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### Pakistan

#### Drones increase terrorism

Poling 13 Foreign Policy Initiative 1-16 (Caitlin, “The U.S. Needs a More Broad-Based Strategy to Combat Al Qaeda in Yemen,” <http://www.foreignpolicyi.org/content/us-needs-more-broad-based-strategy-combat-al-qaeda-yemen>, Mike)

For most of the past decade, Yemen has remained on the periphery of American national security policy. During this time, officials in the administration, Department of Defense, State Department, and Intelligence Community have been unable to devote as much attention as needed to Yemen due to American engagement in Iraq and Afghanistan. However, the Arab Spring uprisings that began in 2011 along with the September 2012 protests and embassy attacks in response to an American-made anti-Muslim video have demonstrated the importance of security in states like Yemen. Our nation’s continued involvement in Yemen is an important component of our national security. Despite all of the other challenges our country currently faces worldwide, our commitment in Yemen should be strengthened. Al Qaeda in the Arab Peninsula (AQAP), the Al Qaeda (AQ) node based out of Yemen, is widely believed to be the most lethal of the AQ affiliates, and has attempted on several occasions to attack the United States directly and harbored, until his killing in September 2011, Anwar al Alwaki, a U.S. citizen and extremist cleric responsible for the radicalization of the Fort Hood shooter and the 2009 Detroit Christmas Day bomber. The Arab Spring, and resulting uprising in Yemen that began in January 2011, as well as an ongoing Houthi rebellion in the north and secessionist movement in the south, have diverted the attention of the Yemeni security forces from counterterrorism efforts, and at the same time, restricted U.S. forces’ ability to operate on the ground. As a result, AQAP has gained strength and operating room amidst the power vacuum. According to April 2012 estimates by White House counter-terrorism advisor and nominee for CIA Director John Brennan, AQAP has more than a thousand members in Yemen and close ties to al Qaeda Core in Pakistan. The Director of National Intelligence, James Clapper, testified in early 2011 that AQAP remains the AQ node most likely to conduct a transnational attack. Yemen is a fragile and challenged nation, but it is not yet failed – there are concrete steps our country can take to help stabilize Yemen, strengthen its capacity for countering AQAP, and prevent it from becoming another Afghanistan or Somalia. The Obama Administration’s Yemen Strategic Plan is a good start, focused on combating AQAP in the short term, increasing development assistance to meet long term challenges, and building international support in order to maximize global efforts to stabilize Yemen. However, the continued excessive use of Unmanned Aerial Vehicle (UAV) airstrikes remains an unaddressed issue. Policymakers should conduct a full assessment of their impact on the Yemeni population and altering their use. The use of airstrikes conducted by UAVs, colloquially known as ‘drones,’ has rapidly expanded during the past decade. However, little has been done to study their long-term effects on populations and American objectives in Yemen. Although touted as “cost-effective,” the true cost of drone strikes among target populations is not adequately taken into account. Drone strikes create a number of problems hindering our objectives – including providing propaganda material for terrorist groups, fueling hostility, increasing retaliatory attacks by AQAP and other extremist groups, and undermining the authority of the already fragile Yemeni government. President Obama authorized at least 42 strikes in Yemen in 2012, a dramatic increase from years prior. Drone strikes have been successful in targeting and eliminating AQAP leadership; however, American drones have killed twelve times more low-level fighters than mid-to-high level AQ leaders since 2008. Killing low-level militants by drone rather than attempting to capture can lead to a loss of potential intelligence. Despite the success in targeting AQ members, drones alone do not suffice as an American counterterrorism strategy in Yemen. As American drone strikes have increased in frequency, so have retaliatory attacks from AQAP. On September 11, 2012 AQAP attempted to assassinate Yemen’s defense minister via car bomb, killing seven bodyguards and five civilians in the heart of Sana’a. This attack was viewed as a direct response to the American drone strike that took out top AQAP operative Said al-Shehri earlier that month. Even more alarmingly, AQAP has now offered a bounty for the killing of the U.S. Ambassador to Yemen, Geral Feierstein, or any American soldiers in Yemen. While there is no easy solution to the ongoing instability and AQAP presence in Yemen, the U.S. should avoid a drone-centric counterterrorism policy in Yemen. The current American policy, while avoiding risk for Americans on the ground, ignores the very real potential for blowback in the long-term. Instead, the administration should limit drone strikes to only targeting high value individuals; use drone strikes as part of a wider strategy that attempts to address some of the Yemen-specific grievances that are the root causes of terrorism; restore American and allied Special Forces presence in Yemen from the pre-2011 unrest; and work towards building effective Yemeni security forces that can pursue AQAP targets on the ground. A combination of limited high value target drone strikes, increased non-military aid and training of Yemeni forces for counterterrorism efforts are more likely to achieve our nation’s goal of a secure and stable Yemen.

**The aff is critical to prevent boots on the ground intervention – causes overstretch**

**Dowd, 13** [Alan W., writes on national defense, foreign policy, and international security, Senior Fellow of the Fraser Institute and Senior Editor of Fraser Insight, “Drone Wars: Risks and Warning,” <http://www.strategicstudiesinstitute.army.mil/pubs/parameters/Issues/WinterSpring_2013/1_Article_Dowd.pdf>, ALB]

As Michael Ignatieff asked in 2000, years before the drone war ¶ began, “If war becomes unreal to the citizens of modern democracies, ¶ will they care enough to restrain and control the violence exercised ¶ in their name . . . if they and their sons and daughters are spared the ¶ hazards of combat?” That question is directly linked to policymakers ¶ in the drone age. The risks policymakers take with UCAVs are greater ¶ because the accountability is less than with manned aircraft. After ¶ all, the loss of a drone is the loss of nothing more than metal. “More ¶ willing to lose is more willing to use,” as Daniel Haulman of the Air ¶ Force Historical Research Agency puts it. Yet as America’s deepening ¶ involvement in Yemen underscores, drones may actually make boots on-the-ground intervention more likely. To identify new targets and ¶ authenticate existing targets for the drone war, Washington has quietly ¶ sent US troops into Yemen. According to unnamed military officials, ¶ the contingent of American troops is growing. As the troops identify ¶ targets, they become targets. Thus, far from preventing more direct ¶ and riskier forms of military engagement, drones are encouraging such ¶ engagement—even as many of their operators paradoxically carry out ¶ their lethal missions from the safety of bases in Nevada or New Mexico.

### Solvo

#### Not a rubber stamp

Daskal, 13 [The Geography of the Battlefield: A Framework for Detention and Targeting Outside the 'Hot' Conflict Zone Jennifer Daskal American University Washington College of Law, April]

That said, there is a reasonable fear that any such court or review board will simply defer. In this vein, FISC’s high approval rate is cited as evidence that reviewing courts or review boards will do little more than rubber-stamp the Executive’s targeting decisions.180 But the high approval rates only tell part of the story. In many cases, the mere requirement of justifying an application before a court or other independent review board can serve as an internal check, creating endogenous incentives to comply with the statutory requirements and limit the breadth of executive action.181 Even if this system does little more than increase the attention paid to the stated requirements and expand the circle of persons reviewing the factual basis for the application, those features in and of themselves can lead to increased reflection and restraint.

### CP – XO

#### Executive check fails and leads to rubber stamping—Strict scrutiny through the courts is Key—Prefer our COMPARATIVE and SPECIFIC evidence

Somin 13 [Ilya, Professor of Law, George Mason University, “Hearing on Drone Wars: the Constitutional and Counterterrorism Implications of Targeted Killing,” <http://www.judiciary.senate.gov/pdf/04-23-13SominTestimony.pdf>, Testimony Before the United States Senate Judiciary Subcommittee on the Constitution, Civil Rights, and Human Rights, 4/23, ALB]

Alternatively, one can envision some kind of more extensive due process within the ¶ executive branch itself, as advocated by Neal Katyal of the Georgetown University Law ¶ Center.But any internal executive process has the flaw that it could always be overriden by ¶ the president, and possibly other high-ranking executive branch officials. Moreover, lower level executive officials might be reluctant to veto drone strikes supported by their superiors, ¶ either out of careerist concerns, or because administration officials are naturally likely to ¶ share the ideological and policy priorities of the president. An external check on targeting ¶ reduces such risks. External review might also enhance the credibility of the target-selection ¶ process with informed opinion both in the United States and abroad. ¶ Whether targeting decisions are made with or without judicial oversight, there is also an ¶ important question of burdens of proof. How much evidence is enough to justify classifying ¶ you or me as a senior Al Qaeda leader? The administration memo does not address that ¶ crucial question either. ¶ Obviously, it is unrealistic to hold military operations to the standards of proof normally ¶ required in civilian criminal prosecutions. But at the same time, we should be wary of giving ¶ the president unfettered power to order the killing of citizens simply based on his assertion ¶ that they pose a threat. Amos Guiora suggests that an oversight court should evaluate ¶ proposed strikes under a “strict scrutiny standard” that ensures that strikes are only ordered ¶ based on intelligence that is “reliable, material and probative.” It is difficult for me to say ¶ whether this standard of proof is the best available option. But the issue is a crucial one that ¶ deserves further consideration. Ideally, we need a standard of proof rigorous enough to ¶ minimize reckless or abusive use of targeted killing, but not so high as to preclude its ¶ legitimate use.

