diplomatic cover.”

The U.S has consistently supported proxy regimes in Rwanda and Uganda that have further destabilized the DRC and facilitated the ongoing extraction of the country’s natural resources. A 2010 United Nations Mapping Report criticized the American government for its “very friendly attitude” towards Rwanda and for “overlooking human rights concerns.”

#### That drives recruitment of child soldiers

**Mednick 12/10** Sam Mednick, 12-10-2018, "Congo's Instability is Driving Children to Join Armed Groups," Vice, <https://www.vice.com/en_au/article/a3mj4z/congos-instability-is-driving-children-to-join-armed-groups> OHS-AT

Viane is one of a growing number of children in the Democratic Republic of Congo bearing the brunt of violence in the country’s east that’s been exacerbated by President Joseph Kabila’s refusal to leave office when his mandate ended in 2016. Congo’s political crisis made 2017 a “devastating year” for Congolese children, according to the United Nations, and contributed to a spike in grave violations against children.

Total violations against children rose by more than 40 percent in 2017 compared with the previous year, according to a report released in May by the U.N.’s Children and Armed Conflict group. The number of children being used by armed groups as combatants and sexual slaves in the country’s center and east is “significant” and worrisome, said a report by UNICEF in 2018. More than 3,000 children have been used in armed groups in Tanganyika and South-Kivu provinces alone, according to UNICEF, and experts warn that violations against children only stand to get worse as armed groups proliferate inside North-Kivu and Ituri.

There’s a particular concern around the recruitment of child-soldiers, said Alexandre Becquevort, country director for DRC at War Child UK, a London-based nonprofit.

“Electoral tensions put children at much greater risk of recruitments,” he said.

Though Kabila has assured a restless nation and an anxious international community that elections scheduled for December 23 will move forward as planned, citizens remain distrustful and worry that more violence is in the offing.

Chaos in Kivu

President Kabila set off a political crisis in 2016 after refusing to step down from office when his term ended. His decision to flout his country's constitution set off protests in the capital Kinshasa and raised alarm among outside observers, including the U.S., which urged Kabila to follow through on his 2018 election timetable.

Few regions in the country suffered worse than North Kivu province. Over 1 million people were internally displaced in North Kivu at the end of December 2017, and by April of this year, that number ballooned to 1.5 million, according to the U.N., just as the country’s political crisis deepened.

Read: A slaughter in silence: How a brutal ethnic cleansing campaign in DRC was made worse by Trump's "America First" policies and the world's neglect.

Local leaders put much of the blame on Kabila, whose government they accuse of collaborating with warring militias to further destabilize the region and create a pretext for election delays.

During a trip to the region in June, three armed groups told VICE News that they were approached in recent months by government soldiers to collaborate on fighting other groups and instigate more violent clashes throughout the region. Congo’s government denies any association with armed groups and the notion that Kabila is trying to incite violence in the east.

One thing is clear, however: Kabila has struggled mightily to contain the country's breakaway east, where approximately 140 armed groups currently operate in the forests of Congo’s North and South Kivu provinces alone — up from 120 one year earlier, according to the Kivu Security Tracker.

This proliferation translates into greater recruitment of child soldiers, said Becquevort.

“I thought about death”

Viane was 15 when he and three other members of his school soccer team were abducted by an armed group in his hometown of Rwindi in Rutshuru Territory in North Kivu. They were told they’d been selected to a group of star student athletes who travel nearby regions to train younger players. Instead, they were drugged and forced into warfare.

“I thought about death. I thought about my family having no idea where I was. I thought I was going to be killed,” he says.

For the next eight months, together with 20 other children, Viane knew only two things: labor and war. He was drugged regularly and instructed to slaughter alleged dissidents captured by senior officers.

“I couldn’t conceive of how to kill a man, and I kept asking myself what will happen to the blood around him, what will happen to the body, what will I gain from killing this guy?” he said.

Instead, he witnessed countless murders by fellow child soldiers.

In April, Viane escaped. During a mission to resupply fighters with weapons, he hung back from the group and hid in the bushes overnight. The next morning, he found the nearest U.N. base and turned himself in. Today, the 16-year-old sits in a youth transit center in Goma waiting to be reconnected with his family after his months of rehabilitation pass.

More than 3,000 children, including 428 girls, left armed groups and were assisted with reintegration programs in 2017, says UNICEF.

Experts say current estimates only scratch the surface and that the numbers in 2018 will probably get worse.

“What we see is only the tip of the iceberg, meaning the children who manage to leave the groups and who are willing to identify themselves with (the U.N.),” said Becquevort of War Child UK. But there are thousands of children in armed groups.”

He said that the rise in child soldier recruitment was linked to renewed rebel group activity. But what worries him more, is that the propagation of groups is pushing children toward voluntarily recruitment in lieu of better options.

“I felt it was the only solution.”

War Child released a report earlier this year that draws a strong connection between the vast presence of children in armed groups and how easy it is to join, citing a “striking” finding between regular interactions with armed groups and communities in the villages. While there’s no single reason children join armed groups, household poverty emerged as the strongest driver according to the report, as well as hunger, lack of opportunity, vengeance and boys trying to escape a bad situation in their communities.

Singura was only 10 when he joined the FDLR — a Hutu militia that operates in North Kivu. Orphaned at a young age with siblings in no better shape to support him, Singura says he had little choice but to fight.

“I felt it was the only solution,” he said.

Friends in the village introduced him to the militia’s commander. The man never questioned his age, and Singura spent the majority of his formative years fighting. He watched children like him die in clashes with other groups. He watched as fellow soldiers murdered civilians in cold blood.

“[Civilians] had to be killed in front of everyone. They could be killed by cutting off their heads with machetes or shooting them and throwing their bodies in the river,” he said. “It was horrible to see.”

In 2016, after four years of fighting, Singura was captured by the Congolese army. He spent the next two years in prison before being moved to the youth transit center in Goma in June.

Founded in 2000, the center is run by CAJED, a national NGO providing psychosocial support for former child soldiers. It has helped more than 12,000 children aged 10-17, including 775 female child soldiers, reintegrate with their families and communities.

“They’ve witnessed many violations, sexual abuse and torture. The girls are systematically raped and molested,” said Gilbert Munda, coordinator of CAJED. “It’s a long process to help them forget.”

The proliferation of armed groups in the region in recent months has become one of the center’s greatest challenges. Munda’s concerned the increased recruitment will only make it harder to keep children out of the army in the future. He estimates 10 percent of his graduates return to fighting after they’re released.

### AT Oil

#### Good for econ

**Bayaan 18** Ibrahiim Bayaan, Chief Economist, Freightwaves, 7-18-2018, "When oil prices rise, it's supposed to hurt the economy. But it isn't that simple anymore," FreightWaves, <https://www.freightwaves.com/news/economics/oil-prices-economy> OHS-AT

So ingrained was this narrative that when oil prices fell at the end of 2014 due to rising US production and high OPEC supply, most expected a big boost to economic activity. Falling prices would be a big boon to consumers and businesses, serving as a sort of implicit tax cut and providing a jolt to the economy.

The results were actually quite different. For one, consumers and businesses that benefited from lower fuel costs ended up pocketing much of the extra savings instead of spending significantly more on goods and services. In addition, oil consumption in the economy has generally plateaued since the great recession and has yet to return to pre-crisis levels as consumer and businesses have gotten more fuel efficient. (The Energy Information Administration's proxy for demand, called Product Supplied, crossed the 21-million b/d mark several times on a monthly basis in 2005-2007. It has yet to return to that level.)

Perhaps more importantly, conditions in the oil industry had changed significantly in the post-recession period. The emergence of hydraulic fracking, combined with horizontal drilling, allowed the US to tap into large shale oil and natural gas reserves, which helped drive investment in new oil rigs in the economy and helped double US crude oil production between the end of the recession and the end of 2014. The number of active oil rigs in the economy rose nearly eightfold during this time, which helped drive additional spending on machinery and equipment for use in fracking. This, in turn, had positive implications for freight markets. We at FreightWaves estimate that each additional rig generates nearly 1 million additional miles for truckers in the economy.

