

NEGATIVE REBUTTAL

TEAM B

SAMPLE DEBATE

SAMPLE NEGATIVE REBUTTAL

The landslide victory of Hamas in Palestinian elections, Iran's referral to the United Nations Security Council, U.S. air strikes in Damadola combined with concomitant street protests and public disapproval of U.S. policy in the northwestern provinces of Pakistan and southern provinces of Afghanistan, and the refusal of NATO to send more troops into Afghanistan all indicate a changing global arena that the affirmative proposal fails to consider and expose the inefficacy of the affirmative plan in dealing with not only the War on Terror but also U.S. foreign policy in general.

Furthermore, the affirmative advocacy has shifted, albeit deftly at first glance. The affirmative originally inferred that with the repeal of the Authorization for Use of Military Force of September 18, 2001, the United States reverse its policy in both Iraq and Afghanistan, release Guantanamo detainees, and end the War on Terror. The affirmative has perhaps not been as extra-resolutional as it intended to be; the proposal falls short when trying to address the greater War on Terror, leaving only a gesture that serves to please no one. Furthermore, the affirmative contended that Israel and the Palestinians would finally reach a two-state solution with the U.S. heading negotiations, and the United States would enjoy a renewal of world support as a democracy-promoting benevolent power, hence providing additional support for worthwhile endeavors as per the testimony of Professor Nye. The Achilles heal of the proposal is that the war in Iraq was predicated on a separate authorization, and while the affirmative constructive notes that "the invasions of Iraq and Afghanistan" were "conducted under the aegis of the War on Terror," the rebuttal assumes a reversal of position in which revocation of the AUMF would only spur U.S. action in Afghanistan (Asad, et al 4). The affirmative fails to cite any author that recommends singular withdrawal from Afghanistan. We repeat: not one author of any credentials, professor or pundit, has had the temerity to suggest in the general literature that the

SAMPLE NEGATIVE REBUTTAL

United States should abandon Afghanistan while simultaneously continuing the War on Terror on the larger front in Iraq. Even Osama Bin Laden in a recent recording emphasized the importance of a U.S. withdrawal from both Iraq and Afghanistan as his terms of “truce” (Bazzi). Furthermore, there are 700 detainees currently in Guantanamo; in comparison, over 20,000 people are currently being detained in Abu Ghraib with an estimated total of over 80,000 detainees in the country of Iraq, most of whom have not been charged and many of whom are tortured (Landau). Because the affirmative plan would only end one front in the War on Terror, it creates a schizophrenic U.S. foreign policy.

Soft Power

The affirmative constructive’s author advocate for a soft power approach to foreign policy has stated on many occasions that Afghanistan is an instance of soft power promotion through coalition building. The affirmative plan calls for a unilateral withdrawal of the one U.S. engagement with legitimacy through ally support, and runs counter to the request of those allies not to shift the burden to their shoulders (Winter).

The affirmative advocates a policy contrary to that recommended by Joseph Nye by destroying the legitimate engagement in Afghanistan in favor of the unilateral and unprovoked war for oil resources in Iraq (Nye). This perception would be re-entrenched if the United States were not committed to democracy promotion in Afghanistan, while continuing to commit troops to a self-motivated invasion of Iraq (Nye).

Iraq

SAMPLE NEGATIVE REBUTTAL

The affirmative points to a concession of the argument “that ending the ‘war on terror’ would decrease support for terrorism” (Asad, et al). However, Linda McQuaig actually attributes the increased instances of terrorism to U.S.’s decision to invade Iraq, not its policies in Afghanistan. McQuaig asserts, “Until the U.S. changes its behavior, the Middle East will be fertile ground for Islamic extremists to win recruits — and even some public support.” As long as we remain in Iraq, the perception of the War on Terror will still exist.

The world closely observes the role America plays in Iraq. The current statement by the Bush administration is that the War on Terror is a war “aimed at advancing freedom and democracy,” justified by America’s real war for democracy in Afghanistan (Martin). However, post the affirmative plan, the logic behind America’s democracy promotion suddenly loses all semblance of legitimacy, and the world will know for certain that had Iraq been producing “lettuce and pickles,” America wouldn’t have thought twice about committing troops to the region (Chomsky). This clear instance of self-motivated military engagement would destroy America’s legitimacy with the world while also alienating the U.S. from its closest allies in both Europe and Israel (Nye).

