## 1AC

#### The United States Congress should restrict the use of remote controlled aerial vehicle targeted killings outside of geographic locations housing active American combat troops to purposes only justifiable under self-defense.

### Advantage {X}: Drone Failure

#### Drone strikes are causing instability and terrorist backlash in Pakistan and Yemen- creating a failed state syndrome and killing relations

Rohde ’12 (David Rohde, American author and investigative journalist for Thomson Reuters. While a reporter for The Christian Science Monitor, he won the Pulitzer Prize for International Reporting in 1996 for his coverage of the Srebrenica massacre. From July 2002 until December 2004, he was co-chief of The New York Times' South Asia bureau, based in New Delhi, India. He shared a second Pulitzer Prize for Times 2008 team coverage of Afghanistan and Pakistan, While in Afghanistan, Rohde was kidnapped by members of the Taliban in November 2008, but managed to escape in June 2009 after seven months in captivity, “How Obama’s drone war is backfiring”, <http://blogs.reuters.com/david-rohde/2012/03/01/how-obamas-drone-war-is-backfiring/>, March/April issue of Foreign Policy, March 1, 2012)

When Barack Obama took the oath of office three years ago, no one associated the phrase “targeted killing” with his optimistic young presidency. In his inaugural address, the 47-year-old former constitutional law professor uttered the word “terror” only once. Instead, he promised to use technology to “harness the sun and the winds and the soil to fuel our cars and run our factories.” Oddly, technology has enabled Obama to become something few expected: a president who has dramatically expanded the executive branch’s ability to wage high-tech clandestine war. With a determination that has surprised many, Obama has embraced the CIA, expanded its powers and approved more targeted killings than any modern president. Over the last three years, the Obama administration has carried out at least 239 covert drone strikes, more than five times the 44 approved under George W. Bush. And after promising to make counterterrorism operations more transparent and rein in executive power, Obama has arguably done the opposite, maintaining secrecy and expanding presidential authority. Just as importantly, the administration’s excessive use of drone attacks undercuts one of its most laudable policies: a promising new post-9/11 approach to the use of lethal American force, one of multilateralism, transparency and narrow focus. Obama’s willingness to deploy lethal force should have come as no surprise. In a 2002 speech, Illinois State Senator Obama opposed Bush’s impending invasion of Iraq, but not all conflicts. “I don’t oppose all wars,” he said. “What I am opposed to is a dumb war.” And as president, in his December 2009 Nobel Peace Prize acceptance speech, Obama warned, “There will be times when nations — acting individually or in concert — will find the use of force not only necessary but morally justified.” Since then, he has not only sent U.S. forces into Afghanistan, Iraq and Libya, but also repeatedly approved commando raids in Pakistan and Somalia and on the high seas, while presiding over a system that unleashed hundreds of drone strikes. In a series of recent interviews, current and former administration officials outlined what could be called an “Obama doctrine” on the use of force. Obama’s embrace of multilateralism, drone strikes and a light U.S. military presence in Libya, Pakistan and Yemen, they contend, has proved more effective than Bush’s go-heavy approach in Iraq and Afghanistan. “We will use force unilaterally if necessary against direct threats to the United States,” Ben Rhodes, the administration’s deputy national security advisor for strategic communications, told me. “And we’ll use force in a very precise way.” Crises the administration deems indirect threats to the United States — such as the uprisings in Libya and Syria — are “threats to global security,” Rhodes argued, and will be responded to multilaterally and not necessarily by force. The drawdown of U.S. troops in Iraq and Afghanistan, as well as the creation of a smaller, more agile U.S. military spread across Asia, the Pacific and the Middle East, are also part of the doctrine. So is the discreet backing of protesters in Egypt, Iran and Syria. The emerging strategy — which Rhodes touted as “a far more focused approach to our adversaries” — is a welcome shift from the martial policies and bellicose rhetoric of both the Bush administration and today’s Republican presidential candidates. But Obama has granted the CIA far too much leeway in carrying out drone strikes in Pakistan and Yemen. In both countries, the strikes often **appear to be backfiring**. Obama and other administration officials insist the drones are used rarely and kill few civilians. In a rare public comment on the program, the president defended the strikes in late January. “I want to make sure the people understand, actually, drones have not caused a huge number of civilian casualties,” Obama said. “For the most part, they have been very precise precision strikes against al Qaeda and their affiliates. And we are very careful in terms of how it’s been applied.” But from Pakistan to Yemen to post-American Iraq, **drones** often **spark deep resentment** where they operate. When they do attack, they kill as brutally as any weapon of war. The administration’s practice of classifying the **strikes as secret** only **exacerbates** local **anger and suspicion**. Under Obama, drone strikes have become too frequent, too unilateral, and too much associated with the heavy-handed use of American power. In 2008, I saw this firsthand. Two Afghan colleagues and I were kidnapped by the Taliban and held captive in the tribal areas of Pakistan for seven months. From the ground, drones are terrifying weapons that can be heard circling overhead for hours at a time. They are a potent, unnerving symbol of unchecked American power. At the same time, they were clearly effective, killing foreign bomb-makers and preventing Taliban fighters from gathering in large groups. The experience left me convinced that drone strikes should be carried out — but very selectively. In the January interview, Obama insisted drone strikes were used only surgically. “It is important for everybody to understand,” he said, “that this thing is kept on a very tight leash.” Drones, though, are in no way surgical. In interviews, current and former Obama administration officials told me the president and his senior aides had been eager from the outset to differentiate their approach in Pakistan and Afghanistan from Bush’s. Unlike in Iraq, where Democrats thought the Bush administration had been too aggressive, they thought the Bush White House had not been assertive enough with Afghan and Pakistani leaders. So the new administration adopted a unilateral, get-tough approach in South Asia that would eventually spread elsewhere. As candidate Obama vowed in a 2007 speech, referring to Pakistan’s president at the time, “If we have actionable intelligence about high-value terrorist targets and President Musharraf won’t act, we will.” In his first year in office, Obama approved two large troop surges in Afghanistan and a vast expansion of the number of CIA operatives in Pakistan. The CIA was also given more leeway in carrying out drone strikes in the country’s ungoverned tribal areas, where foreign and local militants plot attacks for Afghanistan, Pakistan and beyond. The decision reflected both Obama’s belief in the need to move aggressively in Pakistan and the influence of the CIA in the new administration. To a far greater extent than the Bush White House, Obama and his top aides relied on the CIA for its analysis of Pakistan, according to current and former senior administration officials. As a result, preserving the agency’s ability to carry out counterterrorism, or “CT,” operations in Pakistan became of paramount importance. “The most important thing when it came to Pakistan was to be able to carry out drone strikes and nothing else,” said a former official who spoke on condition of anonymity. “The so-called strategic focus of the bilateral relationship was there solely to serve the CT approach.” Initially, the CIA was right. Increased drone strikes in the tribal areas eliminated senior al Qaeda operatives in 2009. Then, in July 2010, Pakistanis working for the CIA pulled up behind a white Suzuki navigating the bustling streets of Peshawar. The car’s driver was later tracked to a large compound in the city of Abbottabad. On May 2, 2011, U.S. commandos killed Osama bin Laden there. The U.S. intelligence presence, though, extended far beyond the hunt for bin Laden, according to former administration officials. At one point, the CIA tried to deploy hundreds of operatives across Pakistan but backed off after suspicious Pakistani officials declined to issue them visas. At the same time, the agency aggressively used the freer hand Obama had given it to launch more drone strikes than ever before. Established by the Bush administration and Musharraf in 2004, the covert CIA drone program initially carried out only “personality” strikes against a preapproved list of senior al Qaeda members. Pakistani officials were notified before many, but not all, attacks. Between 2004 and 2007, nine such attacks were carried out in Pakistan, according to the New America Foundation. In 2008, the Bush administration authorized less-restrictive **“signature” strikes** in the tribal areas. Instead of basing attacks on intelligence regarding a specific person, CIA drone operators could carry out strikes based on the behavior of people on the ground. Operators could launch a drone strike if they saw a group, for example, crossing back and forth over the Afghanistan-Pakistan border. In 2008, the Bush administration carried out 33 strikes. Under Obama, the drone campaign has escalated rapidly. The number of strikes rose steeply to 53 in 2009 and then more than doubled to 118 in 2010. Former administration officials said **the looser rules resulted in the killing of more civilians**. Current administration officials insisted that Obama, in fact, tightened the rules on the use of drone strikes after taking office. They said strikes rose under Obama because improved technology and intelligence gathering created more opportunities for attacks than existed under Bush. But as Pakistani public anger over the spiraling strikes grew, other diplomats expressed concern as well. The U.S. ambassador in Pakistan at the time, Anne Patterson, opposed several attacks, but the CIA ignored her objections. When Cameron Munter replaced Patterson in October 2010, he objected even more vigorously. On at least two occasions, CIA Director Leon Panetta dismissed Munter’s protests and launched strikes, the Wall Street Journal later reported. One strike occurred only hours after Sen. John Kerry, head of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, had completed a visit to Islamabad. A March 2011 strike brought the debate to the White House. A day after Pakistani officials agreed to release CIA contractor Raymond Davis, the agency — again over Munter’s objections — carried out a signature drone strike that the Pakistanis say killed four Taliban fighters and 38 civilians. Already angry about the Davis case, Pakistan’s Army chief, Gen. Ashfaq Parvez Kayani, issued an unusual public statement, saying a group of tribal elders had been “carelessly and callously targeted with complete disregard to human life.” U.S. intelligence officials dismissed the Pakistani complaints and insisted 20 militants had perished. “There’s every indication that this was a group of terrorists, not a charity car wash in the Pakistani hinterlands,” one official told the Associated Press. Surprised by the vehemence of the official Pakistani reaction, National Security Adviser Tom Donilon questioned whether signature strikes were worthwhile. Critics inside and outside the U.S. government contended that a program that began as a carefully focused effort to kill senior al Qaeda leaders had morphed into a bombing campaign against low-level Taliban fighters. Some outside analysts even argued that the administration had adopted a de facto “kill not capture” policy, given its inability to close Bush’s Guantánamo Bay prison and create a new detention system. In April 2011, the director of Pakistan’s intelligence service, Lt. Gen. Ahmed Shuja Pasha, visited Washington in an effort to repair the relationship, according to news accounts and former administration officials. Just after his visit, two more drone strikes occurred in the tribal areas, which Pasha took as a personal affront. In a rare concession, Panetta agreed to notify Pakistan’s intelligence service before the United States carried out any strike that could kill more than 20 people. In May, after the bin Laden raid sparked further anger among Pakistani officials, Donilon launched an internal review of how drone strikes were approved, according to a former administration official. But the strikes continued. At the end of May, State Department officials were angered when three missile strikes followed Secretary of State Hillary Clinton’s visit to Pakistan. As Donilon’s review progressed, an intense debate erupted inside the administration over the signature strikes, according to the Wall Street Journal. Adm. Mike Mullen, then chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, said the strikes should be more selective. Robert Gates, then the defense secretary, warned that angry Pakistani officials could cut off supplies to U.S. troops in Afghanistan. Clinton warned that too many **civilian casualties** could **strengthen opposition to Pakistan’s weak**, pro-American **president**, Asif Ali Zardari. The CIA countered that Taliban fighters were legitimate targets because they carried out cross-border attacks on U.S. forces, according to the former official. In June, Obama sided with the CIA. Panetta conceded that no drone strike would be carried out when Pakistani officials visited Washington and that Clinton and Munter could object to proposed strikes. But Obama allowed the CIA director to retain final say. Last November, the worst-case scenario that Mullen, Gates and Clinton had warned of came to pass. After NATO airstrikes mistakenly killed 24 Pakistani soldiers on the Afghanistan-Pakistan border, Kayani [army chief general] demanded an end to all U.S. drone strikes and blocked supplies to U.S. troops in Afghanistan. At the same time, popular opposition to Zardari soared. After a nearly two-month lull that allowed militants to regroup, drone strikes resumed in the tribal areas this past January. But signature strikes are no longer allowed — for the time being, according to the former senior official. Among average Pakistanis, the strikes played out disastrously. In a 2011 Pew Research Center poll, 97 percent of Pakistani respondents who knew about the attacks said American drone strikes were a “bad thing.” Seventy-three percent of Pakistanis had an unfavorable view of the United States, a 10-percentage-point rise from 2008. Administration officials say the strikes are popular with Pakistanis who live in the tribal areas and have tired of brutal jihadi rule. And they contend that Pakistani government officials — while publicly criticizing the attacks — agree in private that they help combat militancy. Making the strikes more transparent could reduce public anger in other parts of Pakistan, U.S. officials concede. But they say some elements of the Pakistani government continue to request that the strikes remain covert. For me, the bottom line is that both governments’ approaches are failing. Pakistan’s economy is dismal. Its military continues to shelter Taliban fighters it sees as proxies to thwart Indian encroachment in Afghanistan. And the percentage of Pakistanis supporting the use of the Pakistani Army to fight extremists in the tribal areas — the key to eradicating militancy — dropped from a 53 percent majority in 2009 to 37 percent last year. **Pakistan is more unstable today than it was when Obama took office**. A similar dynamic is creating even worse results on the southern tip of the Arabian Peninsula. Long ignored by the United States, Yemen drew sudden attention after a suicide attack on the USS Cole killed 17 American sailors in the port of Aden in 2000. In 2002, the Bush administration carried out a single drone strike in Yemen that killed Abu Ali al-Harithi, an al Qaeda operative who was a key figure in orchestrating the Cole attack. In the years that followed, the administration shifted its attentions to Iraq, and militants began to regroup. A failed December 2009 attempt by a militant trained in Yemen to detonate a bomb on a Detroit-bound airliner focused Obama’s attention on the country. Over the next two years, the United States carried out an estimated 20 airstrikes in Yemen, most in 2011. In addition to killing al Qaeda-linked militants, the strikes killed dozens of civilians, according to Yemenis. Instead of decimating the organization, the Obama strikes have increased the ranks of al Qaeda in the Arabian Peninsula from 300 fighters in 2009 to more than 1,000 today, according to Gregory Johnsen, a leading Yemen expert at Princeton University. In January, the group briefly seized control of Radda, a town only 100 miles from the capital, Sanaa. “I don’t believe that the U.S. has a Yemen policy,” Johnsen told me. “What the U.S. has is a counterterrorism strategy that it applies to Yemen.” The deaths of bin Laden and many of his lieutenants are a step forward, but Pakistan and Yemen are increasingly unstable. Pakistan is a nuclear-armed country of 180 million with resilient militant networks; Yemen, an impoverished, failing state that is fast becoming a new al Qaeda stronghold. “They think they’ve won because of this approach,” the former administration official said, referring to the administration’s drone-heavy strategy. “A lot of us think there is going to be a lot bigger problems in the future.” The backlash from drone strikes in the countries where they are happening is not the only worry. In the United States, civil liberties and human rights groups are increasingly concerned with the breadth of powers Obama has claimed for the executive branch as he wages a new kind of war. In the Libya conflict, the administration invoked the drones to create a new legal precedent. Under the War Powers Resolution, the president must receive congressional authorization for military operations within 60 days. When the deadline approached in May, the administration announced that because NATO strikes and drones were carrying out the bulk of the missions, no serious threat of U.S. casualties existed and no congressional authorization was needed. “It’s changed the way politicians talk about what should be the most important thing that a nation engages in,” said Peter W. Singer, a Brookings Institution researcher. “It’s changed the way we in the public deliberate war.” Last fall, a series of drone strikes in Yemen set **another dangerous precedent**, according to civil liberties and human rights groups. Without any public legal proceeding, the U.S. government executed three of its own citizens. On Sept. 30, a drone strike killed Anwar al-Awlaki, a charismatic American-born cleric of Yemeni descent credited with inspiring terrorist attacks around the world. Samir Khan, a Pakistani-American jihadist traveling with him, was killed as well. Several weeks later, another strike killed Awlaki’s 16-year-old son, Abdulrahman al-Awlaki, also a U.S. citizen. Administration officials insisted a Justice Department review had authorized the killings but declined to release the full document. “The administration has claimed the power to carry out extrajudicial executions of Americans on the basis of evidence that is secret and is never seen by anyone,” said Jameel Jaffer, deputy legal director of the American Civil Liberties Union. “It’s hard to understand how that is consistent with the Constitution.” After criticizing the Bush administration for keeping the details of its surveillance, interrogation and detention practices secret, Obama is doing the same thing. His administration has declined to reveal the details of how it places people on kill lists, carries out eavesdropping in the United States or decides whom to detain overseas. The administration is also prosecuting six former government officials on charges of leaking classified information to the media — more cases than all other administrations combined. Administration officials deny being secretive and insist they have disclosed more information about their counterterrorism practices than the Bush administration, which fiercely resisted releasing details of its “war on terror” and established the covert drone program in Pakistan. Obama administration officials say they have established a more transparent and flexible approach outside Pakistan that involves military raids, drone strikes and other efforts. They told me that every attack in Yemen was approved by Yemeni officials. Eventually, they hope to make drone strikes joint efforts carried out openly with local governments. For now, keeping them covert prevents American courts from reviewing their constitutionality, according to Jaffer. He pointed out that if a Republican president followed such policies, the outcry on the left would be deafening. “You have to remember that this authority is going to be used by the next administration and the next administration after that,” Jaffer said. “You need to make sure there are clear limits on what is really unparalleled power.” To their credit, Obama and his senior officials have successfully reframed Bush’s global battle as a more narrowly focused struggle against al Qaeda. They stopped using the term “war on terror” and instead described a campaign against a single, clearly identifiable group. Senior administration officials cite the toppling of Muammar al-Qaddafi as the prime example of the success of their more focused, multilateral approach to the use of force. At a cost of zero American lives and $1 billion in U.S. funding, the Libya intervention removed an autocrat from power in five months. The occupation of Iraq claimed 4,484 American lives, cost at least $700 billion, and lasted nearly nine years. “The light U.S. footprint had benefits beyond less U.S. lives and resources,” Rhodes told me. “We believe the Libyan revolution is viewed as more legitimate. The U.S. is more welcome. And there is less potential for an insurgency because there aren’t foreign forces present.” In its most ambitious proposal, the administration is also trying to restructure the U.S. military, implement steep spending cuts and “right-size” U.S. forces around the world. Under Obama’s plan, the Army would be trimmed by 80,000 soldiers, some U.S. units would be shifted from the Middle East to the Pacific, and more small, covert bases would be opened. Special Forces units that have been vastly expanded in Iraq and Afghanistan would train indigenous forces and carry out counterterrorism raids. Declaring al Qaeda nearly defeated, administration officials say it is time for a new focus. “Where does the U.S. have a greater interest in 2020?” Rhodes asked. “Is it Asia-Pacific or Yemen? Obviously, the Asia-Pacific region is clearly going to be more important.” Rhodes has a point, but Pakistan and its nuclear weapons — as well as Yemen and its proximity to vital oil reserves and sea lanes — are likely to haunt the United States for years. Retired military officials warn that drones and commando raids are no substitute for the difficult process of helping local leaders marginalize militants. Missile strikes that kill members of al Qaeda and its affiliates in Pakistan and Yemen do not strengthen economies, curb corruption or improve government services. David Barno, a retired lieutenant general who commanded U.S. forces in Afghanistan from 2003 to 2005, believes hunting down senior terrorists over and over again is not a long-term solution. “How do you get beyond this attrition warfare?” he asked me. “I don’t think we’ve answered that question yet.”

