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### CIR

#### Immigration reform has been delayed but will pass later this year – the aff pushes it off the agenda and into 2014 which derails the deal

Shear and Preston 9-8

(\*MICHAEL D. SHEAR, a White House correspondent for The New York Times, \*\*JULIA PRESTON, member of The New York Times team that won the 1998 Pulitzer Prize for reporting on international affairs, became a national correspondent covering immigration for The Times in April 2006.“Immigration Reform Falls to the Back of the Line” September 8, 2013, <http://www.nytimes.com/2013/09/09/us/politics/immigration-reform-falls-to-the-back-of-the-line.html?pagewanted=all&_r=0>, KB)

Congress is likely to postpone consideration of an immigration overhaul until the end of the year, if not longer, even as advocates are preparing for an all-out, urgent push this fall to win their longstanding goal of a path to citizenship for millions of immigrants here illegally.¶ In Washington, the sudden debate over military action in Syria and a looming face-off with President Obama over the budget and the nation’s borrowing limit have shot to the top of the legislative agenda, while Republican angst about losing Hispanic voters in the 2012 presidential campaign has faded.¶ In the House, where many Republicans view an overhaul bill passed by the Senate as a federal juggernaut that is too kind to immigrant lawbreakers, the legislative summer recess has done little to stoke enthusiasm for immediate action. Senior Republican aides in the House say immigration is at the back of the line, and unlikely to come up for months.¶ The prospect of a delay is generating frustration among supporters of the legislation, who felt emboldened by a summer in which conservative opposition in House districts largely fizzled and immigrant groups seized the chance to lobby lawmakers on their home turf.¶ “We believe they can walk and chew gum at the same time,” said Eliseo Medina, who leads the immigration campaign for the Service Employees International Union, referring to members of Congress. “The more they delay, the worse it will be for them.”¶ Throughout August, immigration groups organized hundreds of visits to Congressional offices, town hall-style meetings, vigils, marches and rallies, creating a constant buzz in the districts of many House lawmakers, particularly Republicans. On Wednesday, advocates delivered 600,000 petitions to the West Chester, Ohio, offices of Speaker John A. Boehner the old-fashioned way, in dozens of stacks of signed papers. On Sunday, Catholic priests around the country preached for a comprehensive immigration overhaul.¶ At a Mass devoted to immigration in Cincinnati, a mix of Catholics, including immigrants from Mexico and Central America and African-Americans, prayed for Congress to act.¶ “Families in our communities are being ripped apart by deportations, and the system is in chaos,” said Tony Stieritz, director of Catholic Social Action for the Cincinnati Archdiocese, who helped organize the Mass. “A vote for delay is a vote for crisis and disorder in the current system.”¶ José Cabrera, 18, a high school senior from Mexico who spoke at the Mass, said immigrant groups in Ohio expected to see legislation this year, adding that he and other students compared their activities to the civil rights march on Washington, recently celebrated on its 50th anniversary.¶ “We know this is the year,” said Mr. Cabrera, who came here illegally when he was 4 years old and was recently granted a deportation deferral by the Obama administration. “I have put as much effort in as I can and even more. If they just keep pushing it back and back, a lot of activists will be very frustrated.”¶ The gulf between the expectations of advocates and the reality they face in Washington is widening every day. As they feel momentum slipping away, their anger is likely to intensify this fall.¶ And time is not on their side. In June, the Senate passed a bipartisan plan to overhaul border security and grant illegal immigrants a chance to earn citizenship. If the House does not take up the immigration issue until 2014, members will face the prospect of voting on a highly contentious issue in the middle of a Congressional election year.¶ Republican primaries will begin in the spring, and many lawmakers may be reluctant to overhaul the immigration system just before facing their conservative constituents. If Congress does not complete action early next year, Congressional aides said, the issue could be delayed until after the November elections.¶ But leaders of groups supporting an immigration overhaul say they do not plan to let up.¶ The organizations plan a mobilization in early October, with rallies in at least 40 cities on Oct. 5 followed by a march and rally in Washington on Oct. 8. Convinced that a majority exists in the House for the legislation, they will press for Mr. Boehner to allow a vote before the end of the year. Leaders said the Syria debate and the fiscal fight should not become “excuses” to set aside immigration.¶ “We’re gearing up for late October — we’re going to push really hard for votes this fall and negotiations with the Senate,” said Frank Sharry, the executive director of America’s Voice, an advocacy group. “We never figured we’d have an opportunity in September because of the budget stuff and with the debt ceiling.”¶ The government’s authority to spend money under the existing budget will run out on Oct. 1 unless lawmakers reach a budget deal or agree to a temporary delay. And officials say the debt limit must be raised by mid-October or the nation will risk defaulting on its debts.¶ Many immigration advocates said they were especially pleased that conservative activists and talk radio hosts had failed to generate significant opposition to an overhaul in August.¶ At a rally in Richmond, Va., last month that was billed as a Tea Party show of strength, Representative Steve King of Iowa, a Republican who is an outspoken foe of any legal status for illegal immigrants, found himself addressing a nearly empty plaza.¶ By contrast, the Alliance for Citizenship, a coalition of pro-overhaul groups, said it logged nearly 1,200 events last month, from polite office visits to noisy street protests. Several dozen marchers walked from Sacramento to Bakersfield, Calif., hoping to evoke the farmworker protests of the 1960s. While few of the actions made national news, the groups kept up a drumbeat in Republican districts they identified as strategic. The alliance reported that 25 House Republicans had come out in favor of an overhaul including legalization during the recess.¶ Bibles, Badges and Business, a conservative coalition favoring the overhaul, dispatched representatives to more than 60 town hall-style meetings, to respond if opponents turned out in force. But Ali Noorani, a leader of the coalition, said no groundswell of rage had appeared, while support among conservatives appeared to be growing.¶ But that activity does not appear to have significantly altered the debate in Washington, in part because Syria is overshadowing other issues. Republican officials in the House say they will continue to consider a piece-by-piece approach to particular immigration issues in the weeks ahead. But the possibility of working out a comprehensive overhaul with the Senate and the president will have to wait, they say.¶ “In terms of getting anything on the floor, you’re certainly going to have to wait until something happens on the fiscal debate,” one senior Republican leadership aide said, adding that “the more contentious things you put on the schedule, the harder it is to do the thing that goes last.”¶ In that case, some immigration groups have signaled that they could become more aggressive. In Phoenix last month, young undocumented immigrants who call themselves Dreamers chained themselves to a fence at an immigration detention center and sat in front of a police bus carrying immigrants to be deported. Church and immigrant groups have promised fasts and protests in the coming weeks.¶ “We don’t control the timing. What we do control is the pressure,” said Mr. Medina, the labor leader. “They will get this done when the pressure is so great they have to act.”

#### The plan is unpopular

Zengerle and Spetalnick 13 (Patricia Zengerle and Matt Spetalnick, “Obama wants to end 'war on terror' but Congress balks” May 24, 2013, <http://www.reuters.com/article/2013/05/24/us-usa-obama-speech-idUSBRE94M04Y20130524>, KB)

President Barack Obama wants to roll back some of the most controversial aspects of the U.S. "war on terror," but efforts to alter the global fight against Islamist militants will face the usual hurdle at home: staunch opposition from Republicans in Congress.¶ In a major policy speech on Thursday, Obama narrowed the scope of the targeted-killing drone campaign against al Qaeda and its allies and announced steps toward closing the Guantanamo Bay military prison in Cuba.¶ He acknowledged the past use of "torture" in U.S. interrogations, expressed remorse over civilian casualties from drone strikes, and said Guantanamo "has become a symbol around the world for an America that flouts the rule of law."¶ After launching costly wars in Iraq and Afghanistan, the United States is tiring of conflict. While combating terrorism is still a high priority, polls show Americans' main concerns are the economy and other domestic issues such as healthcare.¶ Conservative opponents said they would try to block the closure of Guantanamo and rejected Obama's call to repeal the Authorization for Use of Military Force, passed in September 2001 and the legal basis for much of the "war on terror."¶ "We have 166 prisoners remaining (at Guantanamo) ... the meanest, nastiest people in the world. They wake up every day seeking to do harm to America and Americans. And if they are released, that's exactly what they are going to do," Republican Senator Saxby Chambliss said in an address to constituents on Friday.¶ Obama called for an end to a "boundless global war on terror" but Republicans warned against being too quick to declare al Qaeda a spent force.

#### Current immigration law endangers all innovation – reform is key

McCraw 12

McCraw, professor emeritus at Harvard Business School, 11/1/2012¶ (Thomas, “Innovative Immigrants,” <http://www.nytimes.com/2012/11/02/opinion/immigrants-as-entrepreneurs.html?pagewanted=all>)

SOME 70 million immigrants have come to America since the first colonists arrived. The role their labor has played in economic development is widely understood. Much less familiar is the extent to which their remarkable innovations have driven American prosperity. Indeed, while both Barack Obama and Mitt Romney have lauded entrepreneurship, innovation and “job creation,” neither candidate has made comprehensive immigration reform an issue, despite immigrants’ crucial role in those fields. Yet understanding how **immigrants have fueled innovation through history** is critical to making sure they continue to drive prosperity in the future. At the country’s beginning, the three most important architects of its financial system were immigrants: Alexander Hamilton, from St. Croix, then part of the Danish West Indies; Robert Morris, born in Liverpool, England; and Albert Gallatin of Geneva. Morris was superintendent of finance during the Revolutionary War, using every resource at his command to support the army in the field. Hamilton, as the first secretary of the Treasury, rescued the country from bankruptcy and designed its basic financial system. Gallatin paid down much of the national debt, engineered the financing of the Louisiana Purchase and remains the longest-serving Treasury secretary ever. Immigrants’ financial innovations continued through the 19th century. In 1808 Alexander Brown, from Ireland, founded the nation’s first investment bank, and his immigrant sons set up Brown Brothers. The Lehman brothers, from Germany, began as dry-goods merchants and cotton brokers in Alabama, then moved to New York just before the Civil War and eventually founded a bank. Many other immigrants, including Marcus Goldman of Goldman Sachs, followed similar paths, starting very small, traveling to new cities and establishing banks. Meanwhile, “Yankee” firms like Kidder, Peabody and Drexel, Morgan — whose partners were native-born — remained less mobile, tied by family and high society to Boston and New York. Immigrant innovators were pioneers in many other industries after the Civil War. Three examples were Andrew Carnegie (Scotland, steel), Joseph Pulitzer (Hungary, newspapers) and David Sarnoff (Russia, electronics). Each came to America young, poor and full of energy. Carnegie’s mother brought the family to Pittsburgh in 1848, when Andrew was 12. He became a bobbin-boy in a textile mill, a telegram messenger, a telegraph-key operator, a low-level manager at the Pennsylvania Railroad, a division superintendent for the same railroad and a bond salesman for the railroad in Europe. Recognizing the limitless market for the rails that carried trains, Carnegie jumped to steel. His most important innovation was “hard driving” blast furnaces, wearing them out quickly. This violated the accepted practice of “coddling” furnaces, but he calculated that his vastly increased output cut the price of steel far more than replacing the furnaces cost his company. In turn, an immense quantity of cheap steel found its way into lucrative new uses: structural steel for skyscrapers, sheet steel for automobiles. Pulitzer was the home-tutored son of a prosperous Hungarian family that lost its fortune. He came to the United States in 1864 at age 17, recruited by a Massachusetts Civil War regiment. Penniless after the war ended, he went to St. Louis, a center for German immigrants, whose language he spoke fluently. He worked as a waiter, a railroad clerk, a lawyer and a reporter for a local German newspaper, part of which he eventually purchased. In 1879, he acquired two English-language papers and merged them into The St. Louis Post-Dispatch. In 1883, he moved to New York, where he bought The New York World and began a fierce competition with other New York papers, mainly the Sun and, later, William Randolph Hearst’s New York Journal. The New York World was pro-labor, pro-immigration and, remarkably, both serious and sensationalist. It achieved a huge circulation. Sarnoff was just 9 years old when he arrived from Russia in 1901. He earned money selling Yiddish newspapers on the street and singing at a synagogue, and then worked as an office clerk, a messenger and, like Carnegie, a telegraph operator. From there he became part of the fledgling radio firm RCA and rose rapidly within its ranks. Sarnoff was among the first to see radio’s potential as “point-to-mass” entertainment, i.e., broadcasting. He devoted a huge percentage of profits to research and development, and won an epic battle with CBS over industry standards for color TV. For decades, RCA and electronics were practically synonymous. As these men show, one of the key traits of immigrant innovators is geographic mobility, both from the home country and within the United States. Consider the striking roster of 20th-century immigrants who led the development of fields like movies and information technology: the Hollywood studios MGM, Warner Brothers, United Artists, Paramount and Universal; the Silicon Valley companies Intel, eBay, Google, Yahoo and Sun Microsystems. The economist Joseph Schumpeter — yet another immigrant, and the most perceptive early analyst of innovation — considered it to be the fundamental component of entrepreneurship: “The typical entrepreneur is more self-centered than other types, because he relies less than they do on tradition and connection” and because his efforts consist “precisely in breaking up old, and creating new, tradition.” For that reason, innovators always encounter resistance from people whose economic and social interests are threatened by new products and methods. Compared with the native-born, who have extended families and lifelong social and commercial relationships, immigrants without such ties — without businesses to inherit or family property to protect — are in some ways better prepared to play the innovator’s role. A hundred academic monographs could not prove that immigrants are more innovative than native-born Americans, because each spurs the other on. Innovations by the blended population were, and still are, integral to the economic growth of the **U**nited **S**tates. But our overly complex immigration law hampers even the most obvious innovators’ efforts to become citizens. **It endangers our tradition of entrepreneurship**, and it must be repaired — soon.

