## 2AC Iran DA

#### No negotiations now – Obama is looking to first strike Iran in the SQ – that’s the Greenwald evidence

#### Only removing the military threat is critical to changing Iranian perception of the US

Glaser 09/23 (John Glaser is Editor of Antiwar.com. His articles have been published at The American Conservative Magazine, “Why diplomacy with Iran is doomed” Opinion, September http://www.aljazeera.com/indepth/opinion/2013/09/2013923112820696548.html)

When asked what the Iranians see instead as the real issue, Mousavian stated bluntly, “They believe the US is just after a regime change.”¶ In the bird's eye view, it is hard to see the US approach to Iran as cordial. In the last decade, the US has waged two aggressive wars along Iran's east and west coast, in Afghanistan and Iraq; it constantly floods the Persian Gulf, directly to Iran's south, with fleets of navy warships; it supplies money and weapons to Iran's most threatening regional adversaries, Israel and Saudi Arabia; it has perpetrated the most significant offensive cyber-attack in the 21st century against Iran; and it is imposing aggressive economic warfare that has crippled the economy, all as punishment for a nuclear weapons program that America's most informed intelligence agencies say doesn't exist.¶ From this perspective, foreseeing anything but regime change requires serious effort.¶ For the first time in years, respected experts in both Washington and Tehran are expressing sincere hopes for some kind of rapprochement between the US and Iran, or at least an equitable resolution to the nuclear issue. But any real negotiations are doomed if one party to the talks is certain the other is intent on its destruction.¶ Indeed, if Washington continues its hostile approach, Iran is heavily incentivised to double down on uranium enrichment and begin a nuclear weapons program in earnest. Lessons from Iraq, Libya, and North Korea demonstrate nuclear weapons are the only dependable deterrent against invasion or regime change. And before Tehran gets there, the trigger-happy Israelis are sure to strike preemptively, drawing in the US to what would surely become a regional conflagration.¶ If two purportedly moderate presidents are to have any chance of ushering in an enduring settlement, then military posturing, sanctions, and regime change have to be off the table for both sides. Only then could we capitalise on this historic opportunity.

#### Plan solves the terminal impact – only creation of the Grand Bargain removes the incentive to prolif

#### Ev says that they’re worried about Obama holding up his end of the deal – proves plan is key because the plan results in the creation of the Grand Bargain – also proves CP doesn’t solve

WE solve the link – . If—under the most optimistic scenarios—it reaches a satisfactory negotiated solution (or establishes a process toward one) with Iran, it will need Congress onboard; otherwise it will find its freedom to maneuver and deliver on assurances severely constrained.

## T-Authority

#### We meet – it is an authority to strike/use force against a country that is an imminent threat to security

#### Authority is power to influence or command

Goodman 93 OPINION BY: BY THE COURT; JAMES A. GOODMAN, judge In re: JANICE T. BOURQUE, Debtor Case No. 91-10570 Chapter 13 UNITED STATES BANKRUPTCY COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF MASSACHUSETTS 153 B.R. 87; 1993 Bankr. LEXIS 563; 93-1 U.S. Tax Cas. (CCH) P50,327; 71 A.F.T.R.2d (RIA) 1626 April 12, 1993, Decided lexis

The court in In re Premo, supra, considered whether the ultimate authority to control corporate tax payments is equivalent for purposes of section 6672 to having a "duty" to make such payments. It noted that the term "duty" is defined as "obligatory tasks, conduct, service, or function that arise from one's position", while the word "authority" is defined as the "power to influence or command thought, opinion, or behavior." 116 Bankr. at 525, quoting Webster's Ninth New Collegiate Dictionary (1985). Accordingly, it determined that the terms were not synonymous, and the IRS's reliance upon Monday v. United States, 421 F.2d 1210 (7th Cir.), [\*\*21] cert. denied, 400 U.S. 821, 27 L. Ed. 2d 48, 91 S. Ct. 38 (1970), was misplaced. In Monday, the court ruled that HN7Go to this Headnote in the case.corporate office does not per se impose the duties imposed by section 6672: "liability attaches to those with the power and responsibility within the corporate structure for seeing that the taxes withheld from various sources are remitted to the Government." 421 F.2d at 1214-15. The court went on to state that "this duty is generally found in high corporate officials charged with general control over corporate business affairs who participate in decisions concerning payment of creditors and the disbursal of funds. Id. (emphasis in original).

#### Discretion is limited to the range of authority ---- topical action must limit the authority, not discretion within authority

Luna, 2k Erik Luna, Associate Professor, University of Utah College of Law Iowa Law Review May, 2000

85 Iowa L. Rev. 1107 ARTICLE: Transparent Policing

For present purposes, a modest definition will suffice--discretion is the power to choose between two or more courses of conduct. An official, therefore, has discretion when the boundaries of hisauthority leave him with the freedom to choose how to act--or not to act. n88 This discretionary power is a "residual" n89 concept, the latitude remaining after the authority and decisions of other actors have been tallied. Dworkin employed a colorful simile for discretion to capture its relative, contextual nature: "Discretion, like the hole of a doughnut, does not exist except as an area left open by a surrounding belt of restriction." n90 Using this pastry-based metaphor, imagine a box containing a single doughnut. If the box's total area represents all potential courses of conduct for a particular actor, and the doughnut symbolizes the restrictions on the actor's discretion, the region within the doughnut--the doughnut hole--delineates the totality of his discretionary power. Outside of this area, the actor has no freedom of choice; he must either act in a prescribed manner or not act at all. In other words, the actor is without discretion.

#### Limits – they prevent the aff from debating any specific use of force.

#### Ground – all their da’s should apply to the use of force against Iran.

#### Reasonability – competing interpretations causes a race

## T

#### We meet – we preclude the use of force of hostilies against Iran via the president’s power – gutcheck the plan text says statuoritily preclude which means Congress doesn’t set precedent on its own use of force

#### If congress passed a separate violation then they could do it

#### Congress doesn’t have the ability to use forces but they can declare war -- doesn’t limit congressional warpower

## XO CP

#### Perm do both

#### Doesn’t solve Iran – the president alone isn’t credible. Iran needs to believe that the grand bargain would be approved in congress. That’s Alterman.

