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Negative: Withdraw Tactical Nuclear Weapons from Turkey

HARMS / SIGNIFICANCE

1. No security risk

US nukes in Turkey are safe and secure. Risks of removing them would outweigh risks of Status Quo

Associated Press 2019. (journalist Robert Burns) 19 Oct 2019 Some worries about nuclear weapons at Turkey base (accessed 18 Nov 2022) https://apnews.com/article/182a2170a1d24ac6b4f0c7242d8ff514

Eric Edelman, a former U.S. ambassador to Turkey and senior Pentagon official, said Friday he believes the nuclear weapons are safe and secure. He sees risk in removing them. “I’m not in favor of taking any actions that would potentially accelerate Turkey’s thinking about pursuing its own independent nuclear deterrent,” he said, noting that Erdogan as recently as September mentioned this possibility.

Nukes in Turkey have advanced security

Joe Pappalardo, 2019 (contributing editor at Popular Mechanics) October 25, 2019, “Could Someone Actually Steal a U.S. Nuke?” (accessed 18 Nov 2022) https://www.popularmechanics.com/military/weapons/a29576180/us-nuke-theft/

But can you even set off a stolen nuke? It’s not easy — but that is not the only risk that a rogue nuke poses. Naturally, there are many methods in place to make nukes hard to set off by accident or without authorization. But the technical details about the bombs themselves are seldom discussed, so what we know is based on public sources, some dating back decades to when these weapons were first created.
[**END QUOTE] [HE goes on later in the same article to continue QUOTE:**]
The nukes in Turkey have the most advanced Category F permissive action lock, which “incorporates a multiple-code, 12-digit switch with lockout which disables the warhead after repeated attempts to enter codes,” Hansen says.

No real risk of theft from European nuclear sites

Bruno Tertrais 2011. (Senior Research Fellow at the Fondation pour la recherché stratégique of Paris) Defining the Right Mix of Capabilities: The Irreplaceable Role of NATO Nuclear Arrangements, June 2011 Managing Change - NATO’s Partnerships and Deterrence in a Globalised World (accessed 18 Nov 2022) <http://www.act.nato.int/images/stories/events/2011/managing_change_lr.pdf>

It is true that physical security at European nuclear sites has not always been maintained to American standards and that intrusions on some military bases have confirmed the existence of security lapses; but it is equally true that no recorded incident has in any way shown that there is a real risk of weapons theft.

2. Turkish Air Force could not use them even if they stole one

Turkey doesn't have any planes that can use US nuclear bombs

Miles A. Pomper 2019 (Senior Fellow, James Martin Center for Nonproliferation Studies, Middlebury College) 25 Oct 2019 “Why the US has nuclear weapons in Turkey — and may try to put the bombs away” (accessed 18 Nov 2022) https://www.pri.org/stories/2019-10-25/why-us-has-nuclear-weapons-turkey-and-may-try-put-bombs-away

The 50 bombs still at Incirlik Air Base, in southern Turkey — and others in [Belgium, Germany, Italy and the Netherlands](https://newrepublic.com/article/155381/us-nuclear-bombs-still-turkey) — are the last nuclear remnants of that [Cold War strategy](https://history.state.gov/milestones/1961-1968/cuban-missile-crisis). The US began [pulling nuclear bombs out of NATO countries](https://fas.org/_docs/Non_Strategic_Nuclear_Weapons.pdf) after the Cold War ended, and since 2000 has [removed 40 bombs from Turkey](https://fas.org/blogs/security/2019/10/nukes-out-of-turkey/). Two decades ago, the [Turkish Air Force stopped equipping its planes](https://www.nato.int/acad/fellow/05-06/larsen.pdf) to drop B-61s. Now the bombs at Incirlik could only be used if [US pilots first flew nuclear-weapon-capable planes there](https://fas.org/blogs/security/2019/10/nukes-out-of-turkey/) to load them up.

SOLVENCY

1. The alternative to stationing in Turkey (keep in US / bring back during a crisis) won’t work

Bringing the nukes back in time of crisis isn’t realistic: It would be divisive and could lower the cost of aggression

Bruno Tertrais 2011. (Senior Research Fellow at the Fondation pour la recherché stratégique of Paris) Defining the Right Mix of Capabilities: The Irreplaceable Role of NATO Nuclear Arrangements, June 2011 Managing Change - NATO’s Partnerships and Deterrence in a Globalised World (accessed 18 Nov 2022) <http://www.act.nato.int/images/stories/events/2011/managing_change_lr.pdf>

The adoption by NATO of what could be called a new “Turkish Clause” allowing for the return of B-61s in crisis time is not a credible option. This would imply that nuclear-capable aircraft and bases would continue to be certified, and that pilots would continue to be trained for nuclear missions. It is very dubious that NATO would be willing to bear such costs in the absence of real nuclear-sharing. More importantly, such a decision in crisis time would probably open a divisive debate within the Alliance, that would be highly escalatory. This might lower the possible cost of aggression, as cogently argued by a trio of former US and British officials.

