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### T---Security Cooperation---1NC

#### T SECURITY COOPERATION:

#### “Security cooperation” requires DOD action---the plan is not the DOD.

Alexandra **Kerr 18**, Visiting Research Fellow at the National Defense University in the Center for Complex Operations, “Defense Institution Building in the U.S. Context,” Connections, Vol. 17, No. 3, [Italics in original]

Finally, in the U.S. government, “security cooperation” and “security assistance”—which are the chief lines of effort in the U.S. toolkit to help partners bolster their security and work with the United States to support common security objectives—are overlapping but not necessarily interchangeable. The distinction between “security cooperation” and “security assistance” activities has to do with the agency administering the program: in simplest terms, it is either an activity of the Department of Defense (security cooperation) or the Department of State (security assistance).

DOD and the Department of State (DOS) have shared responsibility for engaging with foreign partner militaries since the mid-twentieth century, with the bulk of congressional security assistance funding allocated to DOS. Any security assistance *administered* by DOD—whether funded under Title 10 (Armed Services) or Title 22 (Foreign Affairs) of the U.S. Code—is a “security cooperation” activity.21 After the terrorist attacks on September 11, 2001, the legal framework for the funding and administration of such activities evolved in response to emerging threats. Congress increasingly granted funding and authorities directly to DOD under Title 10 for security cooperation.22 Therefore, while DOS security assistance programs can include DIB components, the majority of DIB-specific programming is currently funded under and implemented by the Department of Defense and is thus considered security cooperation.

#### Voter for limits and ground---actor proliferation opens the floodgates on a bidirectional topic with three large areas and zero link uniqueness, but DOD action guarantees core agent counterplans and disads.

## 2NC

**SC---Requires DoD---2NC**

**Security Cooperation requires the DoD to be the source of funding**

**Fenell 11**, Captain, US Marine Corps, In Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for the Degree MASTER OF ARTS in INTERNATIONAL STUDIES, at the UNIVERSITY OF SAN FRANCISCO (Nathan, “Security Cooperation Poorly Defined” December, <https://repository.usfca.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?referer=&httpsredir=1&article=1020&context=thes>)//BB

Security cooperation is a compilation of financial, educational, and material resources, that at their foundation are supported by the United States, in particular the Department of Defense, and are used to support the peaceful development of democracies in foreign countries. The resources provided by the Department of Defense are available to foreign countries after the host nation requests the peaceful assistance of the U.S. military in response to systemic deficiencies in the bureaucratic management of a nation state or when a nation state recognizes that its military limitations prevent it from properly defending its geographic borders. The host nation’s request for support from the U.S. is typically an effort by the foreign country to develop its internal capacity to protect its people and limit internal or external threats. The security cooperation exercise Baltic Operation, held in Estonia, is an example of a foreign country using the resources 9 provided by the United States to improve its national defense capabilities in direct response to a perceived threat to its sovereign borders. In this scenario Estonia is attempting to develop its military capabilities and project an image of strength in an effort to maintain the freedom it earned, from Russia, at the conclusion of the Singing Revolution in 1992 and prevent a future Russian incursion across its borders. In contrast to this appropriate use and definition of security cooperation as a strategy to prevent conflict, the Obama Administration is using the term security cooperation as a way to define a national exit strategy from a two front war, a strategy that at its heart is based on the reconstruction of a damaged infrastructure. The false labeling of reconstruction operations as security cooperation is the foci of this thesis project.

**It's strictly limited to DoD actions**

**Reynolds 19**, et al, Commandant, Defense Institute of Security Cooperation Studies (Ronald, “The Management of Security Cooperation,” <http://cebw.org/images/docs/Legislacao_Webinar/Greenbook_39_0.pdf)//BB>

Introduction to Security Cooperation

Introduction

The term security cooperation was first introduced in 1997 by the Defense Reform Initiative (DRI). At that time, the then named Defense Security Assistance Agency (DSAA) already had day to day management responsibilities of many security assistance programs authorized by the Foreign Assistance Act (FAA) and the Armed Export Control Act (AECA). The DRI proposed that DSAA also manage certain Department of Defense (DoD) funded international programs along with their personnel and associated resources. So that other U.S. government (USG) agencies, the private sector and foreign governments could better understand DSAA’s enlarged mission and diverse functions beyond security assistance (SA), DoD re-designated DSAA as the Defense Security Cooperation Agency (DSCA) effective 1 October 1998.