#### Doesn’t solve Israel – the strongest support for Iran strikes is coming from congress – their plan text only says prohibit strikes from US

Times of Israel, 13 (Senate backs Israel in event of strike on Iran nuclear weapon program. http://www.timesofisrael.com/senate-votes-to-back-possible-strike-on-iran-nuclear-weapon-program/)

NEW YORK — In a show of force, the United States Senate on Wednesday unanimously passed a resolution urging an uncompromising US stance against Iranian efforts to acquire nuclear weapons, calling for Washington’s support should Israel strike the program.¶ “If the Government of Israel is compelled to take military action in legitimate self-defense against Iran’s nuclear weapons program, the United States Government should stand with Israel and provide, in accordance with United States law and the constitutional responsibility of Congress to authorize the use of military force, diplomatic, military, and economic support to the Government of Israel in its defense of its territory, people, and existence,” the resolution reads.¶ It also calls for the US to take “such action as may be necessary” to keep Iran from obtaining a nuclear weapons capability.¶ While senators are careful in their calls for US military intervention, the resolution, which passed 99-0, is seen as the most direct expression yet heard from Washington reflecting support for a potential Israeli strike.¶ “I cannot emphasize enough my strong concerns about Iran’s nuclear program and the extraordinary threat it poses to the United States, to Israel and to the entire international community,” Senator Bob Menendez (D-NJ), the powerful chair of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, said in a speech on the Senate floor before Wednesday’s vote.¶ Diploma tic efforts “have failed to achieve their central objective — getting Iran to make concessions on the nuclear program,” Menendez said. “It is clear to me that we cannot allow the Iranians to continue to drag their feet by talking while all the while they grow their nuclear program.”¶ Menendez cited an International Atomic Energy Agency report released earlier Wednesday which said Iran was speeding up its enrichment work at Natanz.¶ “We cannot allow Iran to buy more time talking — even as the centrifuges keep spinning. There is no doubt, there has never been a doubt – not in my mind – that a nuclear-armed Iran is not an option,” he said.¶ The resolution, he said, “makes clear that a nuclear Iran is not an option, and that the Unites States has Israel’s back… Iran’s leaders must understand, that unless they change course their situation will only get worse and economic struggles and international isolation will only grow. They must understand that at the end of the day their pursuit of a nuclear weapons capability will make them less, not more secure.”¶ It also contained a message for Israel, Menendez continued.¶ “The bottom line: Israel should always understand that the United States has its back, that we will not allow Iran to obtain nuclear weapons capability, and, if we are forced to, we will take whatever means necessary to prevent this outcome,” he said.¶ The resolution itself “declares that the United States has a vital national interest in, and unbreakable commitment to, ensuring the existence, survival, and security of the State of Israel, and reaffirms United States support for Israel’s right to self-defense.”¶ The resolution was introduced by Menendez and Senator Lindsey Graham (R-SC), and had 92 cosponsors (out of 100 senators) by the time it reached the Senate floor for a vote. It passed unanimously.¶ Reactions to the resolution included enthusiastic support by pro-Israel groups and criticism by groups opposed to further sanctions or military measures against Iran’s nuclear program.¶ The “Senate action…comes at a critical moment as Iran stands on the verge of attaining nuclear weapons capability following repeated defiance of the international community,” the American Israel Public Affairs Committee said on Wednesday.¶ “The passage of this resolution is an extremely significant and timely statement of solidarity with Israel and a restatement of America’s determination to thwart Iran’s nuclear quest – which endangers American, Israeli, and international security,” AIPAC said.¶ Meanwhile, the National Iranian American Council said the resolution amounted to “saber rattling.”¶ “Apparently the Senate thinks the standoff between the US and Iran suffers from a lack of brinksmanship,” the group’s policy director Jamal Abdi said. “Washington and Tehran are stuck in a vicious cycle of mutual escalation that can only be broken through the give and take of serious negotiations, not through further saber rattling.”¶ He called on Congress to “abstain from any more reckless threats or sanctions that push us closer to the brink of war with Iran. Instead, Congress should ensure diplomacy can succeed by making it absolutely clear and credible that, in exchange for verifiable concessions that prevent Iran from obtaining a nuclear weapon, sanctions will be lifted.”

#### Perm do the cp

#### We fiat the usfg – means that the president is included in the plan.

#### Xo’s are statutory – they carry the force of law and are codified.

#### Credibility only links to the cp – the plan only limits the president in one country. The cp is seen as part of a doctrinal shift by the president.

#### The next president could repeal an xo and it would be ignored while Obama is in office.

Pope 11 [Robert S. Pope, Lieutenant Colonel, USAF, Former Research Fellow, Belfer International Security Program, 2009–2010 Interagency Task Forces The Right Tools for the Job Strategic Studies Quarterly ♦ Summer 2011]

Large changes to the national security system above the single agency or department level would most certainly require action by the president and Congress. Some have argued that a presidential executive order would be sufficient to enact the proposed reforms.93 While an executive order might change the interagency system during the current administration, **history indicates it would be unlikely to remain under the next president.94** For example, President Clinton’s new process for interagency reconstruction and stabilization operations, described in Presidential Decision Directive-56 (PDD-56), did not outlast his presidency, nor was it generally followed while he was in office.95 Nor does an executive order presuppose any support from Congress, which funds the executive branch agencies. Because political power in Congress is often strongly tied to the large sums of money associated with the defense budget, Congress will certainly want to be involved in any reforms that change the national security structure. The CSIS “Beyond Goldwater-Nichols” study team noted: “The role of Congress in the process is the most crucial determinant of the prospects for a reform effort. The recommendations that flow from congressionally mandated groups, commissions, or blue ribbon panels are more likely to lead to lasting changes than efforts launched exclusively at the executive branch level.”96 **Enduring change comes from legislation.** Examples include the 1947 National Security Act which created, among other things, the National Security Council and the Department of Defense; the 1986 GoldwaterNichols Act which created the joint military team; the 2002 act which created the Department of Homeland Security; and the 2004 act which created the office of the Director of National Intelligence.

#### Object fiat – the counterplan fiats the object of the resolution. Means we can’t generate offense since it fiats what the plan attempts to effect and justifies counterplans like Iran shouldn’t proliferate or Israel shouldn’t attack.

#### Statute makes congress a stakeholder -- key to permanence and stability.

Lederman 9 [Gordon, National Security Reform for the Twenty-first Century: A New National Security Act and Reflections on Legislation’s Role in Organizational Change, headed the Project on National Security Reform’s Legal Working Group from 2007 to 2009. Currently a Congressional staffer, he served on the staff of the National Commission on Terrorist Attacks upon the United States (the “9/11 Commission”) from May 2003 to July 2004. This article is based on an address delivered to the National Security Law Section at the Association of American Law Schools’ annual meeting in 2009. JOURNAL OF NATIONAL SECURITY LAW &POLICY [Vol. 3:363 2009] LEGISLATION’S ROLE IN ORGANIZATIONAL CHANGE 367]

However, a statute brings benefits as well, despite the lengthy period of time necessary to enact it. A statute creates **permanence**, which **provides stability** for the system and also can overcome resistance from entrenched bureaucrats who might otherwise think that they can wait out an administration until the next President issues a new executive order. In addition, a statute makes Congress a stakeholder and makes it more likely that Congress will conduct **vigorous oversight** – including by getting commitments from nominees that they will implement the statute aggressively. Finally, a statute can tap into Congress’s premier constitutional power for compelling executive branch action: the power of the purse. The President may create structures and processes and fund them temporarily by transferring resources, but ultimately it is Congress that provides resources on a sustained basis. Without Congress’s input and resources, a presidentially imposed solution to interagency integration may wither for lack of funding.

