Generic Negative: Arms Sales - not a problem

By “Coach Vance” Trefethen

Some AFF plans will restrict arms sales to one or more specific countries. This brief can be used generically when going NEG if we do not know in advance what the specific AFF plan is or what country is being targeted.
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Generic Negative: Arms Sales - not a problem

INHERENCY

1. Safeguards against diversion and misuse

US arms exports have safeguards against diversion and misuse

US State Dept. Bureau of Political Military Affairs 2021. " U.S. Arms Sales and Defense Trade" 20 Jan 2021 (accessed 4 Oct 2022) https://www.state.gov/u-s-arms-sales-and-defense-trade/

Review and [End Use Monitoring](https://www.state.gov/end-use-monitoring-of-u-s-origin-defense-articles/) are integral components of the process for U.S.-origin defense equipment delivered to any recipient nation. The United States works to ensure U.S.-origin defense equipment is used consistent with the agreement or licenses under which the arms were transferred.  The United States is committed to expediting, when possible, defense transfers to U.S. allies and partners, while at the same time seeking to control access to U.S.-origin defense technologies by hostile state and non-state actors.  Before U.S.-origin defense articles and services are exported or transferred to foreign entities, those entities must agree to: 1) not retransfer equipment to third parties without first receiving written U.S. government authorization; 2) not dispose of or use the defense article for purposes other than those for which they were furnished without first receiving written U.S. government authorization; and; 3) maintain the security of any item with substantially the same degree of protection afforded by the U.S. government.

HARMS / SIGNIFICANCE

1. Not fueling world conflict

US arms sales are not fueling global conflicts

Dr James J. Carafano 2012. (master's degree and a doctorate from Georgetown University as well as a master's degree in strategy from the U.S. Army War College; was adjunct professor at Hillsdale College and taught as a visiting professor at National Defense University. He previously served as an assistant professor at the U.S. Military Academy) Arms Sales and False Alarms 10 Sept 2012 (accessed 4 Oct 2022) https://www.heritage.org/arms-control/commentary/arms-sales-and-false-alarms

There is a problem with implying that the United States is fueling warfare in the Third World: there isn’t much evidence to support that suggestion. Indeed, the world is actually getting less—not more—violent. The Human Security Project, a research center affiliated with Simon Fraser University (SFU) in Vancouver, Canada, tracks global trends in political violence. Its 2010 report concluded that various “forces and political developments . . . have driven down the number of international conflicts and war deaths since the 1950s, and the number of civil wars since the early 1990s.”

Countries we sell arms to aren't causing trouble in the world. That would be the ones China & Russia are arming

Dr James J. Carafano 2012. (master's degree and a doctorate from Georgetown University as well as a master's degree in strategy from the U.S. Army War College; was adjunct professor at Hillsdale College and taught as a visiting professor at National Defense University. He previously served as an assistant professor at the U.S. Military Academy) Arms Sales and False Alarms 10 Sept 2012 (accessed 4 Oct 2022) https://www.heritage.org/arms-control/commentary/arms-sales-and-false-alarms

Further the “developing nations” receiving the most arms from all exporting countries are Saudi Arabia, India, Pakistan, the UAE and Venezuela. Saudi Arabia, India and the UAE are hardly powers wreaking havoc throughout the Third World. And while Pakistan and Venezuela may be regarded as more problematic, it’s worth noting that they are supplied in large part by China and Russia, not the United States.

"Troubled countries in Africa and Latin America" - get more weapons from Europe than the U.S.

Dr James J. Carafano 2012. (master's degree and a doctorate from Georgetown University as well as a master's degree in strategy from the U.S. Army War College; was adjunct professor at Hillsdale College and taught as a visiting professor at National Defense University. He previously served as an assistant professor at the U.S. Military Academy) Arms Sales and False Alarms 10 Sept 2012 (accessed 4 Oct 2022) https://www.heritage.org/arms-control/commentary/arms-sales-and-false-alarms

Most of the concern over delivering arms that fuel violence involves troubled nations in Africa and Latin America. No argument that troubled countries in both continents are awash in arms. But it is hardly fair to blame the United States. According to the CRS report, last year Italy sold $300 million to African countries—three times as much as American exports. Meanwhile, just the small European nations logged combined sales of some $2.4 billion to Latin America, nearly double American sales ($1.4 billion).