Israel

The recent Palestinian election victory for Hamas, a terrorist group that refuses to recognize Israel and maintains a strong militant branch, only serves to perpetuate more violence in the region (CNN). Israel has also announced that it will not recognize Hamas as the government of the Palestinians, and the chance for a resumption of the peace process is “impossible.” (Weisman 11). Furthermore, the Bush administration and European leaders are

SAMPLE NEGATIVE REBUTTAL

making good on plans to stop all monetary transfers to the Palestinians under Hamas leadership (Cowell 11).

Unfortunately for the affirmative, this current event virtually assures a Likud party and Netanyahu victory in March elections for Israeli leadership (Associated Press; Mitnick).

Revocation of the AUMF will not magically revive the peace process.

A departure from Afghanistan would greatly affect the way Israel and Iran view the U.S.'s commitment to the War on Terror (Diaz, Newman, Nye). In the status quo, Israel views the U.S. as its greatest ally, one that would contain Iran and who nominally controls the territory between Tehran and Tel Aviv (Nye, Stewart). A U.S. pullout from Afghanistan would show a lack of commitment to the War on Terror. U.S. foreign policy would be abruptly changed, leaving Israel left to wonder if the United States would also withdraw from Iraq (Newman).

Afghanistan

The claim that a withdrawal would be a good foreign policy assumes that NATO is capable, ready, and willing to assume the entire burden of Afghanistan. NATO's website for the operation in Afghanistan shows the plan for a three-stage troop deployment (NATO). NATO is attempting to move forward with stage three, which would assume the southern region of Afghanistan, but is facing cutbacks in troop commitment by the Dutch and England (Winter, The Australian, North). These new revelations that are not assumed in the affirmative rebuttal threaten the entire NATO mission. Furthermore, NATO has no plans to ever assume the eastern region which is known to be a Taliban stronghold and also the most violent area of Afghanistan (NATO, Amens). Given NATO's inability to control all of Afghanistan, and no other organization ready to replace the 20,000 US troops that the affirmative wishes to remove, the

SAMPLE NEGATIVE REBUTTAL

resulting leadership vacuum would create the same warlord power struggle that led to the unpopular Taliban winning control of the country after the Soviet retreat (Schuer 55). The added emphasis on democracy promotion that is advocated in the affirmative rebuttal would be squandered by leaving an incapable NATO force that claims it will no be able to stabilize the region in time for Afghan parliamentary elections scheduled this summer (Sey). As Kathy Gannon, Bureau Chief for Afghanistan and Pakistan for the AP writes, "Here an American lead is key, since hardly any other NATO countries have been willing to send more than a few hundred troops to the country, and those they have remain in the big cities, avoiding the troubled areas in Afghanistan's east."

Afghanistan recent events have also undermined the affirmative's conclusion regarding Afghanistan. Air strikes in Damadola, Pakistan, occurring last week, substantially tarnishing the U.S. image in both Southeastern Afghanistan and Northern Pakistan, as evidenced by massive street protests in both provinces, and undermining the credibility of the December poll cited by the affirmative (Khan). In the Hindu Kush, popularity and credibility with warlords is the political cache required to rule, and President Kharzai, abandoned by his military benefactor and unable to account for the expatriate Gitmo political prisoners who are now to be "criminally prosecuted" in the United State, according to the affirmative, will have neither. (Asad et al, *Human Rights Watch*, Scheuer). Afghanistan will be as democratic as South Vietnam in April 1975.

Conclusion

The die is cast, and the U.S. must maintain its steadfast course of democracy promotion in Afghanistan. A perception of a weakening U.S. commitment to the War on Terror would be

SAMPLE NEGATIVE REBUTTAL

disastrous for maintaining political stability in the Middle and Near East. Specifically, U.S. withdrawal would impel Israel to preemptively strike Iran and NATO to also withdraw from Afghanistan. In the broad spectrum of U.S. foreign policy, withdrawal would spur a collapse of U.S. democracy promotion efforts and reinvigorate insurgency movements while destroying U.S. legitimacy in the international arena and leaving the U.S. mired in a war for oil in Iraq. As such, the affirmative foreign policy proposal of revoking the AUMF of September 2001 must be rejected in favor of the more rational approach.

SAMPLE NEGATIVE REBUTTAL

Works Cited

Abedine, Saad. "Unrest Continues over Hamas 'Revolution'." CNN. 30 January 06.

<<http://www.cnn.com/2006/WORLD/meast/01/28/palestinians/index.html>>.

"Afghan Attacks Put Nato On Edge." The Australian 18 January 2006: Pg. 8.

"Afghanistan: Return of the Warlords." *Human Rights Watch*. June 2002.