#### Only due process solves and is key to rule of law

Guiora 13 [Amos N., Professor of Law, SJ Quinney College of Law, University of Utah, author of numerous books dealing with military law and national security including Legitimate Target: A Criteria-Based Approach to Targeted Killing, “Targeted Killing: When Proportionality Gets All Out of Proportion,” University of Utah College of Law Research Paper No. 1, <http://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract_id=2230686>, ALB]

The U.S. drone policy raises profoundly important questions regarding the very nature of operational counterterrorism; its implementation reveals how morality and the rule of law are applied in an inherently ambiguous and amorphous paradigm. At present, the increasingly broader and more flexible definition of imminence, combined with a continually growing reliance on sleek new technology, is highly problematic and raises significant concerns about whether law and morality are truly serving as the necessary guiding force here. Law not only provides a state with the right to engage those who deliberately and randomly target innocent civilians—it also provides the essential guiding framework for the extent to which and manner by which the state can target and engage those individuals. Simply articulating an aggressive, tough on terrorism policy is not sufficient. Rather, the devil truly is in the details: the state must carefully define both the limits of force and how that limited force is to be applied. Such a carefully-defined limit and application of force is the essence of both morality in armed conflict and the rule of law. In contrast, deliberately operating in an open-ended paradigm with opaque parameters where state power is broadly defined and implemented opens the door, unnecessarily, to significant violations of morality and law.¶ Unlimited drone warfare where limits, targets, and goals are not narrowly defined creates an operational environment in which anyone killed, regardless of whether intended or unintended, is considered a legitimate target. This expanded articulation of legitimate target, premised on significant expansion of tolerable collateral damage, creates a slippery slope that inevitably results in the deaths of otherwise innocent individuals. The allure of modern technology has led many decision makers to minimize the need to carefully distinguish between the individuals who pose a threat and those who do not.¶ Decision makers must not lose sight of the fact that targeted killing, on the basis of received and actionable intelligence information, is inherently a problematic; it poses extraordinary operational challenges that must be resolved precisely because of targeted killing’s importance to lawful self-defense. It must be operationalized in the most careful, narrow, and specific manner possible—meaning that a discriminating analysis of who is a legitimate target must be matched by equally discriminating analysis of who constitutes collateral damage, how much collateral damage is likely, and, most important, how much collateral damage is legally and morally acceptable or tolerable.¶ Morality in armed conflict is not a mere mantra: it imposes significant demands on the nation state that must adhere to limits and considerations beyond simply killing “the other side.” For better or worse, drone warfare of today will become the norm of tomorrow. Multiply the number of attacks conducted regularly in the present and you have the operational reality of future warfare. It is important to recall that drone policy is effective on two distinct levels: it takes the fight to terrorists directly involved, either in past or future attacks, and serves as a powerful deterrent for those considering involvement in terrorist activity.53 However, its importance and effectiveness must not hinder critical conversation, particularly with respect to defining imminence and legitimate target. The overly broad definition, “flexible” in the Obama Administration’s words, raises profound concerns regarding how imminence is applied. That concern is concrete for the practical import of Brennan’s phrasing is a dramatic broadening of the definition of legitimate target. It is also important to recall that operators—military, CIA or private contractors—are responsible for implementing executive branch guidelines and directives.55 For that very reason, the approach articulated by Brennan on behalf of the administration is troubling.

#### That prevents extinction

IEER 3 (Institute for Energy and Environmental Research 03 “Rule of Power or Rule of Law?”, <http://www.lcnp.org/pubs/exesummary.pdf>)

The evolution of international law since World War II is largely a response to the demands of states and individuals living within a global society with a deeply integrated world economy. In this global society, the repercussions of the actions of states, non-state actors, and individuals are not confined within borders, whether we look to greenhouse gas accumulations, nuclear testing, the danger of accidental nuclear war, or the vast massacres of civilians that have taken place over the course of the last hundred years and still continue. Multilateral agreements increasingly have been a primary instrument employed by states to meet extremely serious challenges of this kind, for several reasons. They clearly and publicly embody a set of universally applicable expectations, including prohibited and required practices and policies. In other words, they articulate global norms, such as the protection of human rights and the prohibitions of genocide and use of weapons of mass destruction. They establish predictability and accountability in addressing a given issue. States are able to accumulate expertise and confidence by participating in the structured system established by a treaty. However, influential U.S. policymakers are resistant to the idea of a treaty based international legal system because they fear infringement on U.S. sovereignty and they claim to lack confidence in compliance and enforcement mechanisms. This approach has dangerous practical implications for international cooperation and compliance with norms. U.S. treaty partners do not enter into treaties expecting that they are only political commitments that can be overridden based on U.S. interests. When a powerful and influential state like the United States is seen to treat its legal obligations as a matter of convenience or of national interest alone, other states will see this as a justification to relax or withdraw from their own commitments. When the United States wants to require another state to live up to its treaty obligations, it may find that the state has followed the U.S. example and opted out of compliance. Undermining the international system of treaties is likely to have particularly significant consequences in the area of peace and security. Even though the United States is uniquely positioned as the economic and military sole superpower, unilateral actions are insufficient to protect the people of the United States. For example, since September 11, prevention of proliferation of weapons of mass destruction is an increasing priority. The United States requires cooperation from other countries to prevent and detect proliferation, including through the multilateral disarmament and nonproliferation treaties. No legal system is foolproof, domestically or internationally. While violations do occur, “the dictum that most nations obey international law most of the time holds true today with greater force than at any time during the last century.” And legal systems should not be abandoned because some of the actors do not comply. In the international as in the domestic sphere, enforcement requires machinery for deciding when there has been a violation, namely verification and transparency arrangements. Such arrangements also provide an incentive for compliance under ordinary circumstances. Yet for several of the treaties discussed in this report, including the BWC, CWC, and CTBT, one general characteristic of the U.S. approach has been to try to exempt itself from transparency and verification arrangements. It bespeaks a lack of good faith if the United States wants near-perfect knowledge of others’ compliance so as to be able to detect all possible violations, while also wanting all too often to shield itself from scrutiny. While many treaties lack internal explicit provisions for sanctions, there are means of enforcement. Far more than is generally understood, states are very concerned about formal international condemnation of their actions. A range of sanctions is also available, including withdrawal of privileges under treaty regimes, arms and commodity embargoes, travel bans, reductions in international financial assistance or loans, and freezing of state or individual leader assets. Institutional mechanisms are available to reinforce compliance with treaty regimes, including the U.N. Security Council and the International Court of Justice. Regarding the latter, however, the United States has withdrawn from its general jurisdiction. One explanation for increasing U.S. opposition to the treaty system is that the United States is an “honorable country” that does not need treaty limits to do the right thing. This view relies on U.S. military strength above all and assumes that the U.S. actions are intrinsically right, recalling the ideology of “Manifest Destiny.” This is at odds with the very notion that the rule of law is possible in global affairs. If the rule of power rather than the rule of law becomes the norm, especially in the context of the present inequalities and injustices around the world, security is likely to be a casualty. International security can best be achieved through coordinated local, national, regional and global actions and cooperation. Treaties, like all other tools in this toolbox, are imperfect instruments. Like a national law, a treaty may be unjust or unwise, in whole or in part. If so, it can and should be amended. But without a framework of multilateral agreements, the alternative is for states to decide for themselves when action is warranted in their own interests, and to proceed to act unilaterally against others when they feel aggrieved. This is a recipe for the powerful to be police, prosecutor, judge, jury, and executioner all rolled into one. It is a path that cannot but lead to the arbitrary application and enforcement of law. For the United States, a hallmark of whose history is its role as a progenitor of the rule of law, to embark on a path of disregard of its international legal obligations is to abandon the best that its history has to offer the world. To reject the system of treaty-based international law rather than build on its many strengths is not only unwise, it is extremely dangerous. It is urgent that the United States join with other countries in implementing existing global security treaties to meet the security challenges of the twenty-first century and to achieve the ends of peace and justice to which the United States is committed under the United Nations Charter

#### 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/>, KB)

“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.”