2. Won’t save money

The cost of building up conventional forces to replace the lost capability of NATO nukes would be even more expensive

Bruno Tertrais 2011. (Senior Research Fellow at the Fondation pour la recherché stratégique of Paris) Defining the Right Mix of Capabilities: The Irreplaceable Role of NATO Nuclear Arrangements, June 2011 Managing Change - NATO’s Partnerships and Deterrence in a Globalised World (accessed 18 Nov 2022) <http://www.act.nato.int/images/stories/events/2011/managing_change_lr.pdf>

What about non-nuclear “replacements”? The idea of an “appropriate mix” of capabilities suggests that NATO could compensate reduced reliance on nuclear deterrence with stronger reliance on advanced conventional weapons and missile defense. But neither of these are substitutes: this is not a zero-sum game. Increased investment in those two capabilities will not create the conditions that existed before further reduction of NATO nuclear assets. For both physical and psychological reasons, conventional weapons do not have the same deterrent power as nuclear ones. Conventional deterrence has a long record of failure – in fact, as long as civilization itself. The threat of conventional bombing is not enough to make an adversary desist when the stakes become extreme or vital, or even when they are more limited: the crises of the past twenty years have shown that it does not always lead the adversary to change its strategic calculus. There is still a large difference today – at least one order of magnitude – between conventional and nuclear yields. For this reason, conventional weapons cost much more for an equivalent effect.

3. Need Turkish support

Would need Turkish support to remove US nukes

Miles A. Pomper, 2019. “Why the U.S. Has Nuclear Weapons in Turkey—And May Try to Put the Bombs Away” October 25, 2019. (accessed 18 Nov 2022) https://nationalinterest.org/blog/buzz/why-us-has-nuclear-weapons-turkey—and-may-try-put-bombs-away-90771

Taking the weapons out of Turkey carries some physical risks. The bombs aren’t terribly heavy – roughly 700 pounds each – but moving nuclear material requires significant security. In addition, the Turkish government would have to help – or at least not stand in the way – of landing transport planes or sending cargo convoys by land or sea.

DISADVANTAGES

1. Turkey develops their own nuclear weapons

Link: It’s “frightening” the way Erdogan talks about US nukes in Turkey, but he can’t actually use them. And removal of US nukes would motivate Turkey to develop their own.

Eric Brewer 2020 (Deputy Director and Senior Fellow with the Project on Nuclear Issues (PONI) at the Center for Strategic and International Studies; was previously the Director for Counterproliferation at the National Security Council and Deputy National Intelligence Officer for Weapons of Mass Destruction and Proliferation at the National Intelligence Council) September 2020 “Toward a More Proliferated World? The Geopolitical Forces that Will Shape the Spread of Nuclear Weapons” (accessed 18 Nov 2022) https://csis-website-prod.s3.amazonaws.com/s3fs-public/publication/200902\_Toward\_a\_More\_Proliferated\_World.pdf

U.S. removal of nuclear weapons from Turkey. Erdogan’s implicit threats to use U.S. nuclear weapons on Turkish territory as a political hostage—even if Turkey has no real ability to control their use—is frightening. There is thus a strong argument for the removal of those weapons. Nevertheless, doing so would send an unambiguous signal to Turkey—whatever the privately offered U.S. rationale—that the United States no longer trusts it to fulfill a vital NATO function. This would severely undermine—if not outright collapse—any remaining Turkish confidence in the U.S. extended deterrent. That could be a powerful motivation and justification for Erdogan to decide to embark on a Turkish nuclear weapons program or adopt a hedging strategy.

Link: Turkey would have powerful motivation for considering its own nuclear weapons program

Eric Brewer 2020 (Deputy Director and Senior Fellow with the Project on Nuclear Issues (PONI) at the Center for Strategic and International Studies; was previously the Director for Counterproliferation at the National Security Council and Deputy National Intelligence Officer for Weapons of Mass Destruction and Proliferation at the National Intelligence Council) Sept 2020 “Toward a More Proliferated World? The Geopolitical Forces that Will Shape the Spread of Nuclear Weapons” (accessed 18 Nov 2022) https://csis-website-prod.s3.amazonaws.com/s3fs-public/publication/200902\_Toward\_a\_More\_Proliferated\_World.pdf

If Turkey concludes that its strategic interests and vision no longer align with the United States and NATO, but it has few other alternatives, that could serve as a powerful driver for consideration of a nuclear weapons program.

Link: Removing nukes would cause Turkey to develop their own. Even Turkey just talking about it could trigger Greece, Egypt, Iran, and Saudi Arabia to do the same

Joseph V. Micallef, 2019 (best-selling military history and world affairs author) “Is It Time to Withdraw US Nuclear Weapons from Incirlik?” 14 Nov 2019 (accessed 18 Nov 2022) https://www.military.com/daily-news/2019/11/14/it-time-withdraw-us-nuclear-weapons-incirlik.html

Removing the bombs will likely trigger renewed Turkish rhetoric about the desirability of obtaining atomic weapons. Turkish plans to do so, even if they never come to fruition, will have a direct impact on Iran's nuclear weapons program and on the U.S. and Europe's attempts to curb it. It may also trigger other countries in the region, especially Greece, Egypt and Saudi Arabia, to consider starting their own development programs.