#### Counterplan links to politics.

Hallowell 13 [Billy Hallowell, writer for The Blaze, B.A. in journalism and broadcasting from the College of Mount Saint Vincent in Riverdale, New York and an M.S. in social research from Hunter College in Manhattan, “HERE’S HOW OBAMA IS USING EXECUTIVE POWER TO BYPASS LEGISLATIVE PROCESS” Feb. 11, 2013, http://www.theblaze.com/stories/2013/02/11/heres-how-obamas-using-executive-power-to-bylass-legislative-process-plus-a-brief-history-of-executive-orders/]

“In an era of polarized parties and a fragmented Congress, the opportunities to legislate are few and far between,” Howell said. “So presidents have powerful incentive to go it alone. And they do.”¶ And **the political opposition howls.¶** Sen. Marco Rubio, R-Fla., a possible contender for the Republican presidential nomination in 2016, said that on the gun-control front in particular, Obama is “abusing his power by imposing his policies via executive fiat instead of allowing them to be debated in Congress.”¶ The Republican reaction is to be expected, said John Woolley, co-director of the American Presidency Project at the University of California in Santa Barbara.¶ “For years there has been a **growing concern** about unchecked executive power,” Woolley said. “It tends to have a partisan content, with contemporary complaints coming from the incumbent president’s opponents.”

#### Since Congress can’t directly backlash against an XO, it’ll tank Obama’s other issues.

Risen 10 [Clay Risen, assistant editor of The New Republic, 8/4/10 [http://www.prospect.org/web/page.ww?section=root&name=ViewPrint&articleId=8140]

Congress provides an additional, if somewhat less effective, check on executive orders. In theory, any executive order can be later annulled by Congress. But in the last 34 years, during which presidents have issued some 1,400 orders, it has defeated just three. More often, Congress will counter executive orders by indirect means, holding up nominations or bills until the president relents. “There’s always the potential that a Congress angry about one issue will respond by limiting other things you want,” says Mayer.

#### Israel doesn’t trust the president acting alone.

Kalb, 13 (Marvin, James Clark Welling Fellow at The George Washington University and a member of Atlantic Community Advisory Board, and a Guest Scholar in Foreign Policy at The Brookings Institution. The Road to War

Presidential Commitments Honored and Betrayed. http://www.brookings.edu/research/books/2013/the-road-to-war)

No dosubt, presidential commitments are seen as serious, almost sacred, promises to act made by a chief executive on behalf of his administration. And other nations may view these commitments as binding nation-to-nation promises that succeeding administrations will honor, too. But there is a problem. Will they?¶ In 1982, for example, President Ronald Reagan pledged America’s “iron- clad commitment to the defense of Israel.” The commitment made sense to Reagan at the time, and it has been echoed by one president after another ever since. But does Reagan’s pledge have the same resonance now that it did then? Does it mean that if Israel feels it must bomb Iran to stop its nuclear program that America must join in the attack? Much has to do with trust between leaders and countries. Do Israeli leaders trust President Barack Obama as much as they did Bill Clinton and George W. Bush? These are questions that cut to the heart—and viability—of a presidential commitment.¶ Words have consequence. Spoken by a president, they can often become American policy, with or without congressional approval. When a president “commits” the United States to a controversial course of action, he may be setting the nation on the road to war or on a road to reconciliation. In matters of national security, his powers have become awesome—his word decisive. Who decides when we go to war? The president decides. As former national security adviser Zbigniew Brzezinski told me, it “all depends” on the president. “It’s his call.” Likewise, it is his decision when and whether, and under what conditions, to support a friendly nation.¶ A president, such as Barack Obama, for example, pledges that the United States has “an ironclad commitment” to Israel’s security—meaning, one would imagine, that if Israel were attacked, the United States would come to Israel’s defense. Is there anything more to this commitment than a presidential promise? Obviously, yes. Israel enjoys broad-based support from Congress and the American people. For the most part, both nations share common values and common aims. But the president is the key to determining the flow and texture of this delicate relationship.¶ A question often asked by political leaders in Israel is whether Obama will live up to his word. Will his commitment be honored or betrayed by him or by a successor? The answer to this question can mean war or peace. Might it not be better for both nations to negotiate a formal defense treaty—and, in this way, try to reduce or even eliminate areas of doubt in their relationship? Those who question the value or relevance of a U.S.-Israeli defense treaty point out that in recent years Obama has tried to organize Israeli-Palestinian peace talks only to fail abysmally because of Palestinian objections to Israeli settlements and Israeli insistence on building such settlements in the name of security. How would a treaty resolve these problems, they ask? Indeed, even the effort to negotiate a defense treaty would likely kick up fresh tumult and anxiety among Arab states, which are apt to see a U.S. treaty with Israel as proof that the United States can no longer be counted on as an impartial negotiator.¶ Another question: Obama has warned, more than once: “Let there be no doubt—America is determined to prevent Iran from getting nuclear weapons.” Though the world has heard this warning, there are still many, especially in the Middle East, who question whether Obama would really use American military power to stop Iran from “getting nuclear weapons,” however that phrase might be defined. It is said in Washington and Jerusalem that never before have Israel and the United States been in closer alignment on stopping Iran from developing a nuclear weapon. True, and yet not quite true. In the final analysis, for reasons both political and military, Israel may, on its own, strike Iran. Would it then expect American diplomatic and military support? Obama has strongly implied yes. But, without a mutual defense treaty, there may always be a question about the durability and reliability of a presidential commitment.

#### Congress is key or the perm solves

Matthew Waxman, professor of law at Columbia Law School and an adjunct senior fellow at the Council on Foreign Relations. He previously served as principal deputy director of policy planning (2005–7) and acting director of policy planning (2007) at the US Department of State, 1/28/13, Executive-Congressional Relations and National Security, www.advancingafreesociety.org/the-briefing/executive-congressional-relations-and-national-security/