As a result, the decline in oil prices snuffed out one of the key drivers of growth in the economy. Investment in mining and drilling activities plummeted in the aftermath of the oil price decline, and the number of active rigs fell more than 75% from the start of 2015 through the end of 2016. Industrial production, which had been a source of strength in the economy throughout 2014, saw negative growth in 2015 and 2016 amid large cutbacks in mining and supporting industries.

Not coincidentally, this was also a difficult time for the trucking industry. Lower oil prices did reduce fuel costs, but all of the tonnage associated with the fracking industry largely disappeared. Carriers that were heavily involved in the energy sector, carrying fracking sand and equipment to rigs, saw much of that business decline significantly in response to oil price drops.

So rising oil prices are a positive?

As a result, there is an increasing belief that rising oil prices are good for the economy and trucking overall. Certainly there has been a revival in activity around the mining sector over the past 18 months as oil prices have climbed. Mining production has enjoyed double-digit growth throughout 2018, pushing to record highs by the middle of the year. The number of active oil rigs has not returned to previous levels, but has more than doubled since its trough as producers restarted some previously dormant rigs. This increase in activity has played a role in reviving freight markets, creating an additional source of demand for trucking and rail services and offsetting some of the additional costs that come with higher fuel prices.

In addition, the rise in prices has restarted investment in new rigs and drilling in the economy. Late last year, the World Bank estimated that the break-even price for existing shale drilling rigs is about $30-$35 per barrel, while prices above $50-$60 per barrel help to stimulate new exploration and drilling. This has helped spur growth in machinery production and new drilling equipment.

## Neg

### Politics =

#### Both parties hate the plan

**Toosi 11/30** Nahal Toosi [Nahal Toosi is a foreign affairs correspondent at POLITICO. She joined POLITICO from The Associated Press, where she reported from and/or served as an editor in New York, Islamabad, Kabul and London. She was one of the first foreign correspondents to reach Abbottabad, Pakistan, after the killing of Osama bin Laden. Prior to joining the AP, Toosi worked for the Milwaukee Journal Sentinel, where she mostly covered higher education but also managed to report from Iraq during the U.S. invasion in 2003, as well as from Egypt, Thailand and Germany], 11-30-2018, "Rand Paul under fire for blocking Israel bills," POLITICO, [https://www.politico.com/story/2018/11/30/rand-paul-israel-military-aid-congress-senate-1036943 //](https://www.politico.com/story/2018/11/30/rand-paul-israel-military-aid-congress-senate-1036943%20//) ash

Sen. Rand Paul is infuriating Republicans and Democrats alike by blocking a pair of Israel-related bills, including one authorizing tens of billions of dollars in military aid for the country.

Some advocacy groups are so mad at Paul they’re running ads against the Kentucky Republican, who insists that his long-term goal is actually to help Israel.

The dust-up is the latest example of how Paul is willing to throw a wrench into routine legislation to uphold his libertarian instincts, which make him skeptical of foreign aid. It also could hurt his already-testy ties to President Donald Trump, who sees the U.S.-Israel relationship as near-sacrosanct.

The main bill Paul is blocking puts into law an agreement reached under former President Barack Obama that gives Israel $38 billion in military assistance over 10 years. The measure has broad bipartisan support in Congress. Various versions of the bill have easily passed the Senate and the House in recent months, but the Senate still needs to pass a final version.

### Child Soldiers

#### CP: The United States federal government should

- train foreign military leaders on the dangers of child soldiers

- leverage military assistance to dissuade countries from using child soldiers

- cooperate with other foreign military aid donors on similar legislation

#### That solves

**Stohl 18** Rachel Stohl, 2-12-2018, "Child Soldiers Pose a National Security Threat," National Interest, <https://nationalinterest.org/blog/the-buzz/child-soldiers-pose-national-security-threat-24470> OHS-AT

To combat the reliance on children as tools of warfare, governments can train military leaders on the risks and inefficiencies of relying on children to fight their wars. The Dallaire Child Soldiers Initiative, run by former Canadian Lt. Gen. Roméo Dallaire, who served as the force commander for the UN Mission in Rwanda during the 1994 genocide, has taken such an approach to eradicate the use of child soldiers. The initiative works with governments to implement trainings that educate military leaders on the dangers and pitfalls of using child soldiers, as well as inform them of the international legal frameworks that protect children from exploitation in armed conflict. The initiative also aims to adapt military doctrine to better help national armed forces prepare for the possibility of confronting children in combat. In March 2017, Canada became the first country to adopt such a doctrine.

Governments can also leverage military assistance to dissuade foreign militaries from recruiting and using children in combat. To date, very few countries have linked these issues and implemented national legislation that conditions arms sales and military assistance on a country’s record of using or supporting the use of child soldiers. Such initiatives have been undertaken by Belgium, Switzerland and the United States to augment broader efforts to get children off the battlefield. Although the conversation on child soldiers often falls off national-security agendas—or to a lower-tier priority—there are numerous opportunities to enhance efforts to prevent and ultimately end the recruitment and use of children in combat.

In the United States, one such effort is the Child Soldiers Prevention Act (CSPA), which seeks to encourage countries to stop recruiting and using child soldiers by leveraging U.S. security assistance. Under the CSPA, countries identified by the State Department as using or supporting the use of child soldiers are prohibited from receiving U.S. weapons and certain types of military assistance, unless they receive a waiver from the president. The United States has invoked such national-interest waivers more often than not, however, and allowed nearly $1.7 billion in military assistance to flow to thirteen countries known to use/support the use of child soldiers since the CSPA was enacted—thereby effectively giving a pass to governments that routinely exploit children in their national militaries or government-supported armed groups.

What is needed, then, is not only broader application and implementation of the CSPA, but also potential reframing of the broader issues surrounding the recruitment and use of child soldiers so as to better prepare U.S. military personnel for situations in which they may encounter children in combat roles. This includes awareness raising in advance of operations that may encounter child soldiers, as well as post-deployment counseling to deal with the aftermath of engagement with children in conflict.

The United States could also adopt bureaucratic changes to address the use of child soldiers. While the United States is not Canada, and it plays a different role in military operations around the world, an adapted Canada doctrine may be appropriate for the U.S. military. Regardless, the United States needs to expand the range of stakeholders engaged in these discussions and incorporate the issue into engagement and operation planning to deal with the situation of encountering child soldiers on the ground and better address the psychological aftermath of military engagement with young children.

Further, the United States can work with other countries, particularly those that are military-assistance donors, to establish additional protections for children in conflict. This can mean working with governments to implement their own legislation to condition their military relationships on stopping the use of child soldiers. Such an approach can also include awareness of—and support for—groups and organizations working on child soldier reintegration and prevention so that the most vulnerable children are protected from re-recruitment.

### Kenya

#### CP: <plan> except Kenya

#### Kenya’s the exception – improved counterterrorist efforts and police reform

**Kelly 9/22** Kevin J. Kelley, SEPTEMBER 22 2018, "Kenya an exception to failure of US military aid: study," Daily Nation, <https://www.nation.co.ke/news/Kenya-an-exception-to-failure-of-US-military-aid-study/1056-4772710-nm9lh/index.html> OHS-AT

The studies do not examine specific conflicts, but Kenya is cited in one of the analyses as a seemingly rare example of an African country whose security forces have performed more effectively as a result of US assistance.

“The Kenyan security units that have worked closest with US officials have demonstrated their capacity for counterterrorism, including in challenging contexts,” this evaluation finds. Kenyan troops that received US training “performed well in Amisom operations — for example, successfully retaking territory from Al-Shabaab,” the Rand study team adds.

In addition to supporting KDF contingents deployed in Somalia, the US has focused on enhancing the capacity of Kenyan police, including through the creation of specialised anti-terrorism units, this country-specific report notes.

RECCE SQUAD

US assistance has also been directed to institutional police reforms following the 2007-2008 “outbreak of communal violence in which the police were heavily implicated,” the study says.

“Similarly,” the study adds, “the elite paramilitary police General Services Unit, which has received substantial US support, performed more competently than other units responding to the Westgate Mall attack in 2013, although the overall security forces’ response was plagued by ‘significant shortcomings’.”