### DA – Ptx

#### Won’t pass- health care controversy and ideological opposition

Gregory 11/6/2013 (Paul, research fellow at the Hoover Institution, at Stanford, and the Cullen Professor of Economics at the University of Houston, President Obama's Loss Of Trust Over Obamacare Imperils Immigration Reform, http://www.forbes.com/sites/paulroderickgregory/2013/11/06/veracity-and-lost-presidencies/)

The President’s “misspeaking” on his Obama Care pledges have doomed any chance of immigration reform, or any other major reform, for that matter. Obama may go into campaign mode on immigration reform to gain Hispanic votes, but it will be only talk. There can be no comprehensive reform of anything – immigration, entitlements, or the national debt — if legislators and, more importantly, the voters do not trust the President’s word.¶ Obama has declared immigration reform his top legislative priority for the rest of his term. In June of 2012, the Senate passed the Border Security, Economic Opportunity, and Immigration Modernization Act, which spends more on border security, provides provisional legal status and eventual pathway to citizenship for people living in the country illegally, and outlines reforms for the existing visa programs for immediate relatives and skilled workers.¶ House Speaker John Boehner declared the Senate bill a nonstarter and expressed hope that the House would produce its own bill. A House bi-partisan group of four Republicans and four Democrats began drafting such a plan but has subsequently fallen apart with only one Republican remaining. The chances of passage of any comprehensive immigration reform during the Obama years are about zero.¶ Irrespective of your views, comprehensive immigration reform requires a high degree of trust. Under the Senate bill, the president must enforce border security, decide the disposition of criminal undocumented workers, and set visa regulations, among other things. The Republicans in Congress cannot take the political risk of passing immigration reform to see parts of it enforced, other parts ignored, and yet other parts made unrecognizable by executive order.¶ One Republican member of the collapsed bi-partisan House team put it this way (House immigration group collapses):¶ “If past actions are the best indicators of future behavior; we know that any measure depending on the president’s enforcement will not be faithfully executed,…It would be gravely irresponsible to further empower this administration by granting them additional authority or discretion with a new immigration system.”¶ The Obama administration has made a practice of not enforcing legislation it does not like (DOMA, no child left behind, medical marijuana, gay spousal benefits, to name a few) and by executing other initiatives by executive action (de facto execution of the Dream act). Added to this history of selective enforcement, we have the problem of the President’s veracity. Can we take the President’s solemn pledge to raise border security to legislated levels seriously after he broke an even more solemn promise to the American people on his legacy Obama Care legislation (If you like your policy or your doctor you can keep them).

#### Boehner won’t bring it to the floor- he’ll ONLY do piecemeal

Washington Times 11/5/2013 (Obama’s new pledge: It’ll be ‘easy’ for Republicans to back immigration reform, http://www.washingtontimes.com/news/2013/nov/5/obama-aims-make-it-easy-gop-back-immigration-refor/?utm\_source=RSS\_Feed)

President Obama on Tuesday summoned leading CEOs to the White House to showcase support for a broad immigration reform package, telling Republicans that the business community’s position should make it “easy” to get the measure through the House.¶ But Republican leaders may not be swayed by their traditional business allies. They point to the failed rollout of Obamacare as clear proof that a massive bill — such as the immigration measure that passed the Senate this year — is the wrong approach and would lead to even greater problems.¶ House Speaker John A. Boehner, Ohio Republican, and others in his party also may feel emboldened to scrap the Senate plan and move forward with smaller, targeted pieces of legislation after a coalition of influential conservative groups urged them Tuesday to do just that.¶ “The House of Representatives is in a unique position to propose genuinely conservative solutions to fix our broken immigration system. We, therefore, encourage the House to continue its work to address the different aspects of the immigration issue in a piecemeal basis,” reads a letter signed by the heads of the American Principles Project, the American Conservative Union, Conservatives for Immigration Reform, the Hispanic Leadership Fund and other organizations.¶ The groups urged House Republicans to pursue “legal status to undocumented immigrants, but not a special path to citizenship,” a key difference from what the Senate has approved. The groups also called for the establishment of “market-oriented mechanisms to meet the demand our economy has for foreign workers.”¶ “If President Obama and the Democrats are willing to kill immigration reform in the House because they disagree with these principles, it would show that they are more interested in using the issue politically than actually solving the problem,” the letter said.¶ With House action on the Senate bill becoming less likely each day, the president mounted a perhaps last-ditch push to spur Republicans to action and, in turn, give the White House a major victory on one of its key second-term domestic policy initiatives.¶ At the end of the government shutdown last month, Mr. Obama identified three challenges — a long-term budget, immigration reform and a farm bill — that, he said, realistically could be addressed on a bipartisan basis in the coming months. With a farm bill still in limbo and budget negotiations between House and Senate leaders just getting underway, the president has thrown his full weight behind the push to enact a far-reaching immigration bill and give the administration a badly needed political win.¶ “Although right now there has been some resistance from House Republicans, what’s been encouraging is there have been a number of House Republicans who think this is the right thing to do,” Mr. Obama said just before he met with some of the nation’s top CEOs, including the heads of McDonald's, Lockheed Martin, Motorola Solutions and Marriott.¶ “It’s my estimation that we actually have the votes to get comprehensive immigration reform done right now. The politics are challenging for the speaker and others. We want to make it as easy for him as possible. This is not an issue where we’re looking for a political win. This is one where we’re looking for a substantive win for the U.S. economy.”¶ Mr. Obama is correct when he speaks of bipartisan support; 14 Senate Republicans supported immigration reform when it passed the chamber over the summer.¶ In addition, a handful of House Republicans have signed on as co-sponsors to a House proposal that mirrors the Senate version.¶ But amid the troubles with Obamacare and a growing recognition that the White House may have oversold and underdelivered on its health care reform legislation, House Republicans have a new argument to sink the Senate plan and instead pass smaller measures.¶ “If the president is insisting on one massive, Obamacare-style bill that people don’t understand, we aren’t going to get very far,” said Brendan Buck, a spokesman for Mr. Boehner. “The speaker has made clear publicly and privately that, while it’s important we address immigration reform, the House is not going to consider the Senate plan. Instead, we remain committed to a common-sense, step-by-step approach that gives people confidence immigration reform has been done the right way.”¶ Opposition to the Senate bill is coming from quarters beyond Capitol Hill and outside the political realm.

#### No link – courts are isolated

Whittington 05 Keith E., Cromwell Professor of Politics – Princeton University, ““Interpose Your Friendly Hand”: Political Supports for the Exercise of Judicial Review by the United States Supreme Court”, American Political Science Review, 99(4), November, p. 585, 591-592

There are some issues that politicians cannot easily handle. For individual legislators, their constituents may be sharply divided on a given issue or overwhelmingly hostile to a policy that the legislator would nonetheless like to see adopted. Party leaders, including presidents and legislative leaders, must similarly sometimes manage deeply divided or cross-pressured coalitions. When faced with such issues, elected officials may actively seek to turn over controversial political questions to the courts so as to circumvent a paralyzed legislature and avoid the political fallout that would come with taking direct action themselves. As Mark Graber (1993) has detailed in cases such as slavery and abortion, elected officials may prefer judicial resolution of disruptive political issues to direct legislative action, especially when the courts are believed to be sympathetic to the politician’s own substantive preferences but even when the attitude of the courts is uncertain or unfavorable (see also, Lovell 2003). Even when politicians do not invite judicial intervention, strategically minded courts will take into account not only the policy preferences of well-positioned policymakers but also the willingness of those potential policymakers to act if doing so means that they must assume responsibility for policy outcomes. For cross-pressured politicians and coalition leaders, shifting blame for controversial decisions to the Court and obscuring their own relationship to those decisions may preserve electoral support and coalition unity without threatening active judicial review (Arnold 1990; Fiorina 1986; Weaver 1986). The conditions for the exercise of judicial review may be relatively favorable when judicial invalidations of legislative policy can be managed to the electoral benefit of most legislators. In the cases considered previously, fractious coalitions produced legislation that presidents and party leaders deplored but were unwilling to block. Divisions within the governing coalition can also prevent legislative action that political leaders want taken, as illustrated in the following case.