In recent years, DSCA has absorbed management responsibilities for many DoD international programs. In addition, DSCA leads the broader USG security cooperation enterprise. However, many security cooperation programs continue to be managed by other elements of the Office of the Secretary of Defense (OSD), the combatant commands (CCMDs) or the military departments (MILDEPs). What further complicated the management of security cooperation was that the in-country point of contact between the USG and the host nation generally is either the Defense Intelligence Agency (DIA) sponsored defense attaché office (DAO) or the DSCA sponsored security cooperation office (SCO). These two spigots for security cooperation with a country required a broad knowledge and skill baseline of the very different international programs that are initiated, funded, and managed throughout the DoD and its agencies and the MILDEPs. Most disconnects regarding SCO-DAO coordination of in-country security cooperation were generally resolved with the establishment of the Senior Defense Official-Defense Attaché (SDO/DATT) having oversight over both the SCO and DAO organizations. It was not until 9 June 2004 that DoD published a formal, yet still very broad, definition of security cooperation in Joint Pub 1-02:

All DoD interactions with foreign defense establishments to build defense relationships that promote specific U.S. security interests, develop allied and friendly military capabilities for self-defense and multinational operations, and provide U.S. forces with peacetime and contingency access to a host nation.

DODD 5132.03, DoD Policy and Responsibilities Relating to Security Cooperation, 29 December 2016, further defines security cooperation with assigned responsibilities:

All DoD interactions with foreign defense establishments to build defense relationships that promote specific U.S. security interests, develop allied and partner nation military and security capabilities for self-defense and multinational operations, and provide U.S. forces with peacetime and contingency access to allied and partner nations. This includes DoD administered security assistance programs.

**The most clear and specific definition conclusively requires the DoD**

**Reighard 6**, Lt Col in USAF (Robert, “SECURITY COOPERATION: INTEGRATING STRATEGIES TO SECURE NATIONAL GOALS,” USAWC STRATEGY RESEARCH PROJECT, https://apps.dtic.mil/sti/pdfs/ADA449543.pdf)//BB

Security cooperation has been a part of the U.S. Armed Forces for many years. In fact, historians reveal that the U.S. military has always engaged in security cooperation with other countries and their military forces. However, the term used to designate such activities is now “Security Cooperation,” a term that has evolved conceptually through various programs over the years. During the 1990s, the terms “engagement” and “shaping” were used without sufficient specificity; they were often used interchangeably, resulting in confusion that led to problems in both planning and execution. DOD thus adopted “Security Cooperation” in 2001. It included a broad range of military-to-military activities, but it also clarified roles and responsibilities. The term Security Cooperation thus describes a broad range of activities used by the Department of Defense in peacetime operations. These activities refer to all DOD interactions that are carried out with foreign defense establishments, such as combined exercises, combined training, combined education, military-to-military contacts, humanitarian assistance, and information operations.

**Budget classification proves it’s military-to-military**

**Van Eerden 20**, Captain (James, “Seeking Alpha in the Security Cooperation Enterprise A New Approach to Assessments and Evaluations,” Journal of Advanced Military Studies, 11.1)//BB

The Fiscal Year (FY) 2019 President’s Budget: Security Cooperation Consolidated Budget Display outlines seven categories of security cooperation activity, including military-to-military engagements, support to operations, and humanitarian and assistance activities, among others.6 The security cooperation framework traditionally includes security assistance (SA), security force assistance (SFA), and some aspects of foreign internal defense (FID).7 In the context of this article, the term security cooperation refers primarily to military-to-military engagements, where the U.S. military engages in training partner forces under the auspices of Title 10 and Title 22 authorities.