The last four years should have been a good period for executive-congressional relations in the areas of national security and foreign affairs. The president, vice president, and secretary of state were former Senators. They all viewed President George W. Bush as too inclined to bypass or ignore Congress and they promised to do better. And the Obama administration started with Democratic majorities in the House and Senate.¶ It is thus surprising that the past four years have been notable for inter-branch clashes and paralysis on some major national security agenda items, with the administration failing to engage Congress or operating in a slowly reactive mode, while many congressional Republicans remain in an obstructionist mode. In the second term, the Obama administration will need to pick its legislative priorities more deliberately, engage with allies and opponents in Congress more actively, and be willing to negotiate compromises or wage aggressive campaigns on key issues.¶ Congress has repeatedly stifled the president’s signature counterterrorism promise to close the Guantanamo Bay detention facility. Congress’s opposition has been more than political. Beginning with legislation in 2010 when Democrats controlled both houses of Congress, Congress has consistently placed legal barriers on the president’s ability to transfer Guantanamo detainees or to try them in civilian courts in the United States. After hinting in his speech at the National Archives in 2009 that he would work with Congress on these issues, Obama has put forward no proposal of his own, nor has his administration been willing to explore possible compromises on long-term Guantanamo policies, instead playing defense against moves by congressional blocs with their own Guantanamo agendas. That defensive strategy has included a series of veto threats, which were always abandoned in the end and now carry little credibility.¶ With regard to war powers, the administration barely escaped a significant congressional rebuke after it failed to obtain congressional authorization for the operations in Libya in 2011 or at least to advance a convincing account for why such authorization was not needed. The administration conducted international diplomacy effectively, and obtained UN Security Council and Arab League endorsement of military operations to protect Libyan civilians from slaughter. However, on the domestic front it alienated even congressional supporters of its policy with poor early consultation on the Hill. In the end, Senate Majority Leader Harry Reid prevented the Senate from taking up a resolution passed by the Foreign Relations Committee that would have authorized the operation but rejected the administration’s strained interpretation of the War Powers Resolution. Throughout the Libya crisis, the administration’s approach toward Congress was passive and tentative. It was fortunate for the administration that Congress was splintered and few members were willing to defend its institutional prerogatives, at least within the limited timeframe of the intervention. But Obama might not be so lucky the next time.¶ As to treaties, the administration garnered super-majority Senate advice and consent on a record-low number of agreements in its first term. Despite a strong effort by Secretary of State Hillary Clinton and the Navy leadership, the administration failed to get the UN Convention on the Law of the Sea out of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee. Once again, part of the explanation for failure was the administration’s poorly timed and coordinated engagement of the Senate on the issue. In the face of Senate Republican portrayals of other global treaties as threats to US sovereignty, the White House failed to throw its full weight behind its valid arguments that the Law of the Sea Convention would strengthen the US position with respect, for example, to crisis hotspots in Asia and in commercial spheres.¶ To be clear, the Obama administration has scored successes, too. For example, putting aside the policy merits, it worked reasonably well with Congress on the completed wind-down of the Iraq war. It will need to do the same with respect to the planned wind-down of the Afghanistan war and in developing a long-term strategy for Afghanistan and Pakistan. Much of the blame for policy incoherence on many national security issues such as cybersecurity lies with Congress, which is infected by political polarization and dysfunction as much in international affairs as it is in domestic affairs.¶ Going forward, the Obama administration will need to bring the same kind of sustained attention and hard-nosed strategic thinking to its legislative agenda on national security issues as it has on some major domestic policy issues. First, it will need to be selective in its legislative agenda and then wage aggressive campaigns on matters it labels national security priorities. It did so early in the first term with respect to the New START Treaty, which was in danger of collapse until the administration went all out for it. Obama’s team enlisted influential allies from previous Republican administrations, engaged in a serious communications campaign at the highest levels, and negotiated as necessary to get the key votes in favor of the treaty.¶ On some issues, the administration will need to decide on a coherent policy internally and then more actively engage both its allies and opponents on Capitol Hill. One area where this will be important is the legal architecture of counterterrorism policy. It is widely understood that continuing to rely on the September 2001 congressional Authorization for Use of Military Force as the basis for detention and targeting operations is increasingly problematic as al Qaeda splinters apart and as the United States winds down combat operations in Afghanistan. The Obama administration also maintains publicly a commitment to closing Guantanamo. Yet it has not come forward with proposed legislative frameworks for dealing with these issues. Even though the president has said repeatedly that he wants to work with Congress on a more durable legal architecture for counterterrorism operations, the administration has been reactive and appears to be undecided about what, if anything, it wants from Congress.¶ Another area in which executive-congressional relations will feature heavily is Iran’s nuclear build-up, surely one of the most delicate and complex international crises the administration will face this year. After engaging seriously only at the last minute, it has had to swallow several times congressionally-mandated sanctions that it regards as counterproductive. As the administration tries to ramp up pressure, it will need to convince skeptical members of Congress that it is applying tough diplomatic pressure on other UN Security Council members and on Iran’s trading partners. If—under the most optimistic scenarios—it reaches a satisfactory negotiated solution (or establishes a process toward one) with Iran, it will need Congress onboard; otherwise it will find its freedom to maneuver and deliver on assurances severely constrained.

#### EOs cost capital.

Belco 13 [Michelle Belco, Political Science at Houston, and Brandon Rottinghaus, Presidential Proclamations Project at the University of Houston Political Research Quarterly published online 28 August 2013 In Lieu of Legislation: Executive Unilateral Preemption or Support during the Legislative Process Political Research Quarterly XX(X) 1–13 © 2013 University of Utah]

Presidents may use unilateral orders to set the political agenda of the nation without input from members of Congress (Fine and Warber 2012); however, this runs the risk of circumventing the negotiating process with members of Congress with whom the president must later bargain. Neustadt ([1960] 1990) warns directly of this problem when he counsels that presidents should prefer to bargain with Congress (see Mayer 2009, 428). Yet, a president’s short-term interest in pursuing successful policy outcomes may outweigh his desire to work with Congress on a mutually agreeable political outcome (Krause and Melusky 2012), especially if Congress and the president are at loggerheads over legislation. Presidents may disagree with the ideological or political direction of legislation and issue a preemptive order as an alternative to Congressional action. This too runs the risk of angering Congress who may choose to respond with additional legislation (Howell 2003) or otherwise revoke the order by statute. However, invoking a unilateral order during the legislative process may be a way of gaining participation of members by addressing topics already on the Congressional agenda. Consultation with Congress is especially likely when the president’s objective is to change the agreed-upon status quo (Moe and Howell 1999) by issuing an order supporting proposed legislation. Therefore, presidents, in their desire to work with Congress, may issue a unilateral order to achieve a mutually agreeable policy solution. There is less cost here to the president with respect to angering Congress as the president is “fast tracking” the proposed Congressional legislation into policy, especially if the president is executing the will of Congress through prearranged policy (Fisher 2007, 109; Warber 2006).

## 2AC Congress Rez CP

#### Perm do both

#### CP doesn’t solve – the CP doesn’t preclude the use of force against Iran means they don’t solve any of the aff

#### Only removing the military threat is critical to changing Iranian perception of the US – that was the Glaser ev – the impact is the aff

#### Lifting sanctions only lifts pressure off Iran – regime change needs to be off the table

#### Condo bad

#### Advocacy skills – doesn’t teach the neg to defend a coherent position which is the educational purpose of debate.

#### Reciprocity – we have to defend one plan text. Prefer reciprocity, it’s the most objective standard of fairness.

#### Strat skew—they force us into contradictions and spread out the 2ac.

## 2AC Resolve

#### Iran outweighs and turns – if Obama can get a grand bargain with Iran he will secure a major goal of his administration and improve his credibility. Prefer our specific Iran war scenario over their vague threats of credibility.