US is far better on managing arms exports than most other exporters

Dr James J. Carafano 2012. (master's degree and a doctorate from Georgetown University as well as a master's degree in strategy from the U.S. Army War College; was adjunct professor at Hillsdale College and taught as a visiting professor at National Defense University. He previously served as an assistant professor at the U.S. Military Academy) Arms Sales and False Alarms 10 Sept 2012 (accessed 4 Oct 2022) https://www.heritage.org/arms-control/commentary/arms-sales-and-false-alarms

It is not clear why the United States is the bad guy here. The U.S. record on responsibly managing arms exports is actually better than most other countries. Consider Russia, which places second on the list of top exporters. The Kremlin has far more direct control over arms exports than does Washington. Since 2007, Rosoboronexport, a state-owned company, has been the only Russian entity holding the full license to export arms. Yet Moscow’s record of employing best practices in managing its arms sales is spotty at best. Just check out the number of MANPADS the CRS says Moscow exports. It appears that the Russians sell them only in lots of a thousand. The Arms Control Association can throw all the rocks at Washington it wants, but the group should be under no illusion that countries such as Russia would ever approve a conventional arms treaty that would actually prohibit them from selling arms to anyone they please.

SOLVENCY

1. Target country behavior will not change

Withholding arms as an instrument of coercion doesn’t produce desired benefits

Ray Rounds 2019. (a U.S. Air Force F-15E pilot and a Ph.D. candidate at Georgetown Univ. in International Relations.) “The Case Against Arms Embargos, Even for Saudi Arabia.” April 16, 2019. (accessed 4 Oct 2022) War on the Rocks. <https://warontherocks.com/2019/04/the-case-against-arms-embargos-even-for-saudi-arabia/>

Whether it is delayed approval, as in the recent Kuwaiti F-18 purchase, an outright embargo, like Egyptian F-16s in 2013, or denial of technology transfer, as in the 2016 Turkish Patriot missile request, using the withholding of arms sales as a blunt force instrument of coercion is unlikely to produce desired strategic benefits and often backfires.

Arms sales have useful benefits and are not meant as a tool of coercion

Ray Rounds 2019. (a U.S. Air Force F-15E pilot and a Ph.D. candidate at Georgetown Univ. in International Relations.) “The Case Against Arms Embargos, Even for Saudi Arabia.” April 16, 2019. (accessed 4 Oct 2022) War on the Rocks. <https://warontherocks.com/2019/04/the-case-against-arms-embargos-even-for-saudi-arabia/>

Arms sales are useful tools for maintaining communication, strengthening relationships, and keeping potential adversary states at bay. Conversely, as a blunt instrument of coercion (i.e. if you do not do X, we will suspend Y), they are likely losers.

Government officials and previous research agree: arms transfers aren’t effective as leverage

Ray Rounds 2019. (a U.S. Air Force F-15E pilot and a Ph.D. candidate at Georgetown Univ. in International Relations.) “The Case Against Arms Embargos, Even for Saudi Arabia.” April 16, 2019. (accessed 4 Oct 2022) War on the Rocks. <https://warontherocks.com/2019/04/the-case-against-arms-embargos-even-for-saudi-arabia/>

Senior U.S. government officials involved in the arms transfer process that I interviewed over the past year during the course of my research have echoed similar sentiments. This is also borne out by previous research providing evidence that using arms transfers as situationally coercive tools is rarely successful.

Arms embargoes are least effective against an autocratic regime like Saudi Arabia

Ray Rounds 2019. (a U.S. Air Force F-15E pilot and a Ph.D. candidate at Georgetown Univ. in International Relations.) “The Case Against Arms Embargos, Even for Saudi Arabia.” April 16, 2019. (accessed 4 Oct 2022) War on the Rocks. <https://warontherocks.com/2019/04/the-case-against-arms-embargos-even-for-saudi-arabia/>

Interestingly, coercion attempts using arms transfers are least likely to be successful when used as a punishment or threat against an autocratic regime, such as Saudi Arabia.