Brink: NATO policy will be “critical variable” determining where Turkey goes on developing its own nuclear weapons

Eric Brewer 2020 (Deputy Director and Senior Fellow with the Project on Nuclear Issues (PONI) at the Center for Strategic and International Studies; was previously the Director for Counterproliferation at the National Security Council and Deputy National Intelligence Officer for Weapons of Mass Destruction and Proliferation at the National Intelligence Council) September 2020 “Toward a More Proliferated World? The Geopolitical Forces that Will Shape the Spread of Nuclear Weapons” (accessed 18 Nov 2022) https://csis-website-prod.s3.amazonaws.com/s3fs-public/publication/200902\_Toward\_a\_More\_Proliferated\_World.pdf

These concerns have led to growing bipartisan congressional support for a harder line against Turkey and reportedly resulted in U.S. plans to remove its nuclear weapons from Turkey. The future of the U.S.-Turkish relationship—and by extension, Turkey’s role within NATO—will be a critical variable that shapes Turkish thinking on whether the U.S. extended deterrent is desirable and credible, or whether Ankara needs to invest in alternative options.

Impact: Proliferation = increased risk of nuclear war

GEORGE P. SHULTZ, WILLIAM J. PERRY, HENRY A. KISSINGER AND SAM NUNN 2011 (Mr. Shultz was secretary of state from 1982 to 1989. Mr. Perry was secretary of defense from 1994 to 1997. Mr. Kissinger was secretary of state from 1973 to 1977. Mr. Nunn is former chairman of the Senate Armed Services Committee.) March 7, 2011 “Deterrence in the Age of Nuclear Proliferation” THE WALL STREET JOURNAL(accessed 19 June 2022) <http://online.wsj.com/article/SB10001424052748703300904576178760530169414.html>

Today, the Cold War is almost 20 years behind us, but many leaders and publics cannot conceive of deterrence without a strategy of mutual assured destruction. We have written previously that reliance on this strategy is becoming increasingly hazardous. With the spread of nuclear weapons, technology, materials and know-how, there is an increasing risk that nuclear weapons will be used. It is not possible to replicate the high-risk stability that prevailed between the two nuclear superpowers during the Cold War in such an environment. The growing number of nations with nuclear arms and differing motives, aims and ambitions poses very high and unpredictable risks and increased instability.

2. Loss of US hegemony #1 - Turkey aligns with Russia

Link: Removing nukes from Turkey would deteriorate US/Turkey relations. Only way to avoid would be to remove ALL nukes from NATO

Ellen Ioanes 2019 (Military & Defense Editorial Fellow at INSIDER. She is a graduate of Columbia Journalism School and Davidson College) 14 Oct 2019 US officials are considering pulling nuclear weapons from Turkey, effectively severing the US-Turkey alliance BUSINESS INSIDER (accessed 18 Nov 2022) https://www.businessinsider.com/trumps-threats-against-turkey-could-threaten-us-nuclear-arsenal-2019-10

On Monday, [The New York Times](https://nyti.ms/2qf1Xj7) reported that US officials were considering plans to move the US nuclear arsenal from Incirlik air base in Turkey. This move would be likely to further deteriorate the tense relationship between the US and Turkey, which has rapidly devolved as Turkey invaded northeastern Syria in assault on the Kurdish forces that fought ISIS alongside the US.
**[END QUOTE. SHE GOES ON TO CONCLUDE LATER IN THE ARTICLE QUOTE:]**
The only way to avoid political fallout with Turkey would be to remove the US nuclear arsenal from all the NATO countries where they are stored.

Link: Cutting Turkey loose would drive them to Russia

Halil I. Danismaz, 2016. (president of the Turkish Heritage Organization) “The U.S. and NATO Need Turkey” August 22, 2016. <https://time.com/4457369/the-u-s-and-nato-need-turkey/> (Note: This article addresses an earlier point in the conflict) (accessed 18 Nov 2022)

But the West’s response threatens to complicate how the U.S. and its NATO allies work with a country on the front lines of the global fight against ISIS. To cast Turkey loose now would forfeit our influence in the region and end a decades-long alliance. It could also drive Turkey into the arms of Russia—the wolf scratching at its door, which would like nothing more than to distance Turkey from the West.