#### Fiat solves link

#### Restricting the drone program has bipartisan support- prefer recent evidence on this question

NYT 7/26/2013 (Spy Agencies Under Heaviest Scrutiny Since Abuse Scandal of the '70s, lexis)

The report accuses the C.I.A. of misleading Congress, the Justice Department and even the administration of President George W. Bush about the interrogation program, which is now defunct. Some agency officials and Senate Republicans consider the report to be ill-informed second-guessing, but it will almost certainly come as another blow to the credibility of the spy agencies.¶ Until this year, the C.I.A.'s use of drones to kill terrorism suspects in Pakistan and Yemen -- stepped up in part because detaining and questioning such suspects had proven so problematic -- had generated little public controversy. That changed early this year, as Congress debated the wisdom of targeted killing for the first time, notably in a 13-hour filibuster by Senator Rand Paul, Republican of Kentucky, who challenged the drone killings of Americans overseas.¶ At a time of partisan gridlock in Congress, the drone debate and now the surveillance debate were remarkable for the bipartisan coalitions that took shape on both sides. Libertarian Republicans, wary of government power and especially of the Obama administration, found common cause with liberal Democrats who have long complained of the intelligence agencies' secrecy and power. That coalition could be repeated in the Senate, where Mr. Paul has worked with two Democrats, Ron Wyden of Oregon and Mark Udall of Colorado.¶ Clearly the narrow vote would not be the last word. Representative Mike D. Rogers, Republican of Michigan, the chairman of the House Intelligence Committee, promised lawmakers on Thursday that he would include new privacy safeguards in an intelligence policy bill he hopes to draft in September.¶ ''That's where the action may well be,'' Mr. Udall said.

Drone debates now – triggers the link

Bennett 13 (John T, Senior Congressional Reporter at Defense News, 5/6/2013, "Drones, Sequester Flexibility to Drive 2014 NDAA Debates", www.defensenews.com/article/20130506/DEFREG02/305060006/Drones-Sequester-Flexibility-Drive-2014-NDAA-Debates)

WASHINGTON — US Lawmakers are expected to battle over armed drones, softening the blow of military budget cuts and a controversial missile defense shield as they craft Pentagon policy legislation for fiscal 2014. Mirroring the political climate in Washington, work on the past several national defense authorization acts (NDAAs) has, at times, turned bitterly partisan. Longtime defense insiders say the new tone likely is here to stay for some time. Indeed, the issues expected to dominate the NDAA build this spring and summer in the House and Senate Armed Services committees — and then will spill onto the chamber floors — sharply divide most Democrats and Republicans. From whether to leave President Barack Obama’s drone-strike program under the CIA’s control or shift to the Pentagon, to closing the Guantanamo Bay, Cuba, facility that houses terrorism suspects, to a proposal to build an East Coast missile shield, the 2014 NDAA process is shaping up to be a partisan kerfuffle. “I see a couple of bigger policy issues this year,” House Armed Services Committee (HASC) member Rep. Rick Larsen, D-Wash., told Defense News. “And one of those will be the proper use of drones.” Lawrence Korb, a former Pentagon official now at the Center for American Progress, added to that list of problems with the F-35 Joint Strike Fighter program, the Pentagon’s likely DOA plan to close military bases in the US and whether to keep building Army tanks in Michigan, home state of Democratic Senate Armed Services Committee (SASC) Chairman Sen. Carl Levin. Drones The simmering debate about the White House’s consideration of moving the drone program from the CIA to the military is shaping up to be a turf war among congressional panels. But not political parties. On one side are powerful pro-military lawmakers such as Sen. John McCain, R-Ariz., a senior Senate Armed Services Committee member. On the other are influential pro-CIA members such as Sen. Dianne Feinstein, D-Calif., who chairs the Senate Intelligence Committee. Many pro-military House Democrats, such as HASC member Rep. Hank Johnson, D-Ga., and Larsen favor giving the Pentagon full ownership.

#### Vote no

#### Controversial cases now – that triggers the link

Blum 9/5/2013 (Bill Blum is a former judge and death penalty defense attorney, Sep 5, 2013, Supreme Court Preview: A Storm Is on the Horizon, http://www.truthdig.com/report/page2/supreme\_court\_preview\_a\_storm\_is\_on\_the\_horizon\_20130905/)

They’re b-a-c-k! As the war clouds gather over Washington in preparation for airstrikes against Syria, the nine justices who sit on the Supreme Court have returned from summer break and are preparing to kick up a legal storm of their own as they resume their quest to radically transform federal law and the Constitution. To be sure, there are four moderate to liberal voices on the high court, led by the frail but courageous Ruth Bader Ginsburg, who at the tender age of 80 has become the conscience of the tribunal. But with precious few detours, the court has become, in Ginsburg’s words, “one of the most activist courts in history.” So, as the court readies for the commencement of oral arguments next month in a brand new term, what can we expect from the gang of nine? Here are three cases slated for decisions on the merits with the potential to cause lasting social and political harm, and three more with sufficient weight to be added to the docket as the current term unfolds:

#### Not intrinsic

#### PC isn’t key

**Jacobs and King 10** – University of Minnesota, Nuffield College, (Lawrence and Desmond, “Varieties of Obamaism: Structure, Agency, and the Obama Presidency,” Perspectives on Politics (2010), 8: 793-802)

But personality is not a solid foundation for a persuasive explanation of presidential impact and the shortfalls or accomplishments of Obama's presidency. Modern presidents have brought divergent individual traits to their jobs and yet they have routinely failed to enact much of their agendas. Preeminent policy goals of Bill Clinton (health reform) and George W. Bush (Social Security privatization) met the same fate, though these presidents' personalities vary widely. And presidents like Jimmy Carter—whose personality traits have been criticized as ill-suited for effective leadership—enjoyed comparable or stronger success in Congress than presidents lauded for their personal knack for leadership—from Lyndon Johnson to Ronald Reagan.7 Indeed, a personalistic account provides little leverage for explaining the disparities in Obama's record—for example why he succeeded legislatively in restructuring health care and higher education, failed in other areas, and often accommodated stakeholders. Decades of rigorous research find that impersonal, structural forces offer the most compelling explanations for presidential impact.8 **Quantitative research that compares legislative success and** presidential **personality** **finds no** overall **relationship**.9 In his magisterial qualitative and historical study, Stephen Skowronek reveals that institutional dynamics and ideological commitments structure presidential choice and success in ways that trump the personal predilections of individual presidents.10 **Findings point to** the **predominant** **influence** **on presidential legislative success of** the **ideological** and partisan **composition of Congress, entrenched** **interests**, identities, and institutional design, and a constitutional order that invites multiple and competing lines of authority. The widespread presumption, then, that Obama's personal traits or leadership style account for the obstacles to his policy proposals is called into question by a generation of scholarship on the presidency. Indeed, the presumption is not simply problematic analytically, but practically as well. For the misdiagnosis of the source of presidential weakness may, paradoxically, induce failure by distracting the White House from strategies and tactics where presidents can make a difference. Following a meeting with Obama shortly after Brown's win, one Democratic senator lamented the White House's delusion that a presidential sales pitch will pass health reform—“Just declaring that he's still for it doesn't mean that it comes off life support.”11 Although Obama's re-engagement after the Brown victory did contribute to restarting reform, the senator's comment points to the importance of ideological and partisan coalitions in Congress, organizational combat, institutional roadblocks, and anticipated voter reactions. **Presidential sales pitches go only so far.**

#### No impact

Brandt and Ulfelder 11—\*Patrick T. Brandt, Ph.D. in Political Science from Indiana University, is an Assistant Professor of Political Science in the School of Social Science at the University of Texas at Dallas. \*\*Jay Ulfelder, Ph.D. in political science from Stanford University, is an American political scientist whose research interests include democratization, civil unrest, and violent conflict. [April, 2011, “Economic Growth and Political Instability,” Social Science Research Network]

These statements anticipating political fallout from the global economic crisis of 2008–2010 reflect a widely held view that economic growth has rapid and profound effects on countries’ political stability. When economies grow at a healthy clip, citizens are presumed to be too busy and too content to engage in protest or rebellion, and governments are thought to be flush with revenues they can use to enhance their own stability by producing public goods or rewarding cronies, depending on the type of regime they inhabit. When growth slows, however, citizens and cronies alike are presumed to grow frustrated with their governments, and the leaders at the receiving end of that frustration are thought to lack the financial resources to respond effectively. The expected result is an increase in the risks of social unrest, civil war, coup attempts, and regime breakdown.

Although it is pervasive, the assumption that countries’ economic growth rates strongly affect their political stability has not been subjected to a great deal of careful empirical analysis, and evidence from social science research to date does not unambiguously support it. Theoretical models of civil wars, coups d’etat, and transitions to and from democracy often specify slow economic growth as an important cause or catalyst of those events, but empirical studies on the effects of economic growth on these phenomena have produced mixed results. Meanwhile, the effects of economic growth on the occurrence or incidence of social unrest seem to have hardly been studied in recent years, as empirical analysis of contentious collective action has concentrated on political opportunity structures and dynamics of protest and repression.

