# **1AC**

# **1AC - Sudan**

**Contention 1 is Sudan.**

#### Sudan’s military is wreaking havoc.

**Walsh 25** — (Declan Walsh [Declan Walsh is the Cairo bureau chief, covering Egypt and the Middle East. He was previously based in Pakistan. He spent five months in the United States during the 2016 presidential campaign to write a column, Abroad in America, that considered the election from the perspective of a foreign correspondent.], 1-16-2025, "Sudan’s Military Has Used Chemical Weapons Twice, U.S. Officials Say …", archive.is, https://archive.is/M8Jzs, accessed 2-7-2025) //FK

**Sudan’s military has used chemical weapons** on at least two occasions against the paramilitary group it is battling for control of the country, four senior United States officials said on Thursday. The revelations about chemical weapons came as the United States announced sanctions on Thursday against the Sudanese military chief, Gen. Abdel Fattah al-Burhan, for **documented atrocities** by his troops, **including** indiscriminate **bombing of civilians and the use of starvation** as a weapon of war.The use of chemical weapons crosses yet another boundary in the war between the Sudanese military and the R.S.F., its former ally. By many measures, the conflict in Sudan has created the world’s worst humanitarian crisis, with as many as 150,000 people killed, over 11 million displaced and now the world’s worst famine in decades.

#### Unfortunately, the ICC is underfunded.

**CICC 22**— (Coalition for ICC [A coalition aimed at supporting the ICC.], xx-xx-2022, "Victims could lose out with states’ double-standard on International Criminal Court resources", No Publication, https://coalitionfortheicc.org/news/20220330/OpenLetter\_ICCresources, accessed 2-7-2025) //FK

While the positive response of States Parties signals a commitment to justice, States Parties’ **chronic underfunding of the Court** has led to an exceptional request by the Office of the Prosecutor for voluntary contributions to be provided outside the Court’s regular budget, including through a newly established trust fund and gratis personnel. The Coalition has repeatedly called attention to the significant and long-standing gap between the Court’s workload and the resources available to it in its regular budget. The Court’s budget has consistently been limited by States Parties, including through the insistence of some on “zero nominal growth” and in setting arbitrary financial envelopes, including for legal aid, and by failures on several occasions of the Court to request the resources it needs. This **has impacted the Court’s effectiveness and delayed** victims’ access to **justice**. This recent call by the Office of the Prosecutor to States Parties for voluntary contributions and gratis personnel to support its investigative activities – and the enthusiastic response by some States Parties – amounts to an admission by the Court and its States Parties that the Court does not have adequate resources.

#### Consequently,

**ICC-ASP 24**— (ICC-ASP [International Criminal Court Assembly of State Parties], 12-7-2024, "", No Publication, https://asp.icc-cpi.int/sites/default/files/asp\_docs/ICC-ASP-23-10-AV-ENG.pdf, accessed 2-7-2025) //FK

880. The Court’s external offices have requested an amount of €353.2 thousand, representing a decrease of €26.8 thousand (7.1 per cent) as compared with the resources approved for 2024. The resources requested by the country offices/field presences are required to purchase consumable items to support day-to-day operations, including fuel for vehicles and generators, office supplies, light IT equipment, air conditioners, drinking water, emergency rations and personal protection equipment (PPE) to be used by field staff. The amount requested by the Country Office (Ukraine) (€75.0 thousand) has increased by €5.5 thousand (7.9 per cent) as compared with the resources approved for 2024 due to increased operational costs for managing a larger fleet of vehicles, fuel consumption and increased incountry missions planned by OTP. The Ukrainian electricity infrastructure, power plants and networks have been subject to repeated attack and it is therefore anticipated that the Country Office (Ukraine) will require more fuel for its electricity generator in 2025. The Country Office (Ukraine) also needs to purchase more emergency rations, water and office supplies in 2025 to cover the greater need for operational, logistical and security support. The increase requested by the Country Office (Central African Republic) results from the reintegration of the costs of support (flights, vehicles, internet) by MINUSCA to the missions scheduled by VPRS, CMS, OPCV, SSS, TFV and PIOS outside Bangui. These costs were included in the budgets of Headquarters sections for 2024. **The increase requested by the country offices in Ukraine and the CAR has been** completely **offset by the reductions** identified **in** Côte Advance version ICC-ASP/23/10 10-E-240724 161 d’Ivoire, Uganda, the DRC and **Sudan resulting** from reduced consumption because of a reduction **in** activity as well as **the scaling down of the Court’s presence.**

#### US sanctions also deck the court’s efficacy.

**Casert 25**-- (Molly Quell and Raf Casert, 2-7-2025, "ICC condemns sanctions by Trump administration and pledges to continue its work", https://apnews.com/article/icc-sanctions-trump-israel-gaza-17422a0d6dc57ac211be35abb3f9fb41) //doa2-7-2025 + master chen 💆

Human rights groups have criticized the U.S. sanctions. “Sanctions are for human rights violators, not those working to hold rights abusers to account,” Liz Evenson, international justice director at Human Rights Watch, said in a statement. “Trump’s executive order borrows a page out of Russia’s playbook, which has sought to obstruct the court’s work through arrest warrants against its judges and prosecutor,” she added. Court officials had been preparing for sanctions for months. In January, the court gave staff a three-month advance on their salaries, two court insiders told The Associated Press on condition of anonymity because they weren’t authorized to speak to media. Should the **U.S. sanction** the court itself, it could **cripple operations, leaving the institution unable to pay staff, fund investigations, or access information** stored on servers in the United States. At least two senior staff members at the court have resigned since Trump was elected in an effort to avoid sanctions. ‘ICC’s actions have no legal basis’ In an increasingly polarized Western world, Hungary stood side by side with Trump. “The ICC has recently turned itself into a biased political tool and has discredited the entire international court system,” Foreign Minister Péter Szijjártó said. “Its decisions have also only contributed to exacerbating insecurity in already difficult parts of the world.” Israel’s Foreign Minister Gideon Sa’ar said that “the ICC’s actions are immoral and have no legal basis.” It is the second time that Trump has gone after the court. During his previous term in office, he imposed sanctions on former prosecutor Fatou Bensouda and one of her deputies over her investigation into crimes committed in Afghanistan. U.S. President Joe Biden lifted the sanctions when he took office in 2021.

#### **Affirming solves by preventing sanctions via forcing US compliance.**

**ICC 98** — (ICC Rome Statute [The International Criminal Court; prosecutes individuals for committing crimes], 7-17-1998, "", No Publication, https://www.icc-cpi.int/sites/default/files/NR/rdonlyres/ADD16852-AEE9-4757-ABE7-9CDC7CF02886/283503/RomeStatutEng1.pdf, accessed 2-3-2025) //FK

**Article 86** General obligation to cooperate **States Parties** shall, in accordance with the provisions of this Statute, **cooperate fully with the Court** in its investigation and prosecution of crimes within the jurisdiction of the Court.

#### **AND the US would have to fund the court.**

**Ferragamo 24** — (Mariel Ferragamo [Mariel Ferragamo covers Africa and global health and edits the Daily News Brief. Her previous experience includes roles at the Energy for Growth Hub and in the U.S. Congress. Mariel holds a bachelor’s degree in environmental policy from Colby College and a certification in journalism from New York University.], 11-22-2024, "The Role of the ICC", Council on Foreign Relations, https://www.cfr.org/backgrounder/role-icc, accessed 2-3-2025) //FK

**The ICC’s** annual **budget** for 2024 stands at roughly $187 million [PDF], the vast majority of which **comes from member states. Contributions** are determined by the same method the United Nations uses to assess dues, which roughly **correspond to the size of each member’s economy.** In 2022, the largest contributions [PDF] came from Japan, Germany, France, and the United Kingdom. Some countries, notably Argentina, Brazil, and Venezuela, have run up millions of dollars in overdue payments.

#### **AND the US would encourage other members to fund the court.**

**Ellyatt 25** — (Holly Ellyatt [Holly Ellyatt writes for CNBC.com focusing on European macro-economics and politics. She has led digital coverage of the European financial crisis, U.K. and euro zone politics, Brexit, the Covid-19 pandemic and Russia and the war in Ukraine.], 1-23-2025, “Can Trump force the hand of NATO allies to spend up to 5% of GDP on defense?”, CNBC, https://www.cnbc.com/2025/01/23/can-trump-get-nato-allies-to-spend-more-on-defense.html, accessed 2-8-2025) //FK

As U.S. President Donald **Trump looks to immediately fix** his greatest political and economic bugbears, the thorny issue of **NATO defense spending** is likely to quickly return to the global fore. Trump’s relationship with the Western military alliance was acrimonious during his first presidency, with the Republican leader frequently lambasting NATO member states for not abiding by a 2014 target to spend at least 2% of GDP on defense every year. Ahead of his second term in office, Trump signaled that the debate over military spending — and **Trump’s perception that** NATO **members are over-reliant on the U.S.** for their own security — will be back on the agenda, stating that NATO’s 32 member countries should contribute even more toward defense. “I think NATO should have 5% [of their GDP as a NATO contribution target],” he said in January. “They can all afford it, but they should be at 5%, not 2%”, he said at a press conference in which he also refused to rule out using military force to seize the Panama Canal or Greenland — a territory that belongs to NATO member Denmark. **There has been a broad increase in defense expenditure among NATO members since Trump** was last in power. In 2018, at the height of the White House leader’s irritation with the military bloc, only six member states met even the 2% of GDP target.