Link: US failure to recognize Turkey’s security concerns directly links to broken US/Turkey relationship and Turkey’s willingness to turn towards Russia

Prof. Michael A. Reynolds 2019 (*associate professor of Near Eastern Studies and Director of the Program in Russian, East European and Eurasian Studies in Princeton University*) 24 Oct 2019 “TURKEY AND RUSSIA: A REMARKABLE RAPPROCHEMENT” (accessed 18 Nov 2022) <https://warontherocks.com/2019/10/turkey-and-russia-a-remarkable-rapprochement/>

That the Turks have done their share of damage to the U.S.-Turkish relationship goes without saying, and the dangers that they perceive from America are exaggerated. Moreover, Erdogan’s chronic rancor toward Europe has left Turkey further isolated, and thus vulnerable to Russian power. But the inability, or unwillingness, of American policymakers to craft policies that take into account the fundamental security concerns and sensitivities of a country that has, for decades, been a key partner of the United States in the Middle East, the Balkans, the Black Sea, the Caucasus, and Eurasia must be central to any explanation of the current turn in Turkish-Russian relations. The mutual willingness of Washington and Ankara to rebuild their ties will be the key determinant of the future of the Turkish-Russian relationship.

Brink: US/Turkey relations on a downward slope and now is the most significant crisis time in history

Prof. Michael A. Reynolds 2019 (*associate professor of Near Eastern Studies and Director of the Program in Russian, East European and Eurasian Studies in Princeton University*) 24 Oct 2019 “TURKEY AND RUSSIA: A REMARKABLE RAPPROCHEMENT” (accessed 18 Nov 2022) <https://warontherocks.com/2019/10/turkey-and-russia-a-remarkable-rapprochement/>

Turkey’s purchase of the S-400 missile system from Russia has arrived amidst the most significant crisis in the history of U.S.-Turkish relations. The purchase has not only spurred a further deterioration of these relations but has also changed the fundamental structural dynamics of the crisis so as to make impossible a return to the status quo ante. [**END QUOTE]** Despite the fact that the S-400 deal had been in the works for two years, the delivery of the weapon system this past July appears to have caught American policymakers genuinely by surprise, but it should not have. [**HE GOES ON TO SAY QUOTE:]** Moments of close and even enthusiastic cooperation between Ankara and Washington over the past decade and a half have acted as so much dust in the eyes, obscuring the reality that, since the end of the Cold War, U.S.-Turkish relations have been on an overall downward slope.

Brink: US/Turkey relations have been declining and are at a critical crossroads now

Dr. Kamal A. Beyoghlow 2020 (PhD; adjunct professor of international security at George Washington Univ., where he teaches courses on Turkish politics and foreign policy, North Africa and the world, and cross-cultural communication. He is also an adjunct professor of government at American Univ. in Washington, DC. He is a former professor at the US National War College)TURKEY AND THE UNITED STATES ON THE BRINK: IMPLICATIONS FOR NATO AND THE US-TURKISH STRATEGIC AND MILITARY PARTNERSHIP (accessed 18 Nov 2022) https://permanent.fdlp.gov/gpo132271/publications.armywarcollege.edu/pubs/3721.pdf

The US-Turkish strategic partnership established at the end of World War II reached its climax in the late eighties, and is at a dangerous crossroad. Such an outcome has had a devastating effect on Turkey’s relationship with other Western partners, especially NATO, which has been the backbone of America’s defense alliance since the start of the Cold War. This situation, if it continues, is likely to force the unraveling of NATO as a cohesive organization at a time when it is facing a myriad of collective global security challenges, particularly in Syria, Iraq, and Afghanistan—far beyond its traditional defensive posture on the European continent. All is not lost, however, and with more diligent diplomatic and military-to-military dialogue and compromises, US-Turkish relations can be salvaged.

Link & Brink: If the US doesn’t push Turkey any further, Turkey will not ally with Russia. But if we do, they will

Prof. Michael A. Reynolds 2019 (*associate professor of Near Eastern Studies and Director of the Program in Russian, East European and Eurasian Studies in Princeton University*) 24 Oct 2019 “TURKEY AND RUSSIA: A REMARKABLE RAPPROCHEMENT” (accessed 18 Nov 2022) <https://warontherocks.com/2019/10/turkey-and-russia-a-remarkable-rapprochement/>

The future of Russo-Turkish ties will depend to a great deal, perhaps decisively, on the future of U.S.-Turkish relations. If the United States and Turkey remain allies — even troubled ones — Ankara is unlikely to deepen its ties with Russia beyond what it is doing now. The same aspirations for independence and uncontested sovereignty that push Turkey to distance itself from the United States will, especially when coupled with a historically informed wariness of Russia, work against Turkey becoming a close and enthusiastic partner of Russia. If, however, U.S.-Turkish relations grow still more confrontational, Ankara may deepen its relationship to Moscow.

Link: US loses / Russia gains influence in the Middle East through Turkey’s alignment

Simon Tisdall 2018 ( foreign affairs commentator. He has been a foreign leader writer, foreign editor and US editor for the Guardian) Turkey's ever-closer ties with Russia leave US lacking key ally on Syria THE GUARDIAN 11 Apr 2018 (accessed 18 Nov 2022) <https://www.theguardian.com/world/2018/apr/11/turkey-ever-closer-ties-with-russia-leave-us-lacking-key-ally-on-syria>

Erdoğan and Putin share another aim: curbing US influence in the Middle East. And for Russia, courting Turkey brings additional benefits – sowing discord within Nato and limiting US military options in Syria when, as now, push may come to shove.