<<http://www.hrw.org/backgrounders/asia/afghanistan/warlords.pdf>>

Amens, Paul. "NATO Allies Reject Afghanistan Suggestion." Associated Press 14, Sept. 2005.

Asad, Asad L. Lam, Eva Z. "War on Terror Affirmative Constructive" Wisconsin: Rufus King High School. Jan 2006.

Asad, Asad L. Asad, Amjad L. Lam, Eva Z. "Negative Rebuttal Response to Bellaire High School." Wisconsin: Rufus King High School. Jan 2006.

Bradley, Curtis A. Goldsmith, Jack L. "Congressional Authorization and the War on Terrorism." *Harvard Law Review*. 118 Harv. L. Rev. 2047. May 2005.

Butcher, Tim. "Israeli hawks circle Iran's N-plants Some demand that Israel send in the jets to hit Teheran's nuclear threat - just as it did to Iraq - but, writes Tim Butcher in Jerusalem, it has other cards to play." *The Daily Telegraph*. 12 August 2005.

Carothers, Thomas. "Promoting Democracy and Fighting Terror." *Foreign Affairs*. Jan/Feb 2003.

Chemerinsky, Erwin. Chemerinsky, Stephen Tagman. "Protecting Rights after Guantánamo." *San Diego Tribune*. 1 Jul 2005, <http://www.truthout.org/docs_2005/070205E.shtml>

Cook, Lorne. "Pressure mounts on Dutch to commit troops to Afghanistan." *Agence France Presse*. 22 Jan 2006.

SAMPLE NEGATIVE REBUTTAL

Cowell, Alan. "Europeans Insist Hamas Must Disavow Terrorism." *New York Times*. 27 January 2006.

Khan, Riaz. "Thousands rally against U.S. air strike in second week of Pakistan protests." *CBCNews*. 22 Jan 2006.

North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO). "Revised Operational Plan for NATO's Expanding Mission in Afghanistan." 18 January 2006.

< http://www.nato.int/issues/afghanistan_stage3/index.html > Accessed 23 January 2006.

North, Andrew. "Nato In A Spin Over Afghan Expansion." *BBC News* 12 December 2005.

< http://news.bbc.co.uk/go/pr/fr/-/1/hi/world/south_asia/4521318.stm>.

Nye, Joseph. "Why Military Power Is No Longer Enough." *Observer Worldview*. 31 Mar 2002. January 17, 2006. < <http://observer.guardian.co.uk/print/0,3858,4384507-110490,00.html>>.

Nye, Joseph. "In The Money." *CNN Interviews*. 3 Apr 2004. 17 Jan 2006.

Martin, Patrick. "The State of the Union speech: Bush repeats litany of lies on Iraq war." *WSWS*. 1 Feb 2006. <<http://www.wsws.org/articles/2006/feb2006/bush-f01.shtml>>

McQuaig, Linda. "Are Bush and Blair on right track with war on terror?" *The Toronto Star*. 10 July 2005. 8 Jan 2006.

<http://www.thestar.com/NASApp/cs/ContentServer?pagename=thestar%2FLayout%2FArticle_Type1&c=Article&cid=1120859414214>

Mitnick, Josh. "Israeli Right May Gain Ground." *Christian Science Monitor*. 30 January 2006.

"Netanyahu backs pre-emptive strike on Iran." *USA Today*. 17 Jan 2006.

Ripley, Tim. "Foreign fighters flood into Afghanistan." *The Scotsman*. 13 Jan 2006.

<<http://news.scotsman.com/international.cfm?id=58262006>>

SAMPLE NEGATIVE REBUTTAL

Siaz, Tom. Newman, Barbara. *Lightning Out Of Lebanon: Hezbollah Terrorists on American Soil*. New York: Ballantine Books, 2005.

Serchuk, Vance. "Dutch Retreat: The Perils of Turning Afghanistan over to NATO." *The Weekly Standard*. 16 Jan 2006.

Sey, Cem. "NATO's Big Challenge: Afghanistan." Deutsche Welle 30 January 2006.
<<http://www.dw-world.de/dw/article/0,1564,1492823,00.html>>.

"US troop reduction likely in Afghanistan with NATO expansion." *Agence France Presse*. 8 Dec 2005.

Weisman, Steven. "Bush Defends His Goal of Spreading Democracy to the Mideast." New York Times. 27 January 2006.

Winter, Laura G. "Bigger role for NATO in Afghanistan." *Christian Science Monitor*. 31 Jan 2006.

"Zawahiri Says Survived US Raid: Video." Agence France-Presse 31 January 2006.
<http://www.truthout.org/docs_2006/013106L.shtml>.

5111522.1
0500-11