Kenyan police forces became “less politicised and more professional” due in part to US assistance from 2008 to 2013, “resulting in better performance in the 2013 elections,” the Rand assessment states.

“Also, some evidence suggests that, following US training, the Anti-Terrorism Police Unit is carrying out fewer extrajudicial killings, collecting better evidence, and making more arrests than in the past.”

#### Military interaction protects US-Kenya relationship

**Prinslow 97** Karl E. Prinslow [Foreign Military Studies Office, Fort Leavenworth] , “Building Military Relations in Africa” Military Review, May-June 1997 OHS-AT

This ERC project constructed a live fire training facility, two 80 person dormitories, two water wells and immunized thousands of people against life threatening diseases, on time and within budget. Tangible improvement to the host nation's equipment readiness and soldiers skills and the American engineer's skills were clearly evident to all participants. The true success was an intangible improvement in KenyaU.S. military relations and a demonstration to the government of Kenya the value of that relationship. This improvement can be measured by the conduct of other US-Kenya exercises in FY96 and Kenyan planning for and acceptance of proposed ERC projects and combined training exercises for FY1997-99. Greater participation on the part of other Kenyan units and a broader range of exercises will achieve the CINC's objective of working with a viable coalition partner. This exercise also contributed to the positive US Department of Defense perception of the Kenyan military's potential for contributions to larger forces. The combination of these results reflect the success of the intangible mission of improving international relations.

The weapon of combined exercises in the arsenal of preventive diplomacy and preventive defense must remain on the frontline and members of the American Army must remain ready to use it. In so doing the U.S. Army will achieve its desired training on Mission Essential Tasks and achieve greater efficiencies in international relations via this military to military interaction.

#### Assistance sustains US-Kenya ties and protects key naval bases – also stabilizes East Africa and maintains the leveraging power to push for human rights reform - turns case.

**Johns 90** Michael Johns [Michael Johns is a former policy analyst for African and Third World Affairs at The Heritage Foundation], April 24, 1990, "Strengthening U.S. Ties With Kenya," Heritage Foundation, <https://www.heritage.org/africa/report/strengthening-us-ties-kenya> OHS-AT

766 April 24,1990 INTRODUCIION Among the many dividends of communism's collapse in Eastern Europe is the emergence of a new-found respect in Africa for the United States. From Pretoria, South Africa, to Lagos, Nigeria, African governments are seeking stronger relations with what they perceive to be the world's sole surviving superpower. Yet, at the very moment that Washington could begin devising a creative U.S. policy for Africa, some members of Congress are attacking those African nations that could anchor expanded American engagement in Africa In particular jeopardy is Washington's relationship with one of America's strongest African allies, Kenya. Some members of Congress want to suspend economic and military assistance to Kenya due to alleged human rights viola tions by the Ken y an government Supporting U.S. Interests. Since achieving independence from Britain in 1963, Kenya has been one of the few African nations to pursue a pro-Westem political course. In contrast to most African governments, Kenya has permitted and even welcomed American military access to its naval and air bases. U.S. naval-forces’ dock-adBGel-at Mombasa, Kenya's principal seaport, located on Kenya's southeastern Indian Ocean coast. More important, American use of Mombasa enables the U.S. to project air and naval power in the Gulf of Aden, Indian Ocean, and Persian Gulf in the event of emergencies or threats to American security interests in these regions.

Kenya supports American political interests in Africa as well. With Washington's endorsement, Kenyan Pres ident Daniel arap Moi says he wants to mediate settlements to long-standing civil wars in Ethiopia, Mozambique and Sudan In Sudan, Moi cooperates with Washington's famine relief efforts, which have saved tens of thousands of Sudanese from starvation. Keny a has been the largest provider of famine relief supplies to Sudan.

Despite this, Representative Howard Wolpe, the Michigan Democrat, is leading the attack against Kenya. Though Wolpe mutes his criticism of some of Africas most egregious human rights violators, like Ethiopias Mengistu Haile Mariam he has lashed out at Kenya, and threatened to seek the termination of U.S. military and economic assistance unless human rights in Kenya are improved prosperous Kenya, the Bush Administration and Congress should be consistent in using human rights as a determinant of American policy. The U.S surely cannot ignore violations by communist regimes like those in Ethiopia and Angola while criticizing governments like Mois that not only are friendly to the U.S but which are less repressive than other nations in Africa.

Seeking Stronger Ties. More important, besides the value of preserving U.S.-Kenyan strategic and political cooperation, healthy relations with Kenya will allow Washington to nudge Moi toward a better human rights record. The U.S. thus should seek an even stronger U.S.-Kenyan relationship in which the U.S. can play a constructive role in encouraging political pluralism, a free market economy, and respect for human rights and liberties, while continuing to benefit from U.S.-Kenyan strategic cooperation. To protect strong U.S.-Kenyan relations and help foster a free and To achieve these objectives, the Bush Administration should Maintain U.S. access to the Kenyan air and naval facility at Mom Invite Kenyan Presid e nt Daniel arap Moi to visit Washington to re basa emphasize the importance of U.S.-Kenyan relations. Bush and Moi should discuss increased political, strategic, and trade cooperation between Washington and Nairobi, and Mois role as a peacemaker in Africa E ncourage Kenya to initiate free market reforms, such as privatizing state enterprises and eliminating price and marketing controls. Despite enormous potential, the Kenyan economy is seriously hampered by too much government involvement Assist financially, through the National Endowment for Democracy NED those-Kenyan-organizations that support democraticf free market values Continue military aid, currently $15 million per year, to Kenya to maintain U.S. air and naval access to Kenyan military facilities and assist Kenya in defending itself from external aggression. Kenya borders heavily armed nations such as Ethiopia and Uganda, and U.S. security assistance is important for Kenyas defense Organize a U.S.-Kenyan business council to identi0 and resolve problem s of U.S. investors in Kenya, including burdensome bureaucratic procedures and corruption 2 FROM COLONIALISM TO MOI Before winning independence in 1963, Kenya was a British colony. Britain obtained control over Kenya at the 1885 Berlin Conference, where th e major European powers divided East Africa into spheres of influence.

Britain declared Kenya a British Protectorate in 1895, and Kenya was made an official colony in 1920 rule reached a high point when members of Kenyas Kikuyu tribe launched the Mau Mau rebellion against the British in October 19

52. Mau Mau was a secret organization of Kikuyus who terrorized the British, and often killed other Kikuyus who refused to take an oath swearing not to cooperate with the British Britis h security forces aiding Kenyan police brought the insur rection to an end in 1956, but only after some 13,500 Kenyans were killed. Tens of thousands of suspected and known Mau Mau were detained by the British leaders of the Kenya African Union (KAU an an ti-colonial nationalist party, were arrested and accused of organizing the rebellion.

Prompted in part by the Mau Mau rebellion, London in 1955 began taking steps toward grant ing Kenyaindependence A- ban on Kenyan political parties was partially lifted th at year, ena bling local level political associa tions to organize freely As political activity in Kenya increased, debate intensified among Kenyans over how political power should be distributed in an independent Kenya.

Kenyas two major political par Kenyan opposition to colonial 3 ties -the Kenya African Democratic Union (KADU) and the Kenya African National Union KANU differed strongly on how to share political power.