#### Nuclear arsenal checks – countries still deterred by huge US retaliatory capability

#### Credibility/ Resolve low now.

Barnes, 13 (Fred, Executive editor of the weekly standard. Hesitation, Delay, and Unreliability. http://www.weeklystandard.com/articles/hesitation-delay-and-unreliability\_752788.html)

In his World War II memoirs, Winston Churchill offered this lesson: “In war, resolution; in defeat, defiance; in victory, magnanimity; in peace, good will.” Being resolute—that is, steadfast and determined—comes first. It is normally regarded as a critical component of success.¶ Obama and resolve don’t seem to mix. As the death toll in the Syrian civil war mounted, he opposed American intervention. Then, in an offhand remark a year ago, he said his policy would change if the Assad regime crossed a “red line” and used chemical weapons. Still, he ignored unsubstantiated reports of gas attacks that Secretary of State John Kerry said numbered in the “teens.” He decided to act only when American intelligence confirmed an estimated 1,400 people had been killed in a gas attack by the Syrian military on August 21.¶ A bombing assault was planned for Labor Day weekend to “deter” further use of chemical weapons and “degrade” Assad’s arsenal. But Obama abruptly jettisoned that plan and announced he would seek the approval of Congress. An attack, if there is to be one, could be postponed for weeks, jeopardizing what’s known as “peak” military readiness.¶ Earlier, in June, the White House announced it would send small arms and munitions to the Syrian rebels. By early September, however, no weapons had reached the rebels.¶ So hesitation, delay, and unreliability are the hallmarks of Obama’s approach to Syria, for now. This amounts to presidential “fecklessness,” says Steven F. Hayward, author of Greatness: Reagan, Churchill, and the Making of Extraordinary Leaders. “A strong war leader needs one quality above others,” he says, “a ruthlessness to see it through, coupled with a touch of legerdemain to keep our enemies off balance and fearful of what the United States might do.”¶ Obama certainly lacks that “touch” of cunning. There’s a gulf between his mission and his military. His goal is the removal of Assad as Syrian leader —in other words, regime change. But Obama insists a bombing attack in Syria would be solely to stop further use of chemical weapons. He’s publicly ruled out a wider assault aimed at regime change or deployment of ground troops.¶ “Calling for Assad’s downfall and warning him not to use chemical weapons but being hesitant to back up his strong words with commensurate actions is not how successful commanders in chief behave in wartime,” says Max Boot, author of Invisible Armies: An Epic History of Guerrilla Warfare from Ancient Times to the Present.

#### No specific impacts – make them read scenarios

#### First strike is a bluff—undermines credibility

Riedel and O'Hanlon 10 Bruce Riedel, Senior Fellow, Foreign Policy, Saban Center for Middle East Policy, Michael E. O'Hanlon, Director of Research and Senior Fellow, Foreign Policy, 3-16-10, “The Case Against Threatening Iran,” Politico

In addition, even if the charge is unfair, Obama’s critics at home could accuse him of weakness, increasing the pressure on him to consider an attack. America’s credibility might also be weakened, since Washington would be seen as having its bluff called. Future scenarios in which the United States might wish to credibly threaten an attack against an adversary, perhaps even Iran, would then be harder to handle. So the Obama administration would do well to stop talking publicly about a military option and, instead, tell regional allies a strike is highly unlikely unless Iran’s behavior becomes far more egregious.

#### Credibility not hurt by the plan.

Balkin, 13 ( JACK M. BALKIN is Knight Professor of Constitutional Law and the First Amendment at Yale Law School, and the founder and director of Yale's Information Society Project, an interdisciplinary center that studies law and new information technologies. What Congressional Approval Won't Do: Trim Obama's Power or Make War Legal. http://www.theatlantic.com/politics/archive/2013/09/what-congressional-approval-wont-do-trim-obamas-power-or-make-war-legal/279298/)

Wouldn’t congressional refusal make the United States look weak, as critics including Senator John McCain warn loudly? Hardly. The next dictator who acts rashly will face a different situation and a different calculus. The UN Security Council or NATO may feel differently about the need to act. There may be a new threat to American interests that lets Obama or the next president offer a different justification for acting. It just won’t matter very much what Obama said about red lines in the past. World leaders say provocative things all the time and then ignore them. Their motto is: That was then, and this is now.¶ If Congress turns him down, won’t Obama be undermined at home, as other critics claim? In what sense? It is hard to see how the Republicans could be less cooperative than they already are. And it’s not in the interest of Democrats to fault a president of their own party for acceding to what Congress wants instead of acting unilaterally.

#### Unwillingness to escalate to take out the link and impact

Dianne R. Pfundstein PhD Candidate, Columbia University Paper prepared for the ISA Annual Convention 3-19-2011 Compelling Compliance with the International Order: The United States, the Threat of Force, and Resolve in the Era of Unipolarity

This paper applies this new model of state resolve to the United States to demonstrate how its twenty-first century war-fighting model, and its position as sole superpower, undermine the United States’ ability to employ threats of force to coerce weak target states. The United States enjoys unique freedom to escalate conflicts, both because of its military superiority and because of the absence of a peer competitor in most regions of the world to check its actions. Despite this freedom and its unquestioned conventional military superiority, the United States has over the last sixty-five years steadily and increasingly insulated the bulk of its population from both the human and financial costs of war. Furthermore, norms about the use of violence have evolved such that the U.S. military goes to great lengths to avoid inflicting pain on the civilian populations of target states. I will demonstrate that these trends have given rise to a unique American way of war that renders the United States incapable of compelling weak states to change their behavior without having to actually force compliance: the United States may be willing to escalate, but not to suffer or inflict the costs necessary to defeat strongly motivated but conventionally weak target states, making resistance an attractive option even in the face of a credible U.S. threat to escalate. I will begin by demonstrating how the United States’ unique strategic position since the end of the Cold War has granted it the freedom to escalate most conflicts at little risk to its own safety, rendering escalation itself an uninformative signal of its willingness to suffer and destroy in order to achieve its objectives from target states. I will then examine the United States’ unwillingness to pay the human and material costs of war. My analysis reveals that, despite high absolute levels of defense spending, the United States does not want to pay for major wars, and has embraced many elements of the Revolution in Military Affairs (RMA) to insulate its military from the dangers of combat. I will then evaluate the evolution in norms about the infliction of pain on target states’ civilian populations. These trends, in combination with the demise of bipolarity, have freed U.S. policymakers to threaten and escalate military conflicts when the United States’ vital interests are not engaged and rendered the threat of military force an ineffective tool of coercion against weak but highly motivated target states.