#### **ICC focus on Sudan would prevent conflict by investigating and prosecuting the war’s leaders and imposing international backlash.**

#### The **Most robust empirical studies show ICC prevents aggression.**

**Ford 20** [Stuart Ford, Professor of Law at UIC John Marshall Law School in Chicago, Illinois. “Can the International Criminal Court Succeed? An Analysis of the Can the International Criminal Court Succeed? An Analysis of the Empirical Evidence of Violence Prevention Empirical Evidence of Violence Prevention” Winter 2020 Loyola of Los Angeles International and Comparative Law Review and Comparative Law Review, Volume 43 Number 2 Article 1]

V. SUMMARIZING THE RESULTS OF THE EMPIRICAL STUDIES

While many scholars have very strong **opinions** about whether the ICC can prevent violence, it is only in the last few years that we have seen meaningful attempts to test that question **empirically**.158 The research discussed above represents an important new chapter in research about the ICC. For the first time, we can really answer the question of whether the ICC can prevent violations of ICL.

All the articles described above come with some caveats. Professor Hillebrecht notes that studying Libya represents a best case for the influence of the ICC.159 However, she also controlled for a number of variables other than ICC intervention that could have affected the civilian death rate in Libya.160 Professor Meernik notes that we don’t know exactly why some states respect human rights and thus improved human rights might be the result of something other than the ICC,161 but he also controlled for a number of variables that we might expect to influence compliance with human rights obligations.162 Professors Jo and Simmons also express some concern about the influence of unobserved variables.163 But, they too used control variables to isolate the effect of the ICC from the effect of other variables one would expect to influence violence.164 Professor Dancy acknowledged that it is hard to isolate the ICC’s effect on conflict termination.165 Professor Appel was concerned that the ICC might appear to reduce violations of human rights if only states that had good human rights records joined the Rome Statute,166 but he chose a statistical test designed to minimize that possibility and used a number of control variables to try and isolate the effect of the ICC.167

Ultimately, there will always be caveats associated with statistical studies – there is always the possibility that the model is effected by variables you have not accounted for.168 Nonetheless, the authors took pains to **control for the variables** (other than the ICC) that were most likely to explain the results. By controlling for such variables, they sought to disentangle the impact of the ICC from the impact of other variables that might affect the results. These efforts help ensure the results are robust.

With the exception of Professor Dancy’s work,169 [Footnote 169: Professor Dancy has studied a different phenomenon from the other authors cited in this article and his work is treated separately below. See infra text accompanying notes 177-186.] these studies, each using a different data set and a different methodology, independently came to essentially the same conclusion – **the ICC does prevent violence**. Professor Hillebrecht found that the ICC’s intervention in Libya reduced civilian casualties.170 Professor Meernik found that states with a strong commitment to the ICC had fewer human rights violations than other states, independent of their overall commitment to the rule of law.171 Professors Jo and Simmons found that the ICC reduced civilian deaths caused by both the government and rebel groups, though the effect was more dramatic for government forces.172 Professor Appel found that joining the ICC was associated with a reduction in serious human rights abuses.173

We can now say with reasonable confidence that the ICC does prevent violence. Ratification of the Rome Statute is associated with a reduction in violence. Criminalizing violations of international criminal law in domestic law is associated with a reduction in violence. And when the ICC acts, whether to open an investigation, issue an arrest warrant, or try an accused person, there is a reduction in violence. Moreover, these effects appear to be additive.174 There are **no empirical studies** showing that it increases violence.175 While a single article might not settle the question, **a whole series of articles** using different datasets and different methodologies that all come to the same conclusion is **much more persuasive**. In short, when considered together, **the available empirical studies** strongly suggest that the **ICC does prevent violence**. Considering how “highly contested” this question has been amongst scholars,176 the **uniformity** of the empirical results is **particularly striking**.

#### **Absent action,**

**Darwich 23** — (May Darwich [Associate Professor of International Relations of the Middle East, University of Birmingham], 5-4-2023, "Sudan: the longer the conflict lasts, the higher the risk of a regional war", Conversation, https://theconversation.com/sudan-the-longer-the-conflict-lasts-the-higher-the-risk-of-a-regional-war-204931, accessed 2-7-2025) //FK

There is also a risk that **the conflict could** spill over to neighbouring countries and **escalate into a regional conflict.** Geographically, **Sudan borders** seven countries: Chad, the Central African Republic (CAR), South Sudan, Egypt, Eritrea, Ethiopia and Libya. Politically and culturally, it straddles **the Middle East**, north Africa and the Horn of Africa. There is a real possibility that regional and **international actors will be arming different sides** as they pursue their own, often competing interests. This could bring unprecedented shifts in the region’s already uneasy regional equilibrium, and test pre-existing alliances.

#### Middle East war draws in great powers and goes nuclear.

**Pleasance 20**, senior foreign news reporter with dailymail, (Chris, January 3rd, 2020, “How could Iran crisis lead to World War Three? Tehran could hit back with cyber-attacks or terror attacks on US forces and Israel - provoking Donald Trump to retaliate in tit-for-tat that could drag in Saudi Arabia, Russia, China and Turkey”, )

Iran has vowed to exact a 'crushing revenge' on American forces in retaliation for the killing of Quds commander Qassem Soleimani - leaving the Middle East on the brink of a **conflict** that could quickly spiral into **World War 3.** The Iranian National Security Council is currently meeting in Tehran - chaired by Ayatollah Khamenei himself for the first time ever - to consider its response. At their disposal is the world's 13th most powerful military, a host of militia groups spread across the Middle East, proxy-forces such as Lebanon's Hezbollah and Yemen's Houthi rebels, and allies like Syria's Bashar al-Assad. Targets in their crosshairs are likely to include **US troops and military bases in Iraq and Syria**, Israeli forces in the Golan Heights, tankers in the Strait of Hormuz, and Saudi Arabia's oil infrastructure. While initial strikes are likely to be limited, they could herald a **tit-for-tat series** **of events** - drawing in Russian forces stationed in Syria defending a key Iranian ally in Bashar al-Assad, and Turkish forces fighting in the country's north. China also has ships stationed in the Gulf of Oman and recently carried out joint naval drill with both Iran and Russia, raising the prospect that they could also become involved. Saudi Arabia is already engaged in a conflict with Iran-backed Houthi rebels in Yemen, and any escalation by Tehran would be met with a response from Riyadh. Turkish strongman Recep Erdogan's troops are deployed in northern Syria and he is close to Russia and Iran as well as being a member of NATO - making his actions unpredictable if a conflict escalates across the region. The US, China, Russia and Israel all have **nuclear weapons** - with at least three of those possessing **next-generation** **hypersonic** **missiles** capable of breaching all defense systems. Israel is also armed with nuclear weapons and is an obvious target for any Iranian attacks, but Benjamin Netanyahu and the IDF will not hesitate to defend themselves and have recently struck Iran-backed Hezbollah forces in Syria. If Iran decides to blockade the Strait of Hormuz, as it has often threatened to do in the past, a host of world powers including European nations which rely on the oil which flows through the waterway could find themselves having to defend their interests. Ultimately, if the tit-for-tat exchanges between these countries escalated far enough it is conceivable but unlikely that it would end with a **nuclear exchange** - and **destruction on a global scale.**

#### **Miscalc likely.**

**Ayed** **18** Nahlah, Cbc News, 2-18-2018, "ANALYSIS," CBC,

Hawaii's false alarm about an incoming ballistic missile. **Israel's downing of an Iranian drone**, and the subsequent Syrian downing of an Israeli jet. The U.S. bombing of Russian fighters in Syria. All happened in 2018, and any could have relatively swiftly sparked a major new confrontation. An insistent alarm is being raised over the rising probability the world will trip into its next major conflict rather than deliberately march into it. Miscalculations, accidents, or plain old **human error** — they're an inevitable consequence of human interaction on the global stage and there are often channels to deal with them to prevent escalation. But set against the backdrop of rising global instability and the growing complexity of ongoing, more layered conflicts, experts believe accidents and missteps are **more likely** — and that they are far more dangerous than they might have been in the past. Take the risk of nuclear war. It has "never been higher since the Cuban missile crisis," Ernest Moniz, former U.S. secretary of energy and now head of the Nuclear Threat Initiative, said during this weekend's Munich Security Conference. A B-2 Spirit assigned to the 509th Bomb Wing, Whiteman Air Force Base, taxis on the flightline at Andersen Air Force Base in Guam. The U.S. is beefing up its presence around the Korean Peninsula. (Staff Sgt. Joshua Smoot/U.S. Air Force via Associated Press) But "the principal **risk** right now as we see it is not some planned-out, intentional initiation of nuclear use, but rather accident, miscalculation, blunder and that's why the probability is higher." While not exactly predicting imminent nuclear war, Moniz says fraying relations and waning communication between Russia and the U.S. are prime reasons why these are risky time**s on the nuclear front.** Trump blames Congress for Russia relations 'at an all-time low' Ominous signs that the next war in the Middle East is coming, and it won't be pretty In its list of top risks for 2018, the Eurasia Group rates accidents as second only to China's growing international influence. In its report, it said there are "too many places where a misstep or misjudgment could provoke serious international conflict." One of those places, of course, North Korea, in a region where military exercises on both sides of the Korean divide are the norm, as are missile and nuclear tests. This past fall, at the height of a war of words between Washington and Pyongyang, two American Air force B-1B bombers flew over the peninsula.