#### Positive feedbacks ensure runaway warming, causes extinction

Speth 2008

[James, dean of the Yale School of Forestry and Environmental Studies at Yale University, New Haven, Connecticut. Currently he serves the school as the Carl W. Knobloch, Jr. Dean and Sara Shallenberger Brown Professor in the Practice of Environmental Policy, The Bridge @ the Edge of the World, pg. 26]

The possibility of abrupt climate change is linked to what may be the most problematic possibility of all—"positive" feedback effects where the initial warming has effects that generate more warming. Several of these feedbacks are possible. First, the land's ability to store carbon could weaken. Soils and forests can dry out or burn and release carbon; less plant growth can occur, thus reducing nature's ability to remove carbon from the air. Second, carbon sinks in the oceans could also be reduced due to ocean warming and other factors. Third, the potent greenhouse gas methane could be released from peat bogs, wetlands, and thawing permafrost, and even from the methane hydrates in the oceans, as the planet warms and changes. Finally, the earth's albedo, the reflectivity of the earth's surface, is slated to be reduced as large areas now covered by ice and snow diminish or are covered by meltwater. All these effects would tend to make warming self-reinforcing, possibly leading to a greatly amplified greenhouse effect. The real possibility of these amplifying feedbacks has alarmed some of our top scientists. James Hansen, the courageous NASA climate scientist, is becoming increasingly outspoken as his investigations lead him to more and more disturbing conclusions. He offered the following assessment in 2007: "Our home planet is now dangerously near a 'tipping point.' Human-made greenhouse gases are near a level such that important climate changes may proceed mostly under the climate system's own momentum. Impacts would include extermination of a large fraction of species on the planet, shifting of climatic zones due to an intensified hydrologic cycle with effects on freshwater availability and human health, and repeated worldwide coastal tragedies associated with storms and a continuously rising sea level. .. . "Civilization developed during the Holocene, a period of relatively tranquil climate now almost 12,000 years in duration. The planet has been warm enough to keep ice sheets off North America and Europe, but cool enough for ice sheets on Greenland and Antarctica to be stable. Now, with rapid warming of o.6°C in the past 30 years, global temperature is at its warmest level in the Holocene. "This warming has brought us to the precipice of a great 'tipping point” If we go over the edge, it will be a transition to 'a different planet,' an environment far outside the range that has been experienced by humanity. There will be no return within the lifetime of any generation that can be imagined, and the trip will exterminate a large fraction of species on the planet.

### TP

#### Tea Party influence low now BECAUSE of the disagreement about foreign policy - the plan reverses this

Castillo 9/5 (Dava Castillo, Sep 05th 2013, <http://www.allvoices.com/contributed-news/15460384-political-party-schisms-a-house-divided-turns-into-a-condominium>, “Political party schisms: A house divided turns into a condominium”, AB)

But then the entire question on whether to engage in Syria is unsettling for many as we find ourselves in the same camp with those whom, in most political arenas, we would be opposing. The Democrats are divided as well as the Republicans. The labels this time really are “doves” and “hawks,” literally. The Republicans, however, are divided even further by the tea party component of isolationists driven by fiscal stinginess, which in the case of fighting a war “over there,” works for me. Except now Saudi Arabia and Qatar have said they will pay for some of the expenses relegating the United States military to mercenary status. If engaging in Syria is going to be free, will the Libertarian conservatives say it’s OK or will the Republicans branch off into yet another ideological segment? The Republican Party is beginning to fracture over Syrian intervention, with the small government, isolationist tea party folk on one side and the rest of the old guard, hawkish Republicans led by Sen. John McCain (R-Ariz.) and Lindsey Graham (R-S.C.). Splits in major political parties are uncommon, but it has happened before.

#### Plan is a win for the Tea Party

Metzler 13

Rebekah Metzler 13 is a political writer for U.S. News & World Report. “Marco Rubio, Rand Paul Strike Out to Re-Brand Their Party: Fresh takes on foreign, domestic policies aim to shake up GOP,” February 6, 2013, http://www.usnews.com/news/articles/2013/02/06/marco-rubio-rand-paul-strike-out-to-re-brand-their-party, DOA: 8-1-13, y2k

Paul, delivering a foreign policy speech at the conservative Heritage Foundation Wednesday, struck a balance between George W. Bush era neo-conservativism and support for nation building, and his father, former Texas Rep. Ron Paul's, unique brand of isolationism. The Kentucky senator criticized the traditional GOP stance that money should be no object when it comes to the U.S. military and its mission, and said that America should rethink its role in the world while recognizing the cost to U.S. blood and treasure. "I'd argue that a more restrained foreign policy is the true conservative foreign policy, as it includes two basic tenets of true conservatism: respect for the constitution and fiscal discipline," Paul said, reflecting libertarian ideals held by both Tea Partiers and some progressives. Congress also must be more assertive when it comes to its role in providing checks and balances to the president's war powers, he said. "We did not declare war or authorize force to begin war with Libya," Paul said. "This is a dangerous precedent. In our foreign policy, Congress has become not even a rubber stamp but an irrelevancy." A senator who at times finds himself the only member on a certain side of things—whether it's a willingness to place secret holds on nominations to get a vote on a certain amendment, or an opposition to some spending provision that most Republicans agree with—Paul was obviously striving to legitimize himself as a leader with original but appealing viewpoints. "When foreign policy has become so monolithic, so lacking in debate that Republicans and Democrats routinely pass foreign policy statements without debate and without votes, where are the calls for moderation, the calls for restraint?" he said. "Anyone who questions the bipartisan consensus is immediately castigated, rebuked and their patriotism challenged."

#### Tea Party wins snowball --- saves their influence in Congress

Cillizza 12

(Chris Cillizza, December 4, 2012, “Is the tea party dead? Or just resting?,” Washington Post, http://www.washingtonpost.com/blogs/the-fix/wp/2012/12/04/whither-the-tea-party/)

And Jon Lerner, a Republican consultant who works closely with the Club For Growth, insisted that the tea party remains a major force in GOP primaries — and, as such, is something establishment Republicans should be very wary of ignoring. ”Tea Party voters represent a huge portion of all Republican voters, so while the GOP establishment sometimes finds the Tea Party inconvenient, they are much better off making peace with it than making war with it,” said Lerner.¶ True enough. But, it still seems clear that the tea party is in the midst of a sort of soul searching. For a movement that burst onto the national scene with a force almost never seen in modern American politics, there’s no obvious second act. The movement needs a next fight or, short of that, to make a decision as to whether it can live within the Republican coalition or not.¶ (That latter choice is complicated by the fact that the tea party was built as a leaderless enterprise and so the idea of such a major philosophic decision being made for the entire movement is anathema to, well, the entire movement. Rick Reed, a Republican media consultant, suggested that “there may be a couple of folks whom 10 percent of Republicans would loosely and correctly associate with [the tea party movement], but probably no more.”)¶ One senior Republican party strategist, granted anonymity to speak candidly about the future of the tea party movement, expressed concern that while the tea party was at a “low point” today, the coming legislative fights in Congress could lead to a renaissance in the movement.

#### Strong Tea Party wrecks budget compromises

Montgomery 11

(Lori, "House Republicans divided on spending cuts; for some, it's $100 billion or bust," Feb 11, [www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/content/article/2011/02/10/AR2011021007091.html](http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/content/article/2011/02/10/AR2011021007091.html))

An already wobbly week for House Republicans turned chaotic Thursday as their unruly new majority flatly rejected a spending plan crafted by House leaders, saying its cuts fell far short of fulfilling a campaign pledge to slice $100 billion from federal programs. House leaders offered to redo the package but were struggling to identify the massive and unprecedented cuts that will be required to meet their goal. Dissatisfied conservatives, meanwhile, were pressing for even sharper reductions that could prove difficult to push through the House, much less the Democratic-controlled Senate.¶ The uprising exposed serious divisions among Republicans bent on reducing the size of government, the defining issue of the campaign that swept them back into power in the House this fall. Dozens of freshmen, fueled by tea party fervor, are demanding a rapid response to the groundswell of public anger.¶ Their single-minded focus threatens to spoil efforts by House Speaker John A. Boehner (R-Ohio) to avoid a confrontation with the White House that could trigger a government shutdown in coming months. Until this week, House leaders had anticipated relatively little trouble putting together an initial spending plan, which they had hoped would serve as an austere but responsible counterpoint to the budget request President Obama is due to submit Monday.¶ Across Washington, conservative groups fanned the flames of the rebellion Thursday. At the annual Conservative Political Action Conference, Rep. Michele Bachmann (R-Minn.), the leader of the House Tea Party Caucus, criticized GOP leaders for their first offer to cut spending and demanded more.

#### Destroys the economy --- consumer confidence, dollar strength, credit rating

Brown 13

(Abram, 1/4, "GOP's Threat to Shutdown the Government is a Dangerous Strategy," www.forbes.com/sites/abrambrown/2013/01/04/the-gop-is-already-threatneing-to-shutdown-the-government-to-win-spending-cuts/)

That Republicans are already warning the country that they will turn off the lights in D.C. is an alarming situation. Depending on what happens in the debt ceiling debate, the Treasury Department might just have trouble paying the bills on time…or the whole apparatus could cease to function. Past that, there’s a risk that the credit-rating agencies could downgrade the United States, raising the country’s borrowing costs (and making that newly approved debt more costly).¶ Not to mention the damage to the broader economy. The last debt ceiling fiasco in August 2011 dashed consumer confidence. Why shop anywhere else than bargain-centers like Wal-Mart and or a dollar store when the nation seems to be falling apart? Shortly before the nation went past the deadline in 2011, the CEOs of Bank of America, Citi, JPMorgan Chase and Goldman Sachs sent a letter to The White House that urged for a quick resolution:¶ A default on our nation’s obligations, or a downgrade of America’s credit rating, would be a tremendous blow to business and investor confidence — raising interest rates for everyone who borrows, undermining the value of the dollar, and roiling stock and bond markets — and, therefore, dramatically worsening our nation’s already difficult economic circumstances.¶ Granted, the economy is in slightly better shape today than it was in August 2011. Not so strong, though, that the consequences of a shutdown would be much different.

#### Economic collapse causes nuclear conflicts

Burrows and Harris 9

Mathew J. Burrows counselor in the National Intelligence Council and Jennifer Harris a member of the NIC’s Long Range Analysis Unit “Revisiting the Future: Geopolitical Effects of the Financial Crisis” The Washington Quarterly 32:2 https://csis.org/files/publication/twq09aprilburrowsharris.pdf