**Security Cooperation is military-to-military activity**

**Finkelstein 10**, PhD, Vice President of the CNA Corporation, an independent, non-profit research institution in Arlington, Virginia (David, “The Military Dimensions of U.S.-China Security Cooperation: Retrospective and Future Prospects,” *Center for Naval Analyses*, <https://apps.dtic.mil/sti/citations/ADA530755>)//BB

The United States and China have engaged in security cooperation on a variety of international issues since the normalization of relations in 1979. In fact, security cooperation began even before the formal establishment of state-to-state relations. We recall that during the height of the Cold War the two nations demonstrated that when a pressing and shared security concern in that case, the former Soviet Union presented itself, Washington and Beijing were capable of working together, extant differences notwithstanding. Security consultations and sometime security cooperation between the two countries continue today. But as the record of security cooperation is reviewed, one comes to the conclusion that, for the most part, U.S.-China security cooperation has been mainly of a political nature and operationalized at a high level of strategic policy coordination. Security cooperation between the two nations has been largely the purview of U.S. and Chinese civilian officials and diplomats, not generals and admirals. In other words, over the course of 30 years of relations, security cooperation between the defense-military establishments of the United States and China -- the uniformed services -- has been the exception rather than the rule. If a serious discussion about future security cooperation between the U.S. Navy and the PLA Navy is to take place -- a leitmotif of this series of conferences as described by the sponsors -- then some of the issues, challenges, and problems from the past need to be confronted even as we look over the horizon. For the purposes of this paper, security cooperation is defined as the two militaries working together to achieve a common objective -- not high-level visits, exchanges, port calls, or other activities that are mainly symbolic or representational in nature.

**It’s the DoD**

**Watts** and Biegon **17**, \*PhD candidate in the School of Politics and International Relations at the University of Kent, \*\*associate lecturer and research administrator in the School of Politics and International Relations at the University of Kent(Tom and Rubrick, “Defining Remote Warfare: Security Cooperation,” <https://css.ethz.ch/content/dam/ethz/special-interest/gess/cis/center-for-securities-studies/resources/docs/ORG_RemoteControl_SecCoop.pdf>)//BB

This briefing paper provides an overview of a central, but often overlooked, instrument of US remote warfare: security cooperation. In the briefing, security cooperation is defined as Department of Defense-managed programmes to train, equip and advise foreign security forces to fight alongside, or as surrogates for, American ‘boots on the ground’. Since the final years of the Bush administration, this feature of remote warfare has emerged as a central instrument in the US counterterrorism toolbox. In comparison to the kinetic face of remote warfare, however, it remains poorly understood. This briefing paper demonstrates the significance of security cooperation to remote warfare. It focuses on the use of security cooperation in US counterterrorism operations during the Obama presidency, with examples drawn from efforts to combat Al-Qaeda in the Arabian Peninsula and Al-Shabaab. It concludes by briefly considering the future of security cooperation under the Trump administration.

**SC is done by the military encouraging and enabling other countries to work with the US**

**Mariano** and O’Brien **9**, \*recently served as the Dean of the NATO Defense College in Rome, Italy, \*\*received his M.A. in Security Policy Studies from the George Washington University's Elliott School (Stephen and Charles, “US Army Africa: Smart Power in Action,” Small Wars Journal, https://smallwarsjournal.com/blog/journal/docs-temp/193-mariano.pdf)//BB

Security cooperation is defined as the means by which the Department of Defense encourages and enables countries to work with the United States. It includes official, cooperative and general non-combat interactions.4 Military organizations conduct security cooperation activities, as part of the range of military operations. These activities are intended to build institutional capacity within partner nation security structures so those nations can become self-sufficient, secure their populations, control their borders and contribute to regional peace. Security cooperation activities are also aimed at developing peacetime interoperability between US and partner forces so that in times of crisis, activities are executed effectively and efficiently. The US also conducts security cooperation to enhance relationships with partner nations and to gain dependable host nation support. Though sometimes misconstrued, routine military cooperation activities can evolve into relationships that help ensure the US can successfully assist regional partners in times of crisis. For example, US ability to position forces, equipment and supplies, or use ports, warehouses and airfields when planning and conducting crisis response operations could save time… and ultimately, lives.