#### Pakistan collapse causes nuclear war

Pitt ‘9 (William, a New York Times and internationally bestselling author of two books: "War on Iraq: What Team Bush Doesn't Want You to Know" and "The Greatest Sedition Is Silence.", “Unstable Pakistan Threatens the World,” <http://www.arabamericannews.com/news/index.php?mod=article&cat=commentary&article=2183>, May 8, 2009)

But a suicide bomber in Pakistan rammed a car packed with explosives into a jeep filled with troops today, killing five and wounding as many as 21, including several children who were waiting for a ride to school. Residents of the region where the attack took place are fleeing in terror as gunfire rings out around them, and government forces have been unable to quell the violence. Two regional government officials were beheaded by militants in retaliation for the killing of other militants by government forces. As familiar as this sounds, it did not take place where we have come to expect such terrible events. This, unfortunately, is a whole new ballgame. It is part of another conflict that is brewing, one which puts what is happening in Iraq and Afghanistan in deep shade, and which represents a grave and growing threat to us all. Pakistan is now trembling on the edge of violent chaos, and is doing so with nuclear weapons in its hip pocket, right in the middle of one of the most dangerous neighborhoods in the world. The situation in brief: Pakistan for years has been a nation in turmoil, run by a shaky government supported by a corrupted system, dominated by a blatantly criminal security service, and threatened by a large fundamentalist Islamic population with deep ties to the Taliban in Afghanistan. All this is piled atop an ongoing standoff with neighboring India that has been the center of political gravity in the region for more than half a century. The fact that Pakistan, and India, and Russia, and China all possess nuclear weapons and share the same space means any ongoing or escalating violence over there has the real potential to crack open the very gates of Hell itself. Recently, the Taliban made a military push into the northwest Pakistani region around the Swat Valley. According to a recent Reuters report: The (Pakistani) army deployed troops in Swat in October 2007 and use d artillery and gunship helicopters to reassert control. But insecurity mounted after a civilian government came to power last year and tried to reach a negotiated settlement. A peace accord fell apart in May 2008. After that, hundreds — including soldiers, militants and civilians — died in battles. Militants unleashed a reign of terror, killing and beheading politicians, singers, soldiers and opponents. They banned female education and destroyed nearly 200 girls' schools. About 1,200 people were killed since late 2007 and 250,000 to 500,000 fled, leaving the militants in virtual control. Pakistan offered on February 16 to introduce Islamic law in the Swat valley and neighboring areas in a bid to take the steam out of the insurgency. The militants announced an indefinite cease-fire after the army said it was halting operations in the region. President Asif Ali Zardari signed a regulation imposing sharia in the area last month. But the Taliban refused to give up their guns and pushed into Buner and another district adjacent to Swat, intent on spreading their rule. The United States, already embroiled in a war against Taliban forces in Afghanistan, must now face the possibility that Pakistan could collapse under the mounting threat of Taliban forces there. Military and diplomatic advisers to President Obama, uncertain how best to proceed, now face one of the great nightmare scenarios of our time. "Recent militant gains in Pakistan," reported The New York Times on Monday, "have so alarmed the White House that the national security adviser, Gen. James L. Jones, described the situation as 'one of the very most serious problems we face.'" "Security was deteriorating rapidly," reported The Washington Post on Monday, "particularly in the mountains along the Afghan border that harbor al-Qaeda and the Taliban, intelligence chiefs reported, and there were signs that those groups were working with indigenous extremists in Pakistan's populous Punjabi heartland. The Pakistani government was mired in political bickering. The army, still fixated on its historical adversary India, remained ill-equipped and unwilling to throw its full weight into the counterinsurgency fight. But despite the threat the intelligence conveyed, Obama has only limited options for dealing with it. Anti-American feeling in Pakistan is high, and a U.S. combat presence is prohibited. The United States is fighting Pakistan-based extremists by proxy, through an army over which it has little control, in alliance with a government in which it has little confidence." It is believed Pakistan is currently in possession of between 60 and 100 nuclear weapons. Because Pakistan's stability is threatened by the wide swath of its population that shares ethnic, cultural and religious connections to the fundamentalist Islamic populace of Afghanistan, fears over what could happen to those nuclear weapons if the Pakistani government collapses are very real. "As the insurgency of the Taliban and Al Qaeda spreads in Pakistan," reported the Times last week, "senior American officials say they are increasingly concerned about new vulnerabilities for Pakistan's nuclear arsenal, including the potential for militants to snatch a weapon in transport or to insert sympathizers into laboratories or fuel-production facilities. In public, the administration has only hinted at those concerns, repeating the formulation that the Bush administration used: that it has faith in the Pakistani Army. But that cooperation, according to officials who would not speak for attribution because of the sensitivity surrounding the exchanges between Washington and Islamabad, has been sharply limited when the subject has turned to the vulnerabilities in the Pakistani nuclear infrastructure." "The prospect of turmoil in Pakistan sends shivers up the spines of those U.S. officials charged with keeping tabs on foreign nuclear weapons," reported Time Magazine last month. "Pakistan is thought to possess about 100 — the U.S. isn't sure of the total, and may not know where all of them are. Still, if Pakistan collapses, the U.S. military is primed to enter the country and secure as many of those weapons as it can, according to U.S. officials. Pakistani officials insist their personnel safeguards are stringent, but a sleeper cell could cause big trouble, U.S. officials say." In other words, a shaky Pakistan spells trouble for everyone, especially if America loses the footrace to secure those weapons in the event of the worst-case scenario. If Pakistani militants ever succeed in toppling the government, several very dangerous events could happen at once. Nuclear-armed India could be galvanized into military action of some kind, as could nuclear-armed China or nuclear-armed Russia. If the Pakistani government does fall, and all those Pakistani nukes are not immediately accounted for and secured, the specter (or reality) of loose nukes falling into the hands of terrorist organizations could place the entire world on a collision course with unimaginable disaster. We have all been paying a great deal of attention to Iraq and Afghanistan, and rightly so. The developing situation in Pakistan, however, needs to be placed immediately on the front burner. The Obama administration appears to be gravely serious about addressing the situation. So should we all.

#### Instability in Yemen collapses global trade lanes

Yuriditsky ’11 (Associate of the Institute for Gulf Affairs (Lev, “Yemen's Chaos - August 2011,” <http://yuriditsky.blogspot.com/2011/09/yemens-chaos-august-2011.html>, August 28, 2011)

Towards the end of July, the leader of AQAP, Nasir al Wuhayshi, pledged allegiance to Bin Laden’s successor, Ayman al Zawahiri. Wuhayshi vowed to fight until Sharia law is imposed across the globe and that he and the AQAP fighters under his order will “fight the enemies without leniency or surrender until Islam rules.” Wuhayshi’s pledge of allegiance came just a month after Al Shabaab, the Al Qaeda-linked organization in Somalia gave the same oath. The two groups, separated by the strategic Gulf of Aden and the Bab al-Mandab straight, through which millions of barrels of oil and other goods are shipped daily between Asia, Europe and the Americas, make instability in Yemen a tremendous risk to global trade. The groups have cooperated with each other in the past and together can prove to be one of the most deadly terrorist organizations in history. With Al Shabaab’s strong presence in Somalia, all it takes is Al Qaeda strengthening just slightly and the groups will control the horn of Africa, the southwestern peninsula, and the strategic Gulf of Aden. The alliance between Al Shabaab and Al Qaeda is of special significance to the U.S. Al Shabaab has a proven ability to recruit from the U.S. Somali-American population. During a hearing on Muslim radicalization, chair of the House Homeland Security Committee, Peter King discussed Al Shabaab’s “large cadre of American Jihadis” and the groups growing threat in the U.S. He went on to say that AQAP’s resources, such as arms and training (Yemen is the most heavily armed country in the world) with Al Shabaab’s reach can make for a particularly challenging situation.

#### Collapse of trade causes war

Panzner ‘8 (Michael, faculty at the New York Institute of Finance, 25-year veteran of the global stock, bond, and currency markets who has worked in New York and London for HSBC, Soros Funds, ABN Amro, Dresdner Bank, and JPMorgan Chase, “Financial Armageddon: Protect Your Future from Economic Collapse”, Revised and Updated Edition, p. 136-138, googlebooks)

Continuing calls for curbs on the flow of finance and trade will inspire the United States and other nations to spew forth protectionist legislation like the notorious Smoot-Hawley bill. Introduced at the start of the Great Depression, it triggered a series of tit-for-tat economic responses, which many commentators believe helped turn a serious economic downturn into a prolonged and devastating global disaster. But if history is any guide, those lessons will have been long forgotten during the next collapse. Eventually, fed by a mood of desperation and growing public anger, restrictions on trade, finance, investment, and immigration will almost certainly intensify. Authorities and ordinary citizens will likely scrutinize the cross-border movement of Americans and outsiders alike, and lawmakers may even call for a general crackdown on nonessential travel. Meanwhile,many nations will make transporting or sending funds to other countries exceedingly difficult. As desperate officials try to limit the fallout from decades of ill-conceived, corrupt, and reckless policies, they will introduce controls on foreign exchange. Foreign individuals and companies seeking to acquire certain American infrastructure assets, or trying to buy property and other assets on the cheap thanks to a rapidly depreciating dollar, will be stymied by limits on investment by noncitizens. Those efforts will cause spasms to ripple across economies and markets, disrupting global payment, settlement, and clearing mechanisms. All of this will, of course, continue to undermine business confidence and consumer spending. In a world of lockouts and lockdowns, any link that transmits systemic financial pressures across markets through arbitrage or portfolio-based risk management, or that allows diseases to be easily spread from one country to the next by tourists and wildlife, or that otherwise facilitates unwelcome exchanges of any kind will be viewed with suspicion and dealt with accordingly. The rise in isolationism and protectionism will bring about ever more heated arguments and dangerous confrontations over shared sources of oil, gas, and other key commodities as well as factors of production that must, out of necessity, be acquired from less-than-friendly nations. Whether involving raw materials used in strategic industries or basic necessities such as food, water, and energy, efforts to secure adequate supplies will take increasing precedence in a world where demand seems constantly out of kilter with supply. Disputes over the misuse, overuse, and pollution of the environment and natural resources will become more commonplace. Around the world, such tensions will give rise to full-scale military encounters, often with minimal provocation. In some instances, economic conditions will serve as a convenient pretext for conflicts that stem from cultural and religious differences. Alternatively, nations may look to divert attention away from domestic problems by channeling frustration and populist sentiment toward other countries and cultures. Enabled by cheap technology and the waning threat of American retribution, terrorist groups will likely boost the frequency and scale of their horrifying attacks, bringing the threat of random violence to a whole new level. Turbulent conditions will encourage aggressive saber rattling and interdictions by rogue nations running amok. Age-old clashes will also take on a new, more heated sense of urgency. China will likely assume an increasingly belligerent posture toward Taiwan, while Iran may embark on overt colonization of its neighbors in the Mideast. Israel, for its part, maylook to draw a dwindling list of allies from around the world into a growing number of conflicts. Some observers, like John Mearsheimer, a political scientist at the University of Chicago, have even speculated that an “intense confrontation” between the United States and China is “inevitable” at some point. More than a few disputes will turn out to be almost wholly ideological. Growing cultural and religious differences will be transformed from wars of words to battles soaked in blood. Long-simmering resentments could also degenerate quickly, spurring the basest of human instincts and triggering genocidal acts. Terrorists employing biological or nuclear weapons will vie with conventional forces using jets, cruise missiles, and bunker-busting bombs to cause widespread destruction. Many will interpret stepped-up conflicts between Muslims and Western societies as the beginnings of a new world war.

#### The plan is key to effective drone usage-

#### 1) Host Country-

#### Ending drones key to host country cooperation

Streeter ’13 (Devin C. Streeter, Helms School Of Government, Liberty University “Boko Haram, Drone Policy, And Port Security: Issues For Congress”, [http://www.academia.edu/3523639/U.S.\_Drone\_Policy\_Tactical\_Success\_and\_Strategic\_Failure](http://www.academia.edu/3523639/U.S._Drone_Policy_Tactical_Success_and_Strategic_Failure)shaw), April 19, 2013)

A new set of drone operating procedures would help to **repair international relations** and decrease civilian casualties. Furthermore, nations like Yemen, Somalia, and others, will not feel threatened and will **readily accept U.S. assistance in counterterrorism efforts**.¶ 78¶ Cooperation with affected nations will ensure that their sovereignty is not violated¶ 79¶ and the use of human intelligence programs will reduce civilian casualties, thus resulting in a sanitary, **more effective drone operation**.¶ 80¶ While the U.S. drone program has many noteworthy tactical successes, it simultaneously has suffered various strategic failures. Collateral damage has directly strained our relations with Pakistan, and indirectly stressed our relations with Europe, Asia, and South America. However, by increasing joint cooperation and decreasing civilian casualties, the **harms** inflicted on international relations **can be reconciled**. If this new system is implemented, not only will United States policy makers see the radical decrease of innocent deaths, but they will also see a decrease in terrorism and the terrorist recruiting pool.¶ 81¶ Confronting this issue and establishing a new set of standard operating procedures should be on the forefront of every elected official’s agenda, for the purpose of improving foreign policy and repairing international relations.

#### Host country cooperation key

Cordesman ’13 (Anthony Cordesman, Arleigh A. Burke Chair in Strategy at CSIS, “The Common Lessons of Benghazi, Algeria, Mali, Tunisia, Egypt, Syria, Iraq, Yemen, Afghanistan, Pakistan, and the Arab Spring”, <http://csis.org/publication/common-lessons-benghazi-algeria-mali-tunisia-egypt-syria-iraq-yemen-afghanistan-pakistan>, January 28, 2013)

Working with Regional and Host Country Partners The third lesson is that in most cases the United States will find that **the key partner will** not be a European ally but either a regional partner or **the host country itself**. The internal dynamics of the host country that will determine what real world opportunities exist at what mix of costs and benefits. If the host country lacks the willingness and absorption capability to use U.S. and allied aid, the default setting should be containment not intervention. It is a grim reality that regardless of the humanitarian cost, there is little point in trying to help countries that cannot help themselves and creating a culture of dependence that shifts that responsibility to the United States or some outside power. More broadly, the United States should learn that it needs to work through local governments on their terms and rely on local allies that share a common religion and value system with the host or target country. This is particularly true because much of the reason for the rebirth of religious values throughout the Islamic world has come from the failure of secular governance. U.S. strengths consist of helping nations and nonstate actors deal with secular problems and needs, but the United States will always face major obstacles when it comes to dealing with Islam and different cultural values. This is why allies like the southern Gulf states, Arab states, Turkey and other states with largely Islamic populations will be key partners at both the regional and national level. They can act in ways the United States and other outside powers cannot. They do not bring the burden of western secularism, ties to Israel, or the history of European colonialism to a given problem. They also do not bring the baggage of intervention in Iraq and Afghanistan or the war on terrorism. Moreover, **such partnerships are necessary** because the United States must also work with its regional allies to help them to maintain or achieve their own internal stability and to limit the risk of the political upheavals that are underway in so many states. Patient diplomatic and advisory **efforts** to help allied and friendly countries **make their own reforms in** areas like **economics and governance will be key sources of stability** and evolutionary change. So will assistance in creating effective counterterrorism forces and internal security efforts, as will support to regional security structures like the Gulf Cooperation Council.

#### 2) The plan shifts the CIA to focus to intel – key to drone effectiveness

Anderson ’13 (Kenneth Anderson, Professor of law at Washington College of Law, American University; a visiting fellow of the Hoover Institution and member of its Task Force on National Security and Law; and a non-resident senior fellow of the Brookings Institution. He writes on international law, the laws of war, and national security, and his most recent book is "Living with the UN: American Responsibilities and International Order.", “Taking the CIA Out of Drone Strikes? The Obama Administration’s Yemen Experience”, <http://www.lawfareblog.com/2013/05/taking-the-cia-out-of-drone-strikes-the-obama-administrations-yemen-experience/>, May 28, 2013)

Washington Post national security reporter Greg Miller has an excellent story in Sunday’s paper on the operational role of the CIA in drone warfare. Back at the time of the Brennan confirmation hearings, and even before, there had been discussion that the CIA would be pulled – even if only gradually – out of drone warfare and this form of using lethal force would be turned over the military. The CIA would re-focus itself on intelligence gathering and analysis, which many commentators inside and outside government said had taken a backseat to operational roles. Brennan himself urged this re-configuring of CIA priorities – including a shift away from counterterrorism to re-emphasize other intelligence missions; and the administration has said similar things in recent weeks. Focusing on drone warfare in Yemen, however, Miller’s report suggests this is easier said than done – whether in Yemen (or, it might be added, in Pakistan). A fundamental reason seems to be something noted many times here at Lawfare – the firing of a missile from a drone is the last kinetic step in a long chain of intelligence-gathering that includes surveillance over time from drones, signals intelligence and, crucially, on-ground human intelligence networks that give the US reason to be focusing on certain people as possible targets. Whether in Pakistan or Yemen, the effectiveness of drone warfare has been a function of the quality of the front-end intelligence that finally might lead to a strike. The drone’s contribution to the intelligence is far from being entirely tactical, of course – the drone’s surveillance has far more utility than just the preparation of a strike and that surveillance is crucial for reducing collateral harm from the strike itself. But drones are not quite so useful if one has no prior idea who one is searching for or where he might be or even why him – and much of this intelligence is gathered at the front end of the process in reliance on human intelligence networks. Although in principle the functions of intelligence gathering at the front end might be separated out from the intelligence involved in the preparation of a strike and from the actual strike itself, with the CIA engaged in the intelligence side and the military serving as the trigger pullers, the experience in Yemen raises some cautions about how easy it is to create this division of labor.

#### 3) Over-reliance on drones causes failed policy

Schwartz ’13 (Bernard L. Schwartz, Senior Fellow New America Foundation, Professor of Law, Georgetown University Law Center, “The Constitutional and Counterterrorism Implications of Targeted Killing Testimony Before the Senate Judiciary Subcommittee on the Constitution, Civil Rights, and Human Rights”, April 23, 2013)

3. The true costs of current US drone policy When we come to rely excessively on drone strikes as a counterterrorism tool, this has potential costs of its own. Drones strikes enable a "short-term fix" approach to counterterrorism, one that relies excessively on eliminating specific individuals deemed to be a threat, without much discussion of whether this strategy is likely to produce long-term security gains. Most counter-terrorism experts agree that in the long-term, terrorist organizations are rarely defeated militarily. Instead, terrorist groups fade away when they lose the support of the populations within which they work. They die out when their ideological underpinnings come undone – when new recruits stop appearing—when the communities in which they work stop providing active or passive forms of assistance—when local leaders speak out against them and residents report their activities and identities to the authorities. A comprehensive counterterrorist strategy recognizes this, and therefore relies heavily on activities intended to undermine terrorist credibility within populations, as well as on activities designed to disrupt terrorist communications and financing. Much of the time, these are the traditional tools of intelligence and law enforcement. Kinetic force undeniably has a role to play in counterterrorism in certain circumstances, but it is rarely a magic bullet. In addition, overreliance on kinetic tools at the expense of other approaches can be dangerous. Drone strikes -- lawful or not, justifiable or not – can have the unintended consequence of increasing both regional instability and anti-American sentiment. Drone strikes sow fear among the "guilty" and the innocent alike, 24 and the use of drones in Pakistan and Yemen has increasingly been met with both popular and diplomatic protests. Indeed, drone strikes are increasingly causing dismay and concern within the US population. As the Obama administration increases its reliance on drone strikes as the counterterrorism tool of choice, it is hard not to wonder whether we have begun to trade tactical gains for strategic losses. What impact will US drone strikes ultimately have on the stability of Pakistan, Yemen, or Somalia? 25 To what degree -- especially as we reach further and further down the terrorist food chain, killing small fish who may be motivated less by ideology than economic desperation -- are we actually creating new grievances within the local population – or even within diaspora populations here in the United States? 26 As Defense Secretary Donald Rumsfeld asked during the Iraq war, are we creating terrorists faster than we kill them? 27 At the moment, there is little evidence that US drone policy – or individual drone strikes—result from a comprehensive assessment of strategic costs and benefits, as opposed to a shortsighted determination to strike targets of opportunity, regardless of long-term impact. As a military acquaintance of mine memorably put it, drone strikes remain “a tactic in search of a strategy.”

#### 4) International and Alliance Blowback

Streeter ‘13 (Devin C, Director of Activities, Public Relations, and Recruitment at Liberty University Strategic Intelligence Society, “US Drone Policy: Tactical Success and Strategic Failure,” [http://www.academia.edu/3523639/U.S.\_Drone\_Policy\_Tactical\_Success\_and\_Strategic\_Failure, April 19](http://www.academia.edu/3523639/U.S._Drone_Policy_Tactical_Success_and_Strategic_Failure,%20April%2019), 2013)

The first category of nations, while not targeted by drone strikes, is intimidated by their capabilities. India, Iran, Pakistan, Russia, Japan, South Korea, and over 40 other nations have announced intentions to acquire drones. 27 The main producers of unmanned aerial vehicles are the United States, Israel, and China. 28 The United States, while the leader in drone use and production 29 , must deal with “American export controls.” 30 Israel, however, has fewer restrictions, considering China’s acquisition of drone technology by buying an “anti-radar attack drone” 31 from the small nation. China in turn has offered to sell lower grade drones to the international community. 32 It is unlikely that drone technology will go unshared for long. 33 In essence, the United States has sparked a miniature arms race and has intimidated nations with the threat of a new, superior technology. Governments that have begun pursuing their own UAV programs have shown a notable bitterness to the United States for its unchecked use of drones. 34 Nations such as China, Japan, Russia, and Brazil all disapprove of United States drone policies by over 30 percentage points. 35 To them, the United States seems heavy handed and brutish; holding back technology while indiscriminately using it against our enemies. The lack of consideration and cooperation is a negative influence on world leaders. At the same time, other nations feel that drones violate their airspace and are used without approval from the international community. 36 The majority of these nations fall within the boundaries of the European Union, and while their disapproval is not as notable as the first group, it often reaches the double digits rate. 37 Germany, Great Britain, Poland, and other European Union members do not understand the ‘fire from the hip’ mentality of drone strikes. 38 The European Council on Foreign Relations noted “it [United States] seems to interpret the concept of imminence in a rather more permissive way than most Europeans would be comfortable with.” 39 The European Union fully supports drones in combat support and reconnaissance roles, but has issues with the concept of targeted killings, which often result in collateral damage. 40 European leaders desire an international consensus on how drones should be operated, before more civilians become casualties. 41 The European Council on Foreign Relations further notes: The Obama administration has so far chosen to operate by analogy with inter-state war, but in an era marked by the individualization of conflict, this seems like an outdated approach. 42 Europe does not share the mentality of drone strikes with "acceptable" collateral damage and apolicy that is not accountable to the international community. As a result, relations with Europe have reached a critical point. 43 European nations, alienated by the Obama administration’s progressive dialogue but aggressive drone policy, 44 are ready to try and take the lead in international relations. 45 Germany in particular will be a key nation as it increases in prominence among European states. 46 Hans Kundnani, a well-known journalist and political pundit, notes, “Obama is extremely popular in Germany, but Berlin’s deeply-held views on the use of military force… have the potential to create a Europe-America split.” 47 Kundnani also states, “A ‘special relationship’ is developing between China and Germany.” 48 Because of anti-drone sentiment, long-time U.S. allies grow increasingly distant, to the point of forming new relationships with China. This is a direct threat to the United States’ place in international relations and a direct challenge to its hegemony. If the relations with Europe are to be fixed, a change in drone protocol is needed.