Link: Blocking Russia in the Middle East is key to maintaining US leadership as a great power

Steven A. Cook 2018 (senior fellow for Middle East and Africa studies at the Council on Foreign Relations ) 16 March 2018 FOREIGN POLICY “Russia Is in the Middle East to Stay” (accessed 18 Nov 2022) https://foreignpolicy.com/2018/03/16/the-middle-east-needs-a-steady-boyfriend/

If the United States is, as Secretary of Defense James Mattis averred in January, in a new era of great power competition, it is time the United States treated the situation as seriously as it is. Putin must be disabused of the notion that the Middle East is the most propitious place to begin weakening the West and the United States. Americans once before contained and rolled back Moscow’s influence in the region; there is no reason to believe that they cannot do it again — but only if they have the wisdom to recognize what is important in the world right now and the collective stomach to meet the challenge.

Impact: Apocalyptic consequences without US hegemony. Loss of peace, prosperity, democracy, world order

Brook Manville 2018 (principal of Brook Manville LLC, consulting on strategy and organization) 14 Oct 2018 “Why A Crumbling World Order Urgently Needs U.S. Leadership” FORBES (accessed 18 Nov 2022) <https://www.forbes.com/sites/brookmanville/2018/10/14/why-a-crumbling-world-order-urgently-needs-u-s-leadership/#2bb8912f2e61> (brackets added)

The botanical metaphor in [Brookings Institution Senior Fellow Robert] Kagan’s book title began our recent conversation. “We’ve been living in a tranquil garden of largely peaceful practices and liberal expectations across much of the world, ignoring the dark forces of jungle multiplying under the rocks. If we don’t defend civilization’s cultivation—especially American’s guarantee of peace and economic integration across the world—the toxic creatures and weeds will roar back.” Thus China’s determined military rise, Russia’s continuing aggressions, fiery authoritarians on the march in so many once democratic countries. [**END QUOTE**] As [Brookings Institution Senior Fellow Robert] Kagan continued, “Trump has been damaging the system—he too seems to have forgotten what good it has delivered—but actually America’s desire for maintaining the global order has been diminishing for years. After the dissolution of the Soviet empire in the 1990s, people talked about [‘the end of history”](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/The_End_of_History_and_the_Last_Man)—that America didn’t have to worry anymore about war or aggression. History doesn’t end, it simply paused. **[HE GOES ON TO SAY QUOTE:]** The ugliest aspects of human nature are surging again.”
**Vanishing Leadership, Vanishing Peace**
Kagan’s apocalyptic message, repeated in other recent writings, is lucid and terrifying, all the more devastating for its relentless use of history. It’s a footnoted plea that “we’ve seen this movie before.” He reminds us that Americans have frequently turned away from defending world order, with regrettably familiar outcomes: to be dragged in later at greater cost (e.g. helping to stop Hitler earlier might have prevented World War II); or, simply hoping that “the problem would go away,” to watch it get ten times worse (e.g. Obama’s policy in Syria). Kagan acknowledges that America has sometimes misstepped (e.g. Viet Nam, Iraq), but he still argues that overall our foreign engagement has produced more peace and prosperity than not. “History shows,” he summarized, “that world order has never been achieved without some constructive force to keep the peace. The relative harmony and fair play we’ve created in the modern world will vanish if the U.S. forsakes international leadership.”

3. NATO disrupted #1 – Turkey gets mad

Link: Turkey is a critical to Europe and NATO security

Robin Emmott 2019 (journalist with Reuters news service) 25 Oct 2019 "Despite loveless marriage, NATO to keep Turkey close" (accessed 18 Nov 2022) https://www.reuters.com/article/us-nato-turkey/despite-loveless-marriage-nato-to-keep-turkey-close-idUSKBN1X41N9

“There’s a concerted effort not to make things worse,” one NATO diplomat told Reuters. “Turkey, after (U.S. President Donald) Trump, has put a renewed strain on the alliance. But Turkey is too important to lose.” Host to U.S. nuclear warheads at its Incirlik air base and with the second-largest military in the alliance, Turkey gives the alliance a strategic presence, notably on the Black and Mediterranean seas. [**END QUOTE**] NATO is also seeking an image of unity when it holds a summit in London on Dec. 4 to celebrate 70 years since its founding in Washington, hoping to shore up confidence shaken by Trump’s portrayal of the alliance in crisis, diplomats said. [**THEY CONCLUDE LATER IN THE CONTEXT QUOTE:]** Once seen by some as a Cold War relic until Russia’s 2014 annexation of Crimea, NATO needs Turkey on side as it confronts militant attacks in Europe and seeks to defend against the threat of ballistic missiles from Iran to North Korea.