#### Heg doesn’t solve conflict.

Fettweis 11 [Christopher, Prof. of Political Science – Tulane, Dangerous Times?: The International Politics of Great Power Peace Page 73-6]

The primary attack on restraint, or justification for internationalism, posits that if the United Stets were to withdraw from the world, a variety of ills would sweep over key regions and eventually pose threats to U.S. security and/or prosperity, nese problems might take three forms (besides the obvious, if remarkably unlikely, direct threats to the homeland): generalized chaos, hostile imbalances in Eurasia, and/or failed states. Historian Arthur Schlesinger was typical when he worried that restraint would mean "a chaotic, violent, and ever more dangerous planet."69 All of these concerns either implicitly or explicitly assume that the presence of the United States is the primary reason for international stability, and if that presence were withdrawn chaos would ensue. In other words, they depend upon hegemonic-stability logic. Simply stated, the hegemonic stability theory proposes that international peace is only possible when there is one country strong enough to make and enforce a set of rules. At the height of Pax Romana between 27 BC and 180 AD, for ex¬ample, Rome was able to bring unprecedented peace and security to the Mediterranean. The Pax Britannica of the nineteenth century brought a level of stabil¬ity to the high seas. Perhaps the current era is peaceful because the United States has established a de facto Pax Americana where no power is strong enough to challenge its dominance, and because it has established a set of rules that are gen¬erally in the interests of all countries to follow. Without a benevolent hegemon, some strategists fear, instability may break out around the globe.70 Unchecked conflicts could cause humanitarian disaster and, in today's interconnected world, economic turmoil that would ripple throughout global financial markets. If the United States were to abandon its commitments abroad, argued Art, the world would "become a more dangerous place" and, sooner or later, that would "re¬dound to America's detriment."71 If the massive spending that the United States engages in actually provides stability in the international political and economic systems, then perhaps internationalism is worthwhile. There are good theoretical and empirical reasons, however, to believe that US **hegemony is not the** primary **cause of** the current era of s**tability**. First of all, the hegemonic-stability argument overstates the role that the United States plays in the system. No country is strong enough to police the world on its own. The only way there can be stability in the community of great powers is if self-policing occurs, if states have decided that their interests are served by peace. If no pacific normative shift had occurred among the great powers that was filtering down through the system, then no amount of international constabulary work by the United States could maintain stability. Likewise, if it true that such a shift has occurred, then most of what the hegemon spends to bring stability would be wasted. The 5 percent of the world's population that 2\* m the United States simply could not force peace upon an unwilling 95. At the nsk of beating the metaphor to death, the United States may be patrolling a neighborhood that has **already rid itself of crime.** Stability and unipolarity may besimply coincidental., order for U.S. hegemony to be the reason for global stability, the rest ome World would have to expect reward for good behavior and fear punishment to/ bad. Since the end of the Cold War, the United States has not always proven to be especially eager to engage in humanitarian interventions abroad. Even rather incontrovertible evidence of genocide has not been sufficient to inspire action. Hegemonic stability can only take credit for influencing those decisions that would have ended in War without the presence, whether physical or psychologi-cal, of the United States. Ethiopia and Eritrea are hardly the only states that could go to War without the slightest threat of U.S. intervention. Since most of the world today is free to fight without U.S. involvement, something else must be at work. Stability exists in many places where no hegemony is present. Second, the limited **empirical evidence** we have suggests that there is **little connection** between the relative level of U.S. activism and international stability. During the 1990s the United States cut back on its defense spending fairly substantially. By 1998 the United States was spending $100 billion less on de¬fense in real terms than it had in 1990.72 To internationalists, defense hawks, and other believers in hegemonic stability, this irresponsible "peace dividend" endangered both national and global security. "No serious analyst of American military capabilities," argued Kristol and Kagan, "doubts that the defense budget has been cut much too far to meet America's responsibilities to itself and to world peace."73 If the pacific trends were due not to U.S. hegemony but a strengthening norm against interstate War, however, one would not have expected an increase in global instability and violence. The verdict from the past two decades is fairly plain: The world grew more peaceful while the United States cut its forces. No state seemed to believe that its security was endangered by a less-capable Pentagon, or at least none took any action that would suggest such a belief. **No militaries were enhanced to address power vacuums; no security dilemmas drove mistrust and arms races; no re-gional balancing occurred** once the stabilizing presence of the U.S. military was diminished. The rest of the world acted as if the threat of international War was not a pressing concern, despite the reduction in U.S. capabilities. The incidence and magnitude of global conflict **declined** while the United States cut its military spending under President Clinton, and it kept declining as the Bush Administra-tion ramped spending back up. No complex statistical analysis should be neces-sary to reach the conclusion that the two are unrelated. It is also worth noting for our purposes that the United States was no less safe. Military spending figures by themselves are insufficient to disprove a con- nection between overall U.S. actions and international stability. One could pre- sumably argue that spending is not the only, or even the best, indication of he- LTm? T 15 inSt6ad US" foreign Political and security commitments Zcre7Tn I ^ ndther was -gnificantly altered during this period, mcreased conflict should not have been expected. Alternately, advocates of heg¬emonic stability could believe that relative rather than absolute spending is de¬cisive in bringing peace. Although the United States cut back on its spending during the 1990s, its relative advantage never wavered. However, even if it were true that either U.S. commitments or relative spend-ing accounts for international pacific trends, the 1990s make it obvious that stability can be sustained at drastically lower levels. In other words, even if one believes that there is a level of engagement below which the United States cannot drop without imperiling global stability, a rational grand strategist would still cut back on engagement (and spending) until that level is determined. As of now, we have no idea how cheap hegemonic stability could be, or if a low point exists at all. Since the United States ought to spend the minimum amount of its blood and treasure while seeking the maximum return on its investment, engagement should be scaled back until that level is determined. Grand strategic decisions are never final; continual adjustments can and must be made as time goes on. And if the constructivist interpretation of events is correct and the global peace is inher-ently stable, no increase in conflict would ever occur, irrespective of U.S. spend-ing, which would save untold trillions for an increasingly debt-ridden nation. It is also perhaps worth noting that if opposite trends had unfolded, if other states had reacted to news of cuts in U.S. defense spending with more aggressive or insecure behavior, then internationalists would surely argue that their expec-tations had been fulfilled. If increases in conflict would have been interpreted as evidence for the wisdom of internationalist strategies, then logical consistency demands that the lack thereof should at least pose a problem. As it stands, the ordy data we have regarding the likely systemic reaction to a more restrained United States suggests that current peaceful trends are unrelated to U.S. military pending. Evidently the rest of the world can operate quite effectively without ^e presence of a global policeman. Those who think otherwise base their view on faith alone. tf the only thing standing between the world and chaos is the U.S. military Presence, then an adjustment in grand strategy would be exceptionally counter-productive. But it is worth recalling that none of the other explanations for the decline of War—**nuclear weapons, complex economic interdependence, international and domestic political institutions, evolution in ideas and norms** necessitate an activist America to maintain their validity. Were America to be-co\*e more restrained, nuclear weapons would still affect the calculations of the would-be aggressor; the process of globalization would continue, deepening the complexity of economic interdependence; the United Nations could still deploy Peacekeepers where necessary; and democracy would not shrivel where it cur-\*7 exis\*s. Most importantly, the idea that war is a worthwhile way to resolve conflict would have no reason to return. As was argued in chapter 2, normative evolution is typically unidirectional. Strategic restraint in such a world would be virtually risk-free. Finally, some analysts have worried that a de facto surrender of U.S. hege¬mony would lead to a rise of Chinese influence. Indeed, China is the only other major power that has increased its military spending since the end of the Cold War, even if it is still a rather low 2 percent of its GDP. Such levels of effort do not suggest a desire to compete with, much less supplant, the United States. The much-ballyhooed decade-long military buildup has brought Chinese spending up to approximately one-tenth the level of that of the United States. It is hardly clear that restraint on the part of the United States would invite Chinese global dominance. Bradley Thayer worries that Chinese would become "the language of diplomacy, trade and commerce, transportation and navigation, the internet, world sport, and global culture," and that Beijing would come to "dominate sci¬ence and technology, in all its forms" to the extent that soon the world would witness a Chinese astronaut who not only travels to the Moon, but "plants the communist flag on Mars, and perhaps other planets in the future."74 Fortunately one need not ponder for too long the horrible specter of a red flag on Venus, since on the planet Earth, where War is no longer the dominant form of conflict resolution, the threats posed by even a rising China would not be terribly dire. The dangers contained in the terrestrial security environment are less frightening than ever before, no matter which country is strongest.