Increased Potential for Global Conflict¶ Of course, the report encompasses more than economics and indeed believes the¶ future is likely to be the result of a number of intersecting and interlocking¶ forces. With so many possible permutations of outcomes, each with ample opportunity for unintended consequences, there is a growing sense of insecurity.¶ Even so, history may be more instructive than ever. While we continue to¶ believe that the Great Depression is not likely to be repeated, the lessons to be¶ drawn from that period include the harmful effects on fledgling democracies and¶ multiethnic societies (think Central Europe in 1920s and 1930s) and on¶ the sustainability of multilateral institutions (think League of Nations in the¶ same period). There is no reason to think that this would not be true in the¶ twenty-first as much as in the twentieth century. For that reason, the ways in¶ which the potential for greater conflict could grow would seem to be even more¶ apt in a constantly volatile economic environment as they would be if change¶ would be steadier.¶ In surveying those risks, the report stressed the likelihood that terrorism and¶ nonproliferation will remain priorities even as resource issues move up on the¶ international agenda. Terrorism’s appeal will decline if economic growth¶ continues in the Middle East and youth unemployment is reduced. For those¶ terrorist groups that remain active in 2025, however, the diffusion of¶ technologies and scientific knowledge will place some of the world’s most¶ dangerous capabilities within their reach. Terrorist groups in 2025 will likely be a¶ combination of descendants of long established groupsinheriting¶ organizational structures, command and control processes, and training¶ procedures necessary to conduct sophisticated attacksand newly emergent¶ collections of the angry and disenfranchised that become self-radicalized,¶ particularly in the absence of economic outlets that would become narrower¶ in an economic downturn.¶ The most dangerous casualty of any economically-induced drawdown of U.S.¶ military presence would almost certainly be the Middle East. Although Iran’s¶ acquisition of nuclear weapons is not inevitable, worries about a nuclear-armed¶ Iran could lead states in the region to develop new security arrangements with¶ external powers, acquire additional weapons, and consider pursuing their own¶ nuclear ambitions. It is not clear that the type of stable deterrent relationship¶ that existed between the great powers for most of the Cold War would emerge¶ naturally in the Middle East with a nuclear Iran. Episodes of low intensity¶ conflict and terrorism taking place under a nuclear umbrella could lead to an¶ unintended escalation and broader conflict if clear red lines between those states¶ involved are not well established. The close proximity of potential nuclear rivals¶ combined with underdeveloped surveillance capabilities and mobile¶ dual-capable Iranian missile systems also will produce inherent difficulties in¶ achieving reliable indications and warning of an impending nuclear attack. The¶ lack of strategic depth in neighboring states like Israel, short warning and missile¶ flight times, and uncertainty of Iranian intentions may place more focus on¶ preemption rather than defense, potentially leading to escalating crises.Types of conflict that the world continues¶ to experience, such as over resources, could¶ reemerge, particularly if protectionism grows and¶ there is a resort to neo-mercantilist practices.¶ Perceptions of renewed energy scarcity will drive¶ countries to take actions to assure their future¶ access to energy supplies. In the worst case, this¶ could result in interstate conflicts if government¶ leaders deem assured access to energy resources,¶ for example, to be essential for maintaining domestic stability and the survival of¶ their regime. Even actions short of war, however, will have important geopolitical¶ implications. Maritime security concerns are providing a rationale for naval¶ buildups and modernization efforts, such as China’s and India’s development of¶ blue water naval capabilities. If the fiscal stimulus focus for these countries indeed¶ turns inward, one of the most obvious funding targets may be military. Buildup of¶ regional naval capabilities could lead to increased tensions, rivalries, and¶ counterbalancing moves, but it also will create opportunities for multinational¶ cooperation in protecting critical sea lanes. With water also becoming scarcer in¶ Asia and the Middle East, cooperation to manage changing water resources is¶ likely to be increasingly difficult both within and between states in a more¶ dog-eat-dog world.¶

### Trials

#### **The United States Congress should establish a policy trial process regarding the United States Congress creating a statutory cause of action for damages for those unlawfully injured by targeted killing operations or their heirs that overrides the state secrets and official immunity doctrine and replaces them with carefully considered procedures for balancing the secrecy concerns. The result of the policy trial should be unconditionally implemented and enforced by the United States Congress.**

#### The trial solves the aff

Noone 12

(Gregory Noone, Director of the Fairmont State University National ¶ Security and Intelligence Program and an Assistant Professor of ¶ Political Science and Law, “The War Powers Resolution and Public Opinion” Volume 45 Fall 2012 Issues 1 & 2, <http://law.case.edu/journals/JIL/Documents/45CaseWResJIntlL1&2.8.Article.Noone.pdf>, KB)

IV. The Public Wants Congress to Approve¶ “Do you think the president should or should not be required to ¶ get the approval of Congress before sending United States armed ¶ forces into action outside the United States?”30 In November 1973 the ¶ response favoring congressional approval was 80% and in May 2008 it ¶ was an equally stark 79%.31 In fact, for the past thirty-five years there ¶ has been little change in this basic sentiment as an overwhelming ¶ majority of Americans believe that the president needs congressional ¶ approval before committing troops overseas. The American people ¶ want Congress to execute its constitutional duties, or in other words, ¶ do its job.¶ In February 1999, for example, 54% approved of a peacekeeping ¶ mission in Kosovo (40% disapproved), whereas 43% Americans ¶ supported airstrikes and 45% opposed.32 However, 78% of Americans ¶ wanted President Clinton to seek approval from Congress.33 In ¶ September 2002, 69% said congressional approval was necessary for an ¶ invasion of Iraq and 51% said Congress should not give unlimited ¶ authority to use military action against Iraq.34 A CBS poll from that ¶ same month found 44% believed Congress was not asking enough ¶ questions, yet 22% believed Congress was asking too many questions, ¶ 16% about right, and 18% don’t know.35¶ Beyond the basic question of obtaining congressional approval, ¶ other specific scenarios polled in May 2008 indicate the desire for ¶ congressional approval remains strong with few exceptions.

#### The CP is more rigorous and avoids the tea party disad

Buchanan, ’13

(Bruce, Professor in Government at the University of Texas at Austin, Presidential Power and Accountability: Toward a Presidential Accountability System, Routledge, p. 114-115, RSR)

Finally and most importantly, invoking the procedure signals the American people that something rare and serious is afoot. They will pay closer attention than usual to the (inevitably televised) proceedings because the news media and political elites will tell them that if history is any guide, their reaction will play a vital role in determining the outcome. In fact, on this count, there is nothing new here. Public opinion has often been highly influential, indeed decisive, in the resolutions of a wide variety of high-pro file formal congressional proceedings. Examples include the Army McCarthy hearings, the McCarthy censure, the Irvin Committee hearings on Watergate, and the Clinton impeachment and Senate trial. Public opposition to U.S. engagement in World War II led Congress to pass two Neutrality Acts (in 1935 and 1937) that prevented a frustrated President Roosevelt from helping the allies before the U.S. entry into the war. These examples suggest that policy trials would be decisive. They would be decisive because, as in the examples, they would be preceded by highly explicit “role-sending” publicity which would put the people on notice that their collective judgment about a major decision facing Congress is likely to carry great weight. If history is any guide, such role sending, particularly when followed by deliberative policy trial proceedings, would almost certainly crystallize a public consensus that is informed, coherent, and sturdy enough both to influence and politically protect members of Congress, most of whom will follow the public lead.

#### The counterplan is not topical and plan-minus

#### a.) It severs should

**Summers 94** (Justice – Oklahoma Supreme Court, “Kelsey v. Dollarsaver Food Warehouse of Durant”, 1994 OK 123, 11-8, http://www.oscn.net/applications/oscn/DeliverDocument.asp?CiteID=20287#marker3fn13)

¶4 The legal question to be resolved by the court is whether the word "should"13 in the May 18 order connotes futurity or may be deemed a ruling in praesenti.14 The answer to this query is not to be divined from rules of grammar;15 it must be governed by the age-old practice culture of legal professionals and its immemorial language usage. To determine if the omission (from the critical May 18 entry) of the turgid phrase, "and the same hereby is", (1) makes it an in futuro ruling - i.e., an expression of what the judge will or would do at a later stage - or (2) constitutes an in in praesenti resolution of a disputed law issue, the trial judge's intent must be garnered from the four corners of the entire record.16

[CONTINUES – TO FOOTNOTE]

13 "Should" not only is used as a "present indicative" synonymous with ought but also is the past tense of "shall" with various shades of meaning not always easy to analyze. See 57 C.J. Shall § 9, Judgments § 121 (1932). O. JESPERSEN, GROWTH AND STRUCTURE OF THE ENGLISH LANGUAGE (1984); St. Louis & S.F.R. Co. v. Brown, 45 Okl. 143, 144 P. 1075, 1080-81 (1914). For a more detailed explanation, see the Partridge quotation infra note 15. Certain contexts mandate a construction of the term "should" as more than merely indicating preference or desirability. Brown, supra at 1080-81 (jury instructions stating that jurors "should" reduce the amount of damages in proportion to the amount of contributory negligence of the plaintiff was held to imply an *obligation* *and to be more than advisory*); Carrigan v. California Horse Racing Board, 60 Wash. App. 79, 802 P.2d 813 (1990) (one of the Rules of Appellate Procedure requiring that a party "should devote a section of the brief to the request for the fee or expenses" was interpreted to mean that a party is under an *obligation* to include the requested segment); State v. Rack, 318 S.W.2d 211, 215 (Mo. 1958) ("should" would mean the same as "shall" or "must" when used in an instruction to the jury which tells the triers they "should disregard false testimony"). 14 In praesenti means literally "at the present time." BLACK'S LAW DICTIONARY 792 (6th Ed. 1990). In legal parlance the phrase denotes that which in law is **presently** or **immediately** effective, as **opposed to** something that will or would become effective in **the future** *[in futurol*]. See Van Wyck v. Knevals, 106 U.S. 360, 365, 1 S.Ct. 336, 337, 27 L.Ed. 201 (1882).

#### b.) It severs substantial

**Words and Phrases 1925**

Judicial and statutory definitions of words and phrases, Volume 7, p. 6738

The words “outward, open, actual, visible, substantial, and exclusive,” in connection with a change of possession, mean substantially the same thing. They mean not concealed; not hidden; exposed to view; free from concealment, dissimulation, reserve, or disguise; in full existence; denoting that which not merely can be, but is opposed to potential, apparent, constructive, and imaginary; veritable; genuine; **certain**; absolute; **real at present time**, as a matter of fact, not merely nominal; opposed to form; actually existing; true; not including admitting, or pertaining to any others; undivided; sole; opposed to inclusive. Bass v. Pease, 79 Ill. App. 308, 318.

#### c.) It severs resolved

American Heritage Dictionary 2k

Resolve: 1. To make a firm decision about.

### K

#### Transparency is impossible – coding it as a goal or method in statist politics creates the false expectation of total transparency which further obscures abuses of governance -turns the case

Fenster 2k10

[mark, seeing the state: transparency as metaphor, administrative law review, 62, 3, summer, american bar association, Prof of Law, UFlorida – Levin College of Law, JD Yale Law, PhD Urbana Champaign]

Employed in this way, the term transparency simultaneously describes both an aspirational goal—full openness to the public—and the core problem that must be overcome in order for that goal to be met—the separation between the state and public. Judges, policy advocates, academics, and legislatures frequently deploy the concept’s metaphorical authority when adjudicating, advocating, and legislating transparency. “Democracies die behind closed doors,” a federal appellate court declared when finding that the First Amendment prohibits the government from closing immigration hearings to the public and press without an individualized showing of justification.6 “Sunlight” or “sunshine,” when it is allowed to shine through previously darkened, secretive places, provides the best of “disinfectants,” Louis Brandeis famously contended when he decried the corrupt trusts of the early twentieth century.7 Information must be set free from its bureaucratic constraints, as Congress declared in the name of its act requiring executive branch agencies to disclose information.8 Deep secrets—those state secrets that the public does not know that it does not know because they are hidden below the public’s view—pose the greatest danger in liberal constitutional democracy, two important recent law review articles have persuasively argued.9 Transparency thus serves as more than a mere technical concept that provides the basis for constitutional, legislative, and regulatory rules. It also acts as a powerful metaphor that drives and shapes the desire for a more perfect democratic order. Ideally, of course, there would be no distance between observer and observed, between the governed and those institutions that govern. The metaphor, in other words, would accurately diagnose the problem and set an agenda for the cure. Under a strong form of transparency, government doors should never be closed; government should not operate in the darkness; all government information should be available to the public; and in the rare instance when they must be kept from the public, government secrets should not be so deep that their existence is unknown.10 How else can citizens make up their minds independently of government officials and media gatekeepers, and advise elected officials as to the wisest course of action? A weaker conception of transparency concedes the need to balance transparency’s beneficial effects and normative value against the state’s need to withhold a limited amount of information whose disclosure would cause identifiable harm.11 As a metaphor, transparency suggests two solutions: allow the public to view the state directly, or require the state to make its work available for the public to review. Open government laws rely on both of these solutions by requiring certain government entities to hold open meetings, trials, and deliberations,12 and by mandating that government records be made public routinely or in response to a public request.13 Both the strong and weak conceptions of transparency assert that the legal order imposed by such laws—and other efforts by the state, urged on by the public, to impose openness—can unveil the state, eradicating or at least mitigating its distance from its citizens through mandates and obligations placed on government institutions and officials. And yet, the regular, ritualistic outpouring of public complaints about the weakness of such laws and the power and dangers of a secretive government suggests that transparency’s metaphorical ideal in fact does not prevail.14 The state remains distant and unseen, perhaps even concealed. In an earlier article, I explored the conceptual reasons why this disappointment seems endemic to transparency.15 In this article, I explain how transparency’s metaphoric dimensions—the problem it identifies and the goal it sets—impede[s] our ability to understand and address the complexities of the modern administrative state. The public prefers a proximate, comprehensible, responsive bureaucracy, one that fulfills the “democratic wish” of a directly accountable government.16 Populist and progressive reforms and political campaigns endeavor to take the nation back from the present crisis caused by an autocratic, secretive “other” ensconced in Washington and state capitols.17 They promise that by revealing the state’s operations, transparency’s metaphoric understanding can enable the public to control the state. The transparency movement, which came of age as part of what Richard Stewart called the “reformation” of American administrative law in the 1970s and after, suggests that the state must and can be made visible.18 Administrative reform cannot, however, deliver on transparency’s metaphoric promise. The state’s large, organizationally and physically dispersed public bureaucracies perform a variety of functions and make a staggering number of decisions of varying importance, not all of which can be viewed before the fact or even easily reviewed later. The state is too big, too remote, and too enclosed to be completely visible. The very nature of the state, in other words, creates the conditions of its obscurity. It can¶ never be fully transparent, at least not in the sense that the term and its populist suspicions of the state require. Overinvestment in transparency as a metaphor leads open government advocates to lament insufficiently effective administrative laws, while the debate over how best to make the government open too often focuses on how to make the state permanently and entirely visible rather than on devising means to improve public oversight and education.19 Transparency’s fear of a secret, remote government—like its promise of a visible, accessible one—heightens the concept’s salience even as it obscures the limits of its enforceability as an administrative norm. Transparency is a means to achieve the end of a more responsive state that more effectively achieves democratically agreed-upon ends. Transparency’s symbolic pull, its ability to grab the public’s imagination, leads us to fetishize [sic][idealize] means at the cost of ends.20 My underlying assumption is that bureaucracy is necessary to carry out the tasks required in a complex society and economy. As the public administration scholar Donald Kettl has argued, “society has yet to discover anything that works better in coordinating complex action” than public bureaucracies.21The public must certainly know about the government’s operations, but obtaining that knowledge is not a costless transaction. Simplistic understandings of the state’s operations and the potential of imposing equally simplistic understandings of transparency can lead to imperfect, costly measures to disclose information and less effective governance. This Article proceeds as follows: Part I explores transparency’s metaphoric work within American law, politics, and culture, and identifies its dual role as both a powerful, populist metaphor and a set of imperfect technocratic tools. It introduces the argument that Parts II and III then develop: transparency’s obsessive concern with visibility and the effort that this concern inspires to contain the state ultimately fail and disappoint because of the state’s inevitable organizational and geographic distan ce from the public. The technocratic tools of open government cannot in fact meet the demands that transparency’s force as a political and administrative symbol animates. Part II focuses on the state’s organizational complexity, both as a matter of form and function, and describes the various constitutional and statutory mechanisms that simultaneously establish an intricate institutional network and impose a limited, variable set of transparency commands. Part III describes the physical impediments to transparency caused by the vast territory of the American state, the complexity of its jurisdictional units, and the physical structures that house government offices. Both Parts II and III explain the impediments to the state’s visibility and the imperfect means that have been developed to overcome them.