Link: Turkey is a critical NATO ally

Tracy Wilkinson and W.J. Hennigan, 2016. (Wilkinson – journalist; bachelor’s degree from Vanderbilt Univ. Hennigan -Pulitzer Prize winning journalist.) “Straddling East and West, Turkey is a critical U.S. ally in fight against Islamic State” July 15, 2016. (accessed 18 Nov 2022) https://www.latimes.com/world/europe/la-fg-turkey-us-importance-20160715-snap-story.html

The sprawling nation of Turkey is one of the United States’ most important and critically strategic allies, straddling the divide between the Middle East and the West. As the only majority-Muslim member of NATO, Turkey has lent its soil to U.S. air bases, supported American military operations in key conflicts — such as Syria today and the Balkans in the 1990s — and served, until recent years, as a rare friendly interlocutor between Muslim nations and Israel.

Link: Turkey’s stability and friendliness toward West vital

Tracy Wilkinson and W.J. Hennigan, 2016. (Wilkinson – journalist; bachelor’s degree from Vanderbilt Univ. Hennigan -Pulitzer Prize winning journalist.) “Straddling East and West, Turkey is a critical U.S. ally in fight against Islamic State” July 15, 2016. (accessed 18 Nov 2022) https://www.latimes.com/world/europe/la-fg-turkey-us-importance-20160715-snap-story.html

Turkey’s stability and the friendliness of its military toward the West are also of vital importance to the U.S. and for countries throughout Europe. Turkey has been a NATO ally since 1952, and U.S. warplanes have used Incirlik Air Base in the south during the invasions of Afghanistan and Iraq. An estimated 1,800 U.S. military personnel are assigned to the base and the U.S. Embassy in Ankara, the capital.

Link & Brink: Further confrontation with Turkey will move them toward Russia and disrupt NATO

Prof. Michael A. Reynolds 2019 (*associate professor of Near Eastern Studies and Director of the Program in Russian, East European and Eurasian Studies in Princeton University*) 24 Oct 2019 “TURKEY AND RUSSIA: A REMARKABLE RAPPROCHEMENT” (accessed 18 Nov 2022) <https://warontherocks.com/2019/10/turkey-and-russia-a-remarkable-rapprochement/>

If, however, U.S.-Turkish relations grow still more confrontational, Ankara may deepen its relationship to Moscow. Moscow will seek to widen and exploit the rift between Washington and, ideally, exploit it so as to disrupt the internal dynamics of NATO.

Brink: NATO at the crossroads, facing most severe crisis in its history

Nicholas Burns and Douglas Lute 2019 (Burns - Professor of the Practice of Diplomacy and International Relations, Harvard Kennedy School. Lute - Non-Resident Senior Fellow at Harvard’s Belfer Center, Project on Europe and the Transatlantic Relationship) NATO at Seventy: An Alliance in Crisis Feb 2019 (accessed 18 Nov 2022) <https://www.belfercenter.org/NATO70>

NATO stands once again at a crossroads, but this is different. As the world’s oldest and most successful military alliance celebrates its seventieth anniversary in April 2019, it faces an array of diverse, simultaneous challenges. Some challenges are familiar, others new and pressing; some from within the Alliance, others from beyond NATO’s borders and still others looming on the horizon. Taken together, these challenges represent the most severe crisis in the security environment in Europe since the end of the Cold War and perhaps ever.

Impact: Western peace, democracy and freedom depend on NATO. Key to blocking rise of authoritarian power

Nicholas Burns and Douglas Lute 2019 (Burns - Professor of the Practice of Diplomacy and International Relations, Harvard Kennedy School. Lute - Non-Resident Senior Fellow at Harvard’s Belfer Center, Project on Europe and the Transatlantic Relationship) NATO at Seventy: An Alliance in Crisis Feb 2019 (accessed 18 Nov 2022) <https://www.belfercenter.org/NATO70>

Approaching the seventieth anniversary of its founding in April 1949, the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) remains the single most important contributor to security, stability and peace in Europe and North America. NATO provides the umbrella defending Europe from conventional and nuclear attack and a secure geopolitical landscape for the world’s two largest economies—the European Union and the United States. NATO members comprise the largest and strongest alliance of democratic countries in the world. They contain Russian aggression and protect over 100 million East Europeans who now live in democracy and freedom after the fall of communism.Far from obsolete, NATO remains vital for the more than 900 million Europeans and North Americans who benefit from it every day. It is no overstatement that if NATO did not exist today, countries on both sides of the Atlantic would need to create it in a troubled, divisive 21st century where authoritarian powers are on the rise.

4. NATO disrupted #2 – Removal of nukes without NATO consensus

Link: AFF doesn’t consult with NATO allies before plan is enacted

They can’t consult, because their mandates say the plan takes effect with an Affirmative ballot. Unless you the Judge are planning to spend a couple months touring all the NATO countries and asking them before you write your ballot and make a decision…?