Since KADU drew its support from a coalition of Kenyas smaller tribes, it advocated a decentralized or federal constitution to prevent political domina tion by Kenyas largest tribe, the Kikuyu. KANU, by contrast, advocated a centralized system of government KANU was led by the charismatic Jomo Kenyatta, who was previously impriso!ed.by t he-Bgtish .as an organizer of the Mau Mau rebellion and who became the first black African insurgent to be known world-wide ber 12,19

63. At first it appeared that Kenya would become a federal state similar to that advocated by KADU. Kenyas first independe nt constitution finalized by KADU and KANU in London in September-1963, gave local governments considerable political autonomy. But in August 1964, Kenyatta announced his intention to make Kenya a centralized republic, abolishing regional autonomy and cre a ting a strong presidency. The proposal was heated ly debated, but when the proposal was voted upon in November 1964, KADU was unable to prevent its passage. Recognizing that the measure was likely to pass, KADU announced that it was dissolving its party a n d merging with KANU On the first anniversary of independence, Kenya was proclaimed a republic. Kenyatta was elected Kenyas president, the first of only two presi dents to rule Kenya. Campaigns for Kenyas parliament have been contested by a multiplicity of KANU candidates, and debate within the party has been uncharacteristically wide for a one-party state. Nonetheless, the centraliza tion of political power within KANU has spawned limited political freedom in Kenya with opposing political parties banned. T h e Kenya Peoples Union KPU), a small political party, was formed in 1966, but the party was banned officially bythe government in 1969 Centralized Republic. Britain granted Kenya full independence on Decem When Kenyatta died on August 22,1978, Vice Preside n t Daniel arap Moi assumed the presidency, in accordance with the countrys constitution. As Kenyatta before him, Moi also serves as president of KANU, which remains Kenyas only legal political party. Unlike Kenyatta, Moi is not a Kikuyu, but comes from the Kalenjin tribe which, at 11 percent of Kenyaspopulation; is about half the size of the Kikuyus. Under Mois leadership, the ethnic base of Kenyas-government has been broadenedtg include-such smaller Kenyan eth nic groups as the Luo and Kamba. Those of Soma l i origin are dso better rep resented MODERN KENYA Kenya is located on Africas east coast, bordering the Indian Ocean to its east and five African countries Ethiopia, Somalia, Sudan, Tanzania, and Uganda to the north, west, and south tive prosperity in a r e gion characterized by political chaos, successive coups Since independence in 1963, Kenya has been an island of stability and rela I 4 detat, violence, and poverty. Kenyas neighbors include some of the worlds most egregious human rights violators such as Ethiopia, Somalia, and Sudan.

Four of Kenyas neighbors Ethiopia, Somalia, Sudan, and Uganda are embroiled in devastating civil wars. And in each of Kenyas neighbors, hunger and starvation are commonplace Human Rights Improvements. Though Moi has kept his n ation at peace Kenyas seven major ethnic groups the Kalenjin, Kamba, Kikuyu, Kisii Luhya, Luo, and Meru -remain bitter rivals. As such, the potential for violence is a major Kenyan concern. Kenyas human rights climate, though often criticized by Western l i berals, is better than such East African neigh bors as Ethiopia, Somalia, and Sudan. According to the U.S. Department of State, there were no political murders in Kenya last year, no reports of disap pearances, and Kenyans were free to engage in private e c onomic activity and own property without government interference.\* Additionally, last June Moi freed all political prisoners detained without trial or charge? Living standards also are higher in Kenya than in other black African nations. The best baromete r of this may be life expectancy In Kenya it is 58 years, the highest of any East African nation.This compares with 53 years inTanzania 49 years in Burundi and in Rwanda, 48 years in Uganda, 47 years in Ethiopia and 47 years in Somalia4 (U.S. life expectan c y is 75 years; Egyptian is 61 Kenya also has fared better economically than its neighbors. Though the Kenyan economy has been hampered by stifling regulations such as govern ment control of major financial institutions and price.controls on many agricultu ral and industrial products and by corruption in many business sec- tors, Kenyas per capita gross national product is the largest in East Africa.

For 1987 it was $330, compared with $300 for Rwanda 290 for Somalia 260 for yganda 250 for Burundi 180 for Tan zania, and $130 for Ethiopia. Kenya has the most developed roads in the region, and it is the only East African nation with a notable industrial capability, producing beverages, tobacco, textiles, cement, metals, and other products. The Kenyan 1 For a ful l er discussion of human rights and political conditions in the Horn of Africa,.see.Michael Johns Preserving American Security Ties to Somalia, Heritage Foundation Backgrounder No. 745, December 26 1989; Michael Johns, A Cautious Welcome for Sudans New Gove r nment, Heritage Foundation Executive Ethiopia, Heritage Foundation Bacmunder No. 692, February 23,1989 2 U.S. Department of State, Counby Reports on Human Rights for-1989: Kenya,-pp. 159-160 3 Kenya Orders Detainees Freed, The Washington Post, June 8,1989 , p. A28 4 The World Bank, World Development Report 1989: Financial Systems and World Development Indicators June 1989, Table 1 (Basic indicators), p. 164 5 The World Bank, World Tables (Baltimore: The Johns Hopb Un;VerS;ty Press, 1989 country tables Memor andum Nor245,-Jdy-28,-1989; and Michael Johns,-!A U.S. Strategy to Foster Human Rights in 5 industrial sector is growing over 12 percent each year. Kenya also is, by far, the largest exporter of goods in East Africa.

Nonetheless, Kenya is one of only 42 co untries listed by the World Ba&p low income economies. Agriculture is the base of the Kenyan economy, ac counting for approximately 30 percent of gross domestic product and engaging over 75 percent of the population, and earning about 66 percent f Kenyas f oreign exchange. In recent years tourism has sur passed coffee and tea as Kenyas main foreign revenue earner as commodity prices for these agricultural products have fal len. Last years earnings on tourism are estimated to have been 340 million, with over 700,000 tourists visiting Kenya.

Unlike Angola, Nigeria, Zaire and other African countries that have natural resources like coal copper, diamonds, and oil Kenya can boast no significant natural resources 9 8 AMERICA AND KENYA Kenyas beauty and splendor ar e well known to Americans about 78,000 of them visit Kenya each-year,Moreover,-some--l20 U.S. firms have subsidiaries, af filiates, or branch offices in Kenya, making the country 6 World Development Report 1989, op. cit.,Table 1 (Basic indicators p. 164 7 U.S. Department of Commerce, Foeign Economic Tends and Their Implications for the United States prepared by the American Embassy, Nairobi March 1990, p 8 8 Roger Throw, Capital Flight Strains Kenyan Economy, Wall SbLeet Journal, August 17,1989 6 among the most attractive African nations for U.S. investment. American firms in Kenya include Cheesbrough-Ponds Incorporated, Delmonte General Motors Corporation, and Mobil Oil Corporation. Kenya is Africas fastest growing commercial market for U.S. goods. U.S. ex p orts to Kenya last year totalled $133 million and included fertilizers, locomotives, industrial and agricultural chemicals, computers, and other products This makes Kenya the third.largest market in Sub:S-aharan Africa. for U.S, goods. after South Africa and Nigeria. Imports from Kenya were 68.3 million, and included coffee tea, and insecticides.

Kenya is important strategically to the U.S. Access to Kenyan air and seaports facilitates American capability to project air and naval power in the Indian Ocean to ensure the free flow of international commerce and to respond to any crisis or security threat, such as terrorism, in the region Important Port. As a result of these threats, the U.S. signed a military agreement with Kenya in April 1980 which permits t h e U.S. Navy to use Mombasa as a liberty port for refueling and docking. Also under the 1980 agreement, the U.S. Navy and Air Force can use Kenyan air facilities if air forces are needed to counteract aggression in the region. The agreement stipulates that either party can renegotiate its terms this year was used extensively for docking and refueling of American warships The U.S. has not used Mombasa for any other major military operations in the past decade, and the facility is considered less important fo r American security interests than the naval and air base in Berbera, Somalia, along Somalias northern coast. Nonetheless, Mombasa continues to play a valuable role as a potential launching point should American forces need to counter terrorism or foreign a gression in the Indian Ocean, Persian Gulf, or Sub Saharan Africa. These are important, though unstable, regions for American security interests. Because an estimated 500,000 barrels of crude oil pass through the region every day, much of which is destine d for the U.S and because the region contains such unpredictable states as Ethiopia and Iran, the U.S. needs to maintain its access to Mombasa.

Mombasas importance is magnified further in light of mounting political instability in Somalia. Mohammed Siad B arre, Somalias leader, disbanded his cabinet this January in a last ditch effort to save his fledgling regime. Anti months, and political opposition to Siad has reached an all-time high. Should Siad fall, the U.S. stands to potentially lose its right to o perate from Berbera and Mogadishu, Somalia’s two military bases, leaving Mombasa as the only remaining military facility in the region to which the U.S. has access. During American naval patrols in the Persian Gulf in the 1980s, Mombasa SiIdreEels have mount e d-military offensives-with growing-success-in-recent 9 9 For a Mer discussion of the importance of Somalias military facilities for US. strategic interests in the Horn of Africa and the Middle East, see Johns, Preserving American Security Ties to Somalia, op. cit 7 KENYAS IMPORTANCE TO EAST AFRICA Because of its economic and political stability, Kenya has the potential of becoming an influential economic and political example of success for East Africa if Kenya achieves steady economic growth and greater p olitical liberty.