#### YOU SHOULD REFUSE THEIR IDEALIZATION OF TRANSPARENCY. INSTEAD YOU SHOULD DEMANDS A MORE SELF-REFLECTIVE FORM OF INTELLIGENT ACCOUNTABILITY GROUNDED IN THE ACKNOWLEDGEMENT OF THE INEVITABLE FAILURE OF TRANSPARENCY.

Roberts 2k9

[john, “no one is perfect: the limits of transparency and an ethic for intelligent accountability”, accounting, organizations, and society, 32, 957-970, Faculty of Economics and Business, U of Sydney]

In setting out to explore the effects of transparency on the subject some clues can be taken from McCreevy’s reference to ‘pride’, ‘bare bottoms’ and ‘ugliness’. Transparency contains these dual and contrasting potentials and perhaps in binary form; it promises and threatens to reveal or discover the self as good or bad, clothed or naked, beautiful or ugly. In what follows, I explore how transparency works to advertise an ideal against which we will always fail so that it plays with my fears of being exposed and humiliated whilst at the same time encouraging me to take pride in what is disclosed. The final focus of the paper concerns the kind of accountability that McCreevy suggests should go on ‘behind closed doors’. Once doors are closed and transparency ceases to be a possibility then we are obliged to trust those on the other side, and yet the whole point of transparency is to obviate the need for such trust or to furnish distant others with good reasons for such trust. The implication of McCreevy’s comments is that only exceptional and very important matters should escape the obligations of transparency – in this case global financial stability. In contrast, here I seek to develop a more nuanced view of transparency’s capabilities and limitations, and suggest that at best it should serve as a supplement to the neglected potentials of what O’Neill (2002) calls ‘intelligent’ accountability. Whilst the metaphor of transparency suggests the capacity to see within or behind closed doors – to abolish such private and confidential space – in practical terms the effects of transparency depend upon how it changes conduct behind closed doors. In what follows I trace two contrasting potentials. The positive and arguably essential function of transparency is to counter the negative potentials of local collusion for distant others. As O’Neill (2006) argues, by giving a local presence to the interests of distant others, transparency can serve as a very effective ‘antidote’ to secrecy. But in what follows I argue that if we rely only on transparency as a form of accountability then these positive effects are often countered by serious distortions to communication which, paradoxically, serve to weaken the effectiveness of accountability. Drawing upon psychoanalytic accounts of recognition and guilt, I argue that the subjective correlate of the pursuit of an ever more complete transparency is often the embrace of an ideal of a perfect-able and fully transparent self. I argue that accountability is then typically self absorbed and driven by the narcissistic imperative to garner praise/reward to the self or absolve the self of blame, rather than by the collective need to manage organisational interdependencies. In contrast to these self-defensive or assertive potentials of accountability as transparency, I then seek to explore the potential for a more ‘intelligent’ and compassionate form of accountability grounded in the conscious acknowledgement of the impossibility of this ideal of a self that is fully transparent to itself and others.

### Adv 1

#### Government is more open than ever about targeted killings and public debate is already happening

Brennan ‘12

[John, Director of the Central Intelligence Agency and former chief counterterrorism advisor to U.S. President Barack Obama. <http://www.lawfareblog.com/2012/04/brennanspeech/> ETB]

Given these efforts, I venture to say that the United States government has never been so open regarding its counterterrorism policies and their legal justification.  Still, there continues to be considerable public and legal debate surrounding these technologies and how they are sometimes used in our fight against al-Qa’ida.

#### No unique internal link- no ev says debating about drones is key to reclaiming or engaging the public sphere- public debates about a litany of other issues solve. No evidence says the public sphere isn’t being engaged now

#### They don’t solve the Williams impact- it says enlightenment thinking has permanently diluted the public sphere- the aff doesn’t end or reverse enlightenment thinking

### Adv 2 - Targeted Killing

#### Drones are effective- eliminate important terrorist human capital and prevent communication and training

Byman 2013

(Daniel L., Research Director of Saban Center for Middle East Policy, “Why Drones Work: The Case for Washington's Weapon of Choice”, Foreign Affairs, July/August 2013, <http://www.brookings.edu/research/articles/2013/06/17-drones-obama-weapon-choice-us-counterterrorism-byman>)

The Obama administration relies on drones for one simple reason: they work. According to data compiled by the New America Foundation, since Obama has been in the White House, U.S. drones have killed an estimated 3,300 al Qaeda, Taliban, and other jihadist operatives in Pakistan and Yemen. That number includes over 50 senior leaders of al Qaeda and the Taliban—top figures who are not easily replaced. In 2010, Osama bin Laden warned his chief aide, Atiyah Abd al-Rahman, who was later killed by a drone strike in the Waziristan region of Pakistan in 2011, that when experienced leaders are eliminated, the result is “the rise of lower leaders who are not as experienced as the former leaders” and who are prone to errors and miscalculations. And drones also hurt terrorist organizations when they eliminate operatives who are lower down on the food chain but who boast special skills: passport forgers, bomb makers, recruiters, and fundraisers.¶ Drones have also undercut terrorists’ ability to communicate and to train new recruits. In order to avoid attracting drones, al Qaeda and Taliban operatives try to avoid using electronic devices or gathering in large numbers. A tip sheet found among jihadists in Mali advised militants to “maintain complete silence of all wireless contacts” and “avoid gathering in open areas.” Leaders, however, cannot give orders when they are incommunicado, and training on a large scale is nearly impossible when a drone strike could wipe out an entire group of new recruits. Drones have turned al Qaeda’s command and training structures into a liability, forcing the group to choose between having no leaders and risking dead leaders.

#### Terrorism causes extinction

Hellman 8

(Martin E, emeritus prof of engineering @ Stanford, “Risk Analysis of Nuclear Deterrence” SPRING, THE BENT OF TAU BETA PI, http://www.nuclearrisk.org/paper.pdf)

The threat of nuclear terrorism looms much larger in the public’s mind than the threat of a full-scale nuclear war, yet this article focuses primarily on the latter. An explanation is therefore in order before proceeding. A terrorist attack involving a nuclear weapon would be a catastrophe of immense proportions: “A 10-kiloton bomb detonated at Grand Central Station on a typical work day would likely kill some half a million people, and inflict over a trillion dollars in direct economic damage. America and its way of life would be changed forever.” [Bunn 2003, pages viii-ix]. The likelihood of such an attack is also significant. Former Secretary of Defense William Perry has estimated the chance of a nuclear terrorist incident within the next decade to be roughly 50 percent [Bunn 2007, page 15]. David Albright, a former weapons inspector in Iraq, estimates those odds at less than one percent, but notes, “We would never accept a situation where the chance of a major nuclear accident like Chernobyl would be anywhere near 1% .... A nuclear terrorism attack is a low-probability event, but we can’t live in a world where it’s anything but extremely low-probability.” [Hegland 2005]. In a survey of 85 national security experts, Senator Richard Lugar found a median estimate of 20 percent for the “probability of an attack involving a nuclear explosion occurring somewhere in the world in the next 10 years,” with 79 percent of the respondents believing “it more likely to be carried out by terrorists” than by a government [Lugar 2005, pp. 14-15]. I support increased efforts to reduce the threat of nuclear terrorism, but that is not inconsistent with the approach of this article. Because terrorism is one of the potential trigger mechanisms for a full-scale nuclear war, the risk analyses proposed herein will include estimating the risk of nuclear terrorism as one component of the overall risk. If that risk, the overall risk, or both are found to be unacceptable, then the proposed remedies would be directed to reduce which- ever risk(s) warrant attention. Similar remarks apply to a number of other threats (e.g., nuclear war between the U.S. and China over Taiwan). his article would be incomplete if it only dealt with the threat of nuclear terrorism and neglected the threat of full- scale nuclear war. If both risks are unacceptable, an effort to reduce only the terrorist component would leave humanity in great peril. In fact, society’s almost total neglect of the threat of full-scale nuclear war makes studying that risk all the more important. The cosT of World War iii The danger associated with nuclear deterrence depends on both the cost of a failure and the failure rate.3 This section explores the cost of a failure of nuclear deterrence, and the next section is concerned with the failure rate. While other definitions are possible, this article defines a failure of deterrence to mean a full-scale exchange of all nuclear weapons available to the U.S. and Russia, an event that will be termed World War III. Approximately 20 million people died as a result of the first World War. World War II’s fatalities were double or triple that number—chaos prevented a more precise deter- mination. In both cases humanity recovered, and the world today bears few scars that attest to the horror of those two wars. Many people therefore implicitly believe that a third World War would be horrible but survivable, an extrapola- tion of the effects of the first two global wars. In that view, World War III, while horrible, is something that humanity may just have to face and from which it will then have to recover. In contrast, some of those most qualified to assess the situation hold a very different view. In a 1961 speech to a joint session of the Philippine Con- gress, General Douglas MacArthur, stated, “Global war has become a Frankenstein to destroy both sides. … If you lose, you are annihilated. If you win, you stand only to lose. No longer does it possess even the chance of the winner of a duel. It contains now only the germs of double suicide.” Former Secretary of Defense Robert McNamara ex- pressed a similar view: “If deterrence fails and conflict develops, the present U.S. and NATO strategy carries with it a high risk that Western civilization will be destroyed” [McNamara 1986, page 6]. More recently, George Shultz, William Perry, Henry Kissinger, and Sam Nunn4 echoed those concerns when they quoted President Reagan’s belief that nuclear weapons were “totally irrational, totally inhu- mane, good for nothing but killing, possibly destructive of life on earth and civilization.” [Shultz 2007] Official studies, while couched in less emotional terms, still convey the horrendous toll that World War III would exact: “The resulting deaths would be far beyond any precedent. Executive branch calculations show a range of U.S. deaths from 35 to 77 percent (i.e., 79-160 million dead) … a change in targeting could kill somewhere between 20 million and 30 million additional people on each side .... These calculations reflect only deaths during the first 30 days. Additional millions would be injured, and many would eventually die from lack of adequate medical care … millions of people might starve or freeze during the follow- ing winter, but it is not possible to estimate how many. … further millions … might eventually die of latent radiation effects.” [OTA 1979, page 8] This OTA report also noted the possibility of serious ecological damage [OTA 1979, page 9], a concern that as- sumed a new potentiality when the TTAPS report [TTAPS 1983] proposed that the ash and dust from so many nearly simultaneous nuclear explosions and their resultant fire- storms could usher in a nuclear winter that might erase homo sapiens from the face of the earth, much as many scientists now believe the K-T Extinction that wiped out the dinosaurs resulted from an impact winter caused by ash and dust from a large asteroid or comet striking Earth. The TTAPS report produced a heated debate, and there is still no scientific consensus on whether a nuclear winter would follow a full-scale nuclear war. Recent work [Robock 2007, Toon 2007] suggests that even a limited nuclear exchange or one between newer nuclear-weapon states, such as India and Pakistan, could have devastating long-lasting climatic consequences due to the large volumes of smoke that would be generated by fires in modern megacities. While it is uncertain how destructive World War III would be, prudence dictates that we apply the same engi- neering conservatism that saved the Golden Gate Bridge from collapsing on its 50th anniversary and assume that preventing World War III is a necessity—not an option.