This paper helps fill that gap by rigorously re-examining the effects of short-term variations in economic growth on the occurrence of several forms of political instability in countries worldwide over the past few decades. In this paper, we do not seek to develop and test new theories of political instability. Instead, we aim to subject a hypothesis common to many prior theories of political instability to more careful empirical scrutiny. The goal is to provide a detailed empirical characterization of the relationship between economic growth and political instability in a broad sense. In effect, we describe the conventional wisdom as seen in the data. We do so with statistical models that use smoothing splines and multiple lags to allow for nonlinear and dynamic effects from economic growth on political stability. We also do so with an instrumented measure of growth that explicitly accounts for endogeneity in the relationship between political instability and economic growth. To our knowledge, ours is the first statistical study of this relationship **to simultaneously address** the **possibility of nonlinearity and problems of endogeneity**. As such, we believe this paper offers what is probably the most rigorous general evaluation of this argument to date.

As the results show, some of our findings are surprising. Consistent with conventional assumptions, we find that social unrest and civil violence are more likely to occur and democratic regimes are more susceptible to coup attempts around periods of slow economic growth. At the same time, our analysis shows no significant relationship between variation in growth and the risk of civil-war onset, and results from our analysis of regime changes contradict the widely accepted claim that economic crises cause transitions from autocracy to democracy. While we would hardly pretend to have the last word on any of these relationships, our findings do suggest that the relationship between economic growth and political stability is neither as uniform nor as strong as the conventional wisdom(s) presume(s). We think these findings also help explain why the global recession of 2008–2010 has failed thus far to produce the wave of coups and regime failures that some observers had anticipated, in spite of the expected and apparent uptick in social unrest associated with the crisis.

### K – Buddhism

#### b. It’s key to decision-making skills

Hodson 10 Derek, professor of education – Ontario Institute for Studies @ University of Toronto, “Science Education as a Call to Action,” Canadian Journal of Science, Mathematics and Technology Education, Vol. 10, Issue 3, p. 197-206

\*\*note: SSI = socioscientific issues

The final (fourth) level of sophistication in this issues-based approach is concerned with students findings ways of putting their values and convictions into action, helping them to prepare for and engage in responsible action, and assisting them in developing the skills, attitudes, and values that will enable them to take control of their lives, cooperate with others to bring about change, and work toward a more just and sustainable world in which power, wealth, and resources are more equitably shared. Socially and environmentally responsible behavior will not necessarily follow from knowledge of key concepts and possession of the “right attitudes.” As Curtin (1991) reminded us, it is important to distinguish between caring about and caring for. It is almost always much easier to proclaim that one cares about an issue than to do something about it. Put simply, our values are worth nothing until we live them. Rhetoric and espoused values will not bring about social justice and will not save the planet. We must change our actions. A politicized ethic of care (caring for) entails active involvement in a local manifestation of a particular problem or issue, exploration of the complex sociopolitical contexts in which the problem/issue is located, and attempts to resolve conflicts of interest. FROM STSE RHETORIC TO SOCIOPOLITICAL ACTION Writing from the perspective of environmental education, Jensen (2002) categorized the knowledge that is likely to promote sociopolitical action and encourage pro-environmental behavior into four dimensions: (a) scientific and technological knowledge that informs the issue or problem; (b) knowledge about the underlying social, political, and economic issues, conditions, and structures and how they contribute to creating social and environmental problems; (c) knowledge about how to bring about changes in society through direct or indirect action; and (d) knowledge about the likely outcome or direction of possible actions and the desirability of those outcomes. Although formulated as a model for environmental education, it is reasonable to suppose that Jensen's arguments are applicable to all forms of SSI-oriented action. Little needs to be said about dimensions 1 and 2 in Jensen's framework beyond the discussion earlier in the article. With regard to dimension 3, students need knowledge of actions that are likely to have positive impact and knowledge of how to engage in them. It is essential that they gain robust knowledge of the social, legal, and political system(s) that prevail in the communities in which they live and develop a clear understanding of how decisions are made within local, regional, and national government and within industry, commerce, and the military. Without knowledge of where and with whom power of decision making is located and awareness of the mechanisms by which decisions are reached, intervention is not possible. Thus, the curriculum I propose requires a concurrent program designed to achieve a measure of political literacy, including knowledge of how to engage in collective action with individuals who have different competencies, backgrounds, and attitudes but share a common interest in a particular SSI. Dimension 3 also includes knowledge of likely sympathizers and potential allies and strategies for encouraging cooperative action and group interventions. What Jensen did not mention but would seem to be a part of dimension 3 knowledge is the nature of science-oriented knowledge that would enable students to appraise the statements, reports, and arguments of scientists, politicians, and journalists and to present their own supporting or opposing arguments in a coherent, robust, and convincing way (see Hodson [2009b] for a lengthy discussion of this aspect of science education). Jensen's fourth category includes awareness of how (and why) others have sought to bring about change and entails formulation of a vision of the kind of world in which we (and our families and communities) wish to live. It is important for students to explore and develop their ideas, dreams, and aspirations for themselves, their neighbors and families and for the wider communities at local, regional, national, and global levels—a clear overlap with futures studies/education. An essential step in cultivating the critical scientific and technological literacy on which sociopolitical action depends is the application of a social and political critique capable of challenging the notion of technological determinism. We can control technology and its environmental and social impact. More significantly, we can control the controllers and redirect technology in such a way that adverse environmental impact is substantially reduced (if not entirely eliminated) and issues of freedom, equality, and justice are kept in the forefront of discussion during the establishment of policy.

#### c. Drone discussions re-orient symbolic representations of global issues—Macro-political discussion key to overcome institutional bias

Green and Bernal 13 [May 29th, Droning Toward the Boundless War, Volume 25, Issue 2, Pages 212-218, Published authors under, Peace Review: A Journal of Social Justice, <http://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/10402659.2013.785324>]