### Advantage {Y}: Sovereignty Violations

#### Unrestrained executive drone policy violates sovereignty claims and undermines rule of law- sends a global signal

Schwartz ’13 (Bernard L. Schwartz, Senior Fellow New America Foundation, Professor of Law, Georgetown University Law Center, “The Constitutional and Counterterrorism Implications of Targeted Killing Testimony Before the Senate Judiciary Subcommittee on the Constitution, Civil Rights, and Human Rights”, April 23, 2013)

Once you take targeted killings outside hot battlefields, it’s a different story . The Obama Administration is currently using drones to strike terror suspects in Pakistan, Somalia, Yemen, and – perhaps — Mali and the Philippines as well. Defenders of the administration's increasing reliance on drone strikes in such places assert that the US is in an armed conflict with “al Qaeda and its associates,” and on that basis, they assert that the law of war is applicable -- in any place and at any time -- with regard to any person the administration deems a combatant. The trouble is, no one outside a very small group within the US executive branch has any ability to evaluate who is and who isn’t a combatant. The war against al Qaeda and its associates is not like World War II, or Libya, or even Afghanistan: it is an open - ended conflict with an inchoate, un defined adversary (who exactly are al Qaeda’s “associates ” ?). What is more, targeting decisions in this nebulous “ war” are based largely on classified intelligence reporting. As a result, Administration assertions about who is a combatant and what constitutes a threat are entirely non - falsifiable, because they're based wholly on undisclosed evidence. Add to this still another problem: most of these strikes are considered covert action, so although the US sometimes takes public credit for the deaths of alleg ed terrorist leaders, most of the time, the US will not even officially acknowledge targeted killings. This leaves all the key rule - of - law questions related to the ongoing war again st al Qaeda and its "associates " unanswered. 36 Based on what criteria might someone be considered a combatant or directly participating in hostilities? What constitutes “ hostil ities” in the context of an armed conflict against a non - state actor, and what does it mean to participate in them? And just where is the war? Does the war (and thus the law of war) somehow "travel" with combatants? Does the US have a “right” to target enemy combatants anywhere on earth, or does it depend on the consent of the state at issue? Who in the United States government is authorized to make such determinations, and what is the precise chain of command for such decisions? I think the rule of law problem here is obvious: when “armed conflict” becomes a term flexible enough to be applied both to World War II and to the relations between the United States and “associates” of al Qaeda such as Somalia’s al Shabaab, the concept of armed conflict is not very useful anymore. And when we lack clarity and consensus on how to re cognize “armed conflict,” we no longer have a clear or principled basis for deciding how to categorize targeted killings. Are they, as the US government argues, legal under the laws of war? Or are they , as some human rights groups have argued, unlawful murder?

#### Drones outside battlefield specifically causes aggressive arms race based off of US modeling

Bergen and Rowland ’12 [Peter Bergen, director of the National Security Studies Program at the New America Foundation, a research fellow at New York University's Center on Law and Security and CNN's national security analyst, former adjunct lecturer at the Kennedy School of Government at Harvard University and an Adjunct Professor at the Paul H. Nitze School of Advanced International Studies at Johns Hopkins University, CNN National Security analyst, and Jennifer Rowland, research associate at the New America Foundation, “A dangerous new world of drones,” <http://www.cnn.com/2012/10/01/opinion/bergen-world-of-drones/index.html>]

A decade ago, the United States had a virtual monopoly on drones. Not anymore. According to data compiled by the New America Foundation, more than 70 countries now own some type of drone, though just a small number of those nations possess armed drone aircraft. The explosion in drone technology promises to change the way nations conduct war and threatens to begin a new arms race as governments scramble to counterbalance their adversaries. Late last month, China announced that it would use surveillance drones to monitor a group of uninhabited islands in the South China Sea that are controlled by Japan but claimed by China and Taiwan. In August 2010, Iran unveiled what it claimed was its first armed drone. And on Tuesday, the country's military chief, Gen. Amir Ali Hajizadeh, disclosed details of a new long-range drone that he said can fly 2,000 kilometers (1,250 miles), which puts Tel Aviv easily in range. Israel looks to Lebanon after drone shot down But without an international framework governing the use of drone attacks, the United States is setting a dangerous precedent for other nations with its aggressive and secretive drone programs in Pakistan and Yemen, which are aimed at suspected members of al Qaeda and their allies. Just as the U.S. government justifies its drone strikes with the argument that it is at war with al Qaeda and its affiliates, one could imagine that India in the not too distant future might launch such attacks against suspected terrorists in Kashmir, or China might strike Uighur separatists in western China, or Iran might attack Baluchi nationalists along its border with Pakistan. This moment may almost be here. China took the United States by surprise in November 2010 at the Zhuhai Air Show, where it unveiled 25 drone models, some of which were outfitted with the capability to fire missiles. It remains unclear just how many of China's drones are operational and how many of them are still in development, but China is intent on catching up with the United States' rapidly expanding drone arsenal. When President George W. Bush declared a "War on Terror" 11 years ago, the Pentagon had fewer than 50 drones. Now, it has around 7,500. As Bush embarked on that war, the United States had never used armed drones in combat. The first U.S. armed drone attack, which appears to be the first such strike ever, took place in mid-November 2001 and killed the military commander of al Qaeda, Mohammed Atef, in Afghanistan. Since then, the CIA has used drones equipped with bombs and missiles hundreds of times to target suspected militants in Pakistan and Yemen. Only the United States, United Kingdom and Israel are known to have launched drone strikes against their adversaries, although other members of the International Security Assistance Force in Afghanistan, such as Australia, have "borrowed" drones from Israel for use in the war there. Drone technology is proliferating rapidly. A 2011 study estimated that there were around 680 active drone development programs run by governments, companies and research institutes around the world, compared with just 195 in 2005. In 2010, U.S.-based General Atomics received export licenses to sell unarmed versions of the Predator drone to Saudi Arabia, Egypt, Morocco and the United Arab Emirates. And in March, the U.S. government agreed to arm Italy's six Reaper drones but rejected a request from Turkey to purchase armed Predator drones. An official in Turkey's Defense Ministry said in July that Turkey planned to arm its own domestically produced drone, the Anka. Israel is the world's largest exporter of drones and drone technology, and the state-owned Israeli Aerospace Industries has sold to countries as varied as Nigeria, Russia and Mexico. Building drones, particularly armed drones, takes sophisticated technology and specific weaponry, but governments are increasingly willing to invest the necessary time and money to either buy or develop them, as armed drones are increasingly seen as an integral part of modern warfare. Sweden, Greece, Switzerland, Spain, Italy and France are working on a joint project through state-owned aeronautical companies and are in the final stages of developing an advanced armed drone prototype called the Dassault nEURon, from which the France plans to derive armed drones for its air force. And Pakistani authorities have long tried to persuade the United States to give them armed Predator drones, while India owns an armed Israeli drone designed to detect and destroy enemy radar, though it does not yet have drones capable of striking other targets. The Teal Group, a defense consulting firm in Virginia, estimated in June that the global market for the research, development and procurement of armed drones will just about double in the next decade, from $6.6 billion to $11.4 billion. States are not alone in their quest for drones. Insurgent groups, too, are moving to acquire this technology. Last year, Libyan opposition forces trying to overthrow the dictator Moammar Gadhafi bought a sophisticated surveillance drone from a Canadian company for which they paid in the low six figures. You can even buy your own tiny drone on Amazon for $250. (And for an extra $3.99, you can get next-day shipping.) As drone technology becomes more widely accessible, it is only a matter of time before well-financed drug cartels acquire them. And you can imagine a day in the not too distant future where armed drones are used to settle personal vendettas. Given the relatively low costs of drones -- already far cheaper than the costs of a fighter jet and of training a fighter jet pilot -- armed drones will play a key role in future conflicts. While the drone industry thrives and more companies, research institutes and nations jump on board the drone bandwagon, the United States is setting a powerful international norm about the use of armed drones, which it uses for pre-emptive attacks against presumed terrorists in Pakistan and Yemen. It is these kinds of drone strikes that are controversial; the use of drones in a conventional war is not much different than a manned aircraft that drops bombs or fires missiles. According to figures compiled by the New America Foundation, drone attacks aimed at suspected militants are estimated to have killed between 1,900 and 3,200 people in Pakistan over the past eight years. While there has been considerable discussion of the legality of such strikes in a number of U.S. law schools, there has been almost no substantive public discussion about drone attacks among policymakers at the international level. The time has come for some kind of international convention on the legal framework surrounding the uses of such weapons, which promise to shape the warfare of the future as much as tanks and bombers did during the 20th century.

#### This “world as a battlefield” precedent risk accidental miscalc that escalates

Dowd ’13 (Alan Dowd, Writes on national defense, foreign policy, and international security. His writing has appeared in multiple publications including Parameters, Policy Review, The Journal of Diplomacy and International Relations, World Politics Review, American Outlook, The Baltimore Sun, The Washington Times, The National Post, The Wall Street Journal Europe, The Jerusalem Post, and The Financial Times Deutschland. He holds a B.A. with high honors from Butler University and an M.A. from Indiana University, “Drone Wars: Risks and Warnings”, <http://www.strategicstudiesinstitute.army.mil/pubs/parameters/Issues/WinterSpring_2013/1_Article_Dowd.pdf>, Winter/Spring 2013)

First, if the battlespace is the entire earth, the enemy would seem to have the right to wage war on those places where UCAV operators are based. That’s a sobering thought, one few policymakers have contemplated. Second, power-projecting nations are following America’s lead and developing their own drones to target their distant enemies by remote. An estimated 75 countries have drone programs underway.45 Many of these nations are less discriminating in employing military force than the United States—and less skillful. Indeed, drones may usher in a new age of accidental wars. If the best drones deployed by the best military crash more than any other aircraft in America’s fleet, imagine the accident rate for mediocre drones deployed by mediocre militaries. And then imagine the international incidents this could trigger between, say, India and Pakistan; North and South Korea; Russia and the Baltics or Poland or Georgia; China and any number of its wary neighbors. China has at least one dozen drones on the drawing board or in pro- duction, and has announced plans to dot its coastline with 11 drone bases in the next two years.46 The Pentagon’s recent reports on Chinese mili- tary power detail “acquisition and development of longer-range UAVs and UCAVs . . . for long-range reconnaissance and strike”; development of UCAVs to enable “a greater capacity for military preemption”; and interest in “converting retired fighter aircraft into unmanned combat aerial vehicles.”47 At a 2011 air show, Beijing showcased one of its newest drones by playing a video demonstrating a pilotless plane tracking a US aircraft carrier near Taiwan and relaying targeting information.48 Equally worrisome, the proliferation of drones could enable nonpower-projecting nations—and nonnations, for that matter—to join the ranks of power-projecting nations. Drones are a cheap alternative to long-range, long-endurance warplanes. Yet despite their low cost, drones can pack a punch. And owing to their size and range, they can conceal their home address far more effectively than the typical, nonstealthy manned warplane. Recall that the possibility of surprise attack by drones was cited to justify the war against Saddam Hussein’s Iraq.49 Of course, cutting-edge UCAVs have not fallen into undeterrable hands. But if history is any guide, they will. Such is the nature of proliferation. Even if the spread of UCAV technology does not harm the United States in a direct way, it is unlikely that opposing swarms of semiautonomous, pilotless warplanes roaming about the earth, striking at will, veering off course, crashing here and there, and sometimes simply failing to respond to their remote-control pilots will do much to promote a liberal global order. It would be ironic if the promise ofrisk-free warpresented by drones spawned a new era of danger for the United States and its allies.

#### Breaks down deterrence

**Boyle ‘13** [Michael J. Boyle, PhD, is an Assistant Professor of Political Science at La Salle University in Philadelphia. He was previously a Lecturer in International Relations and Research Fellow at the Centre for the Study of Terrorism and Political Violence at the University of St. Andrews. He is also an alumnus of the Political Science Department at La Salle, research interests are on terrorism and political violence, with particular reference to the strategic use of violence in insurgencies and civil wars, “The costs and consequences of drone warfare,” International Affairs 89: 1 (2013) 1–29, <http://www.chathamhouse.org/sites/default/files/public/International%20Affairs/2013/89_1/89_1Boyle.pdf>, 2013]

The emergence of this arms race for drones raises at least five long-term strategic consequences, not all of which are favourable to the United States over the long term. First, it is now obvious that other states will use drones in ways that are inconsistent with US interests. One reason why the US has been so keen to use drone technology in Pakistan and Yemen is that at present it retains a substantial advantage in high-quality attack drones. Many of the other states now capable of employing drones of near-equivalent technology—for example, the UK and Israel—are considered allies. But this situation is quickly changing as other leading geopolitical players, such as Russia and China, are beginning rapidly to develop and deploy drones for their own purposes. While its own technology still lags behind that of the US, Russia has spent huge sums on purchasing drones and has recently sought to buy the Israeli-made Eitan drone capable of surveillance and firing air-to-surface missiles.132 China has begun to develop UAVs for reconnaissance and combat and has several new drones capable of long-range surveillance and attack under development.133 China is also planning to use unmanned surveillance drones to allow it to monitor the disputed East China Sea Islands, which are currently under dispute with Japan and Taiwan.134 Both Russia and China will pursue this technology and develop their own drone suppliers which will sell to the highest bidder, presumably with fewer export controls than those imposed by the US Congress. Once both governments have equivalent or near-equivalent levels of drone technology to the United States, they will be similarly tempted to use it for surveillance or attack in the way the US has done. Thus, through its own over-reliance on drones in places such as Pakistan and Yemen, the US may be hastening the arrival of a world where its qualitative advantages in drone technology are eclipsed and where this technology will be used and sold by rival Great Powers whose interests do not mirror its own. A second consequence of the spread of drones is that many of the traditional concepts which have underwritten stability in the international system will be radically reshaped by drone technology. For example, much of the stability among the Great Powers in the international system is driven by deterrence, specifically nuclear deterrence.135 Deterrence operates with informal rules of the game and tacit bargains that govern what states, particularly those holding nuclear weapons, may and may not do to one another.136 While it is widely understood that nuclear-capable states will conduct aerial surveillance and spy on one another, overt military confrontations between nuclear powers are rare because they are assumed to be costly and prone to escalation. One open question is whether these states will exercise the same level of restraint with drone surveillance, which is unmanned, low cost, and possibly deniable. States may be more willing to engage in drone overflights which test the resolve of their rivals, or engage in ‘salami tactics’ to see what kind of drone-led incursion, if any, will motivate a response.137 This may have been Hezbollah’s logic in sending a drone into Israeli airspace in October 2012, possibly to relay information on Israel’s nuclear capabilities.138 After the incursion, both Hezbollah and Iran boasted that the drone incident demonstrated their military capabilities.139 One could imagine two rival states—for example, India and Pakistan—deploying drones to test each other’s capability and resolve, with untold consequences if such a probe were misinterpreted by the other as an attack. As drones get physically smaller and more precise, and as they develop a greater flying range, the temptation to use them to spy on a rival’s nuclear programme or military installations might prove too strong to resist. If this were to happen, drones might gradually erode the deterrent relationships that exist between nuclear powers, thus magnifying the risks of a spiral of conflict between them. Another dimension of this problem has to do with the risk of accident. Drones are prone to accidents and crashes. By July 2010, the US Air Force had identified approximately 79 drone accidents.140 Recently released documents have revealed that there have been a number of drone accidents and crashes in the Seychelles and Djibouti, some of which happened in close proximity to civilian airports.141 The rapid proliferation of drones worldwide will involve a risk of accident to civilian aircraft, possibly producing an international incident if such an accident were to involve an aircraft affiliated to a state hostile to the owner of the drone. Most of the drone accidents may be innocuous, but some will carry strategic risks. In December 2011, a CIA drone designed for nuclear surveillance crashed in Iran, revealing the existence of the spying programme and leaving sensitive technology in the hands of the Iranian government.142 The expansion of drone technology raises the possibility that some of these surveillance drones will be interpreted as attack drones, or that an accident or crash will spiral out of control and lead to an armed confrontation.143 An accident would be even more dangerous if the US were to pursue its plans for nuclear-powered drones, which can spread radioactive material like a dirty bomb if they crash.144 Third, lethal drones create the possibility that the norms on the use of force will erode, creating a much more dangerous world and pushing the international system back towards the rule of the jungle. To some extent, this world is already being ushered in by the United States, which has set a dangerous precedent that a state may simply kill foreign citizens considered a threat without a declaration of war. Even John Brennan has recognized that the US is ‘establishing a precedent that other nations may follow’.145 Given this precedent, there is nothing to stop other states from following the American lead and using drone strikes to eliminate potential threats. Those ‘threats’ need not be terrorists, but could be others— dissidents, spies, even journalists—whose behaviour threatens a government. One danger is that drone use might undermine the normative prohibition on the assassination of leaders and government officials that most (but not all) states currently respect. A greater danger, however, is that the US will have normalized murder as a tool of statecraft and created a world where states can increasingly take vengeance on individuals outside their borders without the niceties of extradition, due process or trial.146 As some of its critics have noted, the Obama administration may have created a world where states will find it easier to kill terrorists rather than capture them and deal with all of the legal and evidentiary difficulties associated with giving them a fair trial.147

#### Independently- Executive uncertainty of US Drone policy cause accident and escalatory wars

**Dean ‘13** [Adriana, degree from the University of Southern California in Philosophy, Politics and Law, Chapter Officer of Young Americans for Liberty, an organization with over 125,000 members nationwide, “Targeted Killings Behind the Veil of Ignorance,” <http://www.academia.edu/3832442/Targeted_Killings_Behind_the_Veil_of_Ignorance>]

While there are some justifiable points for the targeted killing program that individuals behind the veil of ignorance may find appealing, there is something to be said for the intuition that the possibility of a superpower state running rogue with a lethal program that has little to no oversight and a high probability for civilian casualties would be unnerving to anyone behind the veil of ignorance. Behind the veil, individual states cannot definitively determine if they would be on the sending or receiving end of a Hellfire missile. This uncertainty alone would pose truly terrifying implications for every state involved. It can be just as reasonably argued behind the veil of ignorance that al-Qaeda could have the drones and the whole of the United States would be under attack. This reality would place the entire American populace at risk. Al-Qaeda has definitively identified the United States as the single greatest threat to Islam. Unlike the United States, which has said repeatedly that it is not at war with Islam or with Muslims in general; al-Qaeda would not discriminate between leaders, military members, and civilians. While flawed, there is still a general attempt by the United States to minimize civilian casualties. Al-Qaeda would not be so kind. Perhaps even more chilling than simply the role reversal of the United States and al-Qaeda, the use of drones by the United States has had a consequence that no one could have predicted. Drones seem to have effectively erased the conventional understanding of “battlefields.” While the United States operates in¶ Pakistan with some semblance of approval from the government, it is generally understood that Pakistan is not approving every single strike that is carried out on its soil. If the President only signs off on a third of ¶ personality ¶ strikes in Pakistan, how many strikes can we reasonably assume that the Pakistani government is informed of? And what of signature strikes? The incessant pursuit of terrorists by the United States has opened up the entire world to the realm of drone strikes. Indeed, although not covered in this paper, the United States has also expanded its use of drones to both Yemen and Somalia, and these three states only constitute the states in which that the international community¶ knows¶ drone strikes are taking place. If the United States is capable of riding roughshod over the world and the general principles of engagement, it has set a dangerous precedent for the future use of drones by other states. The global implications of modern drone warfare would be fully realized if the conditions of the veil of ignorance were simply equalized, meaning that every state, and perhaps even all terrorist organizations, had access to drones. While it can be easily argued that terrorist organizations¶ would never abide by legal rules of “drone engagement,” just as¶ they do not follow military rules of engagement now, the United States has certainly done itself no favors by not regulating itself with respect to drone usage. If states such as Iran, who are openly hostile to the United States, had access to drones (a possibility that is not entirely far-¶ fetched given Iran’s current possession of a downed US drone) it could pose a threat even more terrifying than nuclear proliferation. Drones are silent, precision weapons. In a world where numerous states had obtained drones, they could be utilized covertly without much risk of discovery. It is easy to envision scenarios in which political figures could be assassinated, military instillations targeted, and major civilian population centers attacked without any indication as to who the perpetrator might be. The lack of oversight and accountability championed by the¶ United States in today’s targeted killing program only lends to this horrifying scenario of ¶ globalized drone usage. If the United States cannot regulate itself in its own usage of drones, it cannot reasonably expect that any other state would listen to international cries for oversight once it obtained drones of its own. The view of targeted killings from behind the veil of ignorance should disturb any state or group. In the first place, the equal likelihood that a state could be the exactor or victim of drone strikes should be enough to deter states from any inclination to utilize drone strikes in which there is no definitive oversight program and the possibility to use signature strikes. Secondly, the knowledge that the loose standards for using targeted killings within ones own country could lead to unfettered global drone warfare among a host of different states should be an even greater incentive for states to adopt more egalitarian means by which to utilize drones. This is not to say that the use of drones is outright unjustifiable. More to the point, it can simply be said that certain components and the resulting implications of the program are categorically unfair. The¶ unfairness inherent in the United States’ lack of oversight and accountability,¶ the use of signature strikes, and the hypothetical role reversal between the United States and al-Qaeda, or the expansion of drone strikes to a global model, behind the veil of ignorance indicates¶ a need for profound change within the United States’ targeted killing¶ program. While there seems to be little to object to with regard to the use of strikes against clearly identified senior-level al-Qaeda targets, the targeted killing program has expanded far beyond the bounds of permissibility behind the veil of ignorance. To this end, the United States must recognize that somewhere along its path of pursuing terrorist is has lost the fundamental principles that defined its claim to self-defense. Senseless collateral loss of civilian life, as well as questionable targeting practices by the executive branch, aid only in¶ undermining the United States’ goal of national security. The drone program must be either¶ drastically reformed in order to return it to a state of justifiability, or else it must be ended entirely. It is clear that the program has departed entirely from the realm of fairness, and every day that the United States continues to utilize the current program is one step further down the path of a precedent that will one day come back to haunt not only the executive, but the United States as a whole.