#### Drones minimize civilian casualties – “pattern-of-life” analysis and reduced operator tension makes collateral damage unlikely – the alternative is empirically worse

Lewis 13

(Michael W. Lewis, flew fighters for the Navy in the early 1990s. He now teaches international law at Ohio Northern University School of Law, “Drones: Actually the Most Humane Form of Warfare Ever” AUG 21 2013, <http://www.theatlantic.com/international/archive/2013/08/drones-actually-the-most-humane-form-of-warfare-ever/278746/>, KB)

Turning to the question of civilian casualties: All armed conflicts cause civilian casualties, and most modern conflicts have done so in large numbers, in part due to the fact that insurgents often hide among the civilian population. The 2006 Israeli conflict with Hezbollah and its 2009 and 2012 battles with Hamas in Gaza, the 1999 Russian war with Chechen rebels, and the final stages of the struggle between Sri Lanka and the LTTE (Tamil Tigers) all killed more civilians than combatants, in some cases substantially more. Although the U.S. has not caused civilian casualties at rates that high, there have been memorable examples of civilian casualties in each of the recent conflicts in which we have been involved, and those casualties were caused by all kinds of weapons systems. The 1991 Gulf War involved the Al-Firdos bunker airstrike that killed up to 400 civilians. The Kosovo campaign included airstrikes that hit the Chinese Embassy in Belgrade and struck a civilian train in the Grdelica gorge. The 2003 Iraq War included civilian casualties caused by Marine ground troops in Haditha and military contractors in Nisoor Square, while a cruise missile strike in 2009 killed approximately 35 civilians at al-Majalah in Yemen.¶ Like any other weapons system, drones have caused civilian casualties. But they also have the potential to dramatically reduce civilian casualties in armed conflicts, and particularly in counterinsurgencies. Their ability to follow targets for days or weeks accomplishes two things that contribute to saving the lives of innocents: First, it confirms that the target is engaged in the behavior that put them on the target list, reducing the likelihood of striking someone based on faulty intelligence. Second, by establishing a "pattern of life" for the intended target, it allows operators to predict when the target will be sufficiently isolated to allow a strike that is unlikely to harm civilians.¶ Another, less obvious, feature that reduces civilian casualties is that drones are controlled remotely, so the decision to employ a weapon can be reviewed in real time by lawyers, intelligence analysts, and senior commanders without any concern (in most cases) that a hesitation to act may cost lives. Even more importantly, the operators themselves are not concerned for their own safety, eliminating the possibility that the combination of tension, an unexpected occurrence, and a concern for personal safety leads to weapons being fired when they shouldn't be.¶ This potential of drones to vastly reduce civilian casualties was not fully realized at first, but it has been dramatically attained in the past few years.¶ In 2007, the U.S. Army and Marine Corps began disseminating a new Counterinsurgency (COIN) Manual that emphasized the need for soldiers to be involved in nation-building and bolstering local civil-society institutions, in addition to defeating insurgents militarily. Part of implementing this strategy involved minimizing civilian casualties. When Gen. Stanley McChrystal took command of ISAF (International Security Assistance Force) in Afghanistan in 2009, he emphasized the need to continue reducing civilian casualties in all phases of operations. He assigned teams of civilians and military officers to conduct root-cause analysis of every civilian casualty in theater and tasked them with developing protocols to eliminate such deaths.¶ These teams produced a number of recommendations for drones. One of the most significant was switching the preferred method of targeting from compounds to vehicles. While targeting compounds improved the likelihood that the right individual was being targeted, it also greatly increased the chances that members of the target's family and the families of his bodyguards and close associates would be harmed. Although vehicle strikes ran a greater risk of target misidentification, increasing surveillance and pattern-of-life analysis mitigated that risk. Because it is easier to determine who is in a vehicle than to keep track of everyone who enters and leaves a compound, vehicle strikes reduced the likelihood that family members and friends would be collateral damage. Also, because vehicle strikes can be conducted on isolated roads, the likelihood of other civilian bystanders being harmed was minimized.¶ How do we know that this has succeeded? Bowden mentions studies done by several independent organizations that have assessed civilian casualties caused by drones in Pakistan. The three most well respected and independent sources on this issue are the Long War Journal, the New America Foundation and The Bureau of Investigative Journalism (TBIJ). Among these, the U.K.-based TBIJ has consistently produced the highest estimates of civilian casualties for drone strikes. According to TBIJ, between January 2012 and July 2013, there were approximately 65 drone strikes in Pakistan, which they estimate to have killed a minimum of 308 people. Yet of these casualties, even TBIJ estimates that only 4 were civilians. This would amount to a civilian casualty rate of less than 1.5 percent, meaning that only 1 in 65 casualties caused by drones over that 19-month period was a civilian. This speaks to drones effective discrimination between civilian and military targets that no other weapons system can possibly match.¶ Another indication that drones cause fewer civilian casualties than traditional warfare was provided by Hamid Karzai in 2011. The U.S. was employing all types of units in Afghanistan, ground troops, airstrikes, artillery and drones. But the source of friction with the Afghan government was not drones but rather special forces night raids. Karzai proclaimed that he would withhold further cooperation until his government was given greater control over night raids. Drones did not cause him or the Afghan people any appreciable concern.

### Solvency

#### No solvency- drone strikes are legal. And, the aff hamstrings military effectiveness

Carafano 8/26

[James Jay Carafano is vice president for defense and foreign policy issues at The Heritage Foundation. <http://www.theatlantic.com/international/archive/2013/08/say-what-you-want-about-drones-theyre-perfectly-legal/278740/> ETB]

I hate Obama's drone war--but, under the law, he has a perfect right to fight one. Armed drones in war may be new, but their use introduces no new ethical or legal issues.¶ In the Western world, the laws of war are built on the foundation of the Just War tradition. The principles for employing force are fairly simple and realistic. The use of force has to be under a competent sovereign authority. And it has to be proportional--that is, the level of force used must be appropriate to the military mission, with appropriate care taken to avoid harming innocents.¶ Those rules apply regardless of the weaponry involved, be it hand grenades, nukes... or armed drones. As I said, nothing new here.¶ Our laws and treaty obligations place a legal framework around the principles of the Just War tradition. At times, the United States has modified these legal instruments to account for the unusual destructive power of certain weapons -- their ability to inflict intentional and unnecessary cruelty or to pose an indiscriminate threat to innocents. For example, the U.S. helped pen conventions on poison gas and biological weapons, as well as treaties to help stem the proliferation of nuclear weapons.¶ Drones, however, present none of these issues. There is nothing novel or unusual about the destructive potential of a drone strike.¶ Pretty much every weapon in the U.S. arsenal may be used in war, provided the users (1) have the legal authority to use them, (2) aim them at that legitimate targets, and (3) use them according to the rules of engagement laid out by their commanders. All those bases are covered when it comes to drones.¶ Congress has given the commander-in-chief an Authorization to Use Military Force--AUMF in Washington-speak--and that's all the legal authority he needs. And, as Mark Bowden's article in this month's The Atlantic illustrates well, the administration has plenty of rules for running armed drone operations.¶ Here is the brutal reality of war: It always requires targeting enemies with lethal force. It is an operational necessity. And it is legal.¶ The problem some people have with killer drones in combat has little to do with the technology of flying weapons. As my colleague at Heritage, Cully Stimson testified before Congress, "Much criticism of drone warfare is actually criticism of broader policies, such as the application of the law of armed conflict to the present conflict, geographical limitations on such conflict, and targeting decisions. Whether a strike is carried out by a drone or an airplane (with the pilot in the vehicle itself) has little or no bearing on these broader policy issues."¶ Turning drone strikes into a battle of legal briefs is more an act "lawfare" than warfare--an attempt to hamstring U.S. military operations by clothing complaints in legal-sounding arguments. Amnesty International declared in its 2012 report that U.S. operations do not "recognize the applicability of international human rights law," an assertion the report conclusively fails to document. Christof Heyns, the UN special rapporteur on extrajudicial killings and summary or arbitrary executions, stated at a conference in Geneva that some U.S. operations might constitute "war crimes." Though he has been on the job for many months, he has yet to prove that allegation.¶ To recapitulate: President Obama has the right to drone on as long as the authority of the AUMF remains in force and as long as he operates within that authority (or operates under some other legal authorization for the use force).

#### Unfettered drone use is inevitable, regardless of restrictions

CNN 13

(Eliott McLaughlin, Jamie Crawford and Joe Sterling, 05/23/13, “Obama: U.S. will keep deploying drones -- when they are only option”, http://www.cnn.com/2013/05/23/politics/obama-terror-speech, AB)

Washington (CNN) -- Drone strikes are a necessary evil, but one that must be used with more temperance as the United States' security situation evolves, President Barack Obama said Thursday.¶ America prefers to capture, interrogate and prosecute terrorists, but there are times when this isn't possible, Obama said in a speech at the National Defense University in Washington. Terrorists intentionally hide in hard-to-reach locales and putting boots on the ground is often out of the question, he said.¶ Thus, when the United States is faced with a threat from terrorists in a country where the government has only tenuous or no influence, drones strikes are the only option -- and they're legal because America "is at war with al Qaeda, the Taliban and their associated forces," Obama said.¶ He added, however, "To say a military tactic is legal, or even effective, is not to say it is wise or moral in every instance. For the same progress that gives us the technology to strike half a world away also demands the discipline to constrain that power -- or risk abusing it."¶ Increased oversight is important, but not easy, Obama said. While he has considered a special court or independent oversight board, those options are problematic, so he plans to talk with Congress to determine how best to handle the deployment of drones, he said.¶ The nation's image was a theme throughout the speech, as Obama emphasized some actions in recent years -- drone strikes and Guantanamo Bay key among them -- risk creating more threats. The nature of threats against the United States have changed since he took office -- they've become more localized -- and so, too, must efforts to combat them, he said.¶ "From our use of drones to the detention of terror suspects, the decisions that we are making now will define the type of nation and world that we leave to our children," he said.¶ Today, al Qaeda operatives in Pakistan and Afghanistan worry more about protecting their own skin than attacking America, he said, but the threat is more diffuse, extending into places such as Yemen, Iraq, Somalia and North Africa. And al Qaeda's ideology helped fuel attacks like the ones at the Boston Marathon and U.S. diplomatic compound in Benghazi.¶ Obama said the use of lethal force extends to U.S. citizens as well.¶ On Wednesday, his administration disclosed for the first time that four Americans had been killed in counterterrorist drone strikes overseas, including one person who was targeted by the United States.¶ "When a U.S. citizen goes abroad to wage war against America -- and is actively plotting to kill U.S. citizens; and when neither the United States, nor our partners are in a position to capture him before he carries out a plot -- his citizenship should no more serve as a shield than a sniper shooting down on an innocent crowd should be protected from a SWAT team," Obama said.¶ To stop terrorists from gaining a foothold, drones will be deployed, Obama said, but only when there is an imminent threat; no hope of capturing the targeted terrorist; "near certainty" that civilians won't be harmed; and "there are no other governments capable of effectively addressing the threat." Never will a strike be punitive, he said.¶ Those who die as collateral damage "will haunt us for as long as we live," the president said, but he emphasized that the targeted individuals aim to exact indiscriminate violence, "and the death toll from their acts of terrorism against Muslims dwarfs any estimate of civilian casualties from drone strikes."¶ It's not always feasible to send in Special Forces, as in the Osama bin Laden raid, to stamp out terrorism, and even if it were, the introduction of troops could mean more deaths on both sides, Obama said.¶ "The result would be more U.S. deaths, more Blackhawks down, more confrontations with local populations and an inevitable mission creep in support of such raids that could easily escalate into new wars," he said.¶ The American public is split on where and how drones should be used, according to a March poll by Gallup.¶ Although 65% of respondents said drones should be used against suspected terrorists abroad, only 41% said drones should be used against American citizens who are suspected terrorists in foreign countries.

#### The drone lobby makes oversight useless

Michaels 13

(Martin Michaels, Mint Press staff writer, “The Human Side Of Drones: Congress Fails In Oversight” May 13, 2013, <http://www.mintpressnews.com/the-human-side-of-drones-congress-fails-in-oversight/158722/>, KB)

The drone lobby?¶ Standing in the way of proper congressional oversight has been the burgeoning drone lobby, an emerging force contributing to Congressional campaigns.¶ “This is all about money when it comes down to it. The fact that there is an unmanned Aerial Systems Caucus in Congress says it all. It’s shameful when you look at the millions of dollars the industry spends on both lobbying and contributing to Congressional candidates,” Benjamin said¶ “You see the collusion between our elected officials and the drone industry,” Benjamin said.¶ Drones represent big money for manufacturers and local communities promised thousands of manufacturing jobs.¶ A recent study by the Teal Group, an aviation and defense consulting firm, estimated that global spending on unmanned aircraft will almost double over the next decade, from $5.9 billion annually to $11.3 billion. Most of that growth will be in the United States.¶ The same study estimated that the drone industry would create 23,000 new jobs in the U.S. by 2025.¶ Political action committees affiliated with drone manufacturers donated a total of $2.3 million to the nearly 60 members of the bipartisan House Unmanned Systems Caucus, according to First Street Research. Seventy-seven percent of these donations went to Republicans.