## 2AC Debt Ceiling

#### Case outweighs -- Iran war is the conflict Merlini describes. The middle east is where miscalculation from economic collapse could escalate. Prefer our specific impact of their generic claims of war.

#### Iran conflict turns economic collapse – Iran would shut the strait of Hormuz and Venezuela would stop selling oil. Stronger internal to the global economy

#### Neither side will back down.

NBC 10/4 [http://firstread.nbcnews.com/\_news/2013/10/04/20818520-first-thoughts-conservatives-arent-backing-down]

\*\*\* Conservatives aren’t backing down: Here we are in Day 4 of the government shutdown, and after a brief period of comity yesterday (given the violent episode on Capitol Hill), both sides in the stalemate are **back into their respective corners.** That’s especially true for conservatives. Despite polls showing that more Americans are blaming Republicans than Democrats for the shutdown, and despite establishment Republicans admitting they aren’t winning this fight, **conservatives aren’t backing down.** In fact, they feel they have survived the fallout from the first few days. Case in point is Sen. Rand Paul’s (R-KY) admission in that hot-mic moment that “We’re gonna win this, I think.” Is that the reality of this standoff? Or it is simply due to the conservative echo chamber? After all, one of the major differences between the last shutdown (in 1995-1996) and now is the rise of FOX News, Drudge, and Breitbart News. As the New York Times recently wrote, “a fervent group of conservatives — bloggers, pundits, activists and even members of Congress — is harnessing the power of the Internet, determined to tell the story of the current budget showdown on its terms.” It explains why conservatives aren’t as convinced as many others are that this will do significant damage to the party.

#### Obama’s caving to a short term deal – but GOP still won’t accept

Zachary Goldfarb 10/7 (10:13 am)

Washington Post http://www.washingtonpost.com/politics/white-house-official-says-obama-would-accept-short-term-agreement-on-debt-ceiling/2013/10/07/ef7b1d94-2f56-11e3-8906-3daa2bcde110\_story.html

President Obama would accept a short-term increase in the federal borrowing cap , rather than one lasting a year or more, a senior White House official said Monday. The statement was an acknowledgment by the administration that it may not be possible to reach a deal on a long-term increase in the debt ceiling before a critical Oct. 17 deadline.¶ Gene Sperling, director of the National Economic Council, said members of Congress ultimately have the responsibility to decide how often they want to raise the debt ceiling, although he argued that an extended hike is preferable.¶ “I think longer is better for economic certainty and jobs, but it is ultimately up to them,” Sperling said in a morning discussion hosted by Politico.¶ The Treasury says it will run low on cash in as little as 10 days, placing the nation at risk of a historic default. Some Republicans have suggested that if Congress can’t reach an agreement by Oct. 17, they might try to forge a coalition to support an interim measure to increase the $16.7 trillion debt ceiling for as little as six weeks.¶ Sperling’s comments Monday suggested that the White House would accept such a measure. The statement was notable because administration officials had rejected a short-term debt ceiling increase during a similar impasse in the summer of 2011, when the White House insisted that the debt limit be increased to cover borrowing through 2012.¶ Now, with no election hanging over him, Obama has more flexibility. But it is not even clear whether Republicans would be able to pass a short-term bill. Aides to House Speaker John A. Boehner (R-Ohio) say no debt-ceiling measure can pass the House without additional policy concessions by the Democrats.

#### Plan doesn’t cause a tradeoff. Negotiations would occur within the republic caucus and republicans would be lockstep in support of limiting Obama’s power.

Sargent 9/12 [Greg, Washington Post, The Morning Plum: Senate conservatives stick the knife in House GOP leaders

http://www.washingtonpost.com/blogs/plum-line/wp/2013/09/12/the-morning-plum-senate-conservatives-stick-the-knife-in-house-gop-leaders/]

All of this underscores a basic fact about this fall’s fiscal fights: Far and away the **dominant factor** shaping how they play out will be the d**ivisions among Republicans. There’s** a great deal of chatter (see Senator Bob Corker for one of the most absurd examples yet) to the effect that Obama’s mishandling of Syria has diminished his standing on Capitol Hill and will weaken him in coming fights. But those battles at bottom will be about whether the Republican Party can resolve its internal differences. Obama’s “standing” with Republicans — if it even could sink any lower — is **utterly irrelevant to that question**. The bottom line is that, when it comes to how aggressively to prosecute the war against Obamacare, **internal GOP differences may be unbridgeable.** Conservatives have adopted a deliberate strategy of deceiving untold numbers of base voters into believing Obamacare will be stopped outside normal electoral channels. Central to maintaining this fantasy is the idea that any Republican leader who breaks with this sacred mission can only be doing so because he or she is too weak and cowardly to endure the slings and arrows that persevering against the law must entail. GOP leaders, having themselves spent years feeding the base all sorts of lies and distortions about the law, are now desperately trying to inject a does of reality into the debate by pointing out that the defund-Obamacare crusade is, in political and practical terms alike, insane. But it may be too late. The time for injecting reality into the debate has long since passed.