War reminds us of our disconnection from one another. If we begin with acknowledging our common humanity, war comes when those small differences between us become amplified. We fail to see in the eyes of another that they are our brothers and sisters. We remove ourselves from the intimacy of knowing what war brings. Through the quiet embrace of an illusion, we fail to see the blood spilled by “them” as also our blood. The irony of war is that it provides a kind of curious veil that places our individual and collective anxiety about death “out there” into someone who will die on our behalf and kill so that we may live. What we consider to be vital in our lives is increasingly about ideologies, resources, and dominance. Behind this veil is an admixture of beliefs that our life is better than those who have become the enemy. What many of us seek unconsciously to protect is not so much life in the sense of our physical safety; rather, it has become more about a way of life where war keeps the balance of the scales tipped to our advantage a bit longer.¶ Our human differences were once about the survival of one tribe over another, one kingdom ruling another, and one nation conquering its neighbor. Warfare was for millennia face-to-face, where club and spear and sword were the implements of the mortal wound. Then with the bullet and the bomb, the mine and the missile, death from war became a more distant affair. The impact of taking a life became visible only in its aftermath. As the distance increased so did the lethality of weaponry. One bomb could kill 100,000. Within two decades in the era of the Cold War, humans had created the capacity to kill ourselves many times over. Yet these wars remained nation against nation. The “other” was one that had a flag, a people, and lands that were within generally recognized boundaries. Through the Geneva Convention, there were rules of war. A World Court was also established to prosecute those who violated these international agreements.¶ On September 11, 2001, war changed. With the beginning of the War on Terrorism, the United States entered the new era of the boundless war. No longer was the enemy another nation-state. What evolved as a consequence was a movement into a transitional space where no rules and no laws of war can any longer be found. With the collapse of the World Trade Center twin towers in New York came a descent into a different way of waging war. Initially, many of the elements remained the same. The United States took action against the Taliban government of Afghanistan for harboring training camps for Al Qaeda. In many respects, this “boots on the ground” approach to warfare had the trappings of modern conventional struggles. Troops were deployed with all the latest tactical support to take on an elusive enemy in a far away land. One powerful nation-state sought to reap justice through war from another nation-state deemed responsible for attacking the sovereignty and sanctity and safety of its people. This decade of action was designed to help Americans believe something was being done to quell the threat of terrorist attacks and implicitly to offer an assurance that the horror of 9/11 would somehow never again reach the shores of the nation. The shadowy adversary, if not vanquished, was so depleted, according to the politicians, that their ability to assault our way of life was dramatically diminished.¶ What is less visible is how the boundaries of the War on Terror morphed into something different where the psychological nature of war shifted once more. Much as The Bomb with its horrific dimensions made death in war a devastating fact for some distant enemy, so it is that the drone has become its more technologically precise and sophisticated counterpart. From thousands of miles away, “assets” can be deployed to eliminate “targets” who are deemed to pose an imminent threat to the United States. The face of the enemy is no longer seen. The hands that guide the lethal cargo do so remotely on a computer screen where the deadly action once executed has the appearance akin to a graphically intense video game. With no troops of “our” own placed in harms way, fewer deaths of innocents as “collateral damage,” and more precise elimination of sworn enemies, collective complacency about the practice was implicitly endorsed by 66 million Americans—if not more—at the last presidential election. The thorny legal complexities of this new terrain of war are placed in abeyance, in part because of the anxiety that is alleviated through the drones of war.¶ At an unconscious level, the named but faceless enemy, consistently presented as top operatives of terrorist organizations, becomes the projective repository of the threat to our way of life. They are the objects that evoke our death anxiety. They remind us that our way of life, and thereby the only life we have come to know, is threatened. They have attacked our symbols of military might and economic power. They have killed those who represent these pillars of our way of being. In this respect, the literal becomes the symbolic. The war on “them,” wherever they may be and whatever nation-state they may call their home, reduces in relevance. A drone crosses all these boundaries, as the lethal action of the surgical strike becomes just because the enemy combatant is one who lives in the shadows and therefore can be pursued there.¶ The rationale for the absence of outcry has deep unconscious antecedents in the most primitive ego defenses. The seemingly antiseptic elimination of targets allows for denial to become normative. Violence viewed through a flat screen has become entertainment, even when practiced at our own hands. When neutralizing an Al Qaeda leader looks the same as scoring a kill on Call of Duty, we can easily deny how we are complicit in a violent action of war. As such a threshold of consciousness that allows us to function in denial, relatively free of death anxiety in our day-to-day lives, remains intact. By seeing a puff on a screen rather than the riddled bodies of the defeated enemy, the connection to our own common mortality is displaced and placed at a distance. They enemy on the other side of the screen become the holders of death, quite literally, while symbolically representing the preservation of our way of life through their demise.¶ The role of the boundless war also provides an endless supply of targets for projection. While given the current name of “Islamic extremists,” this label is less important than how they become icons on which our fears about our mortality can be projected. In the illusion of a war that is not like what war once was and an enemy that is not an army like the troops of the past and a location that has no national borders or discrete regions, the ambiguity becomes a further expression of the boundlessness. War waged in this “No Man's Land” is rendered invisible, denied, and sufficiently subtle so as to remain unconscious to those who benefit from its execution.¶ When the New York Times wrote an expose revealing the appearance of corrupt financial activity on the part of those ascending to power in China, they came under attack. Within days of the publication of the stories, the Times reported a breach in the security of its electronic files. Through malicious code that was introduced into their server by an unsuspecting employee, some distant party began to search files, steal passwords, and target specific reporters. Suspected in these attacks was the Chinese government, known for its ambivalence about press freedoms.¶ These incidents are not isolated. During the summer of 2012, a number of U.S. financial institutions reported “delivery of service” attacks, ones where a flood of data overwhelms an organization's servers to the point that routine business transactions are disrupted. The Iranian government, despite repeated denials, was suspected in these actions. Perhaps an extension of what drones represent in terms of warfare, cyberattacks may be a new frontier in the boundless war. No longer is life itself directly attacked; rather, ideologies and ways of life become the new mortal symbolic targets.The anxiety that comes through such an approach to war means that what is perceived as necessities of life in much of the West—electric power, running water, Internet access—each increasingly controlled by virtual means, can be brought down by infiltration of hackers in distant lands. As with drones where international boundaries are no longer a limit on who may be seen as the enemy, the alleged actions of Iran and China suggest that corporate entities and private citizens who represent assaults on a people can be attacked.¶ One consequence of globalization is that the virtual distance between us is radically reduced to be a click or two away on a device that is often in our pocket or purse. It also means that tools of the emerging warfare may well soon be in each of our hands. Surveillance tools and sources to launch a cyberattack are carried in our cell phone.¶ The boundless war finds its justification in our perceived differences. We wage deadly violence through a kind of zero-sum social logic that views resources as finite. The need to destroy the “other” to access these resources comes through the tacit and often unconscious agreement with similar others that says “they” are a threat to “us.” This kind of paranoid stance allows war to be waged to ensure no disruption in the symbol and source of what “our” group values and perceives it needs. The paradox is in how virtual reality concurrently allows us to know the extent of the global inequities. We in the West operate with the reasonable concern that “they” will not long tolerate this kind of imbalance.¶ Nonetheless, we speak primarily to their threat to us and point to lives lost in terrorist attacks as the rationale for the boundless war. Little corresponding attention is given to the degradation of the environment, the forced migrations, the imposition of government structures, and other evidence of dominance that seed discontent in generations of the “other.” What gets enacted is the fear of death rather than any deeper examination of the mutuality of shared human interests. Death anxiety taps into a greater existential question about what to do with our lives and a more general unease about the unavoidable trajectory toward our own death. Differences in a group's way of life can in this instance be understood as more than cultural nuance. As such, the further paradox is that the boundless war gives life meaning and helps satisfy the human impulse to alleviate existential angst and the certainty of our death by killing the other who threatens this denial.¶ On a healthy level, various cultural symbols such as country, race, or a religious tradition can serve as very positive elements in human meaning-making. They create the fiber of a functioning civil society where debate, discussion, participation, coexistence, and learning are the norm. Under circumstances of threat or significant levels of uncertainty, however, there may be a regressive tendency to attach allegiance to these symbols to an extent that destruction, death, and domination is justified and even celebrated.¶ From a psychological perspective, many conditions contribute to the creation of the boundless war. As referenced previously, globalization reduces the distance between us. Under this condition, there is a virtual intimacy in knowing that we can instantaneously be in touch and face-to-face with someone on the other side of the planet. It is this form of connection that gives substance to our experience of a common humanity. Yet, it is also this same means that can remind us of the inequities and injustices abound. Ideally, consciousness of the experience of the other can bring about greater compassion, empathy, understanding, and identification with our fellow human beings. In other instances, the starkness of the differences may first lead to recoiling into the familiar. Reaching out to the world can be replaced by a regressive return to known narratives that reinforce our view or the world. Those small differences become the beginning of the alienation of one from another. As such, a cycle of displacement of anxieties and projection of fears gets enacted and often perpetuated through war.¶ The small deaths that happens when our point of view of way of being is not understood or recognized by the “other” is like a little war. In seeking to affirm our cherished reality and deeply held belief, the necessity to find those who share our worldview creates coalitions of belonging. These connections form the basis of shared identity, common language, and preferred ways of knowing where our boundaries end and the realm of the “other” begins. There was a time when one could claim access to resources such as people, land, or wealth as the measure of supremacy in such disputes. In the age of the virtual, increasingly there is equity in the capacity to find one's people and that critical mass needed to battle forces that were once invisible.¶ What makes this condition so critical in a time of boundless war is that such coalitions are like shifting sands. Most will find themselves with multiple allegiances and many factors to balance in the quest to keep the fear of death at bay. When the discourse around us becomes increasingly divisive and fear is used to bring the like-minded in line with one another, an either–or mentality becomes like a psychological refugee camp in a world where our interdependence because increasingly undeniable. Boundless war is known to be nowhere and everywhere. We are its victims and its propagators. With no longer a bomb shelter that can protect us nor a country whose boundaries are secure enough to stop the world from closing in on us, a kind of schizoid state that gives us the fleeting solace of self-sufficiency shields us from the deeper and starker reality. From this psychological bunker of virtual walls, we allow the boundless war to drone on, as we remain unconscious.¶ Locating the coordinates and governing social logic that structure the context under which we live and inform our lives reveals a system that operates under a number of principles that currently remain supreme. Globalization spreads to all corners of the world and with it the primacy of profit seeking, wealth accumulation, and the struggle for control of depleting resources. This quest, which has many traits of an addictive process, serves to maintain the lifestyle of an unrestrained consumer culture. What becomes valued are those actions that play a role in mass production and monetary gain. What is compromised is a relational, environmental, ethical, or aesthetic orientation to one another that promotes compassion and helps us sustain our deeper shared human connection.¶ In a globalizing world, tremendous levels of expanding inequality exist at a time when there are great amounts of wealth. This reality suggests an inability to meet some basic human needs despite consciousness of our deeper interconnectedness and interdependence.These conditions have created a situation in both the developed and developing world where a growing sector of the population is becoming alienated from meaning. Our role within the global economy comes with certain by-products and social ills that become translated into a compulsion toward aggression. The cost is the kind of cooperative empathy capable of nurturing diverse environments and addressing inequities for which there is a current collusion to deny.¶ Daily participation within this broader macro system creates the necessary triggers that can expand the relationship we have with anxiety. Our need to reduce this anxiety means reducing the social symbols that link us. The trade-off is in the boundless war, the safety valve for our collective emotional rationalizations. Through drones and loss of boundaries of the nation-state to pursue the enemy, we can justify any number of aggressions on to the “other.” In the boundless war, ongoing financial crises, citizen debt, and the break down of social and public investment accompany a perpetual war that is not only borderless but also ongoing. We are always fighting someone “out there” that threatens our safety and our way of life even to the point where we have to give up civil liberties. Our authority figures become unaccountable when there is constant vigilance and a concentration of power in the name of safety to battle an enemy that has no border. Our justifications and tolerance for destruction deepen when the virtuality of technology and the materiality of human life continue to overlap in a way that can obscure the human connection we actually share on this same planet.