#### Even if predictions in the abstract are wrong, policy debates is productive, improves predictive accuracy, and solves cession of the debate to cloistered experts

Tetlock and Gardner 2011 (Philip Tetlock is a professor of organizational behavior at the Haas Business School at the University of California-Berkeley, AND Dan Gardner is a columnist and senior writer for the Ottawa Citizen and the author of The Science of Fear, received numerous awards for his writing, including the Michener Award, M.A. History from York, "OVERCOMING OUR AVERSION TO ACKNOWLEDGING OUR IGNORANCE" July 11 www.cato-unbound.org/2011/07/11/dan-gardner-and-philip-tetlock/overcoming-our-aversion-to-acknowledging-our-ignorance/)

The optimists are right that there is much we can do at a cost that is quite modest relative to what is often at stake. For example, why not build on the IARPA tournament? Imagine a system for recording and judging forecasts. Imagine running tallies of forecasters’ accuracy rates. Imagine advocates on either side of a policy debate specifying in advance precisely what outcomes their desired approach is expected to produce, the evidence that will settle whether it has done so, and the conditions under which participants would agree to say “I was wrong.” Imagine pundits being held to account. Of course arbitration only works if the arbiter is universally respected and it would be an enormous challenge to create an analytical center whose judgments were not only fair, but perceived to be fair even by partisans dead sure they are right and the other guys are wrong. But think of the potential of such a system to improve the signal-to-noise ratio, to sharpen public debate, to shift attention from blowhards to experts worthy of an audience, and to improve public policy. At a minimum, it would highlight how often our forecasts and expectations fail, and if that were to deflate the bloated confidence of experts and leaders, and give pause to those preparing some “great leap forward,” it would be money well spent. But the pessimists are right, too, that fallibility, error, and tragedy are permanent conditions of our existence. Humility is in order, or, as Socrates said, the beginning of wisdom is the admission of ignorance. The Socratic message has always been a hard sell, and it still is—especially among practical people in business and politics, who expect every presentation to end with a single slide consisting of five bullet points labeled “The Solution.” We have no such slide, unfortunately. But in defense of Socrates, humility is the foundation of the fox style of thinking and much research suggests it is an essential component of good judgment in our uncertain world. It is practical. Over the long term, it yields better calibrated probability judgments, which should help you affix more realistic odds than your competitors on policy bets panning out.

#### Our impacts aren’t constructed until they prove it.

Yudkowsky 6 – Eliezer Yudkowsky, Research Fellow at the Singularity Institute for Artificial Intelligence that has published multiple peer-reviewed papers on risk assessment. Cognitive biases potentially affecting judgment of global risks Forthcoming in Global Catastrophic Risks, eds. Nick Bostrom and Milan Cirkovic. August 31, 2006.

Every true idea which discomforts you will seem to match the pattern of at least one psychological error. Robert Pirsig said: “The world’s biggest fool can say the sun is shining, but that doesn’t make it dark out.” If you believe someone is guilty of a psychological error, then demonstrate your competence by first demolishing their consequential factual errors. If there are no factual errors, then what matters the psychology? The temptation of psychology is that, knowing a little psychology, we can meddle in arguments where we have no technical expertise – instead sagely analyzing the psychology of the disputants. If someone wrote a novel about an asteroid strike destroying modern civilization, then someone might criticize that novel as extreme, dystopian, apocalyptic; symptomatic of the author’s naive inability to deal with a complex technological society. We should recognize this as a literary criticism, not a scientific one; it is about good or bad novels, not good or bad hypotheses. To quantify the annual probability of an asteroid strike in real life, one must study astronomy and the historical record: no amount of literary criticism can put a number on it. Garreau (2005) seems to hold that a scenario of a mind slowly increasing in capability, is more mature and sophisticated than a scenario of extremely rapid intelligence increase. But that’s a technical question, not a matter of taste; no amount of psychologizing can tell you the exact slope of that curve. It’s harder to abuse heuristics and biases than psychoanalysis. Accusing someone of conjunction fallacy leads naturally into listing the specific details that you think are burdensome and drive down the joint probability. Even so, do not lose track of the real- world facts of primary interest; do not let the argument become about psychology. Despite all dangers and temptations, it is better to know about psychological biases than to not know. Otherwise we will walk directly into the whirling helicopter blades of life. But be very careful not to have too much fun accusing others of biases. That is the road that leads to becoming a sophisticated arguer – someone who, faced with any discomforting argument, finds at once a bias in it. The one whom you must watch above all is yourself. Jerry Cleaver said: “What does you in is not failure to apply some high-level, intricate, complicated technique. It’s overlooking the basics. Not keeping your eye on the ball.” Analyses should finally center on testable real-world assertions. Do not take your eye off the ball.

# 2NC

## CP

### 2NC Process CPs Good

#### Education - core topic education is not whether to restrict, but who and how authority is restricted – discussing implementation is key

Elmore 80

Prof. Public Affairs at University of Washington, PolySci Quarterly 79-80, p. 605, 1980

The emergence of implementation as a subject for policy analysis coincides closely with the discovery by policy analysts that decisions are not self-executing. Analysis of policy choices matter very little if the mechanism for implementing those choices is poorly understood in answering the question, "What percentage of the work of achieving a desired governmental action is done when the preferred analytic alternative has been identified?" Allison estimated that in the normal case, it was about 10 percent, leaving the remaining 90 percent in the realm of implementation.

#### AND the president is engaging the public which proves our CP is timely and relevant

Brown and Sherman 13

(CARRIE BUDOFF BROWN, Carrie Budoff Brown She worked as a staff writer at the Hartford Courant and the Philadelphia Inquirer before arriving at POLITICO on the day it launched in 2007, now a White House reporter, and JAKE SHERMAN, covers Congress for POLITICO., “President Obama’s political capital spreads thin” 9/4/13, <http://www.politico.com/story/2013/09/obamas-political-capital-spreads-thin-96306_Page2.html>, KB)

“What the president has asked is what the American people should expect and no less, which is a respectful, nonpartisan, deliberative and thoughtful debate over one of the most difficult discussions and decisions that Congress participates in, which is the use of military force.

### AT Executive Controls Information Flow - Marshall 8

#### The CP provides caution that ensures the best outcome

Buchanan, ’13

(Bruce, Professor in Government at the University of Texas at Austin, Presidential Power and Accountability: Toward a Presidential Accountability System, Routledge, p. 115)

Finally, is this is an attack on the presidency? No, and here is why: first, policy trials are a way to ensure a more rigorous mode of policy analysis than presidents have undertaken in these circumstances by themselves. There are no guarantees, but there is also no denying that a policy that is carefully vetted before adoption has a better chance to work than a military venture that is rushed through under emo- tionally evocative circumstances. That is why a more cautious procedure helps all concerned: including the president, the Congress, and the people. Just as important, policy trials can be a way to head off untenable military initiatives. An agreement to stand down and think carefully before embracing a war option can make it easier to expose questionable proposals before they are launched. That too would clearly serve the interests of all.

## Tea Party DA

### AT TP Jacks Deal Inev

#### Debt ceiling will be raised now but it will be close – the aff makes compromise impossible

Victoria Craig 9/13/13, Fox Business, http://www.foxbusiness.com/government/2013/09/13/deja-vu-deep-divides-delay-deal-in-congress/

Taxes and spending: Two political hot button issues in Washington that become hotter by the day as Congress continues to edge closer to its debt limit deadline with no negotiation, or agreement, in sight. The U.S. is set to hit its debt limit by mid-October, according to the Treasury Department, and without an agreement by both chambers in Congress -- and both parties -- to raise that borrowing limit, the nation will begin to default on its financial obligations. If that wasn’t enough, adding to mounting tensions on Capitol Hill is the federal budget. Congress has failed to pass one for the last five consecutive years, and the nation will again require a stop-gap funding bill, or continuing resolution, by October 1 in order to keep the government's lights on until December. But with a tense environment in Washington following a heated battle in Congress over whether to pursue a strike in Syria following a chemical weapons attack there, battle lines remain deeply drawn, and negotiations appear hard to come by. And because of wasted time spent on Syria negotiations that didn’t result in a material solution, the legislative body has lost a week of valuable time that could have been used to focus on the debt ceiling and federal budget issues. Pair that with an upcoming recess in the House during the last week of the month -- and a threat by leadership to cancel it if no CR is agreed upon -- and you have a high-stakes, high-tension battle just waiting to explode. The Potomac Research Group argues House Speaker John Boehner and Majority Leader Eric Cantor are unable to rally their troops to secure a vote, signaling trouble in the coming days and weeks – and “full crisis mode” will have to be reached before both sides can hash out a palatable compromise. “The stridency in the House makes us even more worried the debt ceiling fight in October will go badly, with a genuine risk that Treasury will have to pick and choose which obligations it can fund,” the consultancy said in a note to clients. The threat of a government shutdown comes as a result of a desire by Republicans in the House to tie a continuing resolution to a repeal of the Affordable Care Act, President Obama’s signature health-care law. However, even if Republicans are able to muster the votes to pass a CR tied to an ObamaCare repeal, it would face a sure demise in the Senate, resulting, most likely, in a government shutdown. But Citigroup (C) sees the situation a little differently. In a letter to clients in August, the bank noted taxes and spending in the government are a critical divide, calling it almost “theological,” and said an agreement on these issues will always be a challenge. Still, despite the flurry of activity on the Hill, the bank notes a deal is easier to reach this time around than it was with the fiscal cliff fiasco of 2012. The bank sees “heated rhetoric battles (‘noise’) and near-death experiences (‘heart attacks’) coming to eventual resolution in the short-term, minimal budget package in the form of a Continuing Resolution.” With a Sequester Comes Consequences In a note to clients on Wednesday, Goldman Sachs (GS) said the effects of last year’s sequester are becoming clearer in economic data with each passing month. The note points to disappointing data in personal income which saw a paltry gain in July thanks to defense furloughs that reduced annual wages for the month; federal payrolls that have declined or remained flat since the sequester was implemented; and weighted effects on unemployment due to federal job losses that have become more pronounced. The investment bank said it sees continued federal job reductions, and if the sequester is renewed for another period, that trend is likely to stay on course. “If sequestration continues, more permanent adjustments will become necessary and agencies may be more willing to undertake them if Congress declines once again to reverse the cuts,” Goldman's analysts wrote. “Assuming agencies ultimately opt to make more permanent adjustments in response to spending restraint, hiring freezes are likely to be more strictly adhered to and are likely to result in additional net federal job losses.” Citigroup agrees, saying it looks increasingly likely a sequester renewal will take place, because the alternative – a government shutdown or debt default – is in neither party’s best interest. The bank said it expects a similar pattern of crisis-mode fights and negotiations of 2012 to emerge with the debate and discussions this time around as time ticks closer to both the debt limit and budget deadlines. “Without specific language to the contrary, sequestration will kick in again for (fiscal 2014). The size of sequestration will be smaller than 2013’s $85 billion, perhaps as low as the $21 billion difference in estimates,” Citigroup noted. Citi’s analysts predict another showdown fight in Congress after the current one ends, since the most likely scenario is for a continuing resolution through mid-December, and budget deal that will carry the government through the next three to six months.

#### Votes now – GOP and democrats will be enough to pass a bill.

BRUCE BARTLETT 9/13/13, The Fiscal Times, http://www.thefiscaltimes.com/Columns/2013/09/13/Debt-Ceiling-Trading-Places-Budget-Debate-Directors-Cut

Clinton won the shutdown fight hands down. Republicans took all the blame for the shutdown and were forced to retreat without getting anything in return. A new CNN/ORC poll shows that Republicans would again suffer most of the blame. Republican pragmatists also know that even threatening to default on the debt is like using nuclear weapons on yourself to get your enemy to surrender. In short, it’s completely nuts. This explains why Obama and congressional Democrats are just standing there like Murphy and Aykroyd in the orange juice trading pit of the New York Mercantile Exchange, seemingly oblivious to all the action going on within the Republican Party. While they appear passive, in fact they are just waiting for the right moment to step in and save the GOP from itself. Sooner or later they expect House Speaker John Boehner to come to them, hat in hand, begging for Democratic votes to pass some sort of budget to prevent a government shutdown and raise the debt limit. Boehner probably has enough Republican votes to pass a budget and a debt limit increase together with the Democrats. But a majority of House Republicans will undoubtedly vote “no.”