2. Alternate suppliers

Arms embargoes often motivate the target state to diversify to other suppliers

Ray Rounds 2019. (a U.S. Air Force F-15E pilot and a Ph.D. candidate at Georgetown Univ. in International Relations.) “The Case Against Arms Embargos, Even for Saudi Arabia.” April 16, 2019. (accessed 4 Oct 2022) War on the Rocks. <https://warontherocks.com/2019/04/the-case-against-arms-embargos-even-for-saudi-arabia/>

Arms exports are best used for maintaining or strengthening relationships while limiting adversary access to client states; a tool of nuanced influence, not outright coercion. In fact, threatening to withhold arms sales to coerce a state into changing its behavior often has the opposite effect, leading clients to diversify their arms sourcing instead of shifting course.

Using arms embargos as a form of coercion motivates buyers to look elsewhere

Derek Bisaccio 2018. (Military Markets Analyst for Forecast International, a research organization for decision makers in the world’s aerospace and defense markets) “Examining U.S. Arms Sales to Saudi Arabia. October 23, 2018. Forecast International’s Defense & Security Monitor blog. (accessed 4 Oct 2022) <https://dsm.forecastinternational.com/wordpress/2018/10/23/examining-u-s-arms-sales-to-saudi-arabia/>

Moreover, regularly resorting to playing hardball with arms equipment can convince importers that a degree of diversification is in order if the supplier is unreliable, hurting the supplier’s sales position and defense sector – more so if the supplier is seen as making arms sales only to use them years or decades later to coerce the importer over domestic policy.

Past precedent: Egypt changed suppliers to avoid US whining about their domestic policies

Ray Rounds 2019. (a U.S. Air Force F-15E pilot and a Ph.D. candidate at Georgetown Univ. in International Relations.) “The Case Against Arms Embargos, Even for Saudi Arabia.” April 16, 2019. (accessed 4 Oct 2022) War on the Rocks. <https://warontherocks.com/2019/04/the-case-against-arms-embargos-even-for-saudi-arabia/>

Consider Indonesia and Egypt. In 2015, Egypt agreed to purchase nearly 50 Russian MiG-29M/M2s and more than two-dozen French Rafales. This represented a shocking turn of events after more than three decades of purchasing only American-made fighter jets. It was also driven largely by the U.S. embargo put in place in 2013, after the Egyptian army’s removal of then-President Mohamed Morsi, who had won the presidency in a 2012 election. The embargo caused significant tension between the two states driven by “an Egyptian sense that they were at a point of mortal peril” while the United States was moralizing about democratic reforms. Remarkably, the United States lifted the embargo in 2015 with virtually no change in Egyptian policies, no official U.S. “democracy certification”, and Egyptian military support for the Saudi-led war in Yemen. The U.S. arms embargo as a tool of coercive change was an abject failure.

3. Security first, human rights later

To be effective, we must address security concerns before expecting them to reform human rights

Doug Bandow 2021 (senior fellow at the Cato Institute, specializing in foreign policy and civil liberties. He worked as special assistant to President Ronald Reagan; JD from Stanford Univ.) “Eight Ways We Can Serve US Interests and Pursue Human Rights Too” 28 May 2021  (Accessed 7 September 2022) https://www.cato.org/commentary/eight-ways-we-can-serve-us-interests-pursue-human-rights-too

“Address political and security relations before expecting improved human rights. For instance, brutal oppression ensures survival of North Korea’s Kim dynasty. So long as Supreme Leader Kim Jong‐​un feels vulnerable, he is unlikely to make human rights concessions. Establishing regular political dialogue and addressing regime change fears would increase the possibility, though still low, of winning at least some human rights concessions.”