#### Extinction.

**Sarg 15** — (Stoyan Sarg, Director of the Physics Research Department at the World Institute for Scientific Exploration, 10-9-2015, "The Unknown Danger of Nuclear Apocalypse", Foreign Policy Journal, https://www.foreignpolicyjournal.com/2015/10/09/the-unknown-danger-of-nuclear-apocalypse/, accessed 2-7-2025) //TH

With the new NATO plan for installation of nuclear tactical weapons in Europe, nuclear missiles may reach Moscow in only 6 minutes, and the opposite case is also possible in the same time. The question is: how can we be sure that this will not be triggered by a human error or computer malfunction. An adequate reaction dictated by the dilemma “to be or not to be” and the concept of preventive **nuclear strike** may lead to a nuclear consequence that is difficult to stop. At the present level of distributed controlled systems and military global navigations, this will lead to **unstoppable global nuclear war**. However, there is something not predicted, of which the military strategists, politicians and powerful forces are not aware. Probably, it will **not** be a **nuclear winter** that they hope to survive in their **underground facilities**. The **most probable** consequence will be a **partial loss** of the **Earth’s atmosphere** as a result of one or many **powerful simultaneous tornadoes** caused by the **nuclear explosions**. In a tornado, a powerful **antigravitational** effect takes place. The official science does not have an adequate explanation for this feature due to an incorrect concept about space. The antigravitational effect is not a result of the circling air. It is a specific physical effect in the aether space that is dismissed in physics as it is currently taught. Therefore, the effective height of this effect is not limited to the height of the atmosphere. Then in the case of many simultaneous **powerful tornadoes**, an **effect** of **suction** of the **earth atmosphere into space** might take place. Such events are **observed on the Sun** and the present physical science does not have an explanation for them. The antigravitational effect is accompanied by specific electric and magnetic fields with a twisted shape. This is observed in tornado events on the Sun. Some effects in the upper Earth atmosphere known as sprites have a similar combination of electrical and magnetic fields but in a weaker form. They are also a mystery for contemporary physical science. At the time of **atmospheric nuclear tests**, made in the last century, a number of **induced tornadoes** are observed near the **nuclear mushroom** as shown in Figure 1. The strongest anti gravitational effect, however, occurs in the central column of the formed nuclear mushroom. The analysis of underwater nuclear tests also indicates a strong anti gravitational effect. It causes a rise of a vertical column of water. In the test shown in Figure 2, the vertical column contains millions tons of water. Thermonuclear bombs are **multiple times more powerful**. The largest thermonuclear bomb of the former Soviet Union tested in 1961 is 50 megatons. It is 3,300 times more powerful than the bomb dropped by USA on Hiroshima at the second world war and may kill millions. It is known that Mars once had liquid water and consequently an atmosphere that has mysteriously disappeared. If the scenario described above takes place, the Earth will become a **dead planet like Mars**. The powerful politicians, military adventurers and their financial supporters must be aware that even the most secured **underground facility** will not save them if a global nuclear conflict is triggered. Their disgraced end will be more miserable than the deaths of the billions of innocent human beings, including the animal world.

# **1AC - Gaza**

**Contention two is Gaza.**

**Future military interventions guaranteed under Trump.**

**Al Jazeera 25** — (Al Jazeera Staff, an independent news organisation funded in part by the Qatari government, 1-7-2025, "‘Hell will break out’: Trump hints at military moves in Mideast, Americas", Al Jazeera, https://www.aljazeera.com/news/2025/1/7/hell-will-break-loose-trump-hints-at-military-moves-in-mideast-americas, accessed 1-29-2025) //FK

United States President-elect Donald **Trump has hinted at possible military intervention in the Americas and the Middle East**, as well as other items on his foreign policy agenda, during a wide-ranging news conference in Florida. But his most consequential statements concerned foreign policy. **Trump expounded on a sweeping expansionist vision**, with consequences for countries across the world. **He repeated his desire for US control of the Panama Canal, Greenland and Canada**, while emphasising that “**all hell will break out**” if captives held in Gaza are not released before he takes office. Some observers have interpreted Trump’s statement as a threat of **possible US military intervention in Gaza**, a line that outgoing President Joe Biden has refused to cross, despite surging military aid to Israel.

#### **US troops are a possibility.**

**Sarisohn 25** — (Hannah Sarisohn [Hannah Sarisohn is The Jerusalem Post's US-based correspondent. Based in New York, she spent five years working for CNN.], 1-29-2025, "Trump won't pay for Gaza reconstruction, WH says", The Jerusalem Post | JPost, https://www.jpost.com/breaking-news/article-840863, accessed 2-7-2025) //FK

US President Donald Trump didn’t commit **to sending troops to Gaza** – but **he** also **did not rule anything out** – because, according to White House Press Secretary Karoline Leavitt, **the president is “very good” when negotiating and wants to preserve that leverage.**

#### **Affirming solves – the ICC is incentivized to prosecute the US – it receives relevance.**

**Stradner 20** --- (Ivana Stradner [Ivana Stradner is a research fellow at the Foundation for Defense of Democracies.], 3-17-2020, "The U.S. Must Reject the International Criminal Court’s Attack on Its National Sovereignty", https://www.nationalreview.com/2020/03/united-states-must-reject-international-criminal-court-attack-on-national-sovereignty/) //doa1-27-2025 + master chen :)

Last week, the International Criminal Court (**ICC**) authorized an investigation of alleged war crimes and crimes against humanity by U.S., Afghan, and Taliban troops in Afghanistan, as well as by CIA black sites operated in Poland, Lithuania, and Romania. While the prosecution will likely fail, it represents another effort by a global elite — consisting of European governments, international organizations, and their supporting interest groups, academics, and activists — to **threaten American sovereignty.** 00:00 09:14 Top Stories Colombian President Backs Down on Refusal to Accept Migrants after Trump Threats Brittany Bernstein Tom Homan Fires Back at Pope Francis for Calling Mass Deportations a ‘Disgrace’ David Zimmermann This Is What Democracy Looks Like Rich Lowry NRPLUS The Rome Statute, which established the ICC in 1998, was supported by 120 states. It had the worthy goal of preventing the world’s most horrific crimes. Today the ICC can exercise jurisdiction over war crimes, crimes against humanity, aggression, and genocide. Its founders believed that an international organization in the form of a court could replace the customary role of nation-states to punish those who violate the rules of civilized warfare. The Clinton administration signed the treaty in 2000, but did not submit it for Senate ratification. American support for the court dissolved after 9/11, as American officials worried that the ICC would become an anti-American kangaroo court used by certain countries to constrain nation-state sovereignty. In 2002, the Bush administration announced that it would not sign the agreement, and empowered then-State Department official John Bolton to lead a U.S. campaign to sign bilateral immunity agreements with more than 100 countries to protect both parties from the ICC’s jurisdiction. Ever since, the ICC has labored ineffectually. To date, the Court has spent more than $2 billion dollars and yielded just eight successful convictions and four acquittals, focusing only on African countries. While there are 123 member states, nations that still might have to wage war, such as the U.S., Israel, India, South Korea, China, and Russia, have refused to join. America’s Western European allies, perhaps still hoping for a utopian future where war has disappeared and meager conventional forces are all that is needed, lend the ICC its greatest support. Mos**t ICC officials** have long hoped to **achieve international relevance by attacking** the ICC’s greatest critic**: the United States**. Since November 2017, ICC **chief prosecutor** Fatou Bensouda has sought to **use alleged crimes** in Afghanistan **to bring charges against the U.S. military** and intelligence community. America’s response has been tough, and after numerous threats by the ICC, U.S. secretary of state Mike Pompeo ordered the revocation of the ICC chief prosecutor’s U.S. entry visa (though Bensouda managed to circumvent the ban and attend her UN meetings last April). The ICC Pre-Trial Chamber later ruled against an investigation (and possible prosecution) of the U.S. for alleged crimes in Afghanistan because both would most likely fail. Last week, however, the ICC’s appellate court reversed this finding and allowed Bensouda to continue her pursuits of American activities in Afghanistan and elsewhere after 9/11. To end this charade, the U.S. should continue to challenge the Court’s jurisdiction and protect the rights of nations that are bound only by rules to which they consent. The Trump administration should continue to deny ICC officials and any government officials (such as any military or law enforcement officers) that assist them from entering the United States or using its financial system. Most important, the United States should strike at the ICC through its supporters. Japan, the United Kingdom, France, Italy, Canada, Spain, Mexico, and Australia are all major Court funders. The Trump administration should warn countries who are ICC top funders yet depend utterly on the U.S. for their defense (such as Japan) that they cannot expect American troops to protect any nation seeking to prosecute and imprison them. It should weaken defense ties with ICC member countries, and cut foreign aid to any nation that cooperates with the Court. With these actions, the Trump administration will defend the rights, not just of the United States, but of all sovereign nations. America did not join the Rome Statute. It remains unfettered by its requirements. To protect international law, it should refuse to recognize any ICC probe. International rules should only bind nations that consent to them. Allowing the ICC to claim power over the U.S., which does not consent to its jurisdiction will erode any incentive to obey any international rules at all. The ICC’s actions threaten the only true mechanism for deterring human rights abuses. **Subjecting U.S. forces to an after-the-fact and idealistic human-rights barometer will only discourage Washington from intervening** to end massive human-rights abuses in difficult world hotspots. If the global elite want the U.S. to lead efforts to end killings in places such as Syria, Yemen, or Sudan, the last thing it should do is prosecute American troops when they take on the difficult jobs that no other nation can or will do.