**Even the broadest definitions requires the DoD**

**Williams 12**, Lt Col in Army National Guard (James, “The National Guard State Partnership Program: Element of Smart Power,” <https://apps.dtic.mil/sti/pdfs/ADA562110.pdf>)//BB

Similarly, the six Geographic Combatant Commanders (COCOMs) have underscored security cooperation and building partner capacity as essential to their respective Theater Strategy Plans and Country Campaign Plans in support of National Security objectives. In every COCOM posture statement the reader will find references 7 to the importance of the concepts of cooperation, engagement, and building partner capacity. “Security Cooperation” is defined broadly as interactions between the Department of Defense and foreign militaries that promote specific United States security interests; develop allied and friendly military capabilities; and provide the United States with both peacetime and contingency access to host nations.12 Typical security cooperation and engagement activities include military-to-military contact, coalition training, nation assistance and long term operations. These types of activities range from Navy ship port visits to combined training exercises, foreign military education, leader conferences, foreign military sales and counter-drug operations.

**Security Cooperation requires a military branch to be the implementing agency**

**Arnold 20**, colonel in USAF (Jason, “Add Value to Security Cooperation through Joint Unification,” FAO Journal of International Affairs, <https://faoajournal.substack.com/p/add-value-to-security-cooperation?s=r)//BB>

In the Security Cooperation Enterprise, the military departments loom large as the primary implementing agencies of Foreign Military Sales (FMS) cases, Building Partner Capacity (BPC) cases, and in training activities.[6] These SC programs provide our international partners with the capabilities they require both for their own security and to assist in regional security objectives that improve the overall global security situation. Most open SC cases have one of the military departments as an Implementing Agency (IA) and each service has built its own organizational structure, bureaucracy, and automated systems to support the effort.[7]

**SC---Prefer Our Interp---2NC**

**Given that basically any activity is included, the only functional limit on the topic has to come at the agent-level**

**Mazarr 22**, senior political scientist at the RAND Corporation. Previously he worked at the U.S. National War College, where he was professor and associate dean of academics; as president of the Henry L. Stimson Center; senior fellow at the Center for Strategic and International Studies; senior defense aide on Capitol Hill; and as a special assistant to the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff (Michael, “Security Cooperation in a Strategic Competition,” RAND, <https://www.rand.org/pubs/research_reports/RRA650-1.html>)

To pursue this analysis, we first had to define the bounds of what we would assess. Official U.S. government definitions of security cooperation are very broad. One definition from the Defense Security Cooperation Agency states that security cooperation

comprises all activities undertaken by the Department of Defense (DoD) to encourage and enable international partners to work with the United States to achieve strategic objectives. It includes all DoD interactions with foreign defense and security establishments, including all DoD-administered Security Assistance (SA) programs, that build defense and security relationships; promote specific U.S. security interests, including all international armaments cooperation activities and SA activities; develop allied and friendly military capabilities for self-defense and multinational operations; and provide U.S. forces with peacetime and contingency access to host nations.3

Such definitions clearly include almost any security-related activity for any purpose. To scope the focus of the study, we reviewed official state documents and strategies and the literature on security cooperation to identify 11 types of activities:

1. military aid, which includes funding through the Foreign Military Financing (FMF) program, the Excess Defense Articles program, and other grants and loans

2. arms sales and transfers,4 such as U.S. arms sales through the Foreign Military Sales (FMS) and Direct Commercial Sales (DCS) programs

3. military capacity-building, such as U.S. activities under Section 1206 of the annual National Defense Authorization Act and Sections and 2282 and 333 of U.S. Code, Title 10 (the train and equip authority)

4. education and training, including international military education and training (IMET), professional military education (PME), and regional centers