DISADVANTAGES

1. Lost US hegemony

Link: US arms sales assist with diplomacy and ensure military assistance

Thomas Frohlich 2019. (Assistant Managing Editor of 24/7 Wall St., a financial news and opinion company) “Saudi Arabia buys the most weapons from the US government. See what other countries top list.” March 26, 2019. (accessed 4 Oct 2022) USA Today. <https://www.usatoday.com/story/money/2019/03/26/us-arms-sales-these-countries-buy-most-weapons-government/39208809/> (brackets added)

The United States selects its clients based on well-established partnerships, as well as for strategic reasons related to the leverage it could gain during conflicts. Of the 25 countries buying the most weapons from the U.S., 10 are either NATO member nations or part of other alliances formed with the United States since the Cold War. “The US transfers to these countries are meant to ensure allies security, as arms transfers from the US brings with it security guarantees, which basically entail diplomatic and military assistance in case of troubles,” said [Aude] Fleurant [director of the arms and military expenditure program with the Stockholm International Peace Research Institute].

Link: Arms sales are carefully reviewed to ensure they promote US foreign policy and national security

US State Dept. Bureau of Political Military Affairs 2021. " U.S. Arms Sales and Defense Trade" 20 Jan 2021 (accessed 4 Oct 2022) https://www.state.gov/u-s-arms-sales-and-defense-trade/

**Arms sales and defense trade are tangible implements of foreign policy with potential long-term implications for regional security.** For this reason, the United States takes into account political, military, economic, arms control, and human rights conditions in determining the provision of military equipment and the licensing of direct commercial sales to any country.  Each proposed transfer we review is carefully assessed on a case-by-case basis, and approved if found to further U.S. foreign policy and national security interests.

Link: US arms exports are key to countering Russia and maintaining influence in the global order

Fatima Munib 2019 (master's degree candidate in international studies at Univ. of San Francisco) Dec 2019 (accessed 5 Oct 2022) "The United States Eroding Global Military Advantage; Is There A Way Back?" https://repository.usfca.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=2400&context=thes

On the other hand, Russia’s case-study makes the connection between its increased market share in the global defense industry hampering U.S defense corporations’ arms sales and its challenge to the U.S influence in global affairs. While Russia provides a cost-conditionalities benefit to non-NATO members in its 2 arms sales, it also seeks to impact the future of the U.S. relationship with NATO, which contains military implications for Europe as well as for the global order.

Disregarding our allies weakens US hegemony because we need them to maintain global leadership

Ashley Tellis 2020 (Tata Chair for Strategic Affairs and a senior fellow at the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace. He is also a counselor at the National Bureau of Asian Research and the research director of the Strategic Asia Program) 4 May 2020 "COVID-19 Knocks on American Hegemony" (accessed 5 Oct 2022) https://carnegieendowment.org/2020/05/04/covid-19-knocks-on-american-hegemony-pub-81719

This disregard for the alliance system that the United States has carefully nurtured now for over half a century is grounded fundamentally in a failure to appreciate its importance for both the effectiveness and the legitimacy of American primacy in international politics. All previous administrations intuitively understood the benefits that the alliances provided in material, institutional, and ideational terms and consequently sought to preserve, if not actually deepen, them. The Covid-19 pandemic ordinarily would have stimulated the United States to lead a collective response, if not globally, then at least involving its allies and partners because this crisis was both genuinely transnational and immediately affected U.S. interests as well those of its closest friends in Europe and Asia.

Brink: Now is the critical time. We should be increasing, not decreasing, commitment to allies. It's essential to maintaining US hegemony

Ashley Tellis 2020 (Tata Chair for Strategic Affairs and a senior fellow at the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace. He is also a counselor at the National Bureau of Asian Research and the research director of the Strategic Asia Program) 4 May 2020 "COVID-19 Knocks on American Hegemony" (accessed 5 Oct 2022) https://carnegieendowment.org/2020/05/04/covid-19-knocks-on-american-hegemony-pub-81719

But even as it attends to the business of internal regeneration, Washington must double down on its alliances and partnerships. Only this U.S.-led confederation contains the preponderance of the global product that will durably immunize the “strategic West” against any future challenges emanating from China or other rivals. Preserving American hegemony over the long term thus must begin with consolidating Washington’s leadership within the largest single bloc of material power in order that it may be effective beyond. Ensuring this outcome requires the United States to take seriously—and deepen meaningfully—the special geopolitical ties it has nurtured throughout the postwar period, which would among other things enable it to better shape the world’s engagement with China to advance its own interests.