#### Perception is enough.

**Holy & Dallas 6** (Victoria K. Holt, senior associate at the Henry L. Stimson Center. Former Senior Policy Advisor at the State Department. Graduate of Naval War College and BA from Wesleyan. Elisabeth W. Dallas, research associate at the Henry L. Stimson Center. Previously Senior Fellow with the Public International Law & Policy Group in Washington, DC. She has an MA from Tufts University’s Fletcher School of Law & Diplomacy. “On Trial: The US Military and the International Criminal Court” Henry L. Stimson Center Report No. 55 https://www.stimson.org/wp-content/files/file-attachments/US\_Military\_and\_the\_ICC\_FINAL\_website\_1.pdf March 2006) // ELI MONKEY POX CHEN

The problem, he persisted, is that “**perception is reality**.” **Confusion about the Court among** rank and file **military personnel is real**, and is not being assuaged on the ground. Another participant pointed out that a vague fear of the Court is the bottom line for many in the military, and until they understand how it functions both operationally and legally, they will continue to feel like their **actions** could be **second-guessed**. One advocate of the Court pointed out that this situation helped no one, and that the **confidence of those deployed** to do their job was **paramount.** Critics of the Court agreed: no one wants military personnel to carry an **additional**, **unnecessary burden.** The United States holds a unique **responsibility** – vulnerability, some argue – as the most forward deployed nation in the world, with significant military forces in operations designed to **preserve** international peace and security.123 Due to the size and sophistication of American capabilities, the United States often **plays** an active role worldwide in **response** to perceived threats. Some fear more situations where the US military actions are heavily scrutinized by the international community. This is especially likely when the US makes controversial decisions or takes action that is not presumed to adhere to the standards embodied within international humanitarian law and the laws of war. While the Court is intended to promote justice and human rights around the world, Court critics have argued that it coulddo more harm than good in reducing threats to international peace and security if non-members fear being judged by the Court. With the Court’s extended jurisdiction, some policymakers and military leaders suggest that **states** may be deterred from deploying forces in **response** to a large scale humanitarian crisis, for example. Such a “fear to respond” mentality could **affect** American personnel – soldiers, commanders or generals – if they believe their actions will be evaluated and critiqued by an international judge. US officials have argued that those called to serve in international interventions or peace enforcement operations deserve a certain amount of “exemption” from the court’s jurisdiction, due to the current nature of war where often an unintended consequence is civilian casualties.124 In addition to impacting strategic decisions, others have worried that fear of the Court could impact tactical decisions in the field, leading military personnel to consider limiting the use or type of fire power and/or the type of weapons that are employed. These anxieties are often raised by those unfamiliar with the Court, although not exclusively.125 Part of the concern is focused on how the Court would evaluate US decision-making. US military actions involve **thousands** of discussions and decisions relating to policy and planning. Each decision requires significant evaluation and assessment, and may use **classified** information from various agencies and individuals with expertise in operational law and doctrine. New threats to the United States **emerge** **daily**, and discussions about protecting national security interests with military actions must remain classified and carried out in a closed door setting. It is not possible for even a neutral body, such as the ICRC, to observe the process of determining targets, troop numbers and fire power. Linked to this argument is the likely **evaluation** by both civilian and military leaders as to what constitutes a vital versus a non-vital mission, such as humanitarian interventions or peace operations, which could delay a response by the international community.126 Conversely, a similar strategic decision by **commanders may** be to limit the number of troops deployed within an operation or to **withdraw troops** entirely from a mission where significant civilian casualties are likely. Several senior US military personnel raised the fear that military commanders will be forced to consider constraining their operations in order **to protect** their troops **from possible ICC prosecution**,

#### Empirics prove non-intervention is most likely.

**Goldsmith 03**--- (Jack Goldsmith, [*Jack Landman Goldsmith III is an American legal scholar. He serves as the Learned Hand Professor of Law at Harvard Law School, where he has written extensively in the fields of international law, civil procedure, federal courts, conflict of laws, and national security law*], xx-xx-2003, "The Self-Defeating International Criminal Court on JSTOR", https://www.jstor.org/stable/1600547?read-now=1#page\_scan\_tab\_contents) //doa1-26-2025 + master chen :)

We can now finally begin to see the perverse effects of the ICC. The first component of the central ICC compromise leaves in place in- ternational human rights' dependence on United States political sup- port, funding, and military might. The second component of the fatal compromise exposes the United States, a non-signatory nation, to li- ability for crimes committed in signatory nations or in non-signatory nations that temporarily invoke Article 12(3). But this latter part of the compromise will lead the United States to limit its human rights enforcement activities. And the first enforcement activities to go will be ones involving human rights crises that lack a powerful U.S. wel- fare-enhancing justification. We have already seen these perverse effects in the **United States' threat to pull out of UN peacekeeping missions unless U.S. troops re- ceive immunity before the ICC**. However this is resolved, peacekeep- ing will suffer at least at the margin. To the extent that ad hoc interna- tional tribunals have been important in protecting human rights, they too have suffered, and will continue to suffer, from a general U.S. withdrawal for reasons already canvassed. But perhaps the greatest ef- fect will be on U.S. humanitarian and quasi-humanitarian interven- tions, such as in Haiti, Kosovo, Bosnia, and Somalia. Human rights ad- vocates increasingly view such interventions as legitimate and neces- sary to protect human rights.39 It is hard enough to generate domestic support in the United States for these interventions when there is no threat of liability. U.S. intervention will now be much harder. Such in- terventions invariably involve combat against irregular forces inter- spersed in civilian populations and thus invariably run the risk of war crime accusations

#### Trump supercharges—Trump's actions against the ICC prove he detests their mandate.

**Walker 25** --- (Amy Walker, [reporter @ BBC] 2-7-2025, "ICC: Dozens of member states back top criminal court after Trump sanctions", https://www.bbc.com/news/articles/cx2p19l24g2o) //doa2-7-2025 + master chen 💆

Earlier on Friday, the ICC had called on its member states and global civil society to "stand united for justice and fundamental human rights." It pledged to continue "providing justice and hope to millions of innocent victims of atrocities across the world". The ICC last year issued arrest warrants for US-allied Israeli leaders, and a Hamas commander, over the war in Gaza. ICC prosecutors have said there are "reasonable grounds" to suggest Netanyahu, his former defence minister Yoav Gallant, and Hamas's Mohammed Deif - who was killed last year - bear "criminal responsibility for alleged war crimes and crimes against humanity". But a White House memo circulated on Thursday accused the ICC of creating a "shameful moral equivalency" between Hamas and Israel by issuing the warrants at the same time. **Trump's** order **said** the **ICC's** recent actions "set a dangerous precedent" which threatened to "**infringe upon the sovereignty of the United States**". It argued the ICC **"undermines" the national security and foreign policy work of Washington and its allie**s. The order also said the US and Israel "are thriving democracies with militaries that strictly adhere to the laws of war". The sanctions were announced while Netanyahu was on a visit to Washington. The list of affected individuals has not yet been announced, but the sanctions could target people who work in ICC investigations. Sanctions could include financial and visa restrictions placed on individuals and their families. The court's technical and IT operations - including evidence gathering - could also be affected. Observers have voiced fears that victims of alleged atrocities may hesitate to testify. The court's inaugural chief prosecutor has told the BBC how the rest of the world responds will be most important. "It's a challenge for the all the state parties - for all Europe, UK, South Africa, Argentina, Brazil, Japan, New Zealand, Australia - are they going to let Mr **Trump** to become the global president?" Luis Moreno Ocampo told the BBC Newshour programme. The UN has called for the measure to be reversed, while European Commission President Ursula von der Leyen said the ICC "must be able to freely pursue the fight against global impunity". But Israeli Foreign Minister Gideon Saar said he "strongly" commended Trump's executive order. He **claimed the ICC's actions were "immoral and have no legal basis", accusing the court of not operating "in accordance with international law**". 3:10 Can Trump really take ownership of Gaza? The US has repeatedly rejected any ICC jurisdiction over American officials or citizens, and has accused the court of placing constraints on Israel's right to self-defence, while ignoring Iran and anti-Israel groups. During his first term in office, Trump imposed sanctions on ICC officials who were investigating whether US forces had committed war crimes in Afghanistan. This included a travel ban and asset freezes against former chief prosecutor Fatou Bensouda. Those sanctions were lifted by President Joe Biden's administration. But during his last weeks in office, Biden also criticised the ICC's warrant for Netanyahu, calling the move "outrageous" and saying there was no equivalence between Israel and Hamas. In response to efforts to what they described as attempts to challenge the ICC's authority, nine nations - including South Africa and Malaysia - launched the Hague Group last month in an effort to defend the court and its rulings. Trump's signing of his latest executive order follows his announcement of a plan for the US to "take over" Gaza, resettle its Palestinian population and turn the territory into the "Riviera of the Middle East". After Arab leaders and the UN condemned the idea, the US president restated it on his Truth Social social media platform on Thursday.

#### Absent action, the Middle East erupts into war.

**Aboudouh 2/7** — (Ahmed Aboudouh [Associate Fellow, Middle East and North Africa Programme], 2-7-2025, "Negotiating tactic or not, Trump’s Gaza plan has already done irreparable damage", Chatham House – International Affairs Think Tank, https://www.chathamhouse.org/2025/02/negotiating-tactic-or-not-trumps-gaza-plan-has-already-done-irreparable-damage, accessed 2-7-2025) //FK

But for neighbouring countries, this is a life-or-death matter. **Egypt and Jordan face existential threats from Trump’s proposal: displacing Palestinians into their countries would destabilize their regimes, fuel extremism** and turn their territories into launchpads for Palestinian attacks on Israel. Their **peace treaties with Israel would** effectively **be thrown into the abyss.**  This is a major flaw even on ‘America First’ terms: displacing Gazans twice (most Gazans were initially forced to leave their homes in Israel and the West Bank) is the recipe for Western-friendly Arab regimes to disintegrate. Egypt has already signalled that Israeli moves to push out Palestinians would amount to the end of their peace treaty. This should not be taken as a bluff this time. In a rare moment, Egyptian government-run media, activists, academics, social media and even staunch rivals the Muslim Brotherhood are closing ranks behind the government of President Fatah El-Sisi. In Jordan, the Muslim Brotherhood is a significant power in the parliament after the September elections, and the majority of the population is of Palestinian origin. Were Palestinians to be expelled from Gaza the government in Amman would be in danger of total collapse. Despite being cautious not to antagonize Trump early on in his presidency, the Gulf States also have no appetite for the president’s plan. Rather they are bewildered by his apparent seriousness and the severe threat to their security this proposal poses. The threat is both internal and external – **a US takeover** of Palestinian land **would renew the legitimacy of Iran’s proxies across the region, if not trigger a regional war.** It would also give China and Russia an opportunity to position themselves as champions of the region and the Global South, confronting American neocolonialism.