5. personnel exchanges, such as U.S. activities under the Military Personnel Exchange Program and the State Partnership Program

6. military exercises, both bilateral and multilateral and those that involve foreign partners

7. access-related agreements, such as status of forces agreements (SOFAs) and agreements related to base access and information-sharing

8. armament-related agreements, such as those for co-development of systems and for research, development, test, and evaluation activities

9. sustainment of donor-nation equipment by the donor, the partner, or third parties

10. institutional capacity–building to strengthen the partner institutions that support security services

11. humanitarian assistance and disaster relief (HA/DR), which offers support for efforts to relieve suffering.

These categories offered a consistent template for gathering data across our various study components. A major challenge was that reliable and consistent data on each of the 11 categories were not available for all the competitors—not even for the United States. Especially at the unclassified level, there is simply no comprehensive roster of security cooperation activities by the United States, and neither China nor Russia publishes inclusive data sets of its programs. An additional challenge was that, in some cases, the different countries define the categories somewhat differently, so we could not develop data on entirely comparable sets of security cooperation activities.

## Aff

### T---Security Cooperation---2AC

#### We meet:

#### 1. FUNCTION---the DOD does the plan even if other actors are involved.

#### 2. TEXT---plan text in a vacuum is most objective, alternatives incentivize vagueness.

#### COUNTER-INTERPRETATION: “Security cooperation” is not only DOD action and includes Security Assistance. Their interpretation is in the context of the DOD and doesn’t assume how other agencies function.

Albert Zaccor 5, Colonel in the US Army and Atlantic Council Senior Fellow, August 2005, “Security Cooperation and Non-State Threats: A Call for an Integrated Strategy,” https://www.files.ethz.ch/isn/46290/2005\_08\_Security\_Cooperation\_and\_Non-State\_Threats.pdf

Defining Security Cooperation28

Security Cooperation is a Department of Defense (DOD) term that refers to "...all DOD interactions with foreign defense establishments to:

• Build defense relationships that promote specific U.S. security interests;

• Develop allied and friendly military capabilities for self-defense and coalition operations, including allied transformation;

• Improve information exchange and intelligence sharing to harmonize views on security challenges; and

• Provide U.S. forces with peacetime and contingency access and en route infrastructure."29

Security Cooperation is not the same as Security Assistance. The latter term refers only to programs such as Foreign Military Financing (FMF), Foreign Military Sales (FMS), the International Military Education and Training Program (IMET), and other programs governed by the Foreign Assistance Act and managed by the Defense Security Cooperation Agency. The Department of State plays a key role in providing policy direction for Security Assistance programs. Security Cooperation is a much broader term that, in addition to Security Assistance, includes such categories of activities as combined exercises, combined training, combined education, military-to-military contacts, humanitarian assistance, and information operations.30 It also refers to the planning process DOD organizations use to implement these activities.

In essence, the Security Cooperation planning process is a systematic method for translating strategic guidance into programmatic objectives. The Office of the Secretary of Defense issues annual Security Cooperation Guidance (OSD SCG) to guide the planning and activities of Unified and Specified Commands, the military services, and other DOD agencies and actors.31 The SCG promulgates strategic objectives based on security themes derived from the National Security and Defense strategies. It also provides regional and country priorities, objectives, and measures of effectiveness for assessment.32 The Unified and Specified Commands, the services, and other DOD players develop subordinate plans to execute Security Cooperation activities in support of OSD's objectives. The Unified Commands, for example, develop regional strategies and country plans to guide the implementation of security cooperation activities in their Areas of Operation.33