#### Specifically- Armenian and Caucasus conflicts- draws in Israel/Iran/Russia

Clayton ’12 (Nicholas Clayton, foreign policy analyst @ Foreign Policy, International Crisis Group, Global Post, “Drone violence along Armenian-Azerbaijani border could lead to war”, <http://www.globalpost.com/dispatch/news/regions/europe/121022/drone-violence-along-armenian-azerbaijani-border-could-lead-war>, October 23, 2012)

Armenia and Azerbaijan could soon be at war if drone proliferation on both sides of the border continues. YEREVAN, Armenia — In a region where a fragile peace holds over three frozen conflicts, the nations of the South Caucasus are buzzing with drones they use to probe one another’s defenses and spy on disputed territories. The region is also host to strategic oil and gas pipelines and a tangled web of alliances and precious resources that observers say threaten to quickly escalate the border skirmishes and airspace violations to a wider regional conflict triggered by Armenia and Azerbaijan that could potentially pull in Israel, Russia and Iran. To some extent, these countries are already being pulled towards conflict. Last September, Armenia shot down an Israeli-made Azerbaijani drone over Nagorno-Karabakh and the government claims that drones have been spotted ahead of recent incursions by Azerbaijani troops into Armenian-held territory. Richard Giragosian, director of the Regional Studies Center in Yerevan, said in a briefing that attacks this summer showed that Azerbaijan is eager to “play with its new toys” and its forces showed “impressive tactical and operational improvement.” The International Crisis Group warned that as the tit-for-tat incidents become more deadly, “there is a growing risk that the increasing frontline tensions could lead to an accidental war.” “Everyone is now saying that the war is coming. We know that it could start at any moment.” ~Grush Agbaryan, mayor of Voskepar With this in mind, the UN and the Organization for Security and Co-operation in Europe (OSCE) have long imposed a non-binding arms embargo on both countries, and both are under a de facto arms ban from the United States. But, according to the Stockholm International Peace Research Institute (SIPRI), this has not stopped Israel and Russia from selling to them. After fighting a bloody war in the early 1990s over the disputed territory of Nagorno-Karabakh, Armenia and Azerbaijan have been locked in a stalemate with an oft-violated ceasefire holding a tenuous peace between them. And drones are the latest addition to the battlefield. In March, Azerbaijan signed a $1.6 billion arms deal with Israel, which consisted largely of advanced drones and an air defense system. Through this and other deals, Azerbaijan is currently amassing a squadron of over 100 drones from all three of Israel’s top defense manufacturers. Armenia, meanwhile, employs only a small number of domestically produced models. Intelligence gathering is just one use for drones, which are also used to spot targets for artillery, and, if armed, strike targets themselves. Armenian and Azerbaijani forces routinely snipe and engage one another along the front, each typically blaming the other for violating the ceasefire. At least 60 people have been killed in ceasefire violations in the last two years, and the Brussels-based International Crisis Group claimed in a report published in February 2011 that the sporadic violence has claimed hundreds of lives. “Each (Armenia and Azerbaijan) is apparently using the clashes and the threat of a new war to pressure its opponent at the negotiations table, while also preparing for the possibility of a full-scale conflict in the event of a complete breakdown in the peace talks,” the report said. Alexander Iskandaryan, director of the Caucasus Institute in the Armenian capital, Yerevan, said that the arms buildup on both sides makes the situation more dangerous but also said that the clashes are calculated actions, with higher death tolls becoming a negotiating tactic. “This isn’t Somalia or Afghanistan. These aren’t independent units. The Armenian, Azerbaijani and Karabakh armed forces have a rigid chain of command so it’s not a question of a sergeant or a lieutenant randomly giving the order to open fire. These are absolutely synchronized political attacks,” Iskandaryan said. The deadliest recent uptick in violence along the Armenian-Azerbaijani border and the line of contact around Karabakh came in early June as US Secretary of State Hillary Clinton was on a visit to the region. While death tolls varied, at least two dozen soldiers were killed or wounded in a series of shootouts along the front. The year before, at least four Armenian soldiers were killed in an alleged border incursion by Azerbaijani troops one day after a peace summit between the Armenian, Azerbaijani and Russian presidents in St. Petersburg, Russia. “No one slept for two or three days [during the June skirmishes],” said Grush Agbaryan, the mayor of the border village of Voskepar for a total of 27 years off and on over the past three decades. Azerbaijan refused to issue accreditation to GlobalPost’s correspondent to enter the country to report on the shootings and Azerbaijan’s military modernization. Flush with cash from energy exports, Azerbaijan has increased its annual defense budget from an estimated $160 million in 2003 to $3.6 billion in 2012. SIPRI said in a report that largely as a result of its blockbuster drone deal with Israel, Azerbaijan’s defense budget jumped 88 percent this year — the biggest military spending increase in the world. Israel has long used arms deals to gain strategic leverage over its rivals in the region. Although difficult to confirm, many security analysts believe Israel’s deals with Russia have played heavily into Moscow’s suspension of a series of contracts with Iran and Syria that would have provided them with more advanced air defense systems and fighter jets. Stephen Blank, a research professor at the United States Army War College, said that preventing arms supplies to Syria and Iran — particularly Russian S-300 air defense systems — has been among Israel’s top goals with the deals. “There’s always a quid pro quo,” Blank said. “Nobody sells arms just for cash.” In Azerbaijan in particular, Israel has traded its highly demanded drone technology for intelligence arrangements and covert footholds against Iran. In a January 2009 US diplomatic cable released by WikiLeaks, a US diplomat reported that in a closed-door conversation, Azerbaijani President Ilham Aliyev compared his country’s relationship with Israel to an iceberg — nine-tenths of it is below the surface. More from GlobalPost: Are Iran's drones coordinating attacks in Syria? Although the Jewish state and Azerbaijan, a conservative Muslim country, may seem like an odd couple, the cable asserts, “Each country finds it easy to identify with the other’s geopolitical difficulties, and both rank Iran as an existential security threat.” Quarrels between Azerbaijan and Iran run the gamut of territorial, religious and geo-political disputes and Tehran has repeatedly threatened to “destroy” the country over its support for secular governance and NATO integration. In the end, “Israel’s main goal is to preserve Azerbaijan as an ally against Iran, a platform for reconnaissance of that country and as a market for military hardware,” the diplomatic cable reads. But, while these ties had indeed remained below the surface for most of the past decade, a series of leaks this year exposed the extent of their cooperation as Israel ramped up its covert war with the Islamic Republic. In February, the Times of London quoted a source the publication said was an active Mossad agent in Azerbaijan as saying the country was “ground zero for intelligence work.” This came amid accusations from Tehran that Azerbaijan had aided Israeli agents in assassinating an Iranian nuclear scientist in January. Then, just as Baku had begun to cool tensions with the Islamic Republic, Foreign Policy magazine published an article citing Washington intelligence officials who claimed that Israel had signed agreements to use Azerbaijani airfields as a part of a potential bombing campaign against Iran’s nuclear sites. Baku strongly denied the claims, but in September, Azerbaijani officials and military sources told Reuters that the country would figure in Israel’s contingencies for a potential attack against Iran. "Israel has a problem in that if it is going to bomb Iran, its nuclear sites, it lacks refueling," Rasim Musabayov, a member of the Azerbiajani parliamentary foreign relations committee told Reuters. “I think their plan includes some use of Azerbaijan access. We have (bases) fully equipped with modern navigation, anti-aircraft defenses and personnel trained by Americans and if necessary they can be used without any preparations." He went on to say that the drones Israel sold to Azerbaijan allow it to “indirectly watch what's happening in Iran.” More from GlobalPost: Despite modern facade, Azerbaijan guilty of rights abuses According to SIPRI, Azerbaijan had acquired about 30 drones from Israeli firms Aeronautics Ltd. and Elbit Systems by the end of 2011, including at least 25 medium-sized Hermes-450 and Aerostar drones. In October 2011, Azerbaijan signed a deal to license and domestically produce an additional 60 Aerostar and Orbiter 2M drones. Its most recent purchase from Israel Aeronautics Industries (IAI) in March reportedly included 10 high altitude Heron-TP drones — the most advanced Israeli drone in service — according to Oxford Analytica. Collectively, these purchases have netted Azerbaijan 50 or more drones that are similar in class, size and capabilities to American Predator and Reaper-type drones, which are the workhorses of the United States’ campaign of drone strikes in Pakistan and Yemen. Although Israel may have sold the drones to Azerbaijan with Iran in mind, Baku has said publicly that it intends to use its new hardware to retake territory it lost to Armenia. So far, Azerbaijan’s drone fleet is not armed, but industry experts say the models it employs could carry munitions and be programmed to strike targets. Drones are a tempting tool to use in frozen conflicts, because, while their presence raises tensions, international law remains vague at best on the legality of using them. In 2008, several Georgian drones were shot down over its rebel region of Abkhazia. A UN investigation found that at least one of the drones was downed by a fighter jet from Russia, which maintained a peacekeeping presence in the territory. While it was ruled that Russia violated the terms of the ceasefire by entering aircraft into the conflict zone, Georgia also violated the ceasefire for sending the drone on a “military operation” into the conflict zone. The incident spiked tensions between Russia and Georgia, both of which saw it as evidence the other was preparing to attack. Three months later, they fought a brief, but destructive war that killed hundreds. The legality of drones in Nagorno-Karabakh is even less clear because the conflict was stopped in 1994 by a simple ceasefire that halted hostilities but did not stipulate a withdrawal of military forces from the area. Furthermore, analysts believe that all-out war between Armenia and Azerbaijan would be longer and more difficult to contain than the five-day Russian-Georgian conflict. While Russia was able to quickly rout the Georgian army with a much superior force, analysts say that Armenia and Azerbaijan are much more evenly matched and therefore the conflict would be prolonged and costly in lives and resources. Blank said that renewed war would be “a very catastrophic event” with “a recipe for a very quick escalation to the international level.” Armenia is militarily allied with Russia and hosts a base of 5,000 Russian troops on its territory. After the summer’s border clashes, Russia announced it was stepping up its patrols of Armenian airspace by 20 percent. Iran also supports Armenia and has important business ties in the country, which analysts say Tehran uses as a “proxy” to circumvent international sanctions. Blank said Israel has made a risky move by supplying Azerbaijan with drones and other high tech equipment, given the tenuous balance of power between the heavily fortified Armenian positions and the more numerous and technologically superior Azerbaijani forces. If ignited, he said, “[an Armenian-Azerbaijani war] will not be small. That’s the one thing I’m sure of.”

#### Israel-Iran conflict escalates

Russell ‘9 (James, Senior lecturer in the Department of National Security Affairs at NPS, Strategic Stability Reconsidered: Prospects for Escalation and Nuclear War in the Middle East. Proliferation Papers, 2009)

America’s disapproval of Israeli pre-emption may reflect a reduced national appetite for military action in general, and for unilateral strategic action. However, the intensity of U.S.-Israeli bilateral relations places the United States in an extremely awkward position: on the one hand, a cherished ally could openly be calling for the fulfillment of security commitments77 for its protection and security in response to an external threat; on the other hand, U.S. security commitment to its allies include deterrence and defense, but are widely regarded as excluding preventative actions. To summarize, systemic weaknesses in the coercive bargaining framework induce the prospect of strategic instability in which escalation could unfold in a number of scenarios leading to the use of nuclear weapons by either the United States, Israel, or Iran. For purposes of this paper, escalation means an expansion of the intensity and scope of the conflict.78 The common denominator for the proposed scenarios is that nuclear use occurs in the context of conflict escalation – a conflict that could be initiated by a variety of different parties and in a variety of different circumstances.79 It is extremely unlikely that either the United States or Israel would initiate the use of nuclear weapons as part of a pre-emptive attack on Iran’s nuclear sites.80 However, there are escalation scenarios involving state and non-state actors in the coercive bargaining framework that could conceivably lead to nuclear weapons use by Israel and/or the United States. Iran’s response to what would initially start as a sustained stand-off bombardment (Desert Fox Heavy) could take a number of different forms that might lead to escalation by the United States and Israel, surrounding states, and non-state actors. Once the strikes commenced, it is difficult to imagine Iran remaining in a Saddam-like quiescent mode and hunkering down to wait out the attacks. Iranian leaders have unequivocally stated that any attack on its nuclear sites will result in a wider war 81 – a war that could involve regional states on both sides as well as non-state actors like Hamas and Hezbollah. While a wider regional war need not lead to escalation and nuclear use by either Israel or the United States, wartime circumstances and domestic political pressures could combine to shape decision-making in ways that present nuclear use as an option to achieve military and political objectives. For both the United States and Israel, Iranian or proxy use of chemical, biological or radiological weapons represent the most serious potential escalation triggers. For Israel, a sustained conventional bombardment of its urban centers by Hezbollah rockets in Southern Lebanon could also trigger an escalation spiral.

#### Caucus wars go nuclear

Blank ‘99 (Stephen, Director of Strategic Studies Institute at US Army War College, “Every Shark East of Suez: Great Power Interests, Policies and Tactics in the Transcaspian Energy Wars”, Central Asian Survey (18; 2),)

Past experience suggests Moscow will even threaten a Third World War if there is Turkish intervention in the Transcaucasus and the 1997 Russo-Armenian Treaty of Friendship, Cooperation, and Mutual Assistance and the 1994 Turkish-Azerbaijani Treaty of Friendship and Cooperation suggest just such a possibility. Conceivably, the two larger states could then be dragged in to rescue their allies from defeat. The Russo-Armenian treaty is a virtual bilateral military alliance against Baku, in that it reaffirms Russia’s lasting military presence in Armenia, commits Armenia not to join NATO, and could justify further fighting in Nagorno-Karabakh or further military pressure against Azerbaijan that will impede energy exploration and marketing. It also reconfirms Russia’s determination to resist an expanded U.S. presence and remain the exclusive regional hegemon. Thus, many structural conditions for conventional war or protracted ethnic conflict where third parties intervene now exist in the Transcaucasus. Many Third World conflicts generated by local structural factors have great potential for unintended escalation. Big powers often feel obliged to rescue their proxies and protégés. One or another big power may fail to grasp the stakes for the other side since interests here are not as clear as in Europe. Hence, commitments involving the use of nuclear weapons or perhaps even conventional war to prevent defeat of a client are not well established or clear as in Europe. For instance, in 1993 Turkish noises about intervening in the Karabakh War on behalf of Azerbaijan induced Russian leaders to threaten a nuclear war in such a case. This confirms the observations of Jim Hoagland, the international correspondent of the Washington Post, that “future wars involving Europe and America as allies will be fought either over resources in chaotic Third World locations or in ethnic upheavals on the southern fringe of Europe and Russia.” Unfortunately, many such causes for conflict prevail across the Transcaspian. Precisely because Turkey is a NATO ally but probably could not prevail in a long war against Russia, or if it could conceivably trigger a potential nuclear blow (not a small possibility given the erratic nature of Russia’s declared nuclear strategies), the danger of major war is higher here than almost anywhere else in the CIS or the so-called arc of crisis from the Balkans to China.

### Contention {Z}: Solvency

#### That solves without hamstringing presidential power or military capabilities

Brooks ’13 (Rosa Brooks is a law professor at Georgetown University and a Schwartz senior fellow at the New America Foundation. She served as a counselor to the U.S. defense undersecretary for policy from 2009 to 2011 and previously served as a senior advisor at the U.S. State Department, 2013, “The Law of Armed Conflict, the Use of Military Force, and the 2001 Authorization for Use of Military Force May 16, 2013 Statement for the Record Submitted the Senate Committee on Armed Services”, <http://www.lawfareblog.com/wp-content/uploads/2013/05/Brooks_05-16-13.pdf>, May 16, 2013)

For this reason, I believe that if Congress wishes to refine or clarify the AUMF, it should consider limiting the AUMF’s geographic scope, limiting its temporal duration, limiting the authorized use of force to that which would be considered permissible self defense under international law, or all three. Expressly limiting the AUMF’s geographic scope to Afghanistan and/or other areas in which U.S. troops on the ground are actively engaged in combat, for instance, would clarify that the ongoing armed conflict (and the applicability of the law of armed conflict) is limited to these more traditional battlefield situations. As noted above, such a geographical limitation would by no means undermine the president’s ability to use force to protect the United States from threats emanating from outside of the specified region. Such a geographical limitation would merely make it clear that any presidential desire to use force elsewhere would require him either to request an additional narrowly drawn congressional authorization to use force, or would require that any non-congressionally authorized use of force be justified -- constitutionally and internationally – on self defense grounds, by virtue of the gravity and imminence of a specific threat. Limiting the AUMF’s temporal scope could be accomplished by adding a “sunset” provision to the AUMF. The current AUMF could be set to expire when U.S. troops cease combat operations in Afghanistan, for instance, or in 2015, whichever date comes first. Here again, such a limitation would not preclude the president from requesting an extension or a new authorization to use force, if clearly justified by specific circumstances, nor would it preclude the president from relying on his inherent constitutional powers if force becomes necessary to prevent an imminent attack. Finally, the AUMF could be revised to clarify Congress’ view of the applicable legal framework. Congress could state explicitly that it authorizes the president to engage in an ongoing armed conflict within the borders of Afghanistan between the U.S. and Al Qaeda, the Taliban and their co-belligerents, but that it does not currently authorize the initiation or continuation of an armed conflict in any other place, and expects therefore that any U.S. military action elsewhere or against other actors shall be governed by principles of self-defense rather than by the law of armed conflict.

#### Legislative restrictions prevent circumvention

Barron ‘8 (Professor of Law at Harvard Law School and Martin S. Lederman, Visiting Professor of Law at the Georgetown University Law Center (David J. Barron, “The Commander in Chief at the Lowest Ebb -- A Constitutional History”, Harvard Law Review, February, 121 Harv. L. Rev. 941, Lexis)

In addition to offering important guidance concerning the congressional role, our historical review also illuminates the practices of the President in creating the constitutional law of war powers at the "lowest ebb." Given the apparent advantages to the Executive of possessing preclusive powers in this area, it is tempting to think that Commanders in Chief would always have claimed a unilateral and unregulable authority to determine the conduct of military operations. And yet, as we show, for most of our history, the presidential **practice was otherwise**. Several of our most esteemed Presidents - Washington, Lincoln, and both Roosevelts, among others - never invoked the sort of preclusive claims of authority that some modern Presidents appear to embrace without pause. In fact, no Chief Executive did so in any clear way until the onset of the Korean War, even when they confronted problematic restrictions, some of which could not be fully interpreted away and some of which even purported to regulate troop deployments and the actions of troops already deployed. Even since claims of preclusive power emerged in full, the practice within the executive branch has waxed and waned. No consensus among modern Presidents has crystallized. Indeed, rather than denying the authority of Congress to act in this area, some **modern Presidents**, like their predecessors, have **acknowledged** the **constitutionality of legislative regulation**. They have therefore concentrated their efforts on making effective use of other presidential authorities and institutional [\*949] advantages to shape military matters to their preferred design. n11 In sum, there has been much less executive assertion of an inviolate power over the conduct of military campaigns than one might think. And, perhaps **most importantly,** until recently there has been almost **no** actual **defiance** of statutory limitations predicated on such a constitutional theory. This repeated, though not unbroken, deferential executive branch stance is not, we think, best understood as evidence of the timidity of prior Commanders in Chief. Nor do we think it is the accidental result of political conditions that just happened to make it expedient for all of these Executives to refrain from lodging such a constitutional objection. This consistent pattern of executive behavior is more accurately viewed as reflecting deeply rooted norms and understandings of how the Constitution structures conflict between the branches over war. In particular, this well-developed executive branch practice appears to be premised on the assumption that the constitutional plan requires the nation's chief commander **to guard his supervisory powers** over the military chain of command **jealously**, to be willing to act in times of exigency if Congress is not available for consultation, and to use the very powerful weapon of the veto to forestall unacceptable limits proposed in the midst of military conflict - **but** that otherwise, the Constitution compels the Commander in Chief to comply with legislative restrictions. In this way, the founding legal charter itself exhorts the President to justify controversial military judgments to a sympathetic but sometimes skeptical or demanding legislature and nation, not only for the sake of liberty, but also for effective and prudent conduct of military operations. Justice Jackson's famous instruction that "with all its defects, delays and inconveniences, men have discovered no technique for long preserving free government except that the Executive be under the law, and that the law be made by parliamentary deliberations" n12 continues to have a strong pull on the constitutional imagination. n13 What emerges from our analysis is how much pull it seemed to [\*950] have on the executive branch itself for most of our history of war powers development.