Link: Removal of nukes is guaranteed to be controversial within NATO and with Turkey because they like the Status Quo

Aaron Stein & Nilsu Gören 2014. (Stein - Non Proliferation Programme Manager, EDAM Centre for Economics & Foreign Policy Studies. Goren - Graduate Fellow, Center for International and Security Studies at Maryland) 16 Dec 2014 The Nuclear Bargain: Turkey and Tactical Nuclear Weapons (accessed 18 Nov 2022) <https://cissm.umd.edu/sites/default/files/2019-07/Nuclear_Bargain_TR_TNW%20-%20Goren.pdf> (ellipses in original)

According to Ibrahim Kalin, the chief foreign policy adviser to Prime Minister RecepTayyip Erdogan, and Suat Kiniklioglu, a former AKP MP who served as deputy chairman of foreign affairs for the AKP, “‘Turkey would not insist’ that NATO retain forward-deployed nuclear weapons. Conventional forces are sufficient …” These statements, however, suggest a level of comfort with the current nuclear status quo. The NATO Baltic states, for example are on record as supporting the continued deployment of nuclear weapons, which thereby precludes the Alliance from reaching a consensus on the issue in the near future. Turkey, therefore, need not worry about making a decision on its nuclear weapons status in the near future, but rather will remain reactive to developments in the alliance. Nevertheless, the Alliance remains conflicted about the future role of nuclear weapons in Europe.

Link: Agreement and joint decision-making on nuclear weapons is politically significant. It’s important to alliance trust

NATO Secretary General Jens Stoltenberg 2020. “Germany’s support for nuclear sharing is vital to protect peace and freedom” 11 May 2020 (accessed 18 Nov 2022) <https://www.nato.int/cps/en/natohq/opinions_175663.htm>

An important part of our nuclear deterrence strategy is nuclear sharing. NATO’s nuclear sharing is a multilateral arrangement that ensures the benefits, responsibilities and risks of nuclear deterrence are shared among Allies. Politically, this is significant. It means that participating Allies, like Germany, make joint decisions on nuclear policy and planning, and maintain appropriate equipment.  It has also always been an important trust-building measure for Germany’s neighbours. Our common procedures, doctrine and exercises give Allies a voice on nuclear matters that they would not otherwise have.

Link: Questioning nuclear sharing could damage NATO cohesion

Lt Col. Aaron Bazin and Dominika Kunertova 2018. (Bazin – US Army lieutenant colonel. Kunertova - PhD candidate in the Department of Political Science at the Université de Montréal, Quebec, Canada.) “An Alliance Divided? Five Factors That Could Fracture NATO” Jan/Feb 2018 MILITARY REVIEW (accessed 18 Nov 2022) https://www.armyupress.army.mil/Journals/Military-Review/English-Edition-Archives/January-February-2018/An-Alliance-Divided-Five-Factors-That-Could-Fracture-NATO/

Furthermore, the Alliance’s institutional structures allow for information exchange among allies that can raise the level of alliance cohesion independently from external factors. Additionally, the transatlantic bond has depended on credible signaling (i.e., an ally’s trust in another’s assurances). Especially in the context of nuclear sharing, “weak signals” of U.S. commitment to Europe could damage NATO’s cohesion.

Link: Without cohesion, NATO will fail

Lt Col. Aaron Bazin and Dominika Kunertova 2018. (Bazin – US Army lieutenant colonel. Kunertova - PhD candidate in the Department of Political Science at the Université de Montréal, Quebec, Canada.) “An Alliance Divided? Five Factors That Could Fracture NATO” Jan/Feb 2018 MILITARY REVIEW (accessed 18 Nov 2022) https://www.armyupress.army.mil/Journals/Military-Review/English-Edition-Archives/January-February-2018/An-Alliance-Divided-Five-Factors-That-Could-Fracture-NATO/

For almost seventy years, NATO has positively influenced the world. The Alliance’s many credits include acting as a major factor in deterrence of nuclear war, contributing to the erosion of the communist ideology of the Soviet Union, and projecting stability in difficult places such as Bosnia, Kosovo, and Afghanistan. Although these measures of past performance indicate that NATO could continue to succeed in the future, there are no guarantees. In fact, if the complex and adaptive security environment continues to evolve on its present course, it will become increasingly difficult to maintain cohesion of the Alliance. Arguably, it is one of the most successful alliances in human history, but without cohesion, NATO can and will fail.

Impact: WMD’s and Terrorism. Europe without NATO would be more vulnerable to Weapons of Mass Destruction (WMD) and terrorism

Dr. Hans Binnendijk & Dr. Richard Kugler in 2003. (Binnendijk - PhD in international relations; Vice President for Research at National Defense Univ., Director and Roosevelt Chair, Center for Technology and National Security Policy. Kugler - PhD, Distinguished Research Professor in the Center for Technology and National Security Policy at the National Defense Univ) Nov 2003, Center for Technology and National Security Policy, National Defense University, "Dual-Track Transformation for NATO," DEFENSE HORIZONS, https://archive.org/details/DTIC\_ADA496472 p. 166 (accessed 18 Nov 2022) (WMD = weapons of mass destruction)

“Even if bigger budgets were forthcoming, European militaries no longer would enjoy U.S. help in developing new-era doctrines, structures, and technologies. In the military transformation arena, they would be left on the outside looking in. Without U.S. contributions, they could be hard-pressed to muster the wherewithal to deploy missile defenses to shield Europe from WMD attacks. Developing serious forces for power-projection outside Europe also would be difficult, without American help in such critical areas as C4ISR, strategic lift, and logistic support. Overall, the collapse of NATO could leave Europe more vulnerable to threats across the spectrum from terrorism to WMD proliferation and less able to exert influence in the regions that produce these threats.”