#### **Middle East war goes nuclear per Pleasance, miscalc per Ayed, and extinction per Sarg.**

#### **ALSO, per Abodouh,**

**Aboudouh 2/7** — (Ahmed Aboudouh [Associate Fellow, Middle East and North Africa Programme], 2-7-2025, "Negotiating tactic or not, Trump’s Gaza plan has already done irreparable damage", Chatham House – International Affairs Think Tank, https://www.chathamhouse.org/2025/02/negotiating-tactic-or-not-trumps-gaza-plan-has-already-done-irreparable-damage, accessed 2-7-2025) //FK

But for neighbouring countries, this is a life-or-death matter. **Egypt and Jordan face existential threats from Trump’s proposal: displacing Palestinians into their countries would destabilize their regimes, fuel extremism** and turn their territories into launchpads for Palestinian attacks on Israel. Their **peace treaties with Israel would** effectively **be thrown into the abyss.**  This is a major flaw even on ‘America First’ terms: displacing Gazans twice (most Gazans were initially forced to leave their homes in Israel and the West Bank) is the recipe for Western-friendly Arab regimes to disintegrate. Egypt has already signalled that Israeli moves to push out Palestinians would amount to the end of their peace treaty. This should not be taken as a bluff this time. In a rare moment, Egyptian government-run media, activists, academics, social media and even staunch rivals the Muslim Brotherhood are closing ranks behind the government of President Fatah El-Sisi. In Jordan, the Muslim Brotherhood is a significant power in the parliament after the September elections, and the majority of the population is of Palestinian origin. Were Palestinians to be expelled from Gaza the government in Amman would be in danger of total collapse. Despite being cautious not to antagonize Trump early on in his presidency, the Gulf States also have no appetite for the president’s plan. Rather they are bewildered by his apparent seriousness and the severe threat to their security this proposal poses. The threat is both internal and external – **a US takeover** of Palestinian land **would renew the legitimacy of Iran’s proxies across the region, if not trigger a regional war.** It would also give China and Russia an opportunity to position themselves as champions of the region and the Global South, confronting American neocolonialism.

#### **Terrorists use bioweapons—extinction.**

**Myhrvold 13 [**Nathan Myhrvold (formerly Chief Technology Officer at Microsoft, is co-founder of Intellectual Ventures and the principal author of Modernist Cuisine and its successor books). “Strategic Terrorism: A Call to Action.” The Lawfare Research Paper Series, no.2, July 2013.]

A virus genetically engineered to infect its host quickly, to generate symptoms slowly—say, only after weeks or months—and to spread easily through the air or by casual contact would be vastly more devastating than HIV. It could silently penetrate the population to unleash its deadly effects suddenly. This type of epidemic would be almost impossible to combat because most of the infections would occur before the epidemic became obvious. A technologically sophisticated terrorist group could develop such a virus and kill a large part of humanity with it. Indeed, terrorists may not have to develop it themselves: some scientist may do so first and publish the details. Given the rate at which biologists are making discoveries about viruses and the immune system, at some point in the near future, someone may create artificial pathogens that could drive the human race to extinction. Indeed, a detailed species-elimination plan of this nature was openly proposed in a scientific journal. The ostensible purpose of that particular research was to suggest a way to extirpate the malaria mosquito, but similar techniques could be directed toward humans.16 When I’ve talked to molecular biologists about this method, they are quick to point out that it is slow and easily detectable and could be fought with biotech remedies. If you challenge them to come up with improvements to the suggested attack plan, however, they have plenty of ideas. Modern biotechnology will soon be capable, if it is not already, of bringing about the demise of the human race— or at least of killing a sufficient number of people to end high-tech civilization and set humanity back 1,000 years or more. That terrorist groups could achieve this level of technological sophistication may seem far-fetched, but keep in mind that it takes only a handful of individuals to accomplish these tasks. Never has lethal power of this potency been accessible to so few, so easily. Even more dramatically than nuclear proliferation, modern biological science has frighteningly undermined the correlation between the lethality of a weapon and its cost, a fundamentally stabilizing mechanism throughout history. Access to extremely lethal agents—lethal enough to exterminate Homo sapiens—will be available to anybody with a solid background in biology, terrorists included. The 9/11 attacks involved at least four pilots, each of whom had sufficient education to enroll in flight schools and complete several years of training. Bin Laden had a degree in civil engineering. Mohammed Atta attended a German university, where he earned a master’s degree in urban planning—not a field he likely chose for its relevance to terrorism. A future set of terrorists could just as easily be students of molecular biology who enter their studies innocently enough but later put their skills to homicidal use. Hundreds of universities in Europe and Asia have curricula sufficient to train people in the skills necessary to make a sophisticated biological weapon, and hundreds more in the United States accept students from all over the world. Thus it seems likely that sometime in the near future a small band of terrorists, or even a single misanthropic individual, will overcome our best defenses and do something truly terrible, such as fashion a bioweapon that could kill millions or even billions of people. Indeed, the creation of such weapons within the next 20 years seems to be a virtual certainty. The repercussions of their use are hard to estimate. One approach is to look at how the scale of destruction they may cause compares with that of other calamities that the human race has faced.

# **2AC**

## A2 Russia

**[1] Trump wouldn't be able to follow through. - post dates their evid**

**Standish ’25** Reid Standish [China Global Affairs correspondent based in Prague; editor at Foreign Policy magazine and its Moscow correspondent. He has also written for The Atlantic and The Washington Post], 1-22-2025, "Could Trump Cut A Deal With Putin And Leave Ukraine In The Cold?," RadioFreeEurope/RadioLiberty, https://www.rferl.org/a/trump-putin-peace-deal-ukraine-war/33283777.html, accessed 1-22-2025 \\ recut aari U.S. President Donald Trump wields significant influence over the next phase of the war in Ukraine, but how he plans to use it remains an open question. **Trump vowed** during his inaugural address on January 20 to be a "peacemaker" and promised on the campaign trail **to quickly end the war in Ukraine**, the recipient of

billions in U.S. military aid. But his more transactional approach to diplomacy has also led to fears he could cut a deal with Russian President Vladimir Putin over Ukraine's head. "**There is still concern that Trump will reach a deal with Putin and then tell Ukraine they must take it or he will suspend U.S. assistance to Ukraine,"** said Marie Dumoulin, a former French diplomat at the European Council on Foreign Relations. The new **U.S.** president's strategy for ending the war is still taking shape, but analysts said he has two broad paths forward. The first is to push Ukraine -- already grappling with manpower shortages and donor fatigue -- to the negotiating table by withholding pivotal military support and forcing it into a peace deal on unfavorable terms, a possibility Kyiv and most Western capitals consider a **worst-case scenario**. The other is to **ramp up pressure on Russia with new sanctions and increased military assistance for Ukraine.** "At this point, every option is still a possibility," Dumoulin said. Will Trump Strike A Deal With Putin? Both **Putin** and Ukrainian President Volodymyr Zelenskiy have signaled they are **open to negotiations**, but **it's unclear if Kyiv and Moscow are willing to make compromises**. Putin initially wanted to capture Kyiv and install a government sympathetic to Moscow. The Kremlin also holds firm on its demands to keep swathes of occupied Ukrainian territory and limit the size of Ukraine's military. That's been a nonstarter for Kyiv, which calls for the restoration of its territory and the complete withdrawal of Russian forces. Zelenskiy, however, has said he could be open to freezing the war along the current front line in exchange for a pathway to NATO membership.

**2a] [T] - Ukraine is excluded from squo peace talks**

**Vakulina 2/5** [Sasha Vakulina, 2-5-2025, Kyiv and Moscow already tried negotiating, but that didn't go well, Euronews,

https://www.euronews.com/2025/02/05/peace-talks-ukraine-and-russia-already-tried-negotiating-but-that-didnt-g o-well, DOA 2-6-2025, Sasha Vakulina is the Business Editor of Euronews] \\SL

A few months later, **in** September **2022**, Putin announced the illegal seizure of four areas of Ukraine — the regions of Donetsk, Luhansk, Zaporizhzhia and Kherson — saying they were now Russian territory. In response, **Ukraine's National Security and Defence Council imposed a ban on direct negotiations with Putin, which is still in place.** This January, Zelenskyy explained that the ban was introduced to stop separatism as "the Russians were trying to put pressure on Ukraine through many different corridors that Ukraine could not control". "Regarding whether we can talk (with Putin) or not (and) the decision of the National Security and Defence Council, why did I sign this decree? Because Putin had begun very quickly to establish a large number of different channels, in collaboration with separatists and officials from other states, in order to influence Ukraine, our independence, and me directly," Zelenskyy explained. "There were a lot of conversations going on and a lot of shadowy political corridors." "I quickly put a stop to it. I simply stopped separatism in our country by forbidding anyone – any political figures in Ukraine – from holding any negotiations with the Russian side, with

Putin's supporters, during the war," he concluded. The decision stated that the NSDC had decided to "state the impossibility of holding talks with Russian leader Vladimir Putin."