#### Congress key --- self-restraint HURTS Obama’s credibility- seen as continuing to circumvent Congress

Goldsmith ’13 (Jack Goldsmith, Henry L. Shattuck Professor at Harvard Law School, where he teaches and writes about national security law, presidential power, cybersecurity, international law, internet law, foreign relations law, and conflict of laws. Before coming to Harvard, Professor Goldsmith served as Assistant Attorney General, Office of Legal Counsel from 2003-2004, and Special Counsel to the Department of Defense from 2002-2003, “How Obama Undermined the War on Terror The President promised not to undercut the rule of law for expedience's sake. He did. Now we face the consequences”, <http://www.newrepublic.com/article/112964/obamas-secrecy-destroying-american-support-counterterrorism>, May 1, 2013)

Questions grew when the administration **continued to withhold legal memos from Congress**, and when John Brennan danced around the issue during his confirmation hearings to be director of the CIA. Senator Rand Paul then cleverly asked Brennan whether the president could order a drone to kill a terrorist suspect inside the United States. When Brennan and Attorney General Eric Holder seemed to prevaricate, Paul conducted his now-famous filibuster. "I cannot sit at my desk quietly and let the president say that he will kill Americans on American soil who are not actively attacking the country," Paul proclaimed. The president never said, or suggested, any such thing. But with trust in Obama falling fast, Paul was remarkably successful in painting the secret wars abroad as a Constitution-defying threat to American citizens at home. Paul's filibuster attracted attention to the issue of drone attacks on Americans in the homeland. A more serious challenge to the president comes from growing concerns, including within his own party, about the legal integrity of his secret wars abroad. Anne-Marie Slaughter, a former senior official in Obama's State Department, recently gainsaid "the idea that this president would leave office having dramatically expanded the use of drones—including [against] American citizens—without any public standards and no checks and balances." Many in Congress want to increase the transparency of the processes and legal standards for placing a suspect (especially an American) on a targeting list, to tighten those legal standards (perhaps by recourse to a "drone court"), and to establish a more open accounting of the consequences (including civilian casualties) from the strikes. "This is now out in the public arena, and now it has to be addressed," Senator Dianne Feinstein, a Democrat, recently said. Others in Congress worry about the obsolescence of the legal foundation for the way of the knife: the congressional authorization, in 2001, of force against Al Qaeda. "I don't believe many, if any, of us believed when we voted for [the authorization] that we were voting for the longest war in the history of the United States and putting a stamp of approval on a war policy against terrorism that, 10 years plus later, we're still using," said Senator Richard Durbin, also a Democrat, in a Wall Street Journal interview. "What are the checks and balances of the system?" he asked. Senator John McCain, who led bipartisan efforts against what he saw as Bush-era legal excesses, is now focusing similar attention on Obama. "I believe that we need to revisit this whole issue of the use of drones, who uses them, whether the CIA should become their own air force, what the oversight is, [and] what the legal and political foundations [are] for this kind of conflict," he said last month. These are unhappy developments for the president who in his first inaugural address pledged with supercilious confidence that, unlike his predecessor, he would not expend the "rule of law" for "expedience's sake." Obama reportedly bristles at the legal and political **questions about his secret war**, and the lack of presidential trust that they imply. "This is not Dick Cheney we're talking about here," he recently pleaded to Democratic senators who complained about his administration's excessive secrecy on drones, according to Politico. And yet the president has ended up in this position because he committed the same sins that led Cheney and the administration in which he served to a similar place. **The first sin is an** extraordinary **institutional secrecy that Obama has long promised to reduce but has failed to**. In part this results from any White House's inevitable tendency to seek maximum protection for its institutional privileges and prerogatives. The administration's disappointing resistance to sharing secret legal opinions about the secret war with even a small subset of Congress falls into this category. But the point goes deeper, for secrecy is the essence of the type of war that Obama has chosen to fight. The intelligence-gathering in foreign countries needed for successful drone strikes there cannot be conducted openly. Nor can lethal operations in foreign countries easily be acknowledged. Foreign leaders usually insist on non-acknowledgment as a condition of allowing American operations in their territories. And in any event, an official American confirmation of the operations might spark controversies in those countries that would render the operations infeasible. The impossible-to-deny bin Laden raid was a necessary exception to these principles, and the United States is still living with the fallout in Pakistan. For official secrecy abroad to work, the secrets must be kept at home as well. In speeches, interviews, and leaks, Obama's team has tried to explain why its operations abroad are lawful and prudent. But to comply with rules of classified information and covert action, the explanations are conveyed in limited, abstract, and often awkward terms. They usually raise more questions than they answer—and secrecy rules often preclude the administration from responding to follow-up questions, criticisms, and charges. As a result, **much of what the administration says** about its secret war—about civilian casualties, or the validity of its legal analysis, or the quality of its internal deliberations—seems **incomplete, self-serving, and ultimately non-credible.** These **trust-destroying tendencies** are **exacerbated** by its **persistent resistance to transparency demands from Congress**, from the press, and from organizations such as the aclu that have sought to know more about the way of the knife through Freedom of Information Act requests. A related sin is the Obama administration's surprising failure to secure formal congressional support. Nearly every element of Obama's secret war rests on laws—especially the congressional authorization of force (2001) and the covert action statute (1991)—designed for different tasks. The administration could have worked with Congress to update these laws, thereby forcing members of Congress to accept responsibility and take a stand, and putting the secret war on a firmer political and legal foundation. But doing so would have required extended political efforts, public argument, and the possibility that Congress might not give the president precisely what he wants. The administration that embraced the way of the knife in order to lower the political costs of counterterrorism abroad found it easier to avoid political costs at home as well. But this choice deprived it of the many benefits of public argumentation and congressional support. What Donald Rumsfeld said self-critically of Bush-era unilateralism applies to Obama's unilateralism as well: it fails to "take fully into account the broader picture—the complete set of strategic considerations of a president fighting a protracted, unprecedented and unfamiliar war for which he would need sustained domestic and international support." Instead of seeking contemporary congressional support, the administration has **relied mostly on government lawyers' secret interpretive** extensions of the old laws to authorize new operations against new enemies in more and more countries. The administration has great self-confidence in the quality of its stealth legal judgments. But as the Bush administration learned, secret legal interpretations are invariably more persuasive within the dark circle of executive branch secrecy than when exposed to public sunlight. On issues ranging from proper targeting standards, to the legality of killing American citizens, to what counts as an "imminent" attack warranting self-defensive measures, these secret legal interpretations—so reminiscent of the Bushian sin of unilateral legalism—have been **less convincing** in public, further contributing to presidential mistrust. Feeling the heat from these developments, President Obama promised in his recent State of the Union address "to engage with Congress to ensure not only that our targeting, detention, and prosecution of terrorists remains consistent with our laws and system of checks and balances, but that our efforts are even more transparent to the American people and to the world." So far, this promise, like similar previous ones, remains unfulfilled. The administration has floated the idea of "[shifting] the CIA's lethal targeting program to the Defense Department," as The Daily Beast reported last month. Among other potential virtues, this move might allow greater public transparency about the way of the knife to the extent that it would eliminate the covert action bar to public discussion. But JSOC's non-covert targeted killing program is no less secretive than the CIA's, and its congressional oversight is, if anything, less robust. A bigger problem with this proposed fix is that it contemplates executive branch reorganization followed, in a best-case scenario, by more executive branch speeches and testimony about what it is doing in its stealth war. The proposal fails to grapple altogether with the growing mistrust of the administration's oblique representations about secret war. The president cannot establish trust in the way of the knife through internal moves and more words. Rather, he must take advantage of the separation of powers. Military detention, military commissions, and warrantless surveillance became more legitimate and less controversial during the Bush era because adversarial branches of government assessed the president's policies before altering and then approving them. President Obama should ask Congress to do the same with the way of the knife, even if it means that secret war abroad is harder to conduct. Administration officials resist this route because they worry about the outcome of the public debate, and because the president is, as The Washington Post recently reported, "seen as reluctant to have the legislative expansion of another [war] added to his legacy." But the administration can influence the outcome of the debate only by engaging it. And as Mazzetti makes plain, the president's legacy already includes the dramatic and unprecedented unilateral expansion of secret war. What the president should be worried about for legacy purposes is that this form of warfare, for which he alone is today responsible, is increasingly viewed as illegitimate.

## 2AC

### 2AC- Laundry List/ Terror

#### They fail- hydra effect

Blum and Heymann ‘10 (Gabriella Blum\* and Philip Heymann\*\*, \*Assistant Professor of Law, Harvard Law School, \*\* James Barr Ames Professor of Law, Harvard Law School, “ Law and Policy of Targeted killing” ebsco, 2010)

An immediate consequence of eliminating leaders of terrorist organizations will sometimes be what may be called the Hydra effect, the rise of more—and more resolute—leaders to replace them. The decapitating of the organization may also invite retaliation by the other members and followers of the organization. Thus, when Israel assassinated Abbas Mussawi, Hezbollah‘s leader in Lebanon, in 1992, a more charismatic and successful leader, Hassan Nassrallah, succeeded Mussawi. The armed group then avenged the assassination of its former leader in two separate attacks, blowing up Israeli and Jewish targets in Buenos Aires, killing over a hundred people and injuring hundreds more.

#### Intel gathering

Blum and Heymann ‘10 (Gabriella Blum\* and Philip Heymann\*\*, \*Assistant Professor of Law, Harvard Law School, \*\* James Barr Ames Professor of Law, Harvard Law School, “ Law and Policy of Targeted killing” ebsco, 2010)

Targeted killing may also interfere with important gathering of critical intelligence. The threat of being targeted will drive current leaders into hiding, making the monitoring of their movements and activities by the counterterrorist forces more difficult. Moreover, if these leaders are found and killed, instead of captured, the counterterrorism forces lose the ability to interrogate them to obtain potentially valuable information about plans, capabilities, or organizational structure.

#### No nuke terror- can’t use, steal, or transfer bombs

**Clarke 4-17**-13 [Michael, PhD, Senior Research Fellow at Griffith Asia Institute with a special focus in terrorism, Griffith University, Bachelor of Arts (Honors) in Asian and International Studies, “Pakistan and Nuclear Terrorism: How Real is the Threat?” Comparative Strategy, 32:2, 98-114, online]

Although the acquisition of an intact nuclear weapon would be “the most difﬁcult¶ challenge for any terrorist organization,” there remain a number of scenarios that involve¶ a terrorist organization acquiring an intact nuclear weapon,5¶ such as the deliberate transfer¶ of a warhead by a national government, “insider” collusion from senior ofﬁcials, seizure or¶ theft without collusion, and political instability or state failure/collapse. The direct transfer¶ scenario is difﬁcult to imagine as it is almost impossible to conceive of any national¶ government voluntarily gifting their “crown jewels” to a terrorist group due to the likely¶ reprisals they would incur if the weapon were used and the probability that the weapon¶ would be traced back to the state of origin.6¶ The scenario of “insider” collusion in the¶ diversion or transfer of nuclear materials has also been perceived as a major threat. To¶ cope with this threat, most advanced nuclear weapons states such as the United States,¶ France, the United Kingdom, the Russian Federation, and the People’s Republic of China¶ have instituted Personnel Reliability Programs (PRP), which establishes a centralized set of¶ procedures designed to ensure that individuals developing, managing, and guarding nuclear¶ weapons and related facilities are trustworthy.7¶ It has been asserted that theft of “weapons-usable materials” is “a proven and recurring¶ fact.”8¶ However, such a claim tends to refer to instances when small quantities of nuclear¶ material have been stolen. For example. Zimmerman and Lewis noted in 2006 that they¶ were aware of “only one particularly disturbing instance in which smugglers obtained a¶ signiﬁcant quality of highly enriched uranium: a 1994 case in Prague . . . involving Czech,¶ Slovak and Russian nationals.”9¶ In addition, in June 2011, authorities also interdicted¶ a smuggling gang in Moldova attempting to smuggle a small quantity of non–weapons¶ usable uranium-238 (U-238).10¶ The collapse or failure of a state with a nuclear arsenal would raise the potential¶ for nuclear weapons and materials to be diverted or stolen. However, even if a terrorist¶ organization did manage to acquire an intact weapon through one of these scenarios, there¶ would remain a variety of obstacles to be overcome in order to be able to detonate it. In¶ particular, there are a variety of safety and security measures/procedures that protect nuclear¶ weapons against accidents or unauthorized use, such as environmental sensing devices¶ (ESD) that block arming systems until a prescribed environment is achieved (e.g., missile¶ launch acceleration); insensitive high explosives (IHE) that make the weapon resistant to being detonated by mechanical shock; and permissive action links (PALs), which is an¶ electronic device that prevents arming of the weapon unless correct codes are inserted.11¶ To produce an IND, terrorists would need to acquire signiﬁcant quantities of ﬁssile¶ material, either HEU or plutonium.12 Two types of INDs are considered to be theoretically¶ possible for a terrorist organisation to construct—the gun-type weapon and the implosiontype weapon.13The former consists of a gun barrel in which a projectile of subcritical HEU¶ is ﬁred into a stationary piece of subcritical HEU, producing a supercritical mass leading to a¶ nuclear explosion. Bunn and Wier note that the gun type is “simple and robust” and “allows¶ the builder high conﬁdence that it will perform properly without the trouble, expense and¶ exposure of a test explosion.”14 However, as only a small amount of the HEU ﬁssions in a¶ gun-type weapon, a signiﬁcant quantity—between 50 and 60 kilograms (kg)—of HEU is¶ required.15¶ An implosion device, in contrast, “uses a set of shaped explosives arranged around a¶ less-than-critical mass of HEU or plutonium to crush the atoms of material closer together”¶ to produce a nuclear explosion.16Weapons-grade plutonium (plutonium that contains more¶ than 90% of plutonium isotope 239) is the desired type of plutonium for production of¶ such a device as it is most readily detonated, although, reactor-grade plutonium (containing¶ between 50 to 70% plutonium 239) could also produce a nuclear explosion.17 A much¶ smaller amount of plutonium—between 6 and 8 kg—is also required for an implosion device¶ compared to the HEU required for a gun-type device. Unlike uranium, however, plutonium is¶ not a naturally occurring element and is produced when U-238 absorbs neutrons in a nuclear¶ reactor where it is intimately mixed with the U-238. The plutonium must then be separated¶ or “reprocessed” from the U-238 before it can be used for either weapons applications¶ or for reactor fuel.18 Plutonium separation is technically easier than uranium enrichment¶ as it is affected by chemical means rather than isotopic mass in the case of uranium¶ enrichment. The production of plutonium, however, “is made greatly more difﬁcult by the¶ intense radiation emanating from the commingled ﬁssion products.”19 The complexity of an implosion device also poses additional challenges in terms of manufacture/acquisition¶ and testing of components, which could also increase the likelihood of detection.20¶ The acquisition of the required quantity of ﬁssile material remains the major obstacle¶ to terrorists fabricating a nuclear device. Acquisition of ﬁssile material could be achieved in¶ two ways: through terrorists undertaking the process of enrichment or through purchase or¶ theft of weapons grade HEU or plutonium. A terrorist organization is unlikely to attempt the¶ enrichment of natural uranium as this is a technically demanding process, the technologies¶ for which are tightly controlled.21 The theft of a sufﬁcient quantity and quality of HEU is¶ the more likely option due not only to technical requirements but also to the amount of¶ HEU stockpiled around the world. According to the International Panel on Fissile Materials (IPFM), there exists approximately 1,700 metric tons of HEU worldwide in various¶ locations, and 99% is estimated to be in possession of the nuclear weapons states.22 The¶ bulk of this HEU is accounted for by acknowledged military uses, although it is estimated¶ that between 50 and 100 metric tons is in the civilian sector, where it is primarily used in¶ research reactors, the production of medical isotopes, and to fuel Russian icebreakers.23

### T

“Restrictions” are on time, place, and manner – this includes geography

Lobel, professor of law at the University of Pittsburgh, 2008

(Jules, “Conflicts Between the Commander in Chief and Congress: Concurrent Power over the Conduct of War,” Ohio State Law Journal, http://moritzlaw.osu.edu/students/groups/oslj/files/2012/04/69.3.lobel\_.pdf)

Throughout American history, Congress has placed restrictions on the President’s power as Commander in Chief to conduct warfare. On numerous occasions, **Congress has authorized the President to conduct warfare but placed significant restrictions on the time**, **place and manner of warfare**. Congress has regulated the tactics the President could employ, the armed forces he could deploy, the geographical area in which those forces could be utilized, and the time period and specific purposes for which the President was authorized to use force. Its regulations have both swept broadly and set forth detailed instructions and procedures for the President to follow. This historical practice is consistent with the Constitution’s text and Framers’ intent, which made clear that the President was not to have the broad powers of the British King, but was subject to the control and oversight of Congress in the conduct of warfare.

“On” means there’s no limits disad

Dictionary.com, http://dictionary.reference.com/browse/on

On

preposition

1.so as to be or remain supported by or suspended from: Put your package down on the table; Hang your coat on the hook.

2.so as to be attached to or unified with: Hang the picture on the wall. Paste the label on the package.

“War powers authority” includes national self-defense

Manget, law professor at Florida State and formerly in the Office of the General Counsel at the CIA, No Date

(Fred, “Presidential War Powers,” http://media.nara.gov/dc-metro/rg-263/6922330/Box-10-114-7/263-a1-27-box-10-114-7.pdf)

**The President has constitutional authority to order defensive military action in response to aggression without congressional approval**. This theory of self-defense has justified many military actions, from the Barbary Coast to the Mexican-American War to the Tonkin Gul£. 29 The Supreme Court has agreed. In The Prize Cases, it found that President Lincoln had the right to blockade southern states without a congressional declaration of war: "If a war be made by invasion of a foreign nation, the President is not only authorized but bound to resist force by force. He does not initiate the war, but is bound to accept the challenge without waiting for any special legislative authority. " 30 In a case arising out of the Vietnam war, the defendant claimed that draft law was unconstitutionally applied to him because Congress had not declared war. The court rejected that claim, stating that on the basis of the Commander in Chief power, "Unquestionably the President can start the gun at home or abroad to meet force with force. " 3 1 **When the President acts in defense of the nation**, **he acts under war powers authority**.

### PF

#### Google

to

to͞o/

preposition

preposition: to

1.

expressing motion in the direction of (a particular location).

"walking down to the mall"

### Intra-Executive (Geo)

#### Links to politics – immense opposition to bypassing debate

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.”

#### Congress key

#### Statutory definition key

Farley ’12 (Benjamin R. Farley, J.D. with honors, Emory University School of Law, 2011. Editor-in-Chief, Emory International Law Review, 2010-2011. M.A., The George Washington University Elliott School of International Affairs, 2007, South Texas Law Review, 54 S. Tex. L. Rev. 385, “ARTICLE: Drones and Democracy: Missing Out on Accountability?”, Winter, 2012)

Congress should strengthen the WPR regime by defining hostilities in a manner that links hostilities to the scope and intensity of a use of force, irrespective of the attendant threat of U.S. casualties. Without defining hostilities, Congress has ceded to the President the ability to evade the trigger and the limits of the WPR. The President's adoption of a definition of hostilities that is tied to the threat of U.S. casualties or the presence of U.S. ground troops opens the door to long-lasting and potentially intensive operations that rely on drones - at least beyond the sixty-day window - that escape the WPR by virtue of drones being pilotless (which is to say, by virtue of drones being drones). Tying hostilities to the intensity and scope of the use of force will limit the President's ability to evade Congressional regulation of war. It will curtail future instances of the United States being in an armed conflict for purposes of international law but not for purposes of domestic law, as was the case in Libya. Finally, a statutory definition of hostilities will provide the judiciary with a meaningful standard for determining presidential compliance with the WPR - assuming the future existence of a plaintiff able to surmount the various prudential doctrines that have counseled against entertaining WPR cases thus far.

#### The *risk and fear* of Obama reneging on the CP means it doesn’t solve signal

Groll 8/8 (Elias Groll, “The Sudden and Unexpected Return of the Drone War”, <http://blog.foreignpolicy.com/posts/2013/08/08/the_sudden_and_unexpected_return_of_the_drone_war_yemen>, August 8, 2013)

The drone war is back. Amid fears that al Qaeda-affiliated terrorists in Yemen are plotting a major attack, U.S. drones reportedly launched three strikes in the country on Thursday alone, killing 12 suspected al Qaeda militants. In fact, the Obama administration is arguably waging its most intense drone campaign ever in Yemen, with nine suspected drone strikes in the last 13 days and six in the last three. The concentrated bombing is all the more striking considering that just days ago the State Department was shuttering nearly two dozen embassies around the world in response to what seemed an amorphous terrorist threat. The fierce campaign comes on the heels of the White House announcing a major overhaul of its use of drones. With his speech in May outlining a plan to take the United States off its "perpetual wartime footing," the president gave hope to critics of his surprisingly robust drone policy that the strikes would soon be curtailed. But according to Josh Begley, a web developer who tracks drone strikes and runs Dronestream, U.S. drones have struck five times in Pakistan and 11 times in Yemen since Obama's speech. Not since January -- when, during a five-day period, Washington carried out eight suspected strikes -- have U.S. missiles rained down on Yemen with such frequency. While three-strike days are not unprecedented in Yemen, they are far more common in Pakistan. According to Begley's analysis, there have been three likely instances in which U.S. drones struck Yemen three times in one day. In Pakistan, that has occurred 13 times. The interactive map below, courtesy of Begley, shows strikes in Yemen before (yellow dots) and after (red dots) Obama's speech (the first U.S. drone strike in Yemen took place way back in 2002). Some dots below are obscured because of multiple strikes in the same location. The flurry of strikes raises questions about the Obama administration's stated commitment to dial back its aggressive wartime tactics. In a major speech earlier this year, President Obama announced to much fanfare that he hoped to wind down the war on terror and that stricter guidelines would be put in place to govern the use of drone strikes, though those rules largely remain classified and unreleased. "America does not take strikes to punish individuals; we act against terrorists who pose a continuing and imminent threat to the American people, and when there are no other governments capable of effectively addressing the threat," Obama said. "And before any strike is taken, there must be near-certainty that no civilians will be killed or injured -- the highest standard we can set." In a letter to Congress in May, Attorney General Eric Holder hinted at this new, stricter policy. "When capture is not feasible, the policy provides that lethal force may be used only when a terrorist target poses a continuing, imminent threat to Americans, and when certain other preconditions, including a requirement that no other reasonable alternatives exist to effectively address the threat, are satisfied." What those "other preconditions" amount to remains shrouded in mystery. But as articulated in the letter, the administration's new critieria for drone strikes turn on the presence of a "continuing, imminent threat" directed at Americans. Administration officials explain that the prior guidance allowed drone strikes against groups or individuals threatening "U.S. interests" whereas the new policy tightens that guideline to require "U.S. persons" to be threatened by those targeted by drones. This time around, the U.S. government has been making an elaborate, dramatic argument that the latest threat out of Yemen poses imminent danger to Americans. The administration's decision to close and evacuate a slew of diplomatic posts served as a highly visible signal of the perceived seriousness of this threat -- and, most importantly, its implications for U.S. persons. While Obama's speech in May and subsequent policy guidance has been interpreted as an effort by the president to avoid having his legacy defined by the aggressive use of drones, the address itself was notable for its defense of the administration's tactics, which Obama argued have not only undermined terrorist groups but also saved civilian lives. That conviction has been on manifest display in the administration's response this week to the threat emanating from Yemen. Beyond vague hints, apocalyptic warnings, and bizarre leaks, however, U.S. officials have released little information about the nature of that threat. As a result, it remains difficult to evaluate Obama's commitment to his new policy. "There has been an awful lot of chatter out there. Chatter means conversation about terrorists, about the planning that's going on, very reminiscent of what we saw pre-9/11," Sen. Saxby Chambliss, the Georgia Republican, said on NBC's Meet the Press. Later in the week, administration officials revealed that the source of the warning came from an intercepted communication between the head of al Qaeda, Ayman al-Zawahiri, and the chief of the Yemen-based al Qaeda in the Arabian Peninsula. Given the murky nature of the threat, it remains unclear whether, in repeatedly striking targets in Yemen in recent days, the Obama administration is ramping up the pressure on al Qaeda in the Arabian Peninsula in general or simply responding to a specific intelligence threat. The White House's secret legal guidelines would appear to require that the strikes be tied to a specific threat to U.S. persons, but that's a legal standard for which there is no outside oversight or determination. If the U.S. government wants to up the pressure and return to the 2009-2010 heyday of the decade-long drone war, there is nothing stopping it. Meanwhile, for observers of the U.S. national security establishment, the strikes in Yemen upset a commonly accepted wisdom in Washington: that the accession of John Brennan as CIA director heralded the end of aggressive drone strikes. Brennan reportedly favors moving the drone program from the the CIA to the Pentagon, where it will theoretically be subject to greater oversight and transparency. With the transfer of the program, it was also thought that drone strikes would gradually decrease as they moved out of the shadowy world of the CIA and into the, comparatively speaking, more open world of the Defense Department. But events this week in Yemen represent a profound challenge to that line of thinking. And until the White House offers a clear explanation for how it is targeting terrorists and why, prickly questions about the administration's commitment to dialing back the war on terror are likely to persist.