Because Nairobi serves as the commercial center for East Africa, and be cause SMombasa is the central port of the region,-Kenya is well positioned for becoming the hub of regional economic growth.

Ethiopia, Somalia, Sudan, Uganda and other neighbors that trade with Kenya could follow Kenya down the road of free market and democratic reform, opening the door potentially for peace and greater prosperity in em battled East Africa. A prerequisite of su c h regional influence already exists in West Africa, where Nigerias democratic, free market reforms are influencing the attitudes of West Africans. In Nigerias western neighbor, Benin, for in stance, calls for democratic change led to the toppling this mon th of Benins dictator Mathieu Kerekou. In the West African nation of Ivory Coast, too calls are now intensifying for multi-party democracy. If Kenya is successful, it could have a similar impact on Somalia, Tanzania, or even Marxist-controlled Ethiopia.

**Effective naval power prevents global nuclear war**

Seth **Cropsey 16**, Director, Center for American Seapower, 4/13/16, “New American Grand Strategy,” http://www.hudson.org/research/12409-new-american-grand-strategy

The U.S. today faces a heretofore unfamiliar strategic challenge, the possibility of **three linked hegemonies** that span the Eurasian land mass. Russia is on the ramparts in Ukraine, Georgia, and the Middle East. Its Baltic State ambitions are not a secret. NATO’s failure to respond in a real crisis means the alliance’s end and a maturing Russian hegemony that stretches from Central Asia to the Atlantic. China actively seeks to become Asia’s hegemon. Iran’s rulers, armed with missiles of increasing range, added financial resources, and the likelihood of nuclear weapons, have their eye on dominating the strategic space between Moscow’s influence and Beijing’s.

A single hegemony on the Eurasian land mass threatens U.S. markets, our ability to keep conflict at a distance, regional stability, and democracy. At a minimum, the three hegemonies would **overturn the current liberal international order**. If the U.S. does not take effective action to prevent this, its run as a pre-eminent global power will end. **Proximity to the oceans and seas** offers the U.S. the opportunity to leverage its **still-dominant seapower** as **the key** to countering or if necessary opposing the three would-be hegemons.

Since Woodrow Wilson, the goal of American foreign policy has been to prevent regional hegemony.

Two decades after Wilson, President Roosevelt led the United States in another global conflict, against Nazi Germany and the Empire of Japan. Both Europe and Asia were—and remain— critical to our hopes for greater prosperity, security, and an increasingly democratic world. The United States and its allies destroyed both totalitarian hegemons. Finally, the United States contained the Soviet Union for almost half a century, blunting its threat to Europe, and confronting its expanding influence in Asia, Africa, the Middle East, and Latin America.

Emerging from this century of nearly continuous global conflict, the United States was the unquestioned global power. No state could challenge it economically, politically, or militarily. The U.S. destroyed the Iraqi military twice in slightly over a decade, and put a stop to ethnic cleansing in the Balkans.

New threats have ended this brief period of America’s benevolent international leadership. Three competitors are at odds with the American-led international system. The sum of their ambitions is to undermine U.S. global power.

A resurgent Russia aims to reclaim its previous glory, and capitalize on the current U.S. administration’s idea that a small America translates into a more secure world.

The European refugee crisis and potential destabilization in the European Union challenge the American alliance system in Europe – the cornerstone of American security policy since the end of World War II. America’s remaining allies show little resolve. Meager European defense budgets make matters worse.

In Asia, a rising China focuses on cultivating its economic resources and marshalling them to develop its military power. China’s island-building campaign that seeks to extend its territorial claims into international waters directly confronts the international order. As Admiral Harry Harris, commander of U.S. forces in the Pacific recently told Congress, “China has unilaterally changed the (region’s) status quo.” Beijing combines its land reclamation campaign with high-tempo presence operations, conducted by the PLAN and coast guard in contested areas of the South and East China Seas. The Chinese are also **accelerating their ability to project naval power** and control the seas by constructing troop transports, large surface combatants, and a second aircraft carrier.

This situation bears a resemblance to the world America faced before World War II when Nazi Germany and Imperial Japan initially overwhelmed the European powers that had refused to rearm following World War I.

But the semblance is passing. America faces not two aspiring hegemons, but three. The Middle East is the critical link between Europe and Asia. Its oil-rich states supply a large amount of the world’s energy resources, and facilitate exchange between the two hemispheres. With the Red Sea and Persian Gulf/Arabian Sea in the South, the Mediterranean to the West, and the Caspian and Black Sea to the North, the Middle East is more like an island than a contiguous land mass.

On this island Iran attempts to assert its dominance. Russia aids Iran with weapons transfers and its support of Iranian proxy Bashar al-Assad. Relieved of sanctions, the Islamic Republic has begun to receive massive financial inflows, and has actively directed some of its profits towards obtaining dual-use military technology like jet engines. Iranian Special Forces, known as the Quds Force, conduct paramilitary operations in Iraq and Syria, expanding Tehran’s influence over its neighbors.

Although America’s adversaries have worked with one another in the past, the current degree of cooperation between China, Russia, and Iran is a strategic terra incognita. Iranian oil shipped into Chinese ports generates financial resources that the Islamic Republic uses to purchase advanced weapons from Russia. Russia helps Iran fight its proxy wars while Iran supports growing Russian influence in the Eastern Mediterranean.

America’s three strategic competitors oppose the U.S. in similar ways. China, Russia, and Iran understand the lessons of the First Gulf War. Since the Cold War’s end, America’s style of warfare has been to build coalitions, amass men and resources in neighboring countries, and launch combined arms assaults that overwhelm the enemy technologically and operationally. The American-led coalition in the First Gulf War of nearly one million soldiers eviscerated an entrenched Iraqi army of over 1.5 million. However, without neighboring Saudi Arabia’s willingness, the U.S. would have been unable to conduct the operation. A naval assault would have been smaller, and Kuwait’s crowded coastline could have meant high casualties.

The First Gulf War suggested a clear strategy to counter the U.S. Deny American forces access to a region, and the U.S. loses power. Chinese, Russian, and Iranian efforts have all focused on denying America access to their respective regions. As it turns up the heat on the Baltic States, Russia is proscribing options for a rapid buildup by deploying long-range air defense and strike missiles at NATO’s borders. This is consistent with U.S. European Command commander General Philip Breedlove’s late February statement to Congress that “President Putin has sought to undermine the rules-based system of European security and attempted to maximize his power on the world stage.” China’s land reclamation campaign, increasing naval power, and anti-ship missiles aim to keep American forces at a distance from which effective combat power cannot readily be applied. Iran’s low-cost missile boats, midget subs, large numbers of ballistic and cruise missile as well as mines, and its influence at the Strait of Hormuz seek to offset American escalation. Instability in Iraq and the U.S.’s shaky relations with Pakistan further restrict staging points for an American attack.

Declining U.S. military budgets and a shrinking force combined with poor treatment of critical allies have made things worse calling into question the US’ ability to honor its commitments. The current administration’s abrogation of ballistic missile defense agreements with Poland and the Czech Republic; its prolonged interruption of defensive arms sales to Taiwan; and its failure to keep the Saudis informed about last year’s deal with Iran are examples of treating allies shabbily. As a result, the U.S. is less able to rely on adequate basing rights where they are needed both to deter and if necessary to fight.

The man or woman who takes office 10 months from now faces a new challenge to U.S. national security. It calls for changes to American strategy. The access that once allowed us to deter the Soviets has been eroded. Its resurrection in today’s Europe is unlikely. Such access is largely nonexistent in the Middle East and tenuous in East Asia.

Coalitions of allied and partner nations remain extremely important—as they have since the U.S. became a major power. U.S. ground forces will not go it alone. They rarely have. Even the 1994 operation to remove Haiti’s military junta engaged coalition partners: Poland and Argentina. The combat operation, had it been necessary, would have been staged out of the U.S, Puerto Rico and Guantanamo.