**2b] Thus, current talks only embolden Putin more**

**Melkozerova 2/2** [Veronika Melkozerova, 2-2-2025, Ukraine peace talks without Kyiv would send ‘very dangerous’ signal: Zelenskyy, POLITICO,

https://www.politico.eu/article/negotiating-peace-ukraine-america-russia-signal-dictators-act-impunity-volodymyr zelenskyy/, DOA 2-6-2025, Veronika Melkozerova is a Ukraine reporter at Politico Europe] \\SL

KYIV — **Excluding Kyiv from negotiations** about ending Russian President Vladimir Putin’s invasion of Ukraine would **send a "very dangerous" signal to the world's dictators**, according to Ukrainian President Volodymyr Zelenskyy. “If there will be **direct talks between America and Russia without Ukraine**, it is very dangerous, I think,” Zelenskyy said in an interview with the Associated Press published on Saturday. “They may have their own relations, but talking about Ukraine without us — it is dangerous for everyone,” he said. Such U.S.-Russia negotiations would **allow Putin to "show that he was right. He got impunity, and compromise**," Zelenskyy said. "This will mean that anyone can act like this. And this will be a signal to other leaders of the big countries who think about doing the same,” the Ukrainian president said. Zelenskyy's remarks came after U.S. President Donald Trump said late Friday that American and Russian officials were “already talking” bilaterally about the war in Ukraine. Trump said his administration has had “very serious” discussions with Moscow, but he did not elaborate. Kyiv has already had contacts with Trump’s special envoy for Ukraine and Russia, Keith Kellogg, as well as with U.S. National Security Adviser Mike Waltz and Vice President JD Vance. Zelenskyy and Trump have briefly met twice, with one meeting pushed by French President Emmanuel Macron. The government in Kyiv is still waiting for Kellogg and U.S. Secretary of State Marco Rubio to meet with top Ukrainian diplomats, and wants another personal meeting between Trump and Zelenskyy to happen.

**[3] Peace talk won’t work - russia will never stop**

**Mackinnon 25**--- (Amy Mackinnon,[*a national security and intelligence reporter at Foreign Policy.*], 1-30-2025, "Putin Likely to Frustrate Trump's Efforts to Broker Peace in Ukraine", https://archive.is/XNHU3) //doa2-6-2025 + master chen 💆

U.S. President Donald Trump did not, as promised on the campaign trail, manage to broker an end to the war in Ukraine on day one of his return to the White House. But during his first week in office, Trump and the presidents of Russia and Ukraine continued to stake out their negotiating positions ahead of a widely anticipated U.S.-led push to end the conflict. At the World Economic Forum in Davos last week, Ukrainian President Volodymyr Zelensky appeared to channel Trump when Zelensky berated European leaders for not investing more in the continent’s defense, later saying that it would take a 200,000-strong European peacekeeping force to deter Russia from attacking again in the wake of a settlement—a contingent roughly the same size as the entire active-duty personnel in the French Armed Forces. For his part, Trump threatened to impose “high levels” of taxes, tariffs, and sanctions on Russian imports if a deal isn’t reached soon. The war’s instigator, Russian President Vladimir Putin, said on Friday that he was “ready for negotiations” and suggested meeting with Trump in person, describing his relationship with the U.S. leader as “businesslike, pragmatic, and trustworthy.” Despite the conciliatory tone, experts and former Russian and U.S. government officials say they see no sign that Putin is ready to climb down from his ultimate goal of permanently bending Ukraine to his will. For the U.S. president who pitches himself as the dealmaker-in-chief, brokering a sustainable end to the war could prove to be his most difficult deal yet. “I’ve seen no public evidence, or heard from anyone that I trust who knows Putin well, that indicates he is ready to negotiate,” said Michael McFaul, former U.S. ambassador to Russia. A rare point of consensus between Russian and Western officials is that Moscow’s war aims remain unchanged as the third anniversary of its full-scale invasion of Ukraine looms. **Putin still seeks to strip Ukraine of its sovereignty** and ability to pursue an independent foreign policy that could, as many Ukrainians now desire, see it pursue NATO membership. The war is also Putin’s effort to draw a line in the sand with the United States. “It’s about Ukraine not in NATO and NATO not in Ukraine,” said Peter Schroeder, who served on the National Intelligence Council as principal deputy national intelligence officer for Russia and Eurasia until 2022. “**There’s no magic sweet spot to which you can raise the costs for Putin that will persuade him to abandon those core goals,**” he said. Asked for comment about the potential negotiations to end the war, the Russian Embassy in Washington, D.C., directed Foreign Policy to an article originally published on the site Telegra.ph in December by the country’s former president, Dmitry Medvedev, in which he wrote that “Ukraine today stands at a crossroads: to align with Russia or to vanish from the world map altogether” and that the country should “resist opposing themselves to the pan-Russian project, and drive out the demons of political Ukrainianism.” Moreover, experts say that Putin appears to feel that the wind is at his back in achieving these aims. Russian forces are making gradual gains in eastern Ukraine as the Biden administration, which led the Western coalition in supporting Kyiv, has packed its bags. **The Russian leader believes that he is very close to achieving his objective** of forcing the capitulation of Kyiv, said Tatiana Stanovaya, founder of the Russian political analysis firm R.Politik. Putin is not opposed to talks with Trump, so long as they secure the same outcome. “**If the talks with Trump do not lead to this goal, he will drop it and he will achieve it by military means**,” she said. The war has come at a vertiginous cost for Russia. More than 600,000 of its troops are estimated to have been wounded or killed. Export controls imposed by a coalition of countries intended to starve the Russian defense industrial base were painted with such a broad brush that sunglasses, contact lenses, and false teeth were also swept up in the prohibitions. Inflation is at 9.5 percent while the country’s skilled central banker, Elvira Nabiullina, is running out of options to prop up the flailing ruble. The Russian economy may be the most sanctioned on Earth, but there is still more that could be done to push Putin to the negotiating table. “There is head room in increasing the leverage in both the financial and energy sectors,” said Michael Carpenter, who served as senior director for Europe at the National Security Council until earlier this month. Key to persuading Putin to consider a deal is convincing him that it would be futile to deploy more troops and resources to continue the war, Carpenter said. Trump’s threat of tariffs would have limited impact. Imports of Russian goods dropped sharply following the invasion of Ukraine in 2022, with Moscow exporting $2.8 billion worth of goods to the United States last year, down from almost $30 billion in 2021. But stronger U.S. actions, such as blocking sanctions on Russian oil majors, are “extremely low-hanging fruit” that could make it a lot more difficult for Russia to sell its oil and gas, said Edward Fishman, a senior research scholar at Columbia University’s Center on Global Energy Policy. But the Russian economy, while bruised, has proved surprisingly resilient. Moscow has continued to find workarounds, including by turning to Iran, China, and North Korea to sell its energy and procure weapons. A surge in defense spending, which will account for some 40 percent of the state budget this year, has fueled economic growth, driving up wages—particularly among the working class—which has helped pacify the population. While it’s unlikely to prove a sustainable economic strategy, it could see Putin frustrate Trump’s hopes of bringing the war to a quick resolution. “Western hopes rest on a false assumption,” Alexandra Prokopenko, who worked at the Russian Central Bank until early 2022, wrote in a recent essay in Foreign Affairs. “Russia’s economic challenges are not yet so acute that they will make a meaningful difference in the war in the near term.” **As for the lives of Putin’s troops, “Russian lives are no concern for him. It’s just cannon fodder,” s**aid Boris Bondarev, the only Russian diplomat to publicly resign in protest over the invasion of Ukraine. A person close to the Ukrainian government, who spoke on condition of anonymity to speak candidly, said that officials in Kyiv understand that the Trump administration has to make outreach to Moscow, but that Trump officials would likely discover Putin unwilling to compromise. “They have to go through the process. They have to reach these conclusions on their own,” the person said. With Putin unlikely to be bowed by economic pressure, at least in the short term, it leaves two options on the table, said Schroeder. “You either decide that you’re going to negotiate in a way that addresses those two core things that Putin wants,” or you try to hold the line in Ukraine until the Russian president leaves the scene, he said. Trump’s lieutenants have floated ideas for how to end the war. In an April 2024 paper co-authored with Fred Fleitz, retired Lt. Gen. Keith Kellogg, who has since been tasked by Trump to serve as special envoy for Russia and Ukraine, sketched out the broad contours of a deal that would see Ukraine temporarily lose control of Russian-occupied territories in exchange for unspecified security guarantees from the United States, while Ukraine’s NATO membership would be taken off the table for an extended period. Whether Putin would be willing to abandon his efforts to keep Ukraine out of NATO by force in exchange for a diplomatic agreement to put the question of the country’s membership in the alliance on ice will likely depend on the details of such an agreement. Zelensky, for his part, sees NATO membership as integral to his country’s survival. And then there’s the question of whether Putin would faithfully abide by a peace deal. **“I think one has to assume that Russia will use any temporary cease-fire or even a peace agreement to rearm and refit and eventually attack at a time of their choosing,”** Carpenter says.