It is an oft-repeated mantra that in order to defeat transnational terrorism, and by extension other related non-state threats, the United States must apply all the elements of national power, including diplomatic, informational, military, and economic.34 The OSD SCG directs that DOD Security Cooperation "will be integrated with other elements of national power.. .in order to achieve national security, defense, and foreign policy objectives."35 This formulation, while helpful, obscures two key facts. First, Security Cooperation includes activities that by their very nature involve the simultaneous application of more than one element of national power. Security Cooperation at a minimum requires the combination of diplomatic relations, military assistance, military-to-military contacts, and public diplomacy. In other words, Security Cooperation is itself an application of at least three of the classic elements of national power.36 Second, DOD is not the only entity in the USG that interacts with foreign governments to achieve the stated objectives: relationships, capabilities, information and intelligence, and access. The Department of State, the Intelligence Community, and to a lesser extent, other departments and agencies, conduct activities aimed at the accomplishment of these objectives, broadly understood. There is, however, no common USG, or interagency, definition or concept of Security Cooperation.37 We will return to this issue in the final section of this paper. For the purposes of the present discussion, this paper offers the following working definition of Security Cooperation:

Security Cooperation refers to all USG assistance provided to foreign law enforcement, security, and defense establishments in support of national defense, security, and foreign policy objectives.38

#### PREDICTABILITY---DOD definition is arbitrary.

Albert Zaccor 5, Colonel in the US Army and Atlantic Council Senior Fellow, August 2005, “Security Cooperation and Non-State Threats: A Call for an Integrated Strategy,” https://www.files.ethz.ch/isn/46290/2005\_08\_Security\_Cooperation\_and\_Non-State\_Threats.pdf

Part III of this paper offered a definition of Security Cooperation that could be common to the entire USG, not just the Department of Defense. The USG interagency has no such common definition because it lacks a common conceptual understanding of how to translate higher level strategic guidance into specific programs designed to accomplish strategic objectives.

The Department of Defense, despite its size, its diversity, and the scope of its Security Cooperation activities, has such a common understanding. DOD's process is not without its flaws.113 During the late 1990s and the early 21st century, however, the department has successfully established a rational set of procedures for translating the strategic guidance in the National Security, Military, and, now, Defense Strategies, into specific programs executed by the military commands, services, and defense agencies.114 This process promotes discipline by forcing subordinate organizations to demonstrate that their Security Cooperation activities directly support specific objectives in the higher-level strategies. Efforts are under way to discipline the process further by establishing an assessment mechanism to provide feedback on the effectiveness of programs and activities.115 One reason for the success of the DoD program is oSD's publication of periodic Security Cooperation Guidance. This document, in addition to providing authority for subordinate organizations' Security Cooperation activities (see more below), serves the purpose of an informal doctrine, stipulating not only the "what," but the "how" and the "why" of Security Cooperation.116

In order for the USG interagency to plan and execute Security Cooperation programs and activities in an integrated and synergistic manner, a doctrine, or common conceptual framework, for Security Cooperation is necessary. Such a doctrine would have to define what Security Cooperation is, and, what it is not.117 It would have to define precisely which departmental and agency programs qualify as Security Cooperation and outline a procedure for combined interagency planning, programming, and execution. Armed with such a common conceptual framework, executive branch officials and program managers will be better equipped to engage in integrated planning and program execution. True success in this effort, however, will depend on the resolution of the other problems of authority, funding, and process and organization.

[Footnote 117]

As has been suggested here, activities to improve foreign partners' security capabilities conducted by any department or agency would qualify as Security Cooperation. In contrast, general foreign development assistance, although related to security and part of broader U.S. foreign policy, would probably not. Even within DOD, this is not totally clear. Officials in OSD's Counter-proliferation Policy office refused to admit that activities intended to improve the maritime security capabilities of Azerbaijan and Kazakhstan in support of counter-proliferation would be included under the definition of Security Cooperation and declined to integrate their program formally with other DOD Security Cooperation efforts.

#### AFF GROUND---limiting the AFF to the DOD eliminates core affs like arms sales, training, and information sharing which require the guidance and resources of other agencies.

#### NEG GROUND---affs still include the DOD, granting the neg the DOD PIC and trade-off DA, and including other actors gives the neg more PIC and DA ground.

#### GRAMMAR---the resolution says, “The USFG should…” the USFG isn’t only the DOD.

#### REASONABILITY---good is good enough.