### 2NC Uniqueness Wall

#### Infuence is declining – infighting and factions

Fitzgerland 8/28

(Sandy Fitzgerald, Journalist, writer, editor, “IRS Scandal Fuels Tea Party Support” 28 Aug 2013, <http://www.newsmax.com/politics/irs-scandal-tea-party/2013/08/28/id/522684>, KB)

Those numbers, however, are still well below where they were in 2010, when 63 percent of Republicans approved of the movement's efforts. And it remains to be seen whether the movement can generate enough strength to achieve its goals of defunding Obamacare and electing a new round of conservatives to Congress, even if it means getting rid of establishment Republicans whose views are not conservative enough to satisfy tea party voters. ¶ The tea party has already painted targets on the backs of powerful GOP Sens. Lindsey Graham of South Carolina and Lamar Alexander of Tennessee. Each is expected to have several tea party challengers in their bids for re-election next year.¶ "Many traditional conservatives want the tea-party label — again — to distance themselves from the establishment," Republican political strategist John Feehery told the Journal. Feehery predicted tea party activists "will impact some Republican primaries in the midterm elections."¶ But Brad Woodhouse, president of the liberal Americans United for Change and former communications director for the Democratic National Committee, said he doesn't think the tea party's efforts will work.¶ "The tea party's renewed fervor won't translate to broader gains for the Republican Party," he said. "The Republicans are already losing August, because they are fighting with each other . . . whipsawed between establishment and extreme factions."

#### No influence - compromises, elections and lack of public support – mainstream republicans are gaining influence

AP 8/5 (Associated Press, August 5, 2013, <http://www.theepochtimes.com/n3/229399-tea-party-2016-revived-or-asleep/?preventCG=1#tok-congress>, “Tea Party 2016: Revived or Asleep?”, AB)

MIAMI—Some of its hot-headed darlings have compromised. Some of its activists are sitting out elections. This wasn’t the revolution the tea party had in mind. Four years ago, the movement and its potent mix of anger and populism persuaded thousands of costumed and sign-waving conservatives to protest the ballooning deficit and President Obama’s health care law. It swept a crop of no-compromise lawmakers into Congress and governor’s offices and transformed political up-and-comers, including Florida Sen. Marco Rubio, into household names. But as many tea party stars seek re-election next year and Rubio considers a 2016 presidential run, conservative activists are finding themselves at a crossroads. Many of their standard-bearers have embraced more moderate positions on bedrock issues such as immigration and health care, broadening their appeal in swing states but dampening grass-roots passion. “They keep sticking their finger in the eyes of the guys who got them elected,” said Ralph King, a co-founder of the Cleveland Tea Party Patriots. “A lot of people are feeling betrayed.” The tea party is a loosely knit web of activists, and some are hoping to rekindle the fire with 2014 primary challenges to wayward Republicans. But many more say they plan to sit out high-profile races in some important swing states next year, a move that GOP leaders fear could imperil the re-election prospects of former tea party luminaries, including the governors of Florida and Ohio.“It changes the playing field for us,” said Tom Gaitens, former Florida director of FreedomWorks, a political action committee that has spent millions of dollars to help tea party candidates. “The most powerful thing we have as a movement is our feet and our vote.” In the summer of 2009, tea party supporters stormed congressional town hall meetings, shouting down lawmakers who had voted for the bank bailout and the stimulus package. The movement’s voice grew louder after Democrats passed the health care overhaul, and voters took their outrage to the polls in 2010. The tea party wave stunned Democrats and many moderate Republicans, sweeping the GOP into control of the House and changing the balance of power in many statehouses. But not long after some tea party stars took office, political analysts said, they were forced to adapt to a changing landscape, particularly in states Obama won in 2012, and to the realities of governing. The tea party also fell out of favor with many people. At its height after the 2010 elections, a CBS News poll found that 31 percent of those surveyed considered themselves tea party supporters. A May survey found just 24 percent identified with the movement.

### Trade Impact

#### Tea Party control destroys globalization and increases protectionism

Barry Gewen 10 has been an editor at The New York Times Book Review, "How the Tea Party is Wrec king Republican Foreign Policy," 12-4-10, www.newrepublic.com/blog/foreign-policy/79647/tea-party-wrecking-republican-foreign-policy, DOA: 8-1-13, y2k

Similar forces are at play in the case of trade. Tea Partiers are suspicious of free trade and globalization in general, because they fear a loss of American jobs. Yet the Republican Party has traditionally been the party of free trade. The Tea Partiers will find their closest allies on this issue among Democrats, especially trade unionists. We just saw what the future politics of trade will look like when President Obama had trouble concluding a free-trade pact with South Korea, originally approved by George W. Bush in 2007. A coalition of Democrats and Tea Partiers inside and outside of Congress opposed it, despite its potential to boost our economy and strengthen crucial alliances in Asia. In truth, on both immigration and trade, the Tea Partiers are in favor of more government, not less, putting them at odds with Republican Party laissez-faire instincts. However they may feel about the evil of deficits, Tea Partiers are not libertarians. By majorities of almost two-to-one, they support Social Security and Medicare. As Scott Rasmussen and Douglas Schoen write in their book Mad As Hell, “it would be a profound mistake to say that they are an adjunct of the GOP.” But it’s on questions of America’s role in the world that the divisions between Tea Partiers and standard-issue Republicans begin to look like chasms. The key figures here are the Pauls, Ron and Rand, longtime congressman and recently elected senator, father and son. Ron Paul has been called “the Tea Party’s brain,” its “intellectual godfather”; Rand Paul, by virtue of his election victory, has made himself a powerful, perhaps the most powerful, Tea Party spokesman on the hill. The Pauls’ positions on foreign policy are not identical, but the links between them are more than genetic. In a recent statement for Foreign Policy magazine, Ron Paul called for an end to “the disastrous wars in Iraq and Afghanistan.” He went on: “We cannot talk about the budget deficit and spiraling domestic spending without looking at the costs of maintaining an American empire of more than 700 military bases in more than 120 foreign countries.” And like father, like son. Rand Paul has said that “part of the reason we are bankrupt as a country is that we are fighting so many foreign wars and have so many military bases around the world.” He opposes what he calls “a blank check for the military.” These freshly invigorated voices within the Republican Party are already finding common cause with doves inside the Democratic Party. Ron Paul has joined with Barney Frank in calling for the withdrawal of troops from Afghanistan and Iraq, as well as from Germany, Japan, and South Korea. “We don’t need to be the world’s policeman,” Paul said, echoing the Vietnam war protesters of an earlier era. Hawkish Republicans have taken note. Casting a suspicious eye at the Tea Partiers, John McCain has said, “I worry a lot about the rise of protectionism and isolationism in the Republican Party.” There was a truce within the party until the elections, but now, as Richard Viguerie warned, “a massive, almost historic battle for the heart and soul of the Republican Party begins.” Onlookers can expect to hear a great deal of name calling in coming months as charges of “isolationist” and “imperialist” fly back and forth.

#### Protectionism lowers the threshold for all conflict – makes escalation more likely – causes a laundry list of impacts

Patrick 2009 Stewart Patrick (senior fellow and director of the Program on International Institutions and Global Governance at the Council on Foreign Relations) March 2009 “Protecting Free Trade” The National Interest http://nationalinterest.org/article/protecting-free-trade-3060

President Obama and his foreign counterparts should reflect on the lessons of the 1930s-and the insights of Cordell Hull. The longest-serving secretary of state in American history (1933-1944), Hull helped guide the United States through the Depression and World War II. He also understood a fundamental truth: "When goods move, soldiers don't." In the 1930s, global recession had catastrophic political consequences-in part because policymakers took exactly the wrong approach. Starting with America's own Smoot Hawley Tariff of 1930, the world's major trading nations tried to insulate themselves by adopting inward looking protectionist and discriminatory policies. The result was a vicious, self-defeating cycle of tit-for-tat retaliation. As states took refuge in prohibitive tariffs, import quotas, export subsidies and competitive devaluations, international commerce devolved into a desperate competition for dwindling markets. Between 1929 and 1933, the value of world trade plummeted from $50 billion to $15 billion. Global economic activity went into a death spiral, exacerbating the depth and length of the Great Depression. The economic consequences of protectionism were bad enough. The political consequences were worse. As Hull recognized, global economic fragmentation lowered standards of living, drove unemployment higher and increased poverty-accentuating social upheaval and leaving destitute populations "easy prey to dictators and desperadoes." The rise of Nazism in Germany, fascism in Italy and militarism in Japan is impossible to divorce from the economic turmoil, which allowed demagogic leaders to mobilize support among alienated masses nursing nationalist grievances. Open economic warfare poisoned the diplomatic climate and exacerbated great power rivalries, raising, in Hull's view, "constant temptation to use force, or threat of force, to obtain what could have been got through normal processes of trade." Assistant Secretary William Clayton agreed: "Nations which act as enemies in the marketplace cannot long be friends at the council table." This is what makes growing protectionism and discrimination among the world's major trading powers today so alarming. In 2008 world trade declined for the first time since 1982. And despite their pledges, seventeen G-20 members have adopted significant trade restrictions. "Buy American" provisions in the U.S. stimulus package have been matched by similar measures elsewhere, with the EU ambassador to Washington declaring that "Nobody will take this lying down." Brussels has resumed export subsidies to EU dairy farmers and restricted imports from the United States and China. Meanwhile, India is threatening new tariffs on steel imports and cars; Russia has enacted some thirty new tariffs and export subsidies. In a sign of the global mood, WTO antidumping cases are up 40 percent since last year. Even less blatant forms of economic nationalism, such as banks restricting lending to "safer" domestic companies, risk shutting down global capital flows and exacerbating the current crisis. If unchecked, such economic nationalism could raise diplomatic tensions among the world's major powers. At particular risk are U.S. relations with China, Washington's most important bilateral interlocutor in the twenty-first century. China has called the "Buy American" provisions "poison"-not exactly how the Obama administration wants to start off the relationship. U.S. Treasury Secretary Timothy Geithner's ill-timed comments about China's currency "manipulation" and his promise of an "aggressive" U.S. response were not especially helpful either, nor is Congress' preoccupation with "unfair" Chinese trade and currency practices. For its part, Beijing has responded to the global slump by rolling back some of the liberalizing reforms introduced over the past thirty years. Such practices, including state subsidies, collide with the spirit and sometimes the law of open trade. The Obama administration must find common ground with Beijing on a coordinated response, or risk retaliatory protectionism that could severely damage both economies and escalate into political confrontation. A trade war is the last thing the United States needs, given that China holds $1 trillion of our debt and will be critical to solving flashpoints ranging from Iran to North Korea. In the 1930s, authoritarian great-power governments responded to the global downturn by adopting more nationalistic and aggressive policies. Today, the economic crisis may well fuel rising nationalism and regional assertiveness in emerging countries. Russia is a case in point. Although some predict that the economic crisis will temper Moscow's international ambitions, evidence for such geopolitical modesty is slim to date. Neither the collapse of its stock market nor the decline in oil prices has kept Russia from flexing its muscles from Ukraine to Kyrgyzstan. While some expect the economic crisis to challenge Putin's grip on power, there is no guarantee that Washington will find any successor regime less nationalistic and aggressive. Beyond generating great power antagonism, misguided protectionism could also exacerbate political upheaval in the developing world. As Director of National Intelligence Dennis Blair recently testified, the downturn has already aggravated political instability in a quarter of the world's nations. In many emerging countries, including important players like South Africa, Ukraine and Mexico, political stability rests on a precarious balance. Protectionist policies could well push developing economies and emerging market exporters over the edge. In Pakistan, a protracted economic crisis could precipitate the collapse of the regime and fragmentation of the state. No surprise, then, that President Obama is the first U.S. president to receive a daily economic intelligence briefing, distilling the security implications of the global crisis.

## Solvency

# 1NR

### Dfjidfsj

#### The plan guarantees backlash – AUMF proves

Hunt 13

(ALBERT R. HUNT, a columnist for Bloomberg View, the editorial arm of Bloomberg News, “Roadblocks Limit Scope for Change” June 2, 2013, <http://www.nytimes.com/2013/06/03/us/03iht-letter03.html>, KB)

Mr. Obama did something almost unheard of for a modern U.S. president: He called on Congress to limit his authority under the wide-ranging Authorization for Use of Military Force enacted in 2001.¶ The speech was a big deal. Still, it probably will have less effect than either the White House or its critics claim. This reflects the political polarization that dominates even national security issues in Washington and the inability to rally a conflict-weary public behind any global issue.¶ The reactions over the past 10 days have been predictable. Many Republicans and conservatives accused the president of capitulation and of emboldening the United States’ enemies. The left said the change of policy was too little, too late.