**[4] T. Aff checks Putin with info sharing and isolation**

**Zvobgo ’23** [Kelebogile Zvobgo; Assistant Professor of Government at William & Mary and Founder and Director of the International Justice Lab; 10/19/23; “It’s Time for America to Join the International Criminal Court,” Foreign Affairs,

https://www.foreignaffairs.com/ukraine/time-america-join-international-criminal-court-vladimir-putin/] Michael recut cpsof

Going back decades,the official U.S. position has **been** that the ICC does **not** have jurisdiction overthe nationals of **nonmembers**such as Israel, Russia, and the United States itself. The ICC has tried to investigate U.S. actions in Afghanistan, an ICC member state, and the United States has always resisted such scrutiny on principle. But if Washington **helps** the ICC build evidence in cases against **Russians**for their actions in Ukraine—a country that has formally accepted the ICC’s jurisdiction—then it is **suggesting** this principle does **not** apply. Such open hypocrisy **undermines** the legitimacy and effectiveness of a court that **already** struggles to prove to the world that it can apply justice fairly and achieve **real** outcomes. The ICC **needs** help in compiling evidence about abuses in Ukraine. But the **sad** truth is that as long as the **U**nited **S**tates remains **outside** the ICC, the desperately needed **help** the country is providing with regard to Ukraine could also **damage** the court’s **reputation** and greater aims. Even if Biden and Congress have the best intentions, they also have dismantled the clearest arguments the United States ever had for not joining the court and for claiming that U.S. forces cannot be prosecuted in The Hague. Perhaps surprisingly, most Americans, in fact, support the United States joining the ICC. Russia’s war in Ukraine has only made **clearer**the contradictions in U.S. **policy**, and it is time for the United States to finally join the court. HAVING IT BOTH WAYS In 1998, 120 countries adopted the Rome Statute establishing the ICC, a multinational body tasked with investigating and prosecuting individuals accused of atrocities—notably war crimes, crimes against humanity, and genocide. The United States helped draft the treaty, and President Bill Clinton signed it in 2000. But the United States never became a full member. The U.S. Senate did not ratify the Rome Statute—nor did most people expect it to. By signing the Rome Statute without it being likely that Congress would ratify it, Clinton apparently wanted the United States to have its cake and eat it, too. As a signatory, Washington could, according to the ICC’s rules, continue to have a seat at the table in future negotiations about the court’s jurisdiction. Clinton’s successors, Presidents George W. Bush, Barack Obama, and Donald Trump, then took every opportunity to shield U.S. military and intelligence professionals from ICC scrutiny, particularly for crimes allegedly committed on territories over which the ICC has jurisdiction. In 2002, Bush “unsigned” the Rome Statute, telling the international community that the ICC did not have jurisdiction over the United States. After launching the “war on terror,” he also worried that allies could hand over U.S. personnel to the ICC, and he conditioned many offers of aid on “bilateral immunity agreements” that shielded U.S. military and intelligence personnel from potential arrest and transfer to the ICC. That did not stop the ICC from launching a preliminary examination in 2006 into suspected war crimes and crimes against humanity in Afghanistan, including possible torture committed by U.S. personnel. Afghanistan is an ICC member, and the court’s jurisdiction relies more on where alleged abuses occurred than on who committed them. A FEINT TOWARD JUSTICE Obama rewrote Bush’s playbook slightly, providing the ICC diplomatic and logistical support for select investigations. But he continued to reject the possibility of ICC investigations into U.S. service members. Because Clinton had signed the Rome Statute, the Obama administration participated in a 2010 review conference to consider amendments to the treaty. That conference added a fourth international crime to the list the ICC could prosecute: aggression, or “the use of armed force by a State against the sovereignty, integrity or independence of another State.” The principle of nonaggression is foundational to the rules-based international order. Yet it has been challenged again and again, including when powerful countries such as the United States, Russia, and China have threatened, and in some cases committed, aggression. At the 2010 conference, however, the U.S. delegation successfully lobbied for an important distinction: that, in prosecuting aggression, the ICC would not have jurisdiction over the nationals of nonmember states. This apparent win for the United States was a loss for the ICC. When Trump took office in 2017, he went to even more extreme lengths to shield U.S. nationals as well as those of Israel, a key U.S. ally. After the ICC expanded its preliminary examinations of suspected crimes in Afghanistan and in the Palestinian territories into full investigations, in 2020 Trump put economic sanctions on the ICC’s

chief prosecutor, Fatou Bensouda, and her deputy, Phakiso Mochochoko. Trump threatened to do the same to any individuals or organizations that helped the ICC in these investigations. DOUBLE JEOPARDY Facing international pressure, in April 2021, Biden reversed Trump’s sanctions. But U.S. Secretary of State Antony Blinken reiterated that the ICC does not have jurisdiction over U.S. or Israeli forces acting anywhere. Perhaps trying to gain the favor—and aid—of the United States for the ICC’s work, the court’s chief prosecutor, Karim Khan, announced in September 2021 that he would deprioritize the investigations into U.S. personnel in Afghanistan. Now, however, by supporting the ICC’s investigations against Russia for its acts in Ukraine, the White House and Congress have said quiet part out loud:the **U**nited **S**tates believes the ICC **does**, indeed, have **jurisdiction** over acts committed by the **nonmember**-state forces—just **not** over U.S. forces and the forces of its select allies such as Israel. If the United States held Russia to the standard to which it holds itself, it would have to reject the ICC’s claim of jurisdiction over Russians in Ukraine, and the Russian military would enjoy impunity for its serious crimes. But the United States has made an exception for its rival. Thisis a huge problem because it makes the United States’ double standard **explicit**. Such double standards **corrode** the very principle of an **i**nternational rule of **law**. And it **particularly** undermines the ICC, which has been **beleaguered** since its inception by accusations of **bias**. The ICC’s first set of charges—but likely not its last—against Putin concern the unlawful transfer of hundreds of Ukrainian children from Ukraine to Russia. Putin, who is accused alongside another Russian official involved in the transfer, Maria Lvova-Belova, is the fourth sitting head of state that the ICC has formally accused of serious crimes. **Russia**n propagandists are **degrading** the court’s efficacy by **weaponizing** the U.S. double standard. Putin is clearly worried: his government has put a number of ICC officials, including Chief Prosecutor Khan, on a wanted list. And this past August, he had to strike an agreement with South African President Cyril Ramaphosa not to attend a meeting of the BRICS states (Brazil, Russia, India, China, and South Africa) hosted in South Africa; South Africa is an ICC member, and if Putin traveled there, Ramaphosa would have been obligated to hand him over to the court. Russian propagandists, however, are already degrading the court’s efficacy by weaponizing the United States’ double standard. They **argue** that behind the West’s principled rhetoric lies a **purely** selfish wish to protect its **interests** and **hurt**the interests of its **adversaries**. The West, that argument goes, is **no better** than Russia and must be resisted at all costs. JOIN THE CLUB In the coming weeks and months,the ICC may pursue further charges against Putin, Russian soldiers, and Russian intelligence operatives. **Intelligence sharing** between Washington and The Hague will **improve the chances of successful trials**. U.S. intelligence agencies had already reportedly collected evidence of Russian plans to target civilian infrastructure, in addition to evidence concerning the deportation and transfer of children. None of this is to say that the United States cannot help the ICC without formally joining the court. It can. But the long-standing fear that joining the ICC would expose U.S. citizens to unfair prosecution is likely a boogeyman: according to the court’s “complementarity” rule, if a country undertakes genuine investigations into its own personnel and, where appropriate, prosecutes offenders, the ICC, which is a court of last resort, will not have jurisdiction over their citizens. The ICC has upheld its side of this principle in the past, withdrawing from Colombia in 2021 and proving its promise to defer to national governments that conduct their own proceedings. Well beyond Ukraine,**the U**nited **S**tates **can better promote democratic values such as** accountability and **human rights as an ICC member** than as a nonmember. The United States simply does not like to defer to supranational bodies unless it is in the driver’s seat. But in the case of the ICC, this notion has now come to its limit. The “law for thee but not for me” that the United States wishes to apply to Russia is simply not tenable—legally, politically, or morally. Putin may not have his day in court. For a trial to occur, Putin would need to be arrested and transferred to The Hague. Nonetheless, the charges against him hold important symbolic value. Even if Putin is **never** apprehended, he will live as a fugitive of the law and be a **pariah** on the **world stage**. By answering Putin’s **illegal** conduct with a **legal process**, the **international community** is attempting to **reaffirm** its commitment to the **rule of law** and to **distinguish itself** from **Putin**, who so clearly despises it. To do that **successfully**, however, the **U**nited **S**tates **must** first recognize that the rules it applies to the world apply to itself, too.

**[5] Putin already arrested no bright line**

**[6] he is sanctioned by some many countries → alr perceived weak**

**1NC -Skidelsky 24**,**is terrible never says that loss of peace talks leads to escalations.**

**Aboslutley no link in to nuclear war - best is skidelsky which doesn’t say anything abt nukes hold the line there**

## A2 Counter terrorism

**ICC good - emp prove**

**Kalu 24** Benjamin Okezie Kalu and Nabiebu Miebaka, [*Benjamin Okezie Kalu CON is a Nigerian politician who is currently serving as the deputy speaker of the House of Representatives of Nigeria since 2023. He represents the Bende federal constituenc*], “The International Criminal Court: Analyzing Its Efficacy in Combating International Crimes in the 21st Century,” [jurnal.fs.umi.ac.id](http://jurnal.fs.umi.ac.id/). 2024. Accessed 02/03/2025.

<https://jurnal.fs.umi.ac.id/index.php/alpamet/article/download/751/486/> //sarah + recutELI CHEN

The findings of these empirical papers have been compiled in a research-paper published as recently as 2020. You will be astonished to see the positive impact the ICC has had on international crime prevention. It has been determined that the ICC has been able to prevent violence, reduce civilian casualties and lead to fewer infractions of human rights. Some of the more prominent findings from these studies include:

1. **The more action that was taken by the ICC** in relation to Libya, **the lower the civilian fatalities dropped.**
2. While the ICC‟s involvement did not completely abate the violence, it did statistically speaking reduce it.
3. States acceding to the Rome Statute and enacting domestic legislations have an impact on the human rights”protection in the state as a lower level of human rights”infractions have been noticed in such states.
4. The ICC can have a deterrent effect.
5. **State-parties to the Rome Statute** with greater commitment to the ideals of the ICC **have lower incidences of “political violence”** domestically in comparison to stateparties having a lesser commitment to the ICC.
6. **States with ongoing civil wars is likely to see lesser number to civilian deaths where the state has ratified the Rome Statute** and enacted a domestic legislation in furtherance to its commitments under the Rome Statute in comparison to a nationstate which has not ratified the statute.
7. **Ratification of the Rome Statute nearly reduces the acts of state-sponsored killings by half.**
8. Ratification of the Rome Statute has no impact on the behavior of the rebel groups operating from the state.
9. **Opening an ICC investigation** in the concerned state **has a deterrent effect on rebel groups** as a reduction in “rebel-sponsored civilian killings” has been observed in situations where investigations have been initiated.
10. A state which ratifies the Rome Statute while a conflict is on-going is more likely to end the conflict by way of peaceful negotiations than other states.
11. Conflicts where the ICC intervenes are shorter than their counterparts where the ICC does not intervene. You will be astonished to know that **where the ICC intervenes, a conflict** generally **lasts for 2.05 years whereas**, on the other hand, **where the ICC does not intervene, the conflict lasts for 3.41 years.**
12. **State-parties to the Rome Statute were less likely to engage in new conflicts in comparison to their counterparts**, that is, non-state parties.
13. The ICC does not prolong conflicts. Rather, on the contrary, it helps in reducing violence and the timeframe for which conflicts continue.
14. **The states which ratify the Rome Statute have a significant impact on the reduction of human rights violations in comparison to their non-ratifying counterparts.** This naturally reduces violence.