#### Intrinsicness – a logical policymaker controls the disad and the passage of the plan. Kills education.

#### No trade off – no negotiations over debt ceiling.

CNN 9/15 [Obama economic adviser's refrain: No debt ceiling negotiations Posted by CNN's Dan Merica, http://politicalticker.blogs.cnn.com/2013/09/15/obama-economic-advisers-refrain-no-debt-ceiling-negotiations/]

Washington (CNN) - President Barack Obama and his closest advisers are making it clear: They will not negotiate on the looming debt ceiling. In an interview on Sunday with ABC, Obama said he "will not negotiate...on the debt ceiling" because making a debate over the credit of the United States the norm would alter "the constitutional structure of this government entirely." Gene Sperling, a senior economic adviser to Obama, echoed his boss's pledge on a Sunday call with reporters. "All (Obama) has said is that he cannot and will not and should not negotiate on the debt limit because to do so gives credence to the idea of any side threatening the default of the United States of America over a policy dispute," said Sperling, the outgoing director of the National Economic Council. "As you heard the president say, he is not going to negotiate over the debt limit, that we should not be negotiating over whether to pay our bills."

#### Debt ceiling would be attached the plan as a rider—plan guarantees passage.

Waxmen ev is a claim without warrant – no reason why congress would force prez to spend capital on issues

#### PC low – Syria proves

#### Economic decline doesn’t cause war.

Jervis 11 [Robert, Adlai E. Stevenson Professor of International Politics in the Department of Political Science, and a Member of the Arnold A. Saltzman Institute of War and Peace Studies at Columbia University. Force in Our Times Saltzman Working Paper No. 15 July 2011 http://www.siwps.com/news.attachment/saltzmanworkingpaper15-842/SaltzmanWorkingPaper15.PDF]

Even if war is still seen as evil, the security community could be dissolved if severe conflicts of interest were to arise. Could the more peaceful world generate new interests that would bring the members of the community into sharp disputes? 45 A zero-sum sense of status would be one example, perhaps linked to a steep rise in nationalism. More likely would be a worsening of the current economic difficulties, which could itself produce greater nationalism, undermine democracy, and bring back old-fashioned beggar-thy-neighbor economic policies. While these dangers are real, it is hard to believe that the conflicts could be great enough to lead the members of the community to contemplate fighting each other. It is not so much that economic interdependence has proceeded to the point where it could not be reversed – states that were more internally interdependent than anything seen internationally have fought bloody civil wars. Rather it is that even if the more extreme versions of free trade and economic liberalism become discredited, it is hard to see how without building on a pre-existing high level of political conflict leaders and mass opinion would come to believe that their countries could prosper by impoverishing or even attacking others. Is it possible that problems will not only become severe, but that people will entertain the thought that they have to be solved by war? While a pessimist could note that this argument does not appear as outlandish as it did before the financial crisis, an optimist could reply (correctly, in my view) that the very fact that we have seen such a sharp economic down-turn without anyone suggesting that force of arms is the solution shows that even if bad times bring about greater economic conflict, **it will not make war thinkable.**

#### Empirically doesn’t collapse the economy.

Tanner 11 [Michael Tanner 11, National Review, “No Surrender on Debt Ceiling”, Jan 19, http://www.nationalreview.com/articles/257433/no-surrender-debt-ceiling-michael-tanner]

Of course the Obama administration is already warning of Armageddon if Congress doesn’t raise the debt ceiling. Certainly it would be a shock to the economic system. The bond market could crash. The impact would be felt at home and abroad. But would it necessarily be worse than the alternative? While Congress has never before refused to raise the debt ceiling, it has in fact frequently taken its time about doing so. In 1985, for example, Congress waited nearly three months after the debt limit was reached before it authorized a permanent increase. In 1995, four and a half months passed between the time that the government hit its statutory limit and the time Congress acted. And in 2002, Congress delayed raising the debt ceiling for three months. It took three months to raise the debt limit back in 1985 as well. **In none of those cases did the world end.** More important, what will be the consequences if the U.S. government fails to reduce government spending? What happens if we raise the debt ceiling then continue merrily on our way spending more and running up ever more debt? Already Moody’s and Standard & Poor’s have warned that our credit rating might be reduced unless we get a handle on our national debt. We’ve heard a lot recently about the European debt crisis, but, as one senior Chinese banking official recently noted, in some ways the U.S. financial position is more perilous than Europe’s. “We should be clear in our minds that the fiscal situation in the United States is much worse than in Europe,” he recently told reporters. “In one or two years, when the European debt situation stabilizes, [the] attention of financial markets will definitely shift to the United States. At that time, U.S. Treasury bonds and the dollar will experience considerable declines.” Moreover, unless we do something, federal spending is on course to consume 43 percent of GDP by the middle of the century. Throw in state and local spending, and government at all levels will take 60 cents out of every dollar produced in this country. Our economy will not long survive government spending at those levels.

#### Winners win – Plan lets the Obama sweep through gridlock and raise the debt ceiling more quickly.

Hirsch, 13 (Michael, Chief correspondent for the National Journal. There’s No Such Thing as Political Capital. http://www.nationaljournal.com/magazine/there-s-no-such-thing-as-political-capital-20130207)

But the abrupt emergence of the immigration and gun-control issues illustrates how suddenly shifts in mood can occur and how political interests can align in new ways just as suddenly. Indeed, the pseudo-concept of political capital masks a larger truth about Washington that is kindergarten simple: You just don’t know what you can do until you try. Or as Ornstein himself once wrote years ago, “Winning wins.” In theory, and in practice, depending on Obama’s handling of any particular issue, even in a polarized time, he could still deliver on a lot of his second-term goals, depending on his skill and the breaks. Unforeseen catalysts can appear, like Newtown. Epiphanies can dawn, such as when many Republican Party leaders suddenly woke up in panic to the huge disparity in the Hispanic vote.¶ Some political scientists who study the elusive calculus of how to pass legislation and run successful presidencies say that political capital is, at best, an empty concept, and that almost nothing in the academic literature successfully quantifies or even defines it. “It can refer to a very abstract thing, like a president’s popularity, but there’s no mechanism there. That makes it kind of useless,” says Richard Bensel, a government professor at Cornell University. Even Ornstein concedes that the calculus is far more complex than the term suggests. Winning on one issue often changes the calculation for the next issue; there is never any known amount of capital. “The idea here is, if an issue comes up where the conventional wisdom is that president is not going to get what he wants, and he gets it, then each time that happens, it changes the calculus of the other actors” Ornstein says. “If they think he’s going to win, they may change positions to get on the winning side. It’s a bandwagon effect.”