#### Law is key to modeling

Maxwell ’12 (Mark David Maxwell, Colonel, Judge Advocate with the U.S. Army, TARGETED KILLING, THE LAW, AND TERRORISTS, Joint Force Quarterly, <http://www.ndu.edu/press/targeted-killing.html>, Winter 2012)

The weakness of this theory is that it is not codified in U.S. law; it is merely the extrapolation of international theorists and organizations. The only entity under the Constitution that can frame and settle Presidential power regarding the enforcement of international norms is Congress. As the check on executive power, Congress must amend the AUMF to give the executive a statutory roadmap that articulates when force is appropriate and under what circumstances the President can use targeted killing. This would be the needed endorsement from Congress, the other political branch of government, to clarify the U.S. position on its use of force regarding targeted killing. For example, it would spell out the limits of American lethality once an individual takes the status of being a member of an organized group. Additionally, statutory clarification will give other states a roadmap for the contours of what constitutes anticipatory self-defense and the proper conduct of the military under the law of war. Congress should also require that the President brief it on the decision matrix of articulated guidelines before a targeted killing mission is ordered. As Kenneth Anderson notes, “[t]he point about briefings to Congress is partly to allow it to exercise its democratic role as the people’s representative.”74 The desire to feel safe is understandable. The consumers who buy SUVs are not buying them to be less safe. Likewise, the champions of targeted killings want the feeling of safety achieved by the elimination of those who would do the United States harm. But allowing the President to order targeted killing without congressional limits means the President can manipulate force in the name of national security without tethering it to the law advanced by international norms. The potential consequence of such unilateral executive action is that it gives other states, such as North Korea and Iran, the customary precedent to do the same. Targeted killing might be required in certain circumstances, but if the guidelines are debated and understood, the decision can be executed with the full faith of the people’s representative, Congress. When the decision is made without Congress, the result might make the United States feel safer, but the process eschews what gives a state its greatest safety: the rule of law.

### Entrenchment

#### Healthcare, financing, and war-fighting thump entrenchment, and repeal solves the impact

**Posner ’09** [Eric Posner is Kirkland & Ellis Professor of Law at the University of Chicago, “Entrenchment Provisions in the Health Care Bill,” <http://www.volokh.com/2009/12/22/entrenchment-provisions-in-the-health-care-bill/>]

Jonathan notes that the health care bill includes certain “entrenchment” provisions, and asks, “can the current Senate bind future Senates in this way?” If I understand the bill correctly, it creates an independent board that recommends ways to limit Medicare payments. These recommendations go to the president, who in turn is supposed to submit them to Congress. Congressional procedures are likewise constrained. The Senate, for example, cannot debate the proposal for more than 30 hours; there are limits on House procedures as well. The idea seems to be to constrain filibustering and other parliamentary maneuvers that would defeat cost-saving legislation in the future. As Jonathan notes, the bill further provides that these constraints cannot be overturned by majority rule but require a 2/3 supermajority.¶ Can Congress bind itself in this way? As it happens, I have written a paper on this topic (with Adrian Vermeule). The short answer is “no,” or at least, no one thinks that Congress can bind itself in this way. (For some Supreme Court dicta, see U.S. v. Winstar, 518 U.S. 839, 872 (1996)). A Congress at time 1 can pass all the entrenchment provisions it wants, but Congress at time 2 can repeal them by majority rule, rendering the entrenchment provision nugatory ex ante.¶ Academics have spent a lot of time justifying the restriction on entrenchment, but, our paper argues, have failed. Some scholars make conceptual arguments: Congress can’t bind future Congresses to supermajority rules if every Congress rules by majority. But these conceptual arguments are clearly wrong, as Article V of the Constitution shows (and, indeed, the Senate’s own internally enforced supermajority rules). It is certainly possible to entrench policy; the question is whether courts or other relevant agents will respect the rules. Most scholars seem to fear that if Congress can entrench legislation, then it will resolve all questions today that might come up in the future, depriving future generations of their right to self-government.¶ The problem with this argument is that Congress can already bind the future in uncontroversial ways. It borrows money, compelling the future to repay or suffer a loss of credit. It starts wars, compelling the future to finish them. Everything Congress does affects future generations, for good or for ill. Imposing restrictions on its own procedures is not really distinctive. If you think Congress should be able to do anything at all, then you are probably compelled to conclude that it ought to bind itself. In this instance, part of the health care deal is a commitment by Congress to restrain growth in Medicare spending. Since people don’t believe that Congress will actually control Medicare spending if normal parliamentary procedures are used, the Senate is trying to entrench this commitment. Unfortunately, it will fail—at least, if it depends on the courts to enforce these rules. It is possible that the rules will create a political entrenchment of some sort, but it is hard to tell.

#### Congress exerting the power of the purse key to check presidential warfare

Fisher ‘7 (Louis Fisher is a specialist in constitutional law with the Law Library of the Library of Congress, after working for the Congressional Research Service from 1970 to March 6, 2006. During his service with CRS he was research di rector of the House Iran-Contra Committee in 1987, writing major sections of the final report. Fish er received his doctorate in political science from the New School for Social Research and has taught at a number of universities and law schools, appearing before the Senate Committee on the Judiciary, loc.gov/law/help/usconlaw/pdf/Feingold2007rev.pdf, “Exercising Congress’s Constitutional Power to End a War”, January 30, 2007)

The framers carefully studied this monarchical model and repudiated it in its entirety. Not a single one of Blackstone’s prerogatives was granted to the President. They are either assigned entirely to Congress (declare war, issue letters of marque and reprisal, raise and regulate fleets and armies) or shared between the Senate and the President (appointing ambassadors and making treaties). The rejection of the British and monarchical models could not have been more sweeping. This explains what the framers did. The next question is why they did it. The framers gave Congress the power to initiate war because they concluded — based on the history of other nations — that Executives, in their quest for fame and personal glory, had too great an appetite for war and little care for their subjects or the long-term interests of their country. John Jay, whose experience in the Continental Congress and the early years of the Republic was generally in foreign affairs, warned in Federalist No. 4 that “absolute monarchs will often make war when their nations are to get nothing by it, but for purposes and objects merely personal, such as a thirst for military glory, revenge for personal affronts, ambition, or private compacts to aggrandize or support their particular families or partisans. These and a variety of other motives, which affect only the mind of the sovereign, often lead him to engage in wars not sanctified by justice or the voice and interests of his people.” Joseph Story, who served on the Supreme Court from 1811 to 1845, similarly wrote about the need to vest in the representative branch the decision to go to war. The power to declare war “is in its own nature and effects so critical and calamitous, that it requires the utmost deliberation, and the successive review of all the councils of the nations. War, in its best estate, never fails to impose upon the people the most burthensome taxes, and personal sufferings. It is always injurious, and sometime subversive of the great commercial, manufacturing, and agricultural interests.” Story found war as “sometimes fatal to public liberty itself, by introducing a spirit of military glory, which is ready to follow, wherever a successful commander will lead.” Through their study of history and political ambition, the framers came to fear the Executive appetite for war. Human nature has not changed over the years to justify trust in independent and unchecked presidential decisions in war. The record of two centuries in America teaches us that what Jay said in 1788 applies equally well to contemporary times. Offensive and Defensive Wars The debates at the Philadelphia Convention in 1787 underscore the framers’ intent to keep offensive wars in the hands of Congress while reserving to the President certain actions of a defensive nature. All three branches understood that distinction for 160 years, until President Truman went to war against North Korea by going to the UN Security Council for “authority” instead of to Congress. Review what the framers said in Philadelphia. On June 1, 1787, Charles Pinckney offered his support for “a vigorous Executive but was afraid the Executive powers of <the existing> Congress might extend to peace & war &c which would render the Executive a Monarchy, of the worst kind, towit an elective one.” 1 Farrand 64-65. John Rutledge wanted the executive power placed in a single person, “tho’ he was not for giving him the power of war and peace.” James Wilson, who also preferred a single executive, “did not consider the Prerogatives of the British Monarch as a proper guide in defining the Executive powers. Some of these prerogatives were of a Legislative nature. Among others that of war & peace &c.” Id. at 65-66. Edmund Randolph worried about executive power, calling it “the foetus of monarchy.” The delegates to the Philadelphia Convention, he said, had “no motive to be governed by the British Governmt. as our prototype.” Alexander Hamilton, in a lengthy speech on June 18, strongly supported a vigorous and independent President, but plainly jettisoned the British model of executive prerogatives in foreign affairs and the war power. In discarding the Lockean and Blackstonian doctrines of executive power, he proposed giving the Senate the “sole power of declaring war.” The President would be authorized to have “the direction of war when authorized or begun.” Id. at 292. In Federalist No. 69, Hamilton explained the break with English precedents. The power of the king “extends to the declaring of war and to the raising and regulating of fleets and armies.” The delegates decided to place those powers, he said, in Congress. At the constitutional convention, Charles Pinckney objected that legislative proceedings “were too slow” for the safety of the country in an emergency, since he expected Congress to meet but once a year. James Madison and Elbridge Gerry moved to amend the draft constitution, empowering Congress to “declare war” instead of to “make war.” This change in language would leave to the President “the power to repel sudden attacks.” Their motion carried. 2 Farrand 318-19. Reactions to the Madison-Gerry amendment reinforce the narrow grant of authority to the President. Pierce Butler wanted to give the President the power to make war, arguing that he “will have all the requisite qualities, and will not make war but when the Nation will support it.” Not a single delegate supported him. Roger Sherman objected: “The Executive shd. be able to repel and not to commence war.” Id. at 318. Gerry said he “never expected to hear in a republic a motion to empower the Executive alone to declare war.” George Mason spoke “agst giving the power of war to the Executive, because not <safely> to be trusted with it. . . . He was for clogging rather than facilitating war.” 2 Farrand 319. His remarks echo what Jay said in Federalist No. 4. At the Pennsylvania ratifying convention, James Wilson expressed the prevailing sentiment that the system of checks and balances “will not hurry us into war; it is calculated to guard against it. It will not be in the power of a single man, or a single body of men, to involve us in such distress; for the important power of declaring war is vested in the legislature at large.” 2 Elliot 528. The power of initiating war was vested in Congress. To the President was left certain defensive powers “to repel sudden attacks.” This distrust of presidential power in matters of war was expressed frequently after the Philadelphia convention. In 1793, Madison called war “the true nurse of executive aggrandizement. . . . In war, the honours and emoluments of office are to be multiplied; and it is the executive patronage under which they are to be enjoyed. It is in war, finally, that laurels are to be gathered; and it is the executive brow they are to encircle. The strongest passions and most dangerous weaknesses of the human breast; ambition, avarice, vanity, the honourable or venial 4 love of fame, are all in conspiracy against the desire and duty of peace.” Five years later, in a letter to Thomas Jefferson, Madison said that the Constitution “supposes, what the History of all Govts demonstrates, that the Ex. is the branch of power most interested in war, & most prone to 5 it. It has accordingly with studied care, vested the question of war in the Legisl.” The need to keep the purse and the sword in separate hands was a bedrock principle for the framers. They recalled the efforts of English kings who, denied funds from Parliament, decided to rely on outside sources of revenue for their military expeditions. The result was civil war and the loss of Charles I of both his office and his head. The growth of democratic government is directly tied to legislative control over all expenditures, including those for fo and military affairs. reign The U.S. Constitution attempted to avoid the British history of civil war and bloodshed by vesting the power of the purse wholly in Congress. Under Article I, Section 9, “No Money shall be drawn from the Treasury, but in Consequence of Appropriations made by Law.” In Federalist No. 48, Madison explained that “the legislative department alone has access to the pockets of the people.” The President gained the title of Commander in Chief but Congress retained the power to finance military operations. For Madison, it was a fundamental principle of democratic government that “[t]hose who are to conduct a war cannot in the nature of things, be proper or safe judges, whether a war ought to be commenced, continued, or concluded. They are barred from the latter functions by a great principle in free government, analogous to that which separates the sword from the purse, or the power of executing from the power of enacting laws.” This understanding of the war power was widely understood. Jefferson praised the transfer of the war power “from the executive to the Legislative body, from those who are to spend to those who are to pay.”

#### Causes nuclear war

Symonds ‘13 [Peter, leading staff writer for the World Socialist Web Site and a member of its International Editorial Board. He has written extensively on Middle Eastern and Asian politics, contributing articles on developments in a wide range of countries, “Obama’s “playbook” and the threat of nuclear war in Asia,” <http://www.wsws.org/en/articles/2013/04/05/pers-a05.html>, April 5, 2013]

The Obama administration has engaged in reckless provocations against North Korea over the past month, inflaming tensions in North East Asia and heightening the risks of war. Its campaign has been accompanied by the relentless demonising of the North Korean regime and claims that the US military build-up was purely “defensive”. However, the Wall Street Journal and CNN revealed yesterday that the Pentagon was following a step-by-step plan, dubbed “the playbook”, drawn up months in advance and approved by the Obama administration earlier in the year. The flights to South Korea by nuclear capable B-52 bombers on March 8 and March 26, by B-2 bombers on March 28, and by advanced F-22 Raptor fighters on March 31 were all part of the script.¶ There is of course nothing “defensive” about B-52 and B-2 nuclear strategic bombers. The flights were designed to demonstrate, to North Korea in the first instance, the ability of the US military to conduct nuclear strikes at will anywhere in North East Asia. The Pentagon also exploited the opportunity to announce the boosting of anti-ballistic missile systems in the Asia Pacific and to station two US anti-missile destroyers off the Korean coast.¶ According to CNN, the “playbook” was drawn up by former defence secretary Leon Panetta and “supported strongly” by his replacement, Chuck Hagel. The plan was based on US intelligence assessments that “there was a low probability of a North Korean military response”—in other words, that Pyongyang posed no serious threat. Unnamed American officials claimed that Washington was now stepping back, amid concerns that the US provocations “could lead to miscalculations” by North Korea.¶ However, having deliberately ignited one of the most dangerous flashpoints in Asia, there are no signs that the Obama administration is backing off. Indeed, on Wednesday, Defence Secretary Hagel emphasised the military threat posed by North Korea, declaring that it presented “a real and clear danger”. The choice of words was deliberate and menacing—an echo of the phrase “a clear and present danger” used to justify past US wars of aggression.¶ The unstable and divided North Korean regime has played directly into the hands of Washington. Its bellicose statements and empty military threats have nothing to do with a genuine struggle against imperialism and are inimical to the interests of the international working class. Far from opposing imperialism, its Stalinist leaders are looking for a deal with the US and its allies to end their decades-long economic blockade and open up the country as a new cheap labour platform for global corporations.¶ As the present standoff shows, Pyongyang’s acquisition of a few crude nuclear weapons has in no way enhanced its defence against an American attack. The two B-2 stealth bombers that flew to South Korea could unleash enough nuclear weapons to destroy the country’s entire industrial and military capacity and murder even more than the estimated 2 million North Korean civilians killed by the three years of US war in Korea in the 1950s.¶ North Korea’s wild threats to attack American, Japanese and South Korean cities only compound the climate of fear used by the ruling classes to divide the international working class—the only social force capable of preventing war.¶ Commentators in the international media speculate endlessly on the reasons for the North Korean regime’s behaviour. But the real question, which is never asked, should be: why is the Obama administration engaged in the dangerous escalation of tensions in North East Asia? The latest US military moves go well beyond the steps taken in December 2010, when the US and South Korean navies held provocative joint exercises in water adjacent to both North Korea and China.¶ Obama’s North Korea “playbook” is just one aspect of his so-called “pivot to Asia”—a comprehensive diplomatic, economic and military strategy aimed at ensuring the continued US domination of Asia. The US has stirred up flashpoints throughout the region and created new ones, such as the conflict between Japan and China over the disputed Senkaku/Diaoyu islands in the East China Sea. Obama’s chief target is not economically bankrupt North Korea, but its ally China, which Washington regards as a dangerous potential rival. Driven by the deepening global economic crisis, US imperialism is using its military might to assert its hegemony over Asia and the entire planet.¶ The US has declared that its military moves against North Korea are designed to “reassure” its allies, Japan and South Korea, that it will protect them. Prominent figures in both countries have called for the development of their own nuclear weapons. US “reassurances” are aimed at heading off a nuclear arms race in North East Asia—not to secure peace, but to reinforce the American nuclear monopoly.¶ The ratcheting-up of tensions over North Korea places enormous pressures on China and the newly-selected leadership of the Chinese Communist Party. An unprecedented public debate has opened up in Beijing over whether or not to continue to support Pyongyang. The Chinese leadership has always regarded the North Korean regime as an important buffer on its northeastern borders, but now fears that the constant tension on the Korean peninsula will be exploited by the US and its allies to launch a huge military build-up.¶ Indeed, all of the Pentagon’s steps over the past month—the boosting of anti-missile systems and practice runs of nuclear capable bombers—have enhanced the ability of the US to fight a nuclear war against China. Moreover, the US may not want to provoke a war, but its provocations always run the risk of escalating dangerously out of control. Undoubtedly, Obama’s “playbook” for war in Asia contains many more steps beyond the handful leaked to the media. The Pentagon plans for all eventualities, including the possibility that a Korean crisis could bring the US and China head to head in a catastrophic nuclear conflict.