Equally reliable options are limited in Eurasia. So, while alliances and partnerships—for example, of Sunni states opposed to ISIS—are vital, they may not always be available, or dependable. If North Korea were to invade the South, there is no guarantee that Japan would allow its bases to be used for repelling the invaders or striking deep into North Korea.

**Seapower** possesses the advantages of geography, mobility, and—with sufficient investment—numbers and growing technological edge. It will be **essential in future conflicts** because it depends less on nearby bases. Logistics ships in sufficient number can keep battle groups including amphibious forces on station, present, and combat-ready largely independent of basing agreements. Maritime coalitions will likely offer more security in the future. But there is **no alternative to dominant U.S. seapower today**. Allies like Japan lack the industrial capacity to make up the deficit between the U.S. Navy and the expanding PLAN. Newer partners like Vietnam cannot hope to hold against a Chinese onslaught without American support. Seapower is the surest means to assure constant access to effective combat capability in the Western Pacific.

The same shift in thinking applies to the greater Middle East. Its gulfs and seas allow access that is largely independent of diplomatic agreement. Robust seapower may not be sufficient to cover our security interests in the Middle East, but its usefulness increases proportionately to the territorial holdings on which ISIS makes its claim as a caliphate. The Persian Gulf and Gulf of Oman are Iran’s southwest and southern borders. It’s a long haul from there or from the Eastern Mediterranean to Tehran but a doable one with refueling tankers based in Gulf States or carrier-launched drones of the foreseeable future that can refuel the ship’s strike aircraft.

The Cold War plan to mass land forces in defense of Europe has been voided by continental hopes that perpetual peace arrived. Even the most stalwart American partners, such as the UK, have cut military capacity and capability. But Europe is a peninsula. It is surrounded by accessible waters from St. Petersburg to Crimea. Seapower cannot stop a Russian ground invasion of the Baltics but it can snap the supply lines of an attack and give such ground forces as NATO can muster a chance to prevail. **Naval vessels’ ability to project power inland can also deter Russia**.

The U.S. has emerged into a new world. To the potential for **nuclear warfare with a would-be peer competitor**—**China**—that American statesmen most wished to avoid after the Cold War have been added threats from a **nuclear-armed Russia**, **North Korea**, and sooner or later, **Iran**. The more immediate prospect of a triple hegemony may not be an existential threat. But its outcome would cripple our markets, destroy our alliances, and endanger us where we live. **All can be avoided** by a change in grand strategy that continues to hold threats at a distance as it relies on the **independence, accessibility, and technological superiority of seapower**.

### Egypt Terror – UQ CP

#### CP text: the USFG should

#### Encourages Egypt to accept military aid and bolsters the fight against terror.

**Soliman 4/27** Mohamed Soliman [Mohamed Soliman is a Huffington Fellow at the Georgetown University’s Institute for the Study of Diplomacy, where he focuses on US strategy in the Middle East. He appears frequently on television interviews to provide expert commentary on unfolding current events in the Middle East. Soliman has published in several media outlets, including Foreign Affairs, ​Open Democracy and La Stampa, as well as analysis for the Middle East Institute.], 4-27-2018, "How America Can Help Egypt in its War On Terror," The Washington Institute, <https://www.washingtoninstitute.org/fikraforum/view/how-america-can-help-egypt-in-its-war-on-terror> OHS-AT

To be sure, the United States finds it challenging to convince the Egyptian government to accept counter-terrorism training and its integration into its military doctrine. Nevertheless, the U.S. should reorient its military relations with Egypt and build more international support to counter the growing Islamist insurgency in Sinai. The U.S. should also persuade the European counterparts to conduct counter-insurgency training for the Egyptian ground and air forces. Egyptian-European military exercises are still limited to naval operations, which have historically played a role in Egypt’s patrol of the southern Mediterranean Sea and the prevention of illegal immigration to Europe. In light of IS expansion into Northern Sinai, such naval cooperation is insufficient and broader cooperation is needed immediately.

The Egyptian army has been skeptical of any pressure from the U.S. regarding Egypt’s military operations. Egypt has always perceived U.S. military aid in its current form as compensation for the peace treaty with Israel, and would perceive any revision of U.S. military aid as an unfriendly act. But the current landscape offers the most opportune moment to restructure the Egyptian army for fighting the IS insurgency in Sinai, due to the Sisi regime’s need for a quick win to reinvigorate its legitimacy among Egyptians. The U.S. can still pressure the Egyptian leadership to change its arm deals priorities to include the needed counter-terrorism tools.(Instead, to cite but two examples, Egypt has recently bought German submarines and two French amphibious helicopter landing vehicles last year, from national funds.) Finally, on the non-military side, the Egyptian priorities towards Sinai should include a development plan providing basic infrastructure and creating job opportunities for the local Sinai Bedouin, who were marginalized for decades.

### Egypt Terror - DA

#### Terrorist main operations have relocated into Egypt

**Raghavan 3/14** Sudarsan Raghavan, 3-14-2018, "Militant threat emerges in Egyptian desert, opening new front in terrorism fight," Washington Post, <https://www.washingtonpost.com/world/militant-threat-emerges-in-egyptian-desert-opening-new-front-in-terrorism-fight/2018/03/13/1b24e776-1653-11e8-930c-45838ad0d77a_story.html?noredirect=on&utm_term=.0b660f3deef7> OHS-AT

EL WAHAT EL BAHARIYA, Egypt — The desolate terrain of Egypt’s Western Desert is emerging as a new frontier in the global fight against terrorism.

Militant groups linked to the Islamic State and al-Qaeda are using the desert as both a haven and a crossing point for smuggling fighters, weapons and illicit goods from Libya, where lawlessness rules.

Along a highway stretching toward the Libyan border, the winds blow across a vast no man’s land of sand dunes, rocky scrubs and barren hills. There are no villages, no signs of life save for the cars and trucks that speed past. But this peaceful landscape, just an hour’s drive from Cairo, is the staging ground for an ambitious insurgency.

“It’s geographically a crucial place for the terrorists and extremists,” said Khaled Okasha, an Egyptian security expert and member of a government council to counter terrorism and extremism. “The presence of caves and hills makes it easier for them to attack and hide. And the capital is close. They can carry out attacks in a lot of nearby places.”

The ranks of the insurgents are being filled, in part, by fighters returning from Syria and Iraq, where the Islamic State’s caliphate has been dismantled, according to security officials and analysts.

Ominously, a new group linked to al-Qaeda has also emerged in the desert, announcing its presence with an attack in October that killed at least 16 security forces. This group, Ansar al-Islam, is now competing directly with the Islamic State, which had already been active in the Western Desert, introducing a rivalry that could fuel a further uptick in violence.

In recent months, the militants have been solidifying their presence along the Libyan border, moving freely across it with the help of sympathetic tribes. It is a reminder of the extent to which the instability that emerged in Libya after the Arab Spring revolts continues to spill across national borders.

Egypt is using American equipment and military vehicles to surveil and patrol its 700 mile-long border with Libya. At the same time, the Sissi government is aligning with Russia in backing Libyan strongman Khalifa Hifter, who controls much of eastern Libya in the hopes that he will stabilize the border areas.

Yet, despite billions of dollars in military assistance from the United States and other western nations, Egypt’s security forces have struggled to control the flow of militants into the Western Desert.

“There are areas of the border that remain completely unsecured 100 percent,” said Mohannad Sabry, an Egyptian journalist and the author of a book on the Islamist insurgency in Sinai. “The attacks in the past few months tell a lot about how much the terrorists are able to mobilize across the border.”

The militant activity in the Western Desert has largely been overshadowed by the violence emanating from the northern Sinai. ISIS suicide bombers have blasted churches. Hundreds of minority Christians have been killed or injured in militant attacks.

Sufi Muslims, viewed as heretics by the Sunni extremists, have also been targeted. In November, militants who authorities said were affiliated with ISIS overran the Sufi al-Rawda mosque in the northern Sinai, killing more than 300 worshipers gathered for Friday prayers. It was the deadliest terrorist attack in Egypt’s history.