Backup Brink: Global order is in crisis, multiple trends make the international system fragile, and US leadership is in danger of retreat

Global order is in crisis, multiple trends make the international system fragile, and US leadership is in danger of retreat

Prof. [Alexander Cooley and Prof. Daniel H. Nexon](https://www.foreignaffairs.com/author) 2020. (COOLEY is Claire Tow Professor of Political Science at Barnard College and Director of Columbia University’s Harriman Institute.  NEXON is an Associate Professor in the Department of Government and at the Edmund A. Walsh School of Foreign Service at Georgetown University) July/Aug 2020 “How Hegemony Ends” <https://www.foreignaffairs.com/articles/united-states/2020-06-09/how-hegemony-ends> (accessed 5 Oct 2022)

Multiple signs point to a crisis in global order. The uncoordinated international response to the COVID-19 pandemic, the resulting economic downturns, the resurgence of nationalist politics, and the hardening of state borders all seem to herald the emergence of a less cooperative and more fragile international system. According to many observers, these developments underscore the dangers of U.S. President Donald Trump’s “America first” policies and his retreat from global leadership.

Global Impact: World peace & prosperity at risk without US influence. US hegemony is key to global peace & prosperity

Capt. M. V. Prato 2009 (United States Marine Corps, Command and Staff College, Marine Corps Combat Development Command, Marine Corps University) “The Need for American Hegemony” <https://apps.dtic.mil/sti/citations/ADA508040> (accessed 3 June 2021)

The world witnessed a vast shift in the polarity of geopolitics after the Cold War. The United States became the world’s greatest hegemon with an unequalled ability to globally project cultural, political, economic, and military power in a manner not seen since the days of the Roman Empire. **[END QUOTE]** Coined the “unipolar moment” by syndicated columnist Charles Krauthammer, the disparity of power between the U.S. and all other nations allows the U.S. to influence the world for the mutual benefit of all responsible states. Unfortunately, the United States is increasingly forced to act unilaterally as a result of both foreign and domestic resentment to U.S. dominance and the rise of liberal internationalism. [**He goes on to conclude later in the same context QUOTE**:] The United States must exercise benevolent global hegemony, unilaterally if necessary, to ensure its security and maintain global peace and prosperity.

Voting impact: US national interests take priority over other foreign policy goals

Doug Bandow 2021 (senior fellow at the Cato Institute, specializing in foreign policy and civil liberties. He worked as special assistant to President Ronald Reagan; JD from Stanford Univ.) “Eight Ways We Can Serve US Interests and Pursue Human Rights Too”  28 May 2021  (accessed 7 Sept 2022) <https://www.cato.org/commentary/eight-ways-we-can-serve-us-interests-pursue-human-rights-too>

“The central purpose of Washington’s international strategy should be to advance the interests of the American people. That means protecting them along with their territory, constitutional system, liberties, and prosperity. These objectives transcend the many other goals routinely set by governments.”

2. Defeats the greater good and promotes tyranny

Exporting arms to a bad government still produces a greater good. Examples: Soviet Union in World War 2 and South Korea during the Korean War

Dr. Ted Bromund 2021. (PhD in history from Yale; holds two master’s degrees in history from Yale and a bachelor of arts degree from Iowa’s Grinnell College ) The Biden Administration’s Conventional Arms Transfer Policy Should Not Be Handcuffed by the Arms Trade Treaty 1 Nov 2021 (accessed 4 Oct 2022) https://www.heritage.org/global-politics/report/the-biden-administrations-conventional-arms-transfer-policy-should-not-be (brackets added)

If the ATT [Arms Trade Treaty] had existed in 1942, the U.S. could not have extended Lend-Lease aid to Stalin, who used the trucks the U.S. provided to deport almost 100,000 people from the nation of Georgia to Siberia. But aiding Stalin against Hitler was nonetheless the correct policy. If the ATT had existed in 1950, the U.S. could not have aided South Korea, which was a brutal military dictatorship, when it was attacked by the North. But aiding South Korea against North Korea was the correct, and, in fact, the humane, policy to follow.