### Unable or Unwilling

#### Counterplan is the squo

Shane 10/6 (Shane is currently senior writer at Foreign Policy magazine, where he covers national security, intelligence, and cyber security. He is also a Future Tense Fellow at the New America Foundation. His work has appeared in The New York Times, The Wall Street Journal, Slate, The Daily Beast, TheAtlantic.com, National Journal, The Washington Post, The Bulletin of the Atomic Scientists, and the U.S. Naval Institute’s Proceedings. He has provided analysis and commentary for CNN, NPR, the BBC, The History Channel, National Geographic, several foreign media organizations and many local public radio stations. Prior to joining FP, Shane was senior writer at the Washingtonian magazine, where he was part of the team that won the publication its 2011 award for Excellence in Writing from the City and Regional Magazine Association. In 2012, Washingtonian won the coveted General Excellence award for the print magazine and Web site, where Shane wrote a blog on national security called Dead Drop. From 2005 to 2010, Shane was a staff correspondent for National Journal, where he wrote about intelligence and homeland security, “Team Obama Tries Capturing a Terrorist Instead of Droning Him”, <http://killerapps.foreignpolicy.com/posts/2013/10/06/team_obama_tries_capturing_a_terrorist_instead_of_droning_him>, October 6, 2013)

Officials in Libya's interim government have demanded an explanation for the U.S. operation, which they described as a "kidnapping of a Libyan citizen." The United States has never asserted that it needs the permission of a host government to conduct anti-terrorism operations on its soil, although in some cases it does seek out and receive that blessing. But officials have stressed that if a government is unwilling or incapable of rounding up terrorists plotting attacks against the United States, American forces will act in the nation's defense -- a notion that traditionally recieves broad support in Congress

#### No clear limit on “unable or unwilling” means the counterplan doesn’t solve- empirically- independently can’t solve Pakistan because we have *already* deemed them unable or unwilling- bin Laden raid proves

Deeks ’12 (Ashley S. Deeks 12, Academic Fellow, Columbia Law School, Spring 2012, “ARTICLE: "Unwilling or Unable": Toward a Normative Framework for Extraterritorial Self-Defense,” Virginia Journal of International Law, 52 Va. J. Int'l L. 483)

In an August 2007 speech, then-Presidential candidate Barack Obama asserted that his administration would take action against high-value leaders of al-Qaida in Pakistan if the United States had actionable intelligence about them and President Musharraf would not act. n1 He later clarified his position, stating, "What I said was that if we have actionable intelligence against bin Laden or other key al-Qaida officials ... and Pakistan is unwilling or unable to strike against them, we should." n2 On May 2, 2011, the United States put those words into operation. Without the consent of Pakistan's government, U.S. forces entered Pakistan to capture or kill Osama bin Laden. In the wake of the successful U.S. military operation, the Government of Pakistan objected to the "unauthorized unilateral action" of the United States. n3 U.S. officials, on the other hand, suggested that the United States declined to provide Pakistan with advance knowledge of the raid because it was concerned that doing so might have compromised the mission. n4 This failure to notify suggests that the United States determined that Pakistan was indeed "unwilling or unable" to suppress the threat posed by bin Laden. n5 Unfortunately, international law currently gives the United States (or any state in a similar position) little guidance about what factors are relevant when making such [\*486] a determination. Yet the stakes are high: the U.S.-Pakistan relationship has come under serious strain as a result of the operation. If, in the future, a state in Pakistan's position deems another state's use of force in its territory pursuant to an "unwilling or unable" determination to be unlawful, the territorial state could use force in response. The lack of guidance therefore has the potential to be costly. President Obama's speech invoked an important but little understood legal standard governing the use of force. More than a century of state practice suggests that it is lawful for State X, which has suffered an armed attack by an insurgent or terrorist group, to use force in State Y against that group if State Y is unwilling or unable to suppress the threat. n6 Yet there has been virtually no discussion, either by states or scholars, of what that standard means. What factors must the United States consider when evaluating Pakistan's willingness or ability to suppress the threats to U.S. (as well as NATO and Afghan) forces? Must the United States ask Pakistan to take measures itself before the United States lawfully may act? How much time must the United States give Pakistan to respond? What if Pakistan proposes to respond to the threat in a way that the United States believes may not be adequate? Many states agree that the "unwilling or unable" test is the correct standard by which to assess the legality of force in this context. For example, Russia used force in Georgia in 2002 against Chechen rebels who had conducted violent attacks in Russia, based on Russia's conclusion that Georgia was unwilling or unable to suppress the rebels' attacks. n7 Israel has invoked the "unwilling or unable" standard periodically in justifying its use of force in Lebanon against Hezbollah and the Palestine Liberation Organization, noting, "Members of the [Security] Council need scarcely be reminded that under international law, if a State is unwilling or unable to prevent the use of its territory to attack another State, that latter State is entitled to take all necessary measures in its own defense." n8 Similarly, [\*487] Turkey defends its use of force in Iraq against the Kurdish Workers' Party (PKK) by claiming that Iraq is unable to suppress the PKK. n9 Several U.S. administrations have stated that the United States will inquire whether another state is unwilling or unable to suppress the threat before using force without consent in that state's territory. n10 Given that academic discussion of the test has been limited thus far, we may describe what "unwilling or unable" means only at a high level of generality. n11 In its most basic form, a state (the "victim state") suffers an armed attack from a nonstate group operating outside its territory and concludes that it is necessary to use force in self-defense to respond to the continuing threat that the group poses. The question is whether the state in which the group is operating (the "territorial state") will agree to suppress the threat on the victim state's behalf. The "unwilling or unable" test requires a victim state to ascertain whether the territorial state is willing and able to address the threat posed by the nonstate group before using force in the territorial state's territory without consent. If the territorial state is willing and able, the victim state may not use force in the territorial state, and the territorial state is expected to take the appropriate steps against the nonstate group. If the territorial state is unwilling or unable to take those steps, however, it is lawful for the victim state to use [\*488] that level of force that is necessary (and proportional) to suppress the threat that the nonstate group poses. A test constructed at this level of generality offers insufficient guidance to states. Although many inquiries in the use of force area lack precision, including questions about what constitutes an "armed attack" and when force is proportional, states and commentators have discussed the possible meanings of these terms at length and in great detail. n12 The same is not true for the "unwilling or unable" test; strikingly little attention has been paid to the nature and consequences of -- or solutions to -- the imprecision surrounding the "unwilling or unable" test. The test's lack of content undermines the legitimacy of the test as it currently is framed and suggests that it is not, in its current form, imposing effective constraints on a state's use of force. n13 To address this flaw, this Article first identifies the test's historical parentage in the law of neutrality and then conducts an original analysis of two centuries of state practice in order to develop normative factors that define what it means for a territorial state to be "unwilling or unable" to suppress attacks by a nonstate actor.

#### Counterplan doesn’t solve- doesn’t change UN framework

Deeks ’12 (Ashley S. Deeks 12, Academic Fellow, Columbia Law School, Spring 2012, “ARTICLE: "Unwilling or Unable": Toward a Normative Framework for Extraterritorial Self-Defense,” Virginia Journal of International Law, 52 Va. J. Int'l L. 483)

It is worth noting that this test is not the only standard around which states could have coalesced. Although it is possible to imagine a range of [\*489] alternative regimes, it is beyond the scope of this Article to explore those other regimes in detail. n16 Instead, this Article takes as a given that states currently view the "unwilling or unable" test as the proper test. The fact that states currently are acclimated to using the "unwilling or unable" test suggests that any other test would have to overcome a high bar to become the preferred test, a hurdle no other option is poised to meet.

In considering the appropriate content of the test, I argue that the "unwilling or unable" test, properly conceived, should advance three goals, derived from Abram Chayes's articulation of how international law can influence foreign policy decisions. n17 First, the "unwilling or unable" test should constrain victim state action by reducing the number of situations [\*490] in which a victim state resorts to force. Second, the test should be clear and detailed enough to serve to justify or legitimate a victim state's use of force when that force is consistent with the test. Third, the test should establish procedures that will improve the quality of decision-making by the victim and territorial states and by those international bodies that are seized with use of force issues. In considering these goals, I identify the relevance of the "rules versus standards" debate and discuss why, in this context, we should favor a more precise rule over a less determinate standard. A test that promotes the goals I have described within the framework of the UN Charter is likely to be seen as a credible international legal norm. It therefore will legitimize those uses of force that are consistent with the test's requirements and delegitimize (and possibly reduce the frequency of) those that stand in tension with the test.

#### Unwilling or unable fails---doesn’t create internal legal standards

Heller ’11 (Kevin Jon Heller 11, Associate Professor & Reader at Melbourne Law School, where he teaches international criminal law and criminal law. He also serves as Project Director for International Criminal Law at the Asia Pacific Centre for Military Law, a joint project of Melbourne Law School and the Australian Defence Force. He holds a PhD in law from Leiden University, a JD with distinction from Stanford Law School, an MA with honours in literature from Duke University, and an MA and BA, both with honours, in sociology from the New School for Social Research. Kevin’s academic writing has appeared in a variety of journals, including the European Journal of International Law, the American Journal of International Law, the Journal of International Criminal Justice, the Harvard International Law Journal, the Michigan Law Review, the Leiden Journal of International Law, the Journal of Criminal Law & Criminology, Criminal Law Forum, and the Georgetown International Environmental Law Review. His book The Nuremberg Military Tribunals and the Origins of International Criminal Law was published by Oxford University Press in June 2011; Stanford University Press published his edited book (with Markus Dubber) The Handbook of Comparative Criminal Law in February 2011; and he is currently writing a book entitled A Geneology of International Criminal Law, which will be published by Oxford University Press in 2015. He is a permanent member of the international-law blog Opinio Juris. On the practical side, Kevin has been involved in the International Criminal Court’s negotiations over the crime of aggression, served as Human Rights Watch’s external legal advisor on the trial of Saddam Hussein, and served from December 2008 until February 2011 as one of Radovan Karadzic's formally-appointed legal associates. He also regularly conducts training in IHL on behalf of Professionals in Humanitarian Assistance and Protection, a Brussels-based NGO, in association with the Harvard Program on Conflict Research, Opinio Juris, "Ashley Deeks' Problematic Defense of the "Unwilling or Unable" Test", December 15, opiniojuris.org/2011/12/15/ashley-deeks-failure-to-defend-the-unwilling-or-unable-test/, December 15, 2011)

Ashley Deeks, a fellow at Columbia and a former member of the Office of the Legal Adviser, has posted an essay on SSRN — forthcoming in the Virginia Journal of International Law — entitled “Unwilling or Unable: Toward an Normative Framework for Extra-Territorial Self-Defense.” Here is the abstract:¶ Non-state actors, including terrorist groups, regularly launch attacks against states, often from external bases. When a victim state seeks to respond with force to those attacks, it must decide whether to use force on the territory of another state with which it may not be in conflict. International law traditionally requires the victim state to assess whether the territorial state is “unwilling or unable” to suppress the threat itself. Only if the territorial state is unwilling or unable to do so may the victim state lawfully use force. Yet there has been virtually no discussion, either by states or scholars, of what that test requires. The test‟s lack of content undercuts its legitimacy and suggests that it is not currently imposing effective limits on the use of force by states at a time when trans-national armed violence is pervasive.¶ This Article provides the first sustained descriptive and normative analysis of the test. Descriptively, it explains how the “unwilling or unable” test arises in international law as part of a state‟s inquiry into whether it is necessary to use force in response to an armed attack. It identifies the test‟s deep roots in neutrality law, while simultaneously illustrating the lack of guidance about what inquiries a victim state must undertake when assessing whether another state is “unwilling or unable” to address a particular threat. Normatively, the Article plumbs two centuries of state practice to propose a core set of substantive and procedural factors that should inform the “unwilling or unable” inquiry. It then applies those factors to a real-world example – Colombia‟s use of force in Ecuador in 2008 against the Revolutionary Armed Forces of Colombia – to explore how the use of these factors would affect the involved states‟ decision-making and the evaluation by other states of the action‟s legality. The Article argues that the use of these factors would improve the quality of state decision-making surrounding the use of force in important substantive and procedural ways.¶ The essay is a very interesting read, and Deeks should be commended for trying to think systematically about what the “unwilling or unable” test would require in practice. There is, however, a fundamental problem with the essay: it completely fails to establish its thesis that “[i]nternational law traditionally requires the victim state to assess whether the territorial state is ‘unwilling or unable’ to suppress the threat itself.” The current state of the legal regime governing extraterritorial attacks against non-state actors is one of the most difficult and controversial areas of international law, requiring a careful analysis of state practice and opinio juris. Unfortunately, such an analysis is absent from Deeks’ essay. Instead, Deeks relies on a mistaken understanding of neutrality law, provides little more than a few isolated examples of extraterritorial attacks that have ostensibly been justified under the “unwilling or unable” rubric, and ignores all of the contrary examples. That is a methodologically unsound approach, and it significantly weakens what is otherwise a very good essay.¶ Deeks begins her discussion of the supposed “historical lineage” of the “unwilling or unable” test by turning to the law of neutrality, arguing (p. 19) that “neutrality law permits a belligerent to use force on a neutral state’s territory if the neutral state is unable or unwilling to prevent violations of its neutrality by another belligerent.” The law of neutrality, however, applies only in international armed conflicts between two legitimate belligerents; it says nothing about the use of extraterritorial force against NSAs — as Deeks herself recognizes (p. 16):¶ Although neutrality law does not directly govern uses of force between states and non-state actors, this section will show that the equities and concerns of the neutral state and an offended belligerent in the neutrality law context are analogous to those of the territorial state and the state seeking to use force in self-defense against a non-state actor on that territory.¶ This is a very significant admission. The law of neutrality may provide normative support for the “unwilling or unable” test in the context of attacks against NSAs, but it does not provide legal support for it.¶ Again, Deeks recognizes this — so she then cites (p. 22) UK and U.S. laws that effectively applied neutrality law to situations of internal armed conflict, arguing that the existence of such laws “explain[s] how neutrality rules developed to govern acts by states during international armed conflict expanded beyond that context to govern acts by non-state actors during peacetime (and in non-international armed conflicts).” But that is simply mistaken. It is true that the UK and the U.S. enacted such laws (state practice), but they never claimed that they did so out of a sense of legal obligation — the necessary condition of such laws counting as opinio juris in favor of the “unwilling or unable” test. On the contrary, both states recognized that the law of neutrality in no way obligated them to prohibit their nationals from (to quote Lauterpacht) “committing such acts as amount to making the national territory a base for military or naval operations against a friendly state.” As the U.S. Attorney General said in 1895 (emphasis added):¶ While called neutrality laws, because their main purpose is to carry out the obligations imposed upon the United States while occupying a position of neutrality toward belligerents, our laws were intended also to prevent offenses against friendly powers whether such powers should or should not be engaged in war or in attempting to suppress revolt.¶ To quote Tucker, we must always distinguish between “the operation of the law of neutrality as determined by international law and the operation of municipal neutrality laws. The latter may be applied to situations other than war in the sense of international law.” That distinction, unfortunately, is lost on Deeks. (For a longer discussion of the distinction, see my response to Karl Chang’s essay on neutrality here.)¶ There is, of course, another problem with using the law of neutrality to support the “unwilling or unable” test: that law predates the adoption of the UN Charter, which strictly regulates the use of interstate force. Deeks recognizes the problem, but barely addresses it — simply claiming (n. 33) that “[t]he better view is that neutrality law remains relevant and applicable, at least to international armed conflicts,” and that “[e]ven if neutrality law were defunct… the existence of the ‘unwilling or unable’ test in that law provides historical depth to today‘s rule.” Historical depth, maybe. But legal support? Definitely not — especially as Deeks admits that the current relevance of the law of neutrailty is limited to international armed conflicts.¶ The real question, then, is what the customary rule governing extraterritorial force against NSA might be in the post-Charter world. Deeks discusses three different positions on the relationship between Article 2(4) of the UN Charter’s prohibition on interstate force and Article 51′s exception to that prohibition for acts of self-defense in response to an armed attack: (1) that the armed attack giving rise to the right of self-defense must involve a state; (2) that the armed attack can involve a non-state actor (NSA), but the actions of the NSA must be attributable to a state; and (3) that the armed attack can involve a NSA and does not require any kind of attribution to a state. Deeks says that a “premise” of her article, supposedly based on “extensive state practice,” is that the third position is correct. I’ll return to that supposed state practice below, but it’s worth noting here that Deeks attributes the three positions on self-defense to “groups of scholars” — and then relegates to a footnote (n. 17) the rather important fact that the second position is the one that has been specifically endorsed, in multiple cases, by the International Court of Justice. ICJ decisions are not themselves primary sources of international law, but the failure to discuss those decisions is a serious problem with Deeks’ essay — especially as the essay does not even mention the Nicaragua case, in which the ICJ held the most clearly that state attribution is required.¶ So what is this “extensive” state practice that Deeks cites as evidence that the “unwilling or unable” test reflects customary international law? Actually, it’s not extensive at all. In the essay’s introduction, she mentions (pp. 4-5) Russia’s attacks on Chechen rebels in Georgia; Israel’s attacks on Hezbollah and the PLO in Lebanon; and Turkey’s attacks on the PKK in Iraq. Later on, she mentions the Soviet Union’s 1921 attack on White Guard bands in Outer Mongolia; U.S. attacks on Viet Cong soldiers in Cambodia during the Vietnam War; U.S. attacks on al-Qaeda in Afghanistan and the Sudan; and Colombia’s attacks on FARC in Ecuador. That’s it. Pretty weak tea indeed — especially when we factor in the international response to many of those uses of force against “unwilling or unable” states, such as the Organization of American States’ unequivocal condemnation of Colombia’s attacks on FARC as a violation of Ecuador’s sovereignty.¶ More importantly, Deeks simply ignores the numerous instances in which the Security Council and/or states have condemned extraterritorial uses of force against NSAs whose actions were not attributable to the state whose territory was attacked. Examples include Israel’s 1985 raid of a PLO headquarters in Tunis; Iran’s cross-border attacks throughout the 1980s on Kurdish fighters in Iraq (which were vociferously condemned by the U.S.); and Rwanda’s attacks in the late 1990s on Hutu rebels in the DRC.¶ To be sure, it appears that customary international law is slowly evolving away from the Nicaragua standard, especially in the wake of 9/11. But it is far from clear whether that standard has been replaced by the “unwilling or unable” test. Neither Christian Tams nor Tom Ruys, the two scholars who have examined state practice and opinio juris most closely, are willing to go that far. Tams concludes that state attribution is still required, but can be satisfied by something less than Nicaragua‘s “effective control” of the NSA. And Ruys concludes that “[d]e lege lata, the only thing that can be said about proportionate trans-border measures of self-defence against attacks by non-State actors in cases falling below the Nicaragua threshold is that they are ‘not unambiguously illegal’.”¶ Indeed, what is most surprising about Deeks’ essay is that Deeks herself admits that the “unwilling or unable” test cannot be considered customary international law. If you look at footnote 55 of her essay, you find this remarkable statement:¶ I have found no cases in which states clearly assert that they follow the test out of a sense of legal obligation (i.e., the opinio juris aspect of custom), nor have I located cases in which states have rejected the test. Even if one concludes that the rule does not rise to the level of custom, however, the rule makes frequent appearances in state practice and therefore is the appropriate starting point from which to determine how the norm should develop.¶ That is a remarkable admission — and one that directly contradicts Deeks’ thesis that “[i]nternational law traditionally requires the victim state to assess whether the territorial state is ‘unwilling or unable’ to suppress the threat itself.” If there is no opinio juris that supports the “unwilling or unable” test, it is difficult to argue that the test reflects customary international law — especially in light of the consistent and contrary pre-9/11 state practice and opinio juris that both Tams and Ruys discuss.¶ The bottom line: de lege ferenda, there is much to recommend Deeks’ essay. De lege lata, however, it completely fails to make its case.

#### The counterplan is the status quo and Turn- counterplan causes ally backlash

Brennan ’11 (John O. Brennan, Assistant to the President for Homeland Security and Counterterrorism, Program on Law and Security, Harvard Law School, “Remarks of John O. Brennan, "Strengthening our Security by Adhering to our Values and Laws"”, <http://www.whitehouse.gov/the-press-office/2011/09/16/remarks-john-o-brennan-strengthening-our-security-adhering-our-values-an>, September 16, 2011)

An area in which there is some disagreement is the geographic scope of the conflict. The United States does not view our authority to use military force against al-Qa’ida as being restricted solely to “hot” battlefields like Afghanistan. Because we are engaged in an armed conflict with al-Qa’ida, the United States takes the legal position that —in accordance with international law—we have the authority to take action against al-Qa’ida and its associated forces without doing a separate self-defense analysis each time. And as President Obama has stated on numerous occasions, we reserve the right to take unilateral action if or when other governments are unwilling or unable to take the necessary actions themselves. That does not mean we can use military force whenever we want, wherever we want. International legal principles, including respect for a state’s sovereignty and the laws of war, impose important constraints on our ability to act unilaterally—and on the way in which we can use force—in foreign territories. Others in the international community—including some of our closest allies and partners—take a different view of the geographic scope of the conflict, limiting it only to the “hot” battlefields. As such, they argue that, outside of these two active theatres, the United States can only act in self-defense against al-Qa’ida when they are planning, engaging in, or threatening an armed attack against U.S. interests if it amounts to an “imminent” threat.

### Circumvention

#### Obama will follow through- aligns himself with Congress

Bellinger ’13 (John B. Bellinger III, Adjunct Senior Fellow for International and National Security Law, “Seeking Daylight on U.S. Drone Policy”, <http://www.cfr.org/drones/seeking-daylight-us-drone-policy/p30348>, March 29, 2013)

The president also has additional constitutional authority anytime to use force to protect the Unites States, either in self-defense or because he believes that it's in our national security interest. So if President Obama concludes that it's necessary to carry out a drone strike against a terror suspect, but that individual does not fall into the categories covered by the AUMF, he would have additional constitutional authority. But this administration has taken great pains to emphasize that it has been relying on congressional grant of authority rather than the president's own constitutional authority to conduct most of its counterterrorism operations. It has wanted to do that to contrast itself with the Bush administration, which had, at least early in its tenure, relied heavily on the president's constitutional authority. It's not clear though, at this point, given how old and somewhat limited the AUMF is, if the Obama administration has now been forced to rely on constitutional powers for certain drone strikes. It appears to many observers that the administration may be stretching the limits of the AUMF by targeting people who were not responsible for 9/11 or who were not affiliated or associated co-belligerents with those who carried out 9/11. In theory, could the president always claim constitutional authority with regard to these strikes? Although, as you pointed out, the administration is obviously loath to do that. This administration is already finding that 95 percent of its counterterrorism policies, and the legal basis therefore, are the same as the Bush administration's. Absolutely. I think the issue is, in this administration, political. This administration is already finding that 95 percent of its counterterrorism policies, and the legal basis therefore, are the same as the Bush administration's. It came into office with both domestic and international supporters expecting that it would change all of those policies. So one area where it really has been loath to act like the Bush administration is to rely heavily on the president's constitutional authority. We simply don't know whether they are doing it, but politically I'm sure that administration officials would be very reluctant to have to acknowledge that they are acting outside of the grant given to them by Congress.

#### Congress would invoke the power of the purse- solves

Elsea et al ’13 (Jennifer K. Elsea, Legislative Attorney; Michael John Garcia, Legislative Attorney; Thomas J. Nicola, Legislative Attorney; CRS Report for Congress, “Congressional Authority to Limit Military Operations”, <http://fpc.state.gov/documents/organization/206121.pdf>, February 19, 2013)

The Purpose Statute states that funds may be used only for purposes for which they have been appropriated; by implication it precludes using funds for purposes that Congress has prohibited. When Congress states that no funds may be used for a purpose, an agency would violate the Purpose Statute if it should use funds for that purpose; it also in some circumstances could contravene a provision of the Antideficiency Act, 31 U.S.C. Section 1341. Section 1341 prohibits entering into obligations or expending funds in advance of or in excess of an amount appropriated unless authorized by law. If Congress has barred using funds for a purpose, entering into an obligation or expending any amount for it would violate the act by exceeding the amount— zero—that Congress has appropriated for the prohibited purpose.