#### d. Alt puts the cart before the horse – pragmatic action must come first

Owen 2 David, Reader in Political Theory at the University of Southampton, Reorienting International Relations: On Pragmatism, Pluralism and Practical Reasoning”, Millennium: Journal of International Studies, Vol. 31, No. 3, http://mil.sagepub.com/cgi/reprint/31/3/653

Commenting on the ‘philosophical turn’ in IR, Wæver remarks that ‘[a] frenzy for words like “epistemology” and “ontology” often signals this philosophical turn’, although he goes on to comment that these terms are often used loosely.4 However, loosely deployed or not, it is clear that debates concerning ontology and epistemology play a central role in the contemporary IR theory wars. In one respect, this is unsurprising since it is a characteristic feature of the social sciences that periods of disciplinary disorientation involve recourse to reflection on the philosophical commitments of different theoretical approaches, and there is no doubt that such reflection can play a valuable role in making explicit the commitments that characterise (and help individuate) diverse theoretical positions. Yet, such a philosophical turn is not without its dangers and I will briefly mention three before turning to consider a confusion that has, I will suggest, helped to promote the IR theory wars by motivating this philosophical turn. The first danger with the philosophical turn is that it has an inbuilt tendency to prioritise issues of ontology and epistemology over explanatory and/or interpretive power as if the latter two were merely a simple function of the former. But while the explanatory and/or interpretive power of a theoretical account is not wholly independent of its ontological and/or epistemological commitments (otherwise criticism of these features would not be a criticism that had any value), it is by no means clear that it is, in contrast, wholly dependent on these philosophical commitments. Thus, for example, one need not be sympathetic to rational choice theory to recognise that it can provide powerful accounts of certain kinds of problems, such as the tragedy of the commons in which dilemmas of collective action are foregrounded. It may, of course, be the case that the advocates of rational choice theory cannot give a good account of why this type of theory is powerful in accounting for this class of problems (i.e., how it is that the relevant actors come to exhibit features in these circumstances that approximate the assumptions of rational choice theory) and, if this is the case, it is a philosophical weakness—but this does not undermine the point that, for a certain class of problems, rational choice theory may provide the best account available to us. In other words, while the critical judgement of theoretical accounts in terms of their ontological and/or epistemological sophistication is one kind of critical judgement, it is not the only or even necessarily the most important kind. The second danger run by the philosophical turn is that because prioritisation of ontology and epistemology promotes theory-construction from philosophical first principles, it cultivates a theory-driven rather than problem-driven approach to IR. Paraphrasing Ian Shapiro, the point can be put like this: since it is the case that there is always a plurality of possible true descriptions of a given action, event or phenomenon, the challenge is to decide which is the most apt in terms of getting a perspicuous grip on the action, event or phenomenon in question given the purposes of the inquiry; yet, from this standpoint, ‘theory-driven work is part of a reductionist program’ in that it ‘dictates always opting for the description that calls for the explanation that flows from the preferred model or theory’.5 The justification offered for this strategy rests on the mistaken belief that it is necessary for social science because general explanations are required to characterise the classes of phenomena studied in similar terms. However, as Shapiro points out, this is to misunderstand the enterprise of science since ‘whether there are general explanations for classes of phenomena is a question for social-scientific inquiry, not to be prejudged before conducting that inquiry’.6 Moreover, this strategy easily slips into the promotion of the pursuit of generality over that of empirical validity. The third danger is that the preceding two combine to encourage the formation of a particular image of disciplinary debate in IR—what might be called (only slightly tongue in cheek) ‘the Highlander view’—namely, an image of warring theoretical approaches with each, despite occasional temporary tactical alliances, dedicated to the strategic achievement of sovereignty over the disciplinary field. It encourages this view because the turn to, and prioritisation of, ontology and epistemology stimulates the idea that there can only be one theoretical approach which gets things right, namely, the theoretical approach that gets its ontology and epistemology right. This image feeds back into IR exacerbating the first and second dangers, and so a potentially vicious circle arises. It should be noted that I am not claiming that such a vicious circle has been established in IR by virtue of the philosophical turn, nor am I claiming that IR is alone in its current exposure to this threat; on the contrary, Shapiro’s remarks are directed at (primarily North American) political science. I am simply concerned to point out that the philosophical turn in IR increases its exposure to these dangers and, hence, its vulnerability to the kind of vicious circle that they can, collectively, generate.

#### Our 1AC was written the way it was due to qualitative and quantitative research about these threats, we recognize our responsibility for those contributions, we think the responsibility for future generations outweighs

Kateb 92 Professor of Politics at Princeton University (George, “The Inner Ocean” p 111-112)

Schell's work attempts to force on us an acknowledgment that sounds far-fetched and even ludicrous, an acknowledgment hat the possibility of extinction is carried by any use of nuclear weapons, no matter how limited or how seemingly rational or seemingly morally justified. He himself acknowledges that there is a difference between possibility and certainty. But in a matter that is more than a matter, more than one practical matter in a vast series of practical matters, in the "matter" of extinction, we are obliged to treat a possibility-a genuine possibility-as a certainty. Humanity is not to take any step that contains even the slightest risk of extinction. The doctrine of no-use is based on the possibility of extinction. Schell's perspective transforms the subject. He takes us away from the arid stretches of strategy and asks us to feel continuously, if we can, and feel keenly if only for an instant now and then, how utterly distinct the nuclear world is. Nuclear discourse must vividly register that distinctiveness. It is of no moral account that extinction may be only a slight possibility. No one can say how great the possibility is, but no one has yet credibly denied that by some sequence or other a particular use of nuclear weapons may lead to human and natural extinction. If it is not impossible it must be treated as certain: the loss signified by extinction nullifies all calculations of probability as it nullifies all calculations of costs and benefits. Abstractly put, the connections between any use of nuclear weapons and human and natural extinction are several. Most obviously, a sizable exchange of strategic nuclear weapons can, by a chain of events in nature, lead to the earth's uninhabitability, to "nuclear winter," or to Schell's "republic of insects and grass." But the consideration of extinction cannot rest with the possibility of a sizable exchange of strategic weapons. It cannot rest with the imperative that a sizable exchange must not take place. A so-called tactical or "theater" use, or a so-called limited use, is also prohibited absolutely, because of the possibility of immediate escalation into a sizable exchange or because, even if there were not an immediate escalation, the possibility of extinction would reside in the precedent for future use set by any use whatever in a world in which more than one power possesses nuclear weapons. Add other consequences: the contagious effect on nonnuclear powers who may feel compelled by a mixture of fear and vanity to try to acquire their own weapons, thus increasing the possibility of use by increasing the number of nuclear powers; and the unleashed emotions of indignation, retribution, and revenge which, if not acted on immediately in the form of escalation, can be counted on to seek expression later. Other than full strategic uses are not confined, no matter how small the explosive power: each would be a cancerous transformation of the world. All nuclear roads lead to the possibility of extinction. It is true by definition, but let us make it explicit: the doctrine of no-use excludes any first or retaliatory or later use, whether sizable or not. No-use is the imperative derived from the possibility of extinction. By containing the possibility of extinction, any use is tantamount to a declaration of war against humanity. It is not merely a war crime or a single crime against humanity. Such a war is waged by the user of nuclear weapons against every human individual as individual (present and future), not as citizen of this or that country. It is not only a war against the country that is the target. To respond with nuclear weapons, where possible, only increases the chances of extinction and can never, therefore, be allowed. The use of nuclear weapons establishes the right of any person or group, acting officially or not, violently or not, to try to punish those responsible for the use. The aim of the punishment is to deter later uses and thus to try to reduce the possibility of extinction, if, by chance, the particular use in question did not directly lead to extinction. The form of the punishment cannot be specified. Of course the chaos ensuing from a sizable exchange could make punishment irrelevant. The important point, however, is to see that those who use nuclear weapons are qualitatively worse than criminals, and at the least forfeit their offices. John Locke, a principal individualist political theorist, says that in a state of nature every individual retains the right to punish transgressors or assist in the effort to punish them, whether or not one is a direct victim. Transgressors convert an otherwise tolerable condition into a state of nature which is a state of war in which all are threatened. Analogously, the use of nuclear weapons, by containing in an immediate or delayed manner the possibility of extinction, is in Locke's phrase "a trespass against the whole species" and places the users in a state of war with all people. And people, the accumulation of individuals, must be understood as of course always indefeasibly retaining the right of selfpreservation, and hence as morally allowed, perhaps enjoined, to take the appropriate preserving step