Meanwhile, attacks on security forces in urban areas by smaller Islamic extremist groups, with names like Hasm and Liwaa el-Thawra, that seek political change have risen in the past year, also catching the public’s attention. Hasm is the Arabic acronym for the Forearms of Egypt Movement.

The extent of the threat in the Western Desert became clearer in October. About 80 miles southwest of Cairo, not far off the highway, militants attacked a security convoy patrolling near an oasis, killing at least 16 soldiers and police. Military officials said more than 50 died, but the government disputed that figure, even attacking foreign media for reporting the higher number.

For security officials and analysts, the attack revealed that the situation in the Western Desert was more serious than the government had admitted. The attack was claimed by a little-known al-Qaeda-linked group, Ansar al-Islam, which declared a holy war against the Egyptian state, suggesting another lethal dimension to Egypt’s spreading Islamist militant landscape. Linked to Libyan extremists, the group has pledged allegiance to al-Qaeda in the Islamic Maghreb, the network’s North and West Africa branch.

“The location of the ambush suggests that a new theatre of operations linked to Libya may be emerging,” wrote the International Crisis Group, a nonpartisan U.S. think tank, in a Jan. 31 report.

#### Revitalizied military assistance towards Egypt sufficiently wipes out Isis presence

**Soliman 4/27** Mohamed Soliman [Mohamed Soliman is a Huffington Fellow at the Georgetown University’s Institute for the Study of Diplomacy, where he focuses on US strategy in the Middle East. He appears frequently on television interviews to provide expert commentary on unfolding current events in the Middle East. Soliman has published in several media outlets, including Foreign Affairs, ​Open Democracy and La Stampa, as well as analysis for the Middle East Institute.], 4-27-2018, "How America Can Help Egypt in its War On Terror," The Washington Institute, <https://www.washingtoninstitute.org/fikraforum/view/how-america-can-help-egypt-in-its-war-on-terror> OHS-AT

Faced with a stubborn common terrorist enemy, the United States should expand its military support for the Egyptian army’s capabilities, focusing more on training and equipping it to counter the Islamic State (IS) in Sinai. Without increased U.S. military aid, Egypt will be ill-equipped to counter the threat of IS, which will gain a crucial foothold that can expand into other parts of the Middle East. For its part, Egypt must integrate modern counter-terrorism techniques into its military doctrine.

In the past year, IS has lost most of its territories in Iraq and Syria. But having established a powerful base in Egypt since 2013, IS shifted its attention from Iraq and Syria to Egypt. There has been a continuous Islamist insurgency in Northern Sinai led by more than 1,000 IS fighters. The Sinai insurgency has had drastic consequences: the take-down of a Russian passenger plane in 2015 that killed all 224 people on board; the attacks on the Multinational Force of Observers (MFO), including American personnel Task Force of Sinai; the killing of more than 250 people in the al-Rawda mosque bombing of November 2017, and the targeting of Egypt’s Minister of Defense and Minister of Interior during their visit to al-Arish airport in December 2017.

In February 2018, Egypt’s military started Operation Sinai, involving land, naval and air forces, plus police and border guards, to target terrorist organizations in northern and southern Sinai. After two weeks of military operations, Mohamed Farid, chief of staff of the armed forces, asked President Sisi to extend the campaign by at least three months. Farid justified his request by noting the terrorist organizations’ extensive possession of explosives and the hardships that Egypt’s forces face in residential areas. In fact, the Egyptian Army has been incapable of countering IS expansion because it lacks advanced relevant training for its aircrews and enhanced ground forces training in urban combat.

Current American aid to Egypt has strengthened Egypt’s ability for conventional warfare, but has not enhanced the capabilities necessary to defeat IS in Sinai. The Egyptian army’s failure underscores the need to re-evaluate the effectiveness of the $1.3 billion in annual U.S. military support. This aid started as compensation for Egypt’s peace deal with Israel, by providing an alternative arms supplier to Cairo, and establishing a semi-military deterrence between Egypt and Israel. Today, however, the United States cannot and should not shoulder this responsibility alone. European nations, NATO, and Israel also have a vested interest in countering IS threats in this region, and should play an active role in increasing Egyptian counter-terrorism capability.

### Egyptian Stability - DA

#### Continued US military aid is necessary to stabilize Egypt – spills over to the entire Middle. East and preserves counterterrorist operations

Clingan 7/31 Bruce Clingan, 7-31-2018, "Commentary: The U.S. is right to restore aid to Egypt," U.S., <https://www.reuters.com/article/us-clingan-egypt-commentary/commentary-the-us-is-right-to-restore-aid-to-egypt-idUSKBN1KK1YE> OHS-AT

Last week the United States restored the $195 million in military aid that it had withheld from Egypt because of the country’s human rights record and its ties to North Korea. This was the right move.

Egypt has long been one of the world’s largest recipients of U.S. aid, accepting $71.6 billion in bilateral military and economic aid between 1948 and 2011 – the largest amount of any country in that time period, other than Israel. The United States has given Egypt about $1.3 billion per year in military aid since 1987. Last August, the United States decided to deny Egypt $95.7 million in aid and to delay an additional $195 million because of concerns about human rights under Abdel Fattah al-Sisi.

Sisi was elected president after he led the army in ousting Mohammad Mursi. His government then enacted a law restricting the activities of nongovernmental organizations – part of a wider crackdown on dissent. Under Sisi scores of websites have been taken down and journalists and opponents have been arrested. In a 2017 State Department memo to Congress, U.S. officials wrote that the “overall human rights climate in Egypt continues to deteriorate, with the government enacting legislation that conflicts with its human rights obligations, including the right of peaceful assembly, freedom of association, freedom of expression, and due process guarantees.” In March voters elected Sisi to a second term, in an election that saw all major opposition candidates cut short their campaigns, citing intimidation.

Yet despite Sisi’s record on human rights, it is still in the United States’ interests to support Egypt. Doing so will help hold the line against IS and prevent Egypt from turning to a country like Russia for security and economic cooperation. Washington should adopt a two-track approach with Egypt, as it has historically done with Turkey, advancing security issues at the same time it pushes for improvements in human rights and democracy.

Egypt has long been a critical U.S. security partner because of its control of the Suez Canal and its border with Israel. When U.S. forces are engaged in the region, Egypt provides expedited access for U.S. naval vessels transiting the Suez Canal and overflight rights for U.S. military aircraft, both of which are crucial for the United States’ ability to project power across the Middle East. Its role as a linchpin of regional stability has grown with multiple forces roiling the Middle East in recent years. Amid Iranian and Russian entrenchment in the Levant, and the recent rise in IS and Hamas operations, Egypt has remained squarely in the camp of secular and reformist Middle Eastern countries trying to stop the spread of Islamist extremism.

Cairo is working with Israel to contain IS in the Sinai and Hamas in Gaza, and the countries’ navies coordinate regularly on Mediterranean security issues. I met with Sisi in May, when I visited Egypt as part of a delegation sponsored by the Jewish Institute for National Security of America, and he was keen to emphasize the common security interests Cairo shares with Washington and Jerusalem, and his desire to advance both partnerships.

Egypt’s internal security is threatened by a relentless IS-affiliated insurgency in Sinai. In November the group attacked a Sinai mosque, killing more than 300 people. Egypt also faces the ever-present challenge of preventing the conflict in Libya from spilling over its western border. (While Cairo and Washington both want a stable Libya, the Sisi government is backing Gen. Khalifa Haftar, a military strongman who was once a CIA asset; the United States is supporting his rival and UN-backed Libyan government.)

Further instability in Egypt would be disastrous for its nearly 100 million citizens, the region and the United States. Regardless of which might come first – the collapse of Egypt’s economy or the spread of Islamist insurgency – the other would surely follow.

The result would be new extremist safe havens, millions of desperate Egyptians seeking to flee to Europe, an existential threat to Israel, the disruption of the Suez Canal upon which global economic stability depends and the potential for the United States to get involved in yet another Middle East quagmire.

Recent American support for Egypt’s counterterrorism efforts in Sinai and the resumption of Bright Star joint military exercises are both steps in the right direction. So is the United States’ recent decision to provide Egypt with its fully-authorized $1.3 billion in foreign military financing.