Impact: NATO is essential to world peace, saving lives

Admiral James Stavridis 2019 (US Navy Admiral; former Supreme Allied Commander of NATO) 4 Apr 2019 “Why NATO Is Essential For World Peace, According to Its Former Commander (accessed 18 Nov 2022) https://time.com/5564171/why-nato-is-essential-world-peace/

Moreover, despite all the frustrations of coalition warfare, most observers would agree with Winston Churchill that “there is only one thing worse than fighting with allies, and that is fighting without them.” The greatest single advantage the U.S. has on the global stage is our network of allies, partners and friends. That network is under deliberate pressure: from China, with its “One Belt, One Road” competitive strategy, and from Russia, with its relentless attacks on coalition unity. A strong NATO means not only having allies in a fight, should it come to that, but also a powerful deterrent to the aggression of ambitious adversaries. Perhaps NATO’s greatest accomplishment is not even its unblemished record of deterring attack against its members but rather the fact that no alliance nation has ever attacked another. NATO’s most fundamental deliverable has been peace among Europe’s major powers for 70 years after two millennia of unhesitating slaughter on the continent. The disasters of the 20th century alone pulled the U.S. into two world wars that killed more than half a million Americans. History provides few achievements that compare to those seven decades of peace.

5. Loss of US hegemony #2 - China

Link: AFF plan turns Turkey against the US and NATO

Cross-apply the link evidence in DA’s 2 and 3.

Link: Alliance with Turkey is critical to blocking Chinese global influence, if we overcome our differences

Foundation for Political, Economic and Social Research 2020 (also known as SETA after its Turkish acronym; non-profit, independent, nonpartisan think tank based in Washington, D.C. dedicated to innovative studies on national, regional, and international issues concerning Turkey and US-Turkey relations) 16 July 2020 “Event Summary: The Future of US-Turkey Defense Relationship“ <https://setadc.org/event-summary-the-future-of-us-turkey-defense-relationship/> (brackets added) (accessed 18 Nov 2022)

He [Admiral James Stavridis; former Supreme Allied Commander of NATO] described Turkey not as a bridge between the east and west, but as a center of gravity because of its size, its economics, its military capability, and its membership in the NATO alliance. **[END QUOTE]** Turkey is also a fundamental part of NATO’s combat power because of its military and capabilities today. The Turkish arms industry continues to demonstrate its ability to produce high quality combat systems including unmanned systems, which have been effectively used in Libya and Syria. [**HE GOES ON TO SAY QUOTE**:] There are tactical differences that need to be overcome in order to have a strategic future together, but Stavridis believes that the two countries can find a technical solution to the challenges through high level technical working groups. Due to the rise of China, it is critical that the US holds its allies close. The greatest advantage the US has against China is its alliance structures, of which Turkey is a critical component.

Link: China is growing its military, intends to become a challenger to American power, and not just in East Asia

Dr. Kim R. Holmes 2015 (PhD in history from Georgetown Univ.; formerly worked for the Defense Policy Board, the U.S. defense secretary’s primary resource for expert outside advice; and public member of the U.S. delegation to the Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe) 3 June 2015 China prepping for regional hegemony (accessed 18 Nov 2022) https://www.heritage.org/asia/commentary/china-prepping-regional-hegemony

Increases in defense spending have been outpacing GDP growth rates for years, and although China’s defense spending is still far below America’s, it is growing while the U.S. is cutting its defense expenditures. All of this adds up to a bold new role for China’s armed forces. Long thought to be content with the mere defense of its mainland territory, China is clearly staking a larger claim for itself. It is striving to become the dominant military power in East Asia for sure, but also, in the long run, a rival challenger to American military power.

Link: China gaining Asian regional hegemony leads to gaining global hegemony, replacing USA

Min-Hyung Kim 2019 (Department of Political Science and International Relations, Kyung Hee University, South Korea) 4 Feb 2019 “A real driver of US–China trade conflict: The Sino–US competition for global hegemony and its implications for the future” (accessed 18 Nov 2022) <https://www.emerald.com/insight/content/doi/10.1108/ITPD-02-2019-003/full/html>

Although China repeatedly claims that it does not seek to replace US hegemony in the world, its behavior revealed by the initiatives of the BRI, the AIIB and Made in China 2015 illustrates that its ultimate goal is to be a global hegemon. This is not surprising because all the rising powers in history invariably sought to first dominate the region they are situated (Mearsheimer, 2011, 2014) and expand their power globally (Gilpin, 1981).

Impact: World peace & prosperity at risk. 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” (accessed 18 Nov 2022) https://apps.dtic.mil/sti/citations/ADA508040

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 QUOTE:]** The United States must exercise benevolent global hegemony, unilaterally if necessary, to ensure its security and maintain global peace and prosperity.