If achieving the goal of “highest expected value” does not sound like success then what does?

**[2a] We give u the warrant**

Benjamin Appel, xx-xx-2018, "In the Shadow of the International Criminal Court: Does the ICC Deter Human Rights Violations?," Journal of Conflict Resolution, https://www-jstor-org.ezproxy.ivc.edu/stable/48597287?seq=1, accessed 1-30-2025 //savdharia

As one analyst claimed, ‘‘the sensitive nature of the investigation brings increased risk for those involved’’ (Human Rights Watch 2013). International Audience Costs Potential **perpetrators** can **suffer international costs across all stages of ICC’s involvement.** The logic here is similar to work that focuses on how international actors Appel 9 and organizations can engage in **naming/shaming** and other forms of international coercion. As Krain (2012, 576) argues, ‘‘naming and shaming human

rights abuses brings atrocities to light and creates common understandings of the actions of perpetrators across the international community.’’ This, in turn, can **cause third parties to implement economic and political sanctions** or otherwise reduce their cooperation with a targeted leader (e.g., Lebovic and Voeten 2009; Murdie and Davis 2012; Schneider 2000). The ICC acts as a similar international spotlight that informs the international community about a leader’s wrongdoing. ICC’s involvement sends a signal to third parties that those being investigated have potentially committed grave human rights abuses. In turn, third parties may sanction targeted leaders, or lessen their cooperation with them, which can **lead to a reduction in the benefits accrued from international cooperation (i.e., foreign direct investment, military assistance,** etc.). Lower levels of international support also mean that leaders have fewer resources to provide to their supporters, **eroding their base of support and potentially weakening their hold on power.** As Akhavan (2001, 12) argues, ‘‘The stigmatization associated with indictment . . . may significantly threaten the attainment of sustained political power.’’ Third parties have implemented sanctions against governments being investigated by the ICC. Shortly after the ICC started

**[2b] The ICC imposes prosecution costs on perpetrators Appel 18**

Benjamin Appel, xx-xx-2018, "In the Shadow of the International Criminal Court: Does the ICC Deter Human Rights Violations?," Journal of Conflict Resolution, https://www-jstor-org.ezproxy.ivc.edu/stable/48597287?seq=1, accessed 1-30-2025 //savdharia

Wanted war criminal Bosco Ntaganda turned himself in after evading arrest for several years in Rwanda. Some commentators

argue that he surrendered because Rwanda was pressured to transfer him to the Hague (Fisher 2013). Prosecution Costs Finally, there are the costs that are associated with ICC prosecution and incarceration. Evidence suggests that **the threat of prosecution has influenced the decision- making of individuals and governments under the Court’s jurisdiction**.14 According to the former chief prosecutor, Luis Moreno-Ocampo, militaries from around the world have altered their rules of engagement to be in accordance with the Rome Statute (Rosenberg 2012). Likewise, he also remarked that the ICC has influenced the behavior of individual soldiers. He claimed, for instance, that ‘‘In 2003 an Australian military pilot conducting operations in Iraq realized that if he executed the order received, he could be prosecuted in accordance with the Rome Statute. He returned to his base without dropping the bombs’’ (Prosecutor 2009). Beyond punishment, the **costs that individuals incur during trials can serve to deter them from violating international law.** There is obviously the lack of freedom that individuals incur during this time. Leaders may also suffer health and financial losses during trials that can further increase their costs from a guilty verdict and/or standing trial. As Kim and Sikkink (2010, 942) argue regarding the former Chiliean dictator Augusto Pinochet, ‘‘although Pinochet was never convicted of human rights crimes, most would agree that his detention was very costly to him.’’

**3] T. A lack of US accountability for war crimes emboldens terrorists and undermines counterterrorism efforts – aff solves their impacts o/w on probability**

**Johnson 16 –** (Douglas Johnson [Lecturer in Public Policy at the Harvard Kennedy School. Faculty Director of the Carr Center for Human Rights Policy. Executive Director for Center for the Victims of Torture. Under his leadership, they supported 33 rehab centers in the U.S. and 17 centers abroad with technical assistance and funding, provided services to more than 23,000 torture survivors, and mobilized U.S. public policy, including the Torture Victims Relief Act of 1998, which created an annual funding stream of $25 million to support the rehabilitation of torture survivors globally. ], 10-xx-2016, “The Strategic Costs of Torture,” Foreign Affairs, https://www.jstor.org/stable/43946963?read-now=1&seq=1#page\_scan\_tab\_contents, accessed 1-30-2025) // DP

"THE GREATEST RECRUITING TOOL" In 2004, reports surfaced that **U.S. soldiers** had tortured and humiliated prisoners at Abu Ghraib, a prison 20 miles west of Baghdad that held as many as 3,800 detainees. Our preliminary analysis has found that these revelations, alongside allegations of torture at the U.S. detention center in Guantánamo Bay, Cuba, spurred foreign extremists to join insurgents in Afghanistan and Iraq, contributing to the violence in both places. 122 FOREIGN AFFAIRS The Strategic Costs of Torture The human toll: at Guantánamo Bay, January 2002 in H 2 Z O W pe 73 m c H m Vi According to State Department cables made public by WikiLeaks, in the spring of 2006, a group of senior U.S. officials gathered in Kuwait to discuss how to stem the flow of foreign fighters into Iraq. Their conclusion was startling: that the **mistreatment of detainees at Abu Ghraib** and Guantánamo Bay **was "the single most important motivating factor" in persuading** foreign **jihadists to join the war**. U.S. Senator John McCain reached a similar conclusion in 2008, when he asked a captured senior al Qaeda leader what had allowed the group to establish a foothold in Iraq. "Two things," the prisoner replied, according to a State Department cable. "The chaos after the success of the initial invasion, **and the greatest recruiting tool**: Abu Ghraib." Of course, the claims of a captured terrorist are easy to discount. But in 2009, a Saudi official echoed this sentiment, when, according to another cable, he concurred with the Obama administration's decision not to release any more photos of Abu Ghraib, alleging that when the scandal first broke, Saudi authorities arrested 250 people attempting to leave the country to join extremist groups. And Robert Pape, a political scientist at the University of Chicago, has lent further credence to this assertion by identifying 26 martyrdom videos in which the suicide bombers cite torture at Abu Ghraib as the motivation for their attacks. Even though the total number of foreign fighters in Iraq remained relatively low throughout the war - less than ten percent of all insurgents were foreigners, based on a 2007 estimate by the director of the U.S. Defense Intelligence Agency - their brutality gave them disproportionate influence on the character of the conflict. According to U.S. and Iraqi officials, foreign fighters conducted more than 90 percent of the suicide bombings in Iraq between 2003 and 2005, killing thousands. The revelations about mistreatment at Abu Ghraib and Guantánamo Bay made it easier for Sunni jihadists in Iraq to paint the United States as a villain. Images of Americans torturing prisoners became a motif in their propaganda, used to justify the targeting, kidnapping, and beheading of Shiites, Kurds, and anyone else suspected of cooperating with the United States and its allies. When, in 2004, Abu Musab al-Zarqawi, then the leader of al Qaeda in Iraq, beheaded an American contractor named Nicholas Berg - the first beheading of the conflict - his group claimed that it had acted in retaliation for the abuses at Abu Ghraib. Even **today, U.S. torture plays an important role in** the **propaganda of** the descendant of al Qaeda in Iraq, the self-proclaimed Islamic State (also known as **ISIS**). Isis fighters regularly force prisoners to wear orange jumpsuits similar to the ones the detainees wear at Guantánamo Bay, and they have reportedly waterboarded captives. Of course, jihadists in Iraq likely would have adopted cruel tactics even if the United States had not tortured prisoners. Yet **the United States** nevertheless helped **legitimize** such tactics by allowing **terrorists** to cast them as justified forms of vengeance. In lowering the bar for acceptable behavior, the United States signaled that in the war on terrorism, standards of humane treatment did not bind either side. The **torture revelations** also **made it harder for the United States' to recruit** potential Iraqi **allies**. Part of the U.S. Army's strategy in Iraq included persuading locals that they would be better off siding with U.S. soldiers than with insurgents. **After** the photographs of detainee abuse at **Abu Ghraib** emerged, however, many **Iraqis no longer saw the United States as trustworthy**, and they rejected requests for help. As General Stanley McChrystal, the former head of the U.S. Joint Special Operations Command, acknowledged in a 2013 interview with this magazine, "The thing that hurt us more than anything else in the war in Iraq was Abu Ghraib." He continued: "The Iraqi people . . . felt it was proof positive that the Americans were doing exactly what Saddam Hussein had 124 FOREIGN AFFAIRS Images of Americans torturing prisoners became a motif in jihadist propaganda. The Strategic Costs of Torture done - that it was proof [that] everything they thought bad about the Americans was true." **Without** much **cooperation from local** population**s, coalition forces found it difficult to develop** the kind of **intelligence sources** necessary **to** identify and **target insurgents.**