Egypt needs this assistance to replenish military capabilities expended combatting IS in Sinai, and to respond effectively to any IS resurgence. It will also help improve bilateral military interoperability and promote Egypt’s continued phaseout of Soviet-era weaponry.

#### Middle Eastern instability emboldens Iran – guarantees nuclear warfare with Syria and US – extinction.

Russell 09 James A. Russell [Senior Lecturer, National Security Affairs, Naval Postgraduate School], “Strategic Stability Reconsidered: Prospects for Escalation and Nuclear War in the Middle East” Proliferation Papers, No. 26, Spring 2009 OHS-AT

To summarize, systemic weaknesses in the coercive bargaining framework induce the prospect of strategic instability in which escalation could unfold in a number of scenarios leading to the use of nuclear weapons by either the United States, Israel, or Iran. For purposes of this paper, escalation means an expansion of the intensity and scope of the conflict.78 The common denominator for the proposed scenarios is that nuclear use occurs in the context of conflict escalation – a conflict that could be initiated by a variety of different parties and in a variety of different circumstances.79 It is extremely unlikely that either the United States or Israel would initiate the use of nuclear weapons as part of a pre-emptive attack on Iran’s nuclear sites.80 However, there are escalation scenarios involving state and non-state actors in the coercive bargaining framework that could conceivably lead to nuclear weapons use by Israel and/or the United States.

Iran’s response to what would initially start as a sustained stand-off bombardment (Desert Fox Heavy) could take a number of different forms that might lead to escalation by the United States and Israel, surrounding states, and non-state actors. Once the strikes commenced, it is difficult to imagine Iran remaining in a Saddam-like quiescent mode and hunkering down to wait out the attacks. Iranian leaders have unequivocally stated that any attack on its nuclear sites will result in a wider war81 – a war that could involve regional states on both sides as well as non-state actors like Hamas and Hezbollah. While a wider regional war need not lead to escalation and nuclear use by either Israel or the United States, wartime circumstances and domestic political pressures could combine to shape decision-making in ways that present nuclear use as an option to achieve military and political objectives. For both the United States and Israel, Iranian or proxy use of chemical, biological or radiological weapons represent the most serious potential escalation triggers. For Israel, a sustained conventional bombardment of its urban centers by Hezbollah rockets in Southern Lebanon could also trigger an escalation spiral. Assessing relative probability of these scenarios is very difficult and beyond the scope of this article. Some scenarios for Iranian responses that could lead to escalation by the United States and Israel are:

• Terrorist-type asymmetric attacks on either the U.S. or Israeli homelands by Iran or its proxies using either conventional or unconventional (chemical, biological, or radiological) weapons. Escalation is more likely in response to the use of unconventional weapons in populated urban centers. The potential for use of nuclear retaliation against terrorist type attacks is problematic, unless of course the sponsoring country takes official responsibility for them, which seems highly unlikely.

• Asymmetric attacks by Iran or its proxies using unconventional weapons against U.S. military facilities in Iraq and the Gulf States (Kuwait, Bahrain, UAE, Qatar);

• Long-range missile strikes by Iran attacking Israel and/or U.S. facilities in Iraq and the Gulf States:

• Conventional missile strikes in and around the Israeli reactor at Dimona

• Airbursts of chemical or radiological agents in Israeli urban areas;

• Missile strikes using non-conventional weapons against US Gulf facilities such as Al Udeid in Qatar, Al Dhafra Air Base in the UAE, and the 5th Fleet Headquarters in Manama, Bahrain. Under all scenarios involving chemical/biological attacks on its forces, the United States has historically retained the right to respond with all means at its disposal even if the attacks come from a non-nuclear weapons state.82

• The involvement of non-state actors as part of ongoing hostilities between Iran, the United States, and Israel in which Hezbollah and/or Hamas became engaged presents an added dimension for conflict escalation. While tactically allied with Iran and each other, these groups have divergent interests and objectives that could affect their involvement (or non-involvement in a wider regional war) – particularly in ways that might prompt escalation by Israel and the United States. Hezbollah is widely believed to have stored thousands of short range Iranian-supplied rockets in southern Lebanon. Attacking Israel in successive fusillades of missiles over time could lead to domestic political demands on the Israeli military to immediately stop these external attacks – a mission that might require a wide area-denial capability provided by nuclear weapons and their associated PSI overpressures, particularly if its conventional ground operations in Gaza prove in the mid- to longterms as indecisive or strategic ambiguous as its 2006 operations in Lebanon.

• Another source of uncertainty is the Iran Revolutionary Guard Corps (IRGC) – referred to here as “quasi-state” actor. The IRGC manages the regime’s nuclear, chemical and missile programs and is responsible for “extraterritorial” operations outside Iran. The IRGC is considered as instrument of the state and reports directly to Supreme Leader Ayatollah Khamenei. So far, the IRGC has apparently refrained from providing unconventional weapons to its surrogates. The IRGC also, however arms and funds various Shiite paramilitary groups in Iraq and Lebanon that have interests and objectives that may or may not directly reflect those of the Iranian supreme leader. Actions of these groups in a wartime environment are another source of strategic uncertainty that could shape crisis decision-making in unhelpful ways.

• The most likely regional state to be drawn into a conflict on Iran’s side in a wider regional war is Syria, which is widely reported to have well developed missile and chemical warfare programs. Direct Syrian military involvement in an Israeli-U.S./Iranian war taking the form of missile strikes or chemical attacks on Israel could serve as another escalation trigger in a nuclear-use scenario, in particular if chemical or bio-chem weapons are used by the Syrians, technically crossing the WMD-chasm and triggering a retaliatory strike using any category of WMD including nuclear weapons.

• The last – and perhaps most disturbing – of these near-term scenarios is the possible use by Iran of nuclear weapons in the event of conventional strikes by the United States and Israel. This scenario is built on the assumption of a U.S. and/or Israeli intelligence failure to detect Iranian possession of a nuclear device that had either been covertly built or acquired from another source. It is possible to foresee an Iranian “demonstration” use of a nuclear weapon in such a scenario in an attempt to stop an Israeli/U.S. conventional bombardment. A darker scenario would be a direct nuclear attack by Iran on Israel, also precipitated by conventional strikes, inducing a “use them or lose them” response. In turn, such a nuclear strike would almost certainly prompt an Israeli and U.S. massive response – a potential “Armageddon” scenario.

#### Yes extinction – deterrence is wrong

Russell 09 James A. Russell [Senior Lecturer, National Security Affairs, Naval Postgraduate School], “Strategic Stability Reconsidered: Prospects for Escalation and Nuclear War in the Middle East” Proliferation Papers, No. 26, Spring 2009 OHS-AT

Strategic stability in the region is thus undermined by various factors: (1) asymmetric interests in the bargaining framework that can introduce unpredictable behavior from actors; (2) the presence of non-state actors that introduce unpredictability into relationships between the antagonists; (3) incompatible assumptions about the structure of the deterrent relationship that makes the bargaining framework strategically unstable; (4) perceptions by Israel and the United States that its window of opportunity for military action is closing, which could prompt a preventive attack; (5) the prospect that Iran’s response to pre-emptive attacks could involve unconventional weapons, which could prompt escalation by Israel and/or the United States; (6) the lack of a communications framework to build trust and cooperation among framework participants.

These systemic weaknesses in the coercive bargaining framework all suggest that escalation by any the parties could happen either on purpose or as a result of miscalculation or the pressures of wartime circumstance. Given these factors, it is disturbingly easy to imagine scenarios under which a conflict could quickly escalate in which the regional antagonists would consider the use of chemical, biological, or nuclear weapons.

It would be a mistake to believe the nuclear taboo can somehow magically keep nuclear weapons from being used in the context of an unstable strategic framework. Systemic asymmetries between actors in fact suggest a certain increase in the probability of war – a war in which escalation could happen quickly and from a variety of participants. Once such a war starts, events would likely develop a momentum all their own and decision-making would consequently be shaped in unpredictable ways. The international community must take this possibility seriously, and muster every tool at its disposal to prevent such an outcome, which would be an unprecedented disaster for the peoples of the region, with substantial risk for the entire world.