### AT Link Turns

#### The plan creates congressional fights – mssive GOp backlash

Zengerle and Spetalnick 13

#### Unrestricted use of drones is popular – no link turns, they’ve been supported for years with no oversight

Barry 13 <Tom, senior policy analyst and director of CIP's TransBorder Project, Barry specializes in immigration policy, homeland security, border security, and the outsourcing of national security. He co-founded the International Relations Center (IRC), and joined CIP in 2007. He has authored or co-authored more than twenty books on Mexico, Central America, the Caribbean, food aid, the United Nations, free trade and U.S. foreign policy, Drones Over the Homeland, April 23, 2013 [http://www.ciponline.org/research/html/drones-over-the-homeland>#SPS](http://www.ciponline.org/research/html/drones-over-the-homeland%3e#SPS)

The most unabashed advocates of drone proliferation, however, are in Congress. They claim drones can solve many of America’s most pressing problems – from eliminating terrorists to keeping the homeland safe from unwanted immigrants. However, there has been little congressional oversight of drone deployments, both at home and abroad. Since the post-9/11 congressional interest in drone issues – budgets, role in national airspace, overseas sales, border deployment and UAVs by law enforcement agencies – drone boosterism in Congress has been devoid of any incipient oversight or governance role. Drones made an appearance in the Senate in the first foray to implement immigration reform, when on January 28, 2013 a bipartisan group of senators argued their proposal legislation would “increase the number of unmanned aerial vehicles and surveillance equipment….”19 Drone promotion by U.S. representatives and senators in Congress pops up in what at first may seem the unlikeliest of places. Annually, House members join with UAS manufacturers to fill the foyer and front rooms of the Rayburn House Office Building with displays of the latest drones – an industry show introduced in glowing speeches by highly influential House leaders, notably Buck McKeon, the Southern California Republican who chairs the House Armed Service Committee and co-chairs the Congressional Unmanned Systems Caucus (CUSC) Advances in communications, aviation and surveillance technology have all accelerated the coming of UAVs to the home front.  Yet drones are not solely about technological advances. Money flows and political influence also factor in.

#### No link turns – Congress doesn’t care about oversight

Barry 13 <Tom, senior policy analyst and director of CIP's TransBorder Project, Barry specializes in immigration policy, homeland security, border security, and the outsourcing of national security. He co-founded the International Relations Center (IRC), and joined CIP in 2007. He has authored or co-authored more than twenty books on Mexico, Central America, the Caribbean, food aid, the United Nations, free trade and U.S. foreign policy, Drones Over the Homeland, April 23, 2013 <http://www.ciponline.org/research/html/drones-over-the-homeland>>#SPS

Since 2004, the DHS’s UAV program has drawn mounting concern and criticism from the government’s own oversight and research agencies, including the Congressional Research Service, the Government Accountability Office and the DHS’s own Office of Inspector General.43 These government entities have repeatedly raised questions about the cost-efficiency, strategic focus and performance of the homeland security drones. Yet, rather than subjecting DHS officials to sharp questioning, the congressional committees overseeing homeland security and border security operations have, for the most part, readily and often enthusiastically accepted the validity of undocumented assertions by testifying CBP officials. The House Subcommittee on Border and Maritime Security has been especially notorious for its lack of critical oversight. ¶ As part of the budgetary and oversight process, the House and Senate committees that oversee DHS have not insisted that CBP undertake cost-benefit evaluations, institute performance measures, implement comparative evaluations of its high-tech border security initiatives, or document how its UAV program responds to realistic threat assessments. Instead of providing proper oversight and ensuring that CBP/OAM’s drone program is accountable and transparent, congressional members from both parties seem more intent on boosting drone purchases and drone deployment.

### MPX

#### It’s a conflict multiplier – triggers all their impacts and make war inevitable

Ginsborg et al. 12

Mikkel Funder, Signe Marie Cold-Ravnkilde and Ida Peters Ginsborg - in collaboration with Nanna Callisen Bang, Denmark Institute for International Studies, 2012, "ADDRESSING CLIMATE CHANGE AND CONFLICT IN DEVELOPMENT COOPERATION EXPERIENCES FROM NATURAL RESOURCE MANAGEMENT" [www.diis.dk/graphics/Publications/Reports2012/RP2012-04-Addressing-climate-change\_web.jpg.pdf](http://www.diis.dk/graphics/Publications/Reports2012/RP2012-04-Addressing-climate-change_web.jpg.pdf)

2.2 Climate change as a conﬂict multiplier¶ **Climate change is therefore best seen as a** conﬂict multiplier**, rather than as a major direct cause of conﬂict in itself. Climate change may aggravate and extend the scope of existing conﬂicts, or trigger underlying and latent conﬂicts to break out into the open**. ¶ Previous studies have identiﬁed a number of areas in which **climate change may contribute to a worsening of conﬂicts** (Brown & Crawford 2009). These include:¶ • Land and water access**. Access and use rights to land are a key feature in most situations where climate change has contributed to natural resource conﬂicts so far. Climate change can intensify existing conﬂicts over land, as land becomes less fertile or is ﬂooded, or if existing resource sharing arrangements between diﬀerent users and land use practices are disrupted. In some parts of Africa, climate change may lead to a decline in available water resources of some 10–20% by the end of the century** (op cit.). **This may intensify existing competition for access to water at intra-state and/or subnational levels.** ¶ • Food security**. Reduced rainfall and rising sea levels may lead to a decline in agricultural production and a substantial loss of arable land in some parts of Africa. Reduced yields for own consumption and increasing domestic food prices may in some cases lead to civil unrest, and competition over access to land may intensify**.¶ • Migration and displacement. In some cases, **increased scarcity of and competition over access to water and arable land may contribute to internal or regional migration, and disasters such as ﬂoods may lead to temporary or long-term local displacement. This may in turn strengthen conﬂicts between host societies/communities and migrants looking for access to new land and resources**. ¶ • Increasing inequality and injustice. Through processes such as the above, **some population groups may be particularly hard hit, leading to increased inequality and a sense of injustice. This may intensify existing grievances and disputes between natural resource users and/or between resource users and outside actors such as governments – thereby** increasing the risk and intensity of conﬂict**.**

#### Warming causes hydrogen sulfide poisoning—extinction.

Ward 10

(Peter, PhD, professor of Biology and Earth and Space Sciences at the University of Washington, paleontologist and NASA astrobiologist, Fellow at the California Academy of Sciences, The Flooded Earth: Our Future in a World Without Ice Caps, June 29, 2010)

In the rest of this chapter I will support a contention that within several millennia (or less) the planet will see a changeover of the oceans from their current “mixed” states to something much different and dire. Oceans will become stratified by their oxygen content and temperature, with warm, oxygen-free water lining the ocean basins. Stratified oceans like this in the past (and they were present for most of Earth’s history) have always been preludes to biotic catastrophe. Because the continents were in such different positions at that time, models we use today to understand ocean current systems are still crude when it comes to analyzing the ancient oceans, such as those of the Devonian or Permian Periods. Both times witnessed major mass extinctions, and these extinctions were somehow tied to events in the sea. Yet catastrophic as it was, the event that turned the Canning Coral Reef of Devonian age into the Canning Microbial Reef featured at the start of this chapter was tame compared to that ending the 300 million- to 251 million-year-old Permian Period, and for this reason alone the Permian ocean and its fate have been far more studied than the Devonian. But there is another reason to concentrate on the Permian mass extinction: it took place on a world with a climate more similar to that of today than anytime in the Devonian. Even more important, it was a world with ice sheets at the poles, something the more tropical Devonian Period may never have witnessed. For much of the Permian Period, the Earth, as it does today, had abundant ice caps at both poles, and there were large-scale continental glaciations up until at least 270 million years ago, and perhaps even later.4 But from then until the end of the Permian, the planet rapidly warmed, the ice caps disappeared, and the deep ocean bottoms filled with great volumes of warm, virtually oxygen-free seawater. The trigger for disaster was a short-term but massive infusion of carbon dioxide and other greenhouse gases into the atmosphere at the end of the Permian from the spectacular lava outpourings over an appreciable portion of what would become northern Asia. The lava, now ancient but still in place, is called the “Siberian Traps,” the latter term coming from the Scandinavian for lava flows. The great volcanic event was but the start of things, and led to changes in oceanography. The ultimate kill mechanism seems to have been a lethal combination of rising temperature, diminishing oxygen, and influx into water and air of the highly poisonous compound hydrogen sulfide. The cruel irony is that this latter poison was itself produced by life, not by the volcanoes. The bottom line is that life produced the ultimate killer in this and surely other ancient mass extinctions. This finding was one that spurred me to propose the Medea Hypothesis, and a book of the same name.5 Hydrogen sulfide poisoning might indeed be the worst biological effect of global warming. There is no reason that such an event cannot happen again, given short-term global warming. And because of the way the sun ages, it may be that such events will be ever easier to start than during the deep past. How does the sun get involved in such nasty business as mass extinction? Unlike a campfire that burns down to embers, any star gets ever hotter when it is on the “main sequence,” which is simply a term used to described the normal aging of a star—something like the progression we all go through as we age. But new work by Jeff Kiehl of the University of Colorado shows that because the sun keeps getting brighter, amounts of CO2 that in the past would not have triggered the process result in stagnant oceans filled with H2S-producing microbes. His novel approach was to estimate the global temperature rise to be expected from carbon dioxide levels added to the energy hitting the earth from the sun. Too often we refer to the greenhouse effect as simply a product of the gases. But it is sunlight that actually produces the heat, and that amount of energy hitting the earth keeps increasing. He then compared those to past times of mass extinctions. The surprise is that a CO2 level of 1,000 ppm would—with our current solar radiation—make our world the second hottest in Earth history—when the five hottest were each associated with mass extinction. In the deep history of our planet, there have been at least five short intervals in which the majority of living species suddenly went extinct. Biologists are used to thinking about how environmental pressures slowly choose the organisms most fit for survival through natural selection, shaping life on Earth like an artist sculpting clay. However, mass extinctions are drastic examples of natural selection at its most ruthless, killing vast numbers of species at one time in a way hardly typical of evolution. In the 1980s, Nobel Prize-winning physicist Luis Alvarez, and his son Walter Alvarez, first hypothesized that the impact of comets or asteroids caused the mass extinctions of the past.6 Most scientists slowly come to accept this theory of extinction, further supported by the discovery of a great scar in the earth—an impact crater—off the coast of Mexico that dates to around the time the dinosaurs went extinct. An asteroid probably did kill off the dinosaurs, but the causes of the remaining four mass extinctions are still obscured beneath the accumulated effects of hundreds of millions of years, and no one has found any credible evidence of impact craters. Rather than comets and asteroids, it now appears that short-term global warming was the culprit for the four other mass extinctions. I detailed the workings of these extinctions first in a 1996 Discover magazine article,7 then in an October 2006 Scientific American article, and finally in my 2007 book, Under a Green Sky.8 In each I considered whether such events could happen again. In my mind, such extinctions constitute the worst that could happen to life and the earth as a result of short-term global warming. But before we get to that, let us look at the workings of these past events. The evidence at hand links the mass extinctions with a changeover in the ocean from oxygenated to anoxic bottom waters. The source of this was a change in where bottom waters are formed. It appears that in such events, the source of our earth’s deep water shifted from the high latitudes to lower latitudes, and the kind of water making it to the ocean bottoms was different as well: it changed from cold, oxygenated water to warm water containing less oxygen. The result was the extinction of deep-water organisms. Thus a greenhouse extinction is a product of a changeover of the conveyor-belt current systems found on Earth any time there is a marked difference in temperatures between the tropics and the polar regions. Let us summarize the steps that make greenhouse extinction happen. First, the world warms over short intervals due to a sudden increase in carbon dioxide and methane, caused initially by the formation of vast volcanic provinces called flood basalts. The warmer world affects the ocean circulation systems and disrupts the position of the conveyor currents. Bottom waters begin to have warm, low-oxygen water dumped into them. The warming continues, and the decrease of equator-to-pole temperature differences brings ocean winds and surface currents to a near standstill. The mixing of oxygenated surface waters with the deeper and volumetrically increasing low-oxygen bottom waters lessens, causing ever-shallower water to change from oxygenated to anoxic. Finally, the bottom water exists in depths where light can penetrate, and the combination of low oxygen and light allows green sulfur bacteria to expand in numbers, filling the low-oxygen shallows. The bacteria produce toxic amounts of H2S, with the flux of this gas into the atmosphere occurring at as much as 2,000 times today’s rates. The gas rises into the high atmosphere, where it breaks down the ozone layer. The subsequent increase in ultraviolet radiation from the sun kills much of the photosynthetic green plant phytoplankton. On its way up into the sky, the hydrogen sulfide also kills some plant and animal life, and the combination of high heat and hydrogen sulfide creates a mass extinction on land.9 Could this happen again? No, says one of the experts who write the RealClimate.org Web site, Gavin Schmidt, who, it turns out, works under Jim Hansen at the NASA Goddard Space Flight Center near Washington, DC. I disagreed and challenged him to an online debate. He refused, saying that the environmental situation is going to be bad enough without resorting to creating a scenario for mass extinction. But special pleading has no place in science. Could it be that global warming could lead to the extinction of humanity? That prospect cannot be discounted. To pursue this question, let us look at what might be the most crucial of all systems maintaining habitability on Planet Earth: the thermohaline current systems, sometimes called the conveyor currents.