We couldn't use arms exports to fight against tyranny if we strictly apply human rights standards

Dr. Ted Bromund 2021. (PhD in history from Yale; holds two master’s degrees in history from Yale and a bachelor of arts degree from Iowa’s Grinnell College ) The Biden Administration’s Conventional Arms Transfer Policy Should Not Be Handcuffed by the Arms Trade Treaty 1 Nov 2021 (accessed 4 Oct 2022) https://www.heritage.org/global-politics/report/the-biden-administrations-conventional-arms-transfer-policy-should-not-be (brackets added)

If the U.S. bound itself to respect foreign import controls by treaty, it would be legally dubious for the U.S. to arm anyone resisting a tyranny. For example, the treaty would make it legally very difficult for the U.S. to arm, as Obama did, the opponents of the Assad regime in Syria.  In fact, opponents of Obama’s policy argued that he was likely violating the ATT [Arms Trade Treaty].  Every U.S. President since Harry Truman has armed resistance fighters. The ATT would thus raise serious barriers to U.S. foreign policy as it has been carried out, on a bipartisan basis, since the start of the Cold War. It would also, in practice, put the U.S. on the side of dictators and their human rights violations.

3. Hypocrisy backfires

Hypocrisy of singling out one country sets back overall efforts to promote human rights

Doug Bandow 2021 (senior fellow at the Cato Institute, specializing in foreign policy and civil liberties. He worked as special assistant to President Ronald Reagan; JD from Stanford Univ.) “Eight Ways We Can Serve US Interests and Pursue Human Rights Too”  28 May 2021  (accessed 7 Sept 2022) https://www.cato.org/commentary/eight-ways-we-can-serve-us-interests-pursue-human-rights-too

“Establish moral credibility by applying the same standard to friends and foes. The Trump administration waxed eloquent about Iranian human rights violations while shielding Saudi Arabia’s murderous regime from the consequences of even more grotesque barbarities. President Trump demanded that Cuba democratize while calling Egypt’s brutal Abdel Fattah al‐​Sisi his “favorite dictator.” Such ostentatiously inconsistent policies made it impossible to take the previous administration’s human rights pronouncements seriously and doomed its supposed humanitarian efforts.”

4. US Defense industry jobs

Defense exports create up to 1 million US jobs

US State Dept. Bureau of Political Military Affairs 2021. " U.S. Arms Sales and Defense Trade" 20 Jan 2021 (accessed 4 Oct 2022) https://www.state.gov/u-s-arms-sales-and-defense-trade/

Properly regulated defense transfers support the U.S. defense industrial base, promote interoperability, and reduce the costs of procurement for our own military. Up to 1 million people across our nation rely on U.S. defense exports for their jobs.  These individuals and the companies they work for represent a key part of American entrepreneurship and innovation, as they help to maintain the United States as the world leader in the defense and aerospace sectors and ensure our armed forces sustain their military edge.

Arms exports are necessary for the U.S. defense industry

*Dr. Oleg Svet 2016. (doctoral dissertation on security assistance to Iraq and has analyzed U.S. security cooperation with the Gulf Cooperation Council countries, Iraq, and Afghanistan. From 2015 to 2016 he analyzed security assistance as a consultant supporting the U.S. Defense Dept.)*“Why Congress Supports Saudi Arms Sales.” Sept 26, 2016. The National Interest <https://nationalinterest.org/feature/why-congress-supports-saudi-arms-sales-17840>

When considering this particular sale it is important to keep in mind the big picture of U.S. defense exports and their contribution to America's defense industry. Over the past six years, as U.S. defense spending has faced considerable budgetary pressures, American defense companies have struggled to maintain employees and keep production lines open. With tightening defense budgets, highly-skilled manufacturing jobs on the line, and the prospect of production lines for advanced U.S. weapons being phased out, American exports of defense articles and services have become and will continue to be ever more important.