**The alt fails- Buddhism will NEVER be adopted because it gets bogged down in the discourse of the neg’s understanding**

Harris 9, Religious Scholar [Sam, “Killing the Buddha” http://www.shambhalasun.com/index.php?option=com\_content&task=view&id=2903&Itemid=244]

This is not to say that Buddhism has nothing to offer the world. One could surely argue that the Buddhist tradition, taken as a whole, represents the richest source of contemplative wisdom that any civilization has produced. In a world that has long been terrorized by fratricidal Sky-God religions, the ascendance of Buddhism would surely be a welcome development. **But this will not happen**. There is no reason whatsoever to think that Buddhism can successfully compete with the relentless evangelizing of Christianity and Islam. Nor should it try to. The wisdom of the Buddha is currently trapped within the religion of Buddhism. Even in the West, where scientists and Buddhist contemplatives now collaborate in studying the effects of meditation on the brain, Buddhism remains an utterly parochial concern. While it may be true enough to say (as many Buddhist practitioners allege) that “Buddhism is not a religion,” most Buddhists worldwide practice it as such, in many of the naive, petitionary, and superstitious ways in which all religions are practiced. Needless to say, all non-Buddhists believe Buddhism to be a religion—and, what is more, they are quite certain that it is the wrong religion. To talk about “Buddhism,” therefore**, inevitably imparts a false sense of the Buddha’s teaching to others. So insofar as we maintain a discourse as “Buddhists,” we ensure that the wisdom of the Buddha will do little to inform the development of civilization in the twenty-first century**.

#### Their refusal to address possible catastrophes in the world is more of an attempt of escaping from realities --- it’s more productive to work to remove the causes of fear and suffering

Geshe Kelsang **Gyatso 03**, Internationally renowned teacher and author of 19 books on spirituality, 2003 Tharpa Publications, http://www.tharpa.com/uk/background/dealing-with-fear.htm

According to Buddhism, there is unhealthy fear and healthy fear. For example, when we are afraid of something that cannot actually harm us - such as spiders - or something we can do nothing to avoid - such as old age or being struck down with smallpox or being run over by a truck - then our fear is unhealthy, for it serves only to make us unhappy and paralyze our will. On the other hand, when someone gives up smoking because they are afraid of developing lung cancer, this is a healthy fear because the danger is real and there are constructive steps they can take to avoid it. IT CONTINUES However, right now we need the healthy fear that arises from taking stock of our present situation so that we can resolve to do something about it. For example, there is no point in a smoker being scared of dying of lung cancer unless there is something that he or she can or will do about it, i.e. stop smoking. If a smoker has a sufficient fear of dying of lung cancer, he or she will take steps to kick the habit. If he [or she] prefers to ignore the danger of lung cancer, he [or she] will continue to create the causes of future suffering, living in denial and effectively giving up control. Just as a smoker is vulnerable to lung cancer due to cigarettes, it is true that at the moment we are vulnerable to danger and harm, we are vulnerable to ageing, sickness, and eventually death, all due to our being trapped in samsara — the state of uncontrolled existence that is a reflection of our own uncontrolled minds. We are vulnerable to all the mental and physical pain that arises from an uncontrolled mind-such as the pains that come from the delusions of attachment, anger, and ignorance. We can choose to **live in denial** of this and thereby **give up what control we have**, or we can choose to recognize this vulnerability, recognize that awe are in danger, and then find a way to avert the danger by **removing the actual causes** of all fear (the equivalent of the cigarettes) - the delusions and negative, unskillful actions motivated by those delusions. In this way we gain control, and if we are in control we have no cause for fear. A balanced fear of our delusions and the suffering to which they inevitably give rise is therefore healthy because it serves to **motivate constructive action to avoid a real danger**. We only need fear as an impetus until we have removed the causes of our vulnerability through finding spiritual, inner refuge and gradually training the mind

#### Criticizing our assumptions doesn’t change the facts of the 1AC

**Sokal**, 19**95**

(Alan D., professor of physics at New York University, “Transgressing the Boundaries: An Afterword,” http://physics.nyu.edu/faculty/sokal/afterword\_v1a/afterword\_v1a\_singlefile.html)

For example, Harding (citing Forman 1987) points out that American research in the 1940s and 50s on quantum electronics was motivated in large part by potential military applications. True enough. Now, quantum mechanics made possible solid-state physics, which in turn made possible quantum electronics (e.g. the transistor), which made possible nearly all of modern technology (e.g. the computer).[8](http://physics.nyu.edu/faculty/sokal/afterword_v1a/afterword_v1a_singlefile.html#109) And the computer has had applications that are beneficial to society (e.g. in allowing the postmodern cultural critic to produce her articles more efficiently) as well as applications that are harmful (e.g. in allowing the U.S. military to kill human beings more efficiently). This raises a host of social and individual ethical questions: Ought society to forbid (or discourage) certain applications of computers? Forbid (or discourage) research on computers per se? Forbid (or discourage) research on quantum electronics? On solid-state physics? On quantum mechanics? And likewise for individual scientists and technologists. (Clearly, an affirmative answer to these questions becomes harder to justify as one goes down the list; but I do not want to declare any of these questions a priori illegitimate.) Likewise, sociological questions arise, for example: To what extent is our (true) knowledge of computer science, quantum electronics, solid-state physics and quantum mechanics -- and our lack of knowledge about other scientific subjects, e.g. the global climate -- a result of public-policy choices favoring militarism? To what extent have the erroneous theories (if any) in computer science, quantum electronics, solid-state physics and quantum mechanics been the result (in whole or in part) of social, economic, political, cultural and ideological factors, in particular the culture of militarism?9 These are all serious questions, which deserve careful investigation adhering to the highest standards of scientific and historical evidence. But they have no effect whatsoever on the underlying scientific questions: whether atoms (and silicon crystals, transistors and computers) really do behave according to the laws of quantum mechanics (and solid-state physics, quantum electronics and computer science). The militaristic orientation of American science has quite simply no bearing whatsoever on the ontological question, and only under a wildly implausible scenario could it have any bearing on the epistemological question. (E.g. if the worldwide community of solid-state physicists, following what they believe to be the conventional standards of scientific evidence, were to hastily accept an erroneous theory of semiconductor behavior because of their enthusiasm for the breakthrough in military technology that this theory would make possible.)

### K – Policy Making

#### This form of debate is key to critical activism – debating both sides of hegemonic power structures empirically creates powerful liberal coalitions

Guilhot, research fellow – Social Science Research Council, prof sociology – LSE, ‘5

(Nicolas, The Democracy Makers, p. 13-14)

Finally, there can be double agents only where there is conflict and con­tending agendas. This is crucial dimension to the analyses. The genesis of global prescriptions for democratization or human rights and the production " of international norms in a variety of regulatory areas are conflictual processes. Goals, means, strategies, models, interlocutors, experts, grantees are constantly being contested. The meaning of concepts themselves is at stake in these struggles: for instance, the debate about human rights in the 1980s was entirely about deciding whether human rights were a universal norm that could be opposed to any form of government (as liberals would argue), in whether they did not exist outside of national political traditions and legal systems (as neoconservatives would say)—which then meant, in the latter case, that the defense of U.S. interests could not be contrary to human rights, and that exporting and imposing the rule of law and democracy was the only possible human rights policy. The opposition between different political and social agendas is the perfect ground for the emergence of a tiiick layer of intermediaries, mediators, arbiters, and go-betweens shuttling back and forth between contending groups, between dominant institutions and NGOs, between the national and the international, between the de­tached position of the academic and the involvement of the practitioner. These double agents tend to occupy the middle ground and to be in the best position to make hegemonic institutions more sensitive to emancipatory claims, while at the same time disciplining or moderating NGOs and activ­ists. By doing so, they seem to further all agendas at once. In the 1980s, for instance, the most successful advocates of democratization programs in­cluded committed U.S. and Latin American political scientists who had been promoting both democratization and the limitation of democracy to the political sphere. All this entails no judgment about the psychological motivations of actors. Talking of double agents does not imply that individuals follow cynical self-serving calculations. Cynicism is a model of individual rationality which is anthropologically dubious and epistemologically untenable. On the con­trary, the individuals who appear in this book are often idealists, motivated by a real commitment to the causes they champion. What has changed is the place and the role of this idealism in the global context. What makes them "double" agents is the structural context in which they participate. It is not an issue of character. While the demands for a more ethical foreign policy and other forms of international democratic activism were once clearly critical elements, they have become today the building blocks of new world orders. The construction of "market democracies" across the world has been adopted as a crucial element of the U.S. security doctrine and also an instrument of economic liberalization, while the exportation of democ­racy has given birth to new forms of political, legal, and scientific imperi­alism. In this new context, democratic activism has obviously changed its signification, if not its sides.