### Debt Ceiling

#### Won’t pass because of election fears and Obama’s approach prolongs Republican backlash- star this card

**Kaplan 10-3**-13 [Rebecca, serves as City Councilmember At-Large for Oakland, California, CBS News, “Why is it so difficult to end the government shutdown?” <http://www.cbsnews.com/8301-250_162-57605784/why-is-it-so-difficult-to-end-the-government-shutdown/>]

As the government shutdown enters its third day, Democrats and Republicans seem no closer to bridging their differences than they were when the shutdown began early Tuesday morning. It's difficult to say when the standoff will end. The two shutdowns that occurred in 1995 and 1996 lasted a total of 27 days. And back then, the conditions for getting to a deal were much better.¶ Republicans won the House and Senate in the 1994 midterm elections - the first time the party had a House majority in 40 years. That set up a showdown between House Speaker Newt Gingrich, who had run on a conservative platform, and then-President Bill Clinton. That dispute came in 1995, when Gingrich wanted to balance the budget in a short time frame and Clinton wanted money spent on Democratic priorities. After two separate shutdowns and several weeks, the pressure was too high on Republicans and they cut a deal with Clinton: he would get his priorities, but would have to balance the budget for 10 years.¶ "They were kind of testing each other," said former Rep. Tom Davis, R-Va., who was a freshman in Congress at the time. Afterward, Davis noted, Clinton and Gingrich would go on to work together on a host of issues including welfare reform. The economy boomed, helping to mitigate budget issues.¶ Republicans who were lawmakers or aides in Congress in 1995 cite a variety of reasons that the shutdown ended. For Davis, it was the mounting public pressure on Republicans and their rapidly dropping poll numbers that helped spur a compromise. "There was a revolt, and they simply couldn't hold their members after a while," he said of the Republican leadership. It didn't help that Republicans were afraid of losing the first majority they'd had in decades. Davis recalls going to former Rep. Dick Armey, then the Republican Majority leader from Texas, and saying, "We're getting our butts kicked."¶ But Bob Walker, then a Republican congressman from Pennsylvania, had a different take from the conventional narrative that Republicans had caved. "We stayed focused in 1995 on the fact that what the end result for us was to get a pathway to a balanced budget, and so in the end when we got an agreement to just begin the process of moving toward a balanced budget," he said. "We declared victory on that and we were prepared to then get the government back into action."¶ This time, it's not so easy for Republicans to achieve even a piece of their chief goal - to dismantle the Affordable Care Act. The law is President Obama's signature policy achievement, and its constitutional authority was affirmed by the Supreme Court. Democrats in the Senate and Mr. Obama himself have proven with the shutdown fight that they are determined to keep the law intact.¶ "We didn't get an immediate balanced budget obviously but what we got was a seven-year plan toward a balanced budget that then ended up being accomplished in there years," Walker said of the House Republicans in 1995. But nowadays, he said, "I'm not certain I see where the bottom lines are."¶ As shutdown continues, Obama says Wall Street "should be concerned"¶ Government shutdown: Is Congress acting selfishly?¶ Yet another explanation of why the 1995-1996 shutdown ended had to do with presidential politics. Former Senate Majority Leader Bob Dole, R-Kansas, was eyeing a presidential bid against Clinton in 1996.¶ "He just got sick of it. I think he started seeing that this was directly impacting his ability to run for president," said John Feehery, a political strategist who was the communications director for then-House Majority Whip Tom DeLay during the shutdown. Dole was key to engineering an end to the shutdown, a fact that was apparent to everyone - even Democrats.¶ "It was a huge factor," said American University professor Patrick Griffin, who served as Clinton's assistant for legislative affairs from 1994 to 1996. "We could always sense that there was no love lost between him and [Gingrich] - on the [Contract with America], on the shutdown. It was just not Dole's style...he was wasting time, he was not being able to get his campaign."¶ If anything, presidential politics will lengthen the shutdown. Mr. Obama has no re-election campaign to worry about - like Clinton did at the time - and Republican presidential campaigns cannot be won without pleasing an active base that hates the healthcare law. It would be difficult for any Republican to help broker a compromise that preserved most of Obamacare and then woo Republican primary voters.¶ Not that many Republicans feel as if they can work with Mr. Obama. "Many people in Congress ...believe that the president treats them with contempt and so the atmosphere for negotiating is not very good. That's a big difference," said Walker.¶ House Speaker John Boehner, R-Ohio, and Mr. Obama have tried and failed to negotiate big deals several times. Since the government shut down on Tuesday, they've barely talked aside from a meeting the president held with top congressional leaders Wednesday afternoon. And a recent Politico story that detailed how Boehner and Senate Majority Leader Harry Reid, R-Nev., worked together to preserve congressional subsidies for healthcare coverage will likely have poisoned the well between the leaders of the two chambers.¶ That wasn't the case with Gingrich and Clinton, despite their differences. "Both President Clinton and Speaker Gingrich had a pretty civil and reasonably good personal relationship," said Mack McLarty, Clinton's first chief of staff as president. Both hailed from the south, and had "very inquisitive minds" about the world around them.¶ Perhaps the biggest roadblock to a deal, however, is the increasingly partisan nature of Congress caused by congressional redistricting that puts many members into seats where fewer and fewer constituents are from the opposite party. In 1995, more than 34 percent of Republican representatives in the House were elected in districts that had voted for Clinton as president. Now, only seven percent of House members come from districts that voted for Mr. Obama.¶ There's a larger proportion of hardline conservatives in the House in 2013, and they have so far been more successful at driving the agenda than their more moderate counterparts. "The-rank-and-file members are sick and tired of the rebels running the thing but there's too many of them who vote with the rebels to protect their flank," Feehery said, referring to Republicans who are worried about receiving a primary challenge from the right.¶ With so many factors working against a deal, it's hard to see a way out of the crisis. The only thing that's guaranteed to inject some urgency into the debate is the looming deadline to raise the debt ceiling on Oct. 17. While a government shutdown can have minimal effects on the financial markets, the possibility of the U.S. defaulting is much more likely to cause financial panic that could push lawmakers into a deal.¶ Plus, if the spending and debt ceiling deals morph into one, there may be more issues on the table to discuss such as the sequester and the whole federal budget. That, Walker said, will give Republicans more areas where they can look for victory.

#### All their link args are non-unique

NPR 9/21 (NPR, “Have Obama's Troubles Weakened Him For Fall's Fiscal Fights?”

[http://www.ideastream.org/news/npr/224494760](http://www.ideastream.org/news/npr/224494760m), September 21, 2013)

President Obama has had a tough year. He failed to pass gun legislation. Plans for an immigration overhaul have stalled in the House. He barely escaped what would have been a humiliating rejection by Congress on his plan to strike Syria.¶ Just this week, his own Democrats forced Larry Summers, the president's first choice to head the Federal Reserve, to withdraw.¶ Former Clinton White House aide Bill Galston says all these issues have weakened the unity of the president's coalition.¶ "It's not a breach, but there has been some real tension there," he says, "and that's something that neither the president nor congressional Democrats can afford as the budget battle intensifies."¶ Obama is now facing showdowns with the Republicans over a potential government shutdown and a default on the nation's debt. On Friday, the House voted to fund government operations through mid-December, while also defunding the president's signature health care law — a position that's bound to fail in the Senate.¶ As these fiscal battles proceed, Republicans have been emboldened by the president's recent troubles, says former GOP leadership aide Ron Bonjean.

#### Shutdown crushes Obama’s agenda

O’Brien 10/1 (Michael O'Brien 10/1, "Winners and losers of the government shutdown", 2013, nbcpolitics.nbcnews.com/\_news/2013/10/01/20763839-winners-and-losers-of-the-government-shutdown?lite)

Obama¶ The fiscal fight is a double-edged sword for Obama.¶ Yes, the president won a short-term victory that revitalizes his pull within the Beltway after beating back Republicans and shifting blame primarily to them for a shutdown. But Obama is no less a symbol of Washington dysfunction than Ted Cruz or John Boehner.¶ It might be simplistic, but any president shares in some of the broader opinion toward D.C. just by the very nature of the job. Put another way: as president, Obama is the most visible political leader in the U.S., if not the world. If Americans are dissatisfied with Washington, Obama will have to shoulder some of that burden.¶ Obama's 2011 battles with Republicans over the debt ceiling saw his approval ratings sink to one of the lowest points of his presidency. There are signs this fight might be taking a similar toll: a CNN/ORC poll released Monday found that 53 percent of Americans disapprove of the way the president is handling his job, versus 44 percent who approve.¶ Moreover, after the time and political capital expended on this nasty political fight — and with midterm elections on the docket for 2014 — Obama's top second-term priorities, like comprehensive immigration reform, are on life support.

#### Syria thumps

Sargent 9/12 (Greg Sargent 9-12, September 12th, 2013, "The Morning Plum: Senate conservatives stick the knife in House GOP leaders," Washington Post, factiva)

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

#### FERC thumps

Dixon 10/1 (Darius Dixon, Politico, “Obama FERC nominee Ron Binz withdraws amid coal pushback”, <http://www.politico.com/story/2013/10/ron-binz-ferc-nominee-withdraws-name-97623.html>, October 1, 2013)

President Barack Obama’s nominee to lead the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission abandoned his quest Tuesday, complaining that the fight over his confirmation had become a “blood sport” for partisan attacks and opponents backed by the coal industry. The collapse of Ron Binz’s nomination to lead the little-known agency was a stunning setback for Obama, who had succeeded in winning Senate confirmations for far more controversial nominees at Environmental Protection Agency, the Pentagon and the Labor Department. Continue Reading The consultant and career energy regulator had won over supporters from the green energy world — some of whom took the unusual step of hiring a public relations firm to advance his cause. But Binz said he couldn’t overcome a furious opposition campaign in which his record was “spun and respun” to make him appear biased against fossil fuels. “The caricature that they created had nothing to do with who I am and nothing to do with what I might’ve brought to FERC. It was just a blood sport,” Binz told POLITICO in his first extensive interview since Obama nominated him in June. “I came to Washington with this 35-year career behind me only to encounter a fictional Ron Binz, a fictional character that I didn’t recognize and I would never even support,” he added. Conservative and libertarian groups celebrated Binz’s withdrawal as a setback for Obama’s climate agenda, while his supporters lamented that partisan bickering had defeated a qualified candidate.

#### Unique link turn- drones fights now- plan ends those

Sink and Herb ’13 (Jeremy Herb and Justin Sink, “Obama faces turning point on administration drone policy”, <http://thehill.com/blogs/defcon-hill/policy-and-strategy/286945-obama-faces-turning-point-on-drones>, March 8, 2013)

A 13-hour filibuster by Sen. Rand Paul (R-Ky.) has thrust the expanded use of drone attacks to greater public scrutiny and is putting new pressure on the White House to explain its use of drones to Congress and the public. The same day Paul went to the Senate floor to press President Obama on whether drones could be used to kill American citizens within U.S. borders, Attorney General Eric Holder said Obama would soon speak to the public about the U.S. drone policy. The public address by Obama highlights the administration’s understanding that it needs to give a fuller account of a program that is a hallmark of Obama’s counter-terrorism policy — but that was a covert policy not publicly acknowledged by the government just months ago. It also suggests Obama is close to codifying a set of principles to govern the use of drone strikes for future administrations, which will govern in a world where links to terrorism are less clear and other countries are also using drones. The effort began before last year's election, born from a desire within the White House to provide Mitt Romney with a clear set of procedures and standards for the use of drone strikes, were he to be elected. “He thinks these are important issues,” White House press secretary Jay Carney said Thursday. “He believes very much in the need to be as transparent as possible on these matters with Congress as well as with the public.” Paul declared “victory” Thursday after his filibuster prompted the Obama administration to send the Kentucky senator a letter saying the president could not use drones to kill U.S. citizens on U.S. soil. “It has come to my attention that you have now asked an additional question: ‘Does the President have the authority to use a weaponized drone to kill an American not engaged in combat on American soil?’ ” Holder wrote to Paul. “The answer to that question is no.” The Holder letter is just the latest disclosure from the administration shedding light on a program in the shadows. In January, NBC News obtained a Justice Department white paper explaining the legal authority for drone-killings of senior operational leaders of al Qaeda, even if they were U.S. citizens. Last year, the New York Times reported that the president had personally overseen the development of a top-secret “kill list” identifying potential targets. Obama himself pledged greater transparency in this year’s State of the Union address. “My administration has worked tirelessly to forge a durable legal and policy framework to guide our counterterrorism operations,” said Obama, who pledged in the “months ahead” to explain policies in an “even more transparent” way. It’s a major shift for the White House, which did not publicly acknowledge the use of drones until April 2012, when John Brennan — whose confirmation as CIA Director was held up Wednesday by Paul’s filibuster — gave the first speech about the program. Both the Defense Department and CIA have an arsenal of armed drones, which are used primarily to target terrorists in areas where the U.S. military is not: Yemen, Somalia and Pakistan’s Federally Administered Tribal Areas (FATA). Yet there are more questions about the drone attacks than answers. For example, the administration has not disclosed how many people have been killed by drone strikes in their expanded use under Obama. Some lawmakers, including Paul, have challenged the constitutionality of such attacks. In 2011, New Mexico-born Anwar al-Awlaki was killed in a drone strike in Yemen. Awlaki was an al Qaeda leader connected to attacks against the United States, including the attempted “underwear bombing” of a flight to Detroit in 2009. Heather Hurlburt, executive director of the liberal-leaning National Security Network, said that the issue began getting more public attention last year, but the presidential campaign had curtailed public engagement from the administration. Now that may be changing. “This is an issue that was sort of starting to reach a bubbling point where there was talk inside and outside government about assessing the program,” Hulburt said. “What I think the White House is now doing is picking up the public conversation, the seeds of which were in place before the campaign got really hot.” The drone debate cuts across party lines, with Paul aligned with liberal Democrats like Sen. Ron Wyden (Ore.), the lone Democrat to join Wednesday’s filibuster. There were questions Thursday over why more Democrats didn’t join Paul when many of them have the same concerns about Executive Branch overreach on drones. Wyden said that he expected to see more scrutiny from Congress over the classified program going forward. “I thought it was a day when people would see that this concern about the balance between liberty and security is a bipartisan one,” Wyden said of the filibuster. “I think you’re going to start seeing the emergence as what I sometimes call around here the checks and balances caucus. And there will be a lot of Democrats in it.” While Paul’s filibuster received support from more than a dozen Republicans — including Senate Minority Leader Mitch McConnell (R-Ky.) — he was slammed Thursday by defense hawks Sen. Lindsey Graham (R-S.C.) and John McCain (R-Ariz.). McCain described some of Paul’s arguments as “ridiculous,” and that some of his colleagues who joined Paul should “know better.” He bristled at questions over whether support of the filibuster signified a shift in his party’s foreign policy views. “I have no idea, nor do I care,” McCain said. “I could care less if my view is majority or minority — I know what’s right. I’ve been involved in national security for 60 years.” Paul shot back that McCain was “dismissive” of a legitimate issue. “What I would say is that he’s wrong — the issue is a very important issue,” Paul told reporters. “He’s dismissive of something that involves the discussion of whether the 5th Amendment applies to American citizens and I consider that to be a very important issue.” Sen. Jeff Sessions (R-Ala.), who did not take part in the filibuster, said Paul had shaken things up in the Senate. “There is a sensitivity and a deep concern among the American people that too much power is being arrogated here,” Sessions said. “The president doesn’t have power to just execute somebody, and I think that concern needs to be heard. And Rand Paul made it heard last night.”

#### The plan is popular

Jakes ’13 (Lara Jakes, Associated Press, “Some in Congress back limits on drone strikes”, <http://www.airforcetimes.com/article/20130205/NEWS/302050314/Some-Congress-back-limits-drone-strikes>, February 5, 2013)

WASHINGTON — Uncomfortable with the Obama administration's use of deadly drones, a growing number in Congress is looking to limit America's authority to kill suspected terrorists, even U.S. citizens. The Democratic-led outcry was emboldened by the revelation in a newly surfaced Justice Department memo that shows drones can strike against a wider range of threats, with less evidence, than previously believed. The drone program, which has been used from Pakistan across the Middle East and into North Africa to find and kill an unknown number of suspected terrorists, is expected to be a top topic of debate when the Senate Intelligence Committee grills John Brennan, the White House's pick for CIA chief, at a hearing Thursday. The White House on Tuesday defended its lethal drone program by citing the very laws that some in Congress once believed were appropriate in the years immediately after the Sept. 11 attacks but now think may be too broad. "It has to be in the agenda of this Congress to reconsider the scope of action of drones and use of deadly force by the United States around the world because the original authorization of use of force, I think, is being strained to its limits," Sen. Chris Coons, D-Del., said in a recent interview. Rep. Steny Hoyer of Maryland, the No. 2 Democrat in the House, said Tuesday that "it deserves a serious look at how we make the decisions in government to take out, kill, eliminate, whatever word you want to use, not just American citizens but other citizens as well." Hoyer added: "We ought to carefully review our policies as a country." The Senate Foreign Relations Committee likely will hold hearings on U.S. drone policy, an aide said Tuesday, and chairman Robert Menendez, D-N.J., and the panel's top Republican, Sen. Bob Corker, both have quietly expressed concerns about the deadly operations. And earlier this week, a group of 11 Democratic and Republican senators urged President Obama to release a classified Justice Department legal opinion justifying when U.S. counterterrorism missions, including drone strikes, can be used to kill American citizens abroad. Without those documents, it's impossible for Congress and the public to decide "whether this authority has been properly defined, and whether the president's power to deliberately kill Americans is subject to appropriate limitations and safeguards," the senators wrote. It was a repeated request after receiving last June an unclassified Justice Department memo, which fell short of giving the senators all the information they requested. First detailed publicly by NBC News late Monday, the memo for the first time outlines the Obama administration's decision to kill al-Qaida terrorist suspects without any evidence that specific and imminent plots are being planned against the United States. "The threat posed by al-Qaida and its associated forces demands a broader concept of imminence in judging when a person continually planning terror attacks presents an imminent threat," concluded the document. The memo was immediately decried by civil liberties groups as "flawed" and "profoundly disturbing" — especially in light of 2011 U.S. drone strikes in Yemen that killed three American citizens: Anwar al-Awlaki, his 16-year-old-son and Samir Khan. Al-Awlaki was linked to the planning and execution of several attacks targeting U.S. and Western interests, including the attempt to down a Detroit-bound airliner in 2009 and the plot to bomb cargo planes in 2010. His son was killed in a separate strike on a suspected al-Qaida den. Khan was an al-Qaida propagandist. White House spokesman Jay Carney, echoing comments Brennan made in a speech last April, called the strikes "legal, ethical and wise" and said they are covered by a law that Congress approved allowing the use of military force against al-Qaida. "And certainly, under that authority, the president acts in the United States' interest to protect the United States and its citizens from al-Qaida," Carney said Tuesday. "It is a matter of fact that Congress authorized the use of military force against al-Qaida," Carney said. "It is a matter of fact that al-Qaida is in a state of war against us and that senior leaders, operational leaders of al-Qaida are continually plotting to attack the United States, plotting to kill American citizens as they did most horrifically on September 11th of 2001." Three days after 9/11, Congress approved a law authorizing the military to use "all necessary and appropriate force" against al-Qaida and other groups believed to be helping or harboring the global terror network, including the use of drone strikes. In the decade since the attacks, U.S. intelligence officials say, al-Qaida has splintered into a number of affiliates and allied sympathizers. That means the current laws could allow military force against thousands of extremists across the Mideast and North Africa who have limited or no ability to strike the United States. Currently, both the CIA and the U.S. military are authorized to remotely pilot unmanned, missile-carrying drones against terror suspects. It's unknown exactly how many strikes have been carried out, but experts say that drone attacks in Pakistan are conducted by the CIA, while those in Yemen and Somalia, for example, are by military forces. The drones have strained diplomacy between the U.S. and the nations where the strikes are carried out, as civilians have been killed alongside the targeted terrorists, even though most nations have given Washington at least tacit agreement to carry out the attacks. A Middle Eastern diplomat said that in Yemen, for example, an uptick of U.S. drone strikes last month have killed dozens of people and upset the local public, leading some leaders in Sanaa to reconsider how often they should be used. The diplomat spoke Tuesday on condition of anonymity to avoid political retribution from the Obama administration. The Pentagon is also considering basing surveillance drones in Niger to monitor on burgeoning extremist violence in North Africa, but it's not clear if they will be armed. Scaling back the use of drones also would hamper war plans in Afghanistan after combat troops are scheduled to withdraw in 2014. Drones represent a major thrust of the post-troops campaign to help the limited number of special forces units that remain there keep the Taliban from regrouping. Brennan, who currently serves as the White House counterterrorism czar, has signaled he is prepared to turn the CIA from carrying out lethal drone strikes and hand over those missions to the U.S. military. Sen. Ron Wyden, a senior Democratic member of the Senate Intelligence panel, declared himself unsatisfied Tuesday with the Justice memo and said he will press Brennan at the confirmation hearing about the administration's current policy. The drone debate puts Obama, a former civil rights lawyer, in the awkward position of carrying out lethal attacks in secret and bucking his political allies in the Democratic Party. Democratic lawmakers were incensed by the refusal of the Republican administration of President George W. Bush to hand over classified Justice Department opinions justifying the use of waterboarding, the harsh interrogation tactic that critics call a form of torture. Obama repudiated those methods — and released those opinions — when he took office in 2009. The use of drones proved to have no political cost to Obama in his re-election campaign. House Intelligence Chairman Mike Rogers, R-Mich., defended the use of deadly drones, calling it "a lawful act of national self-defense." "When an individual has joined al-Qaida — the organization responsible for the murder of thousands of Americans — and actively plots future attacks against U.S. citizens, soldiers, and interests around the world, the U.S. government has both the authority and the obligation to defend the country against that threat," Rogers said in a statement. But Rep. Keith Ellison, said the new Justice memo could spur lawmakers into taking a fresh look at deadly drones, and what he called an outdated policy guiding them. "We are sort of running on the steam that we acquired right after our country was attacked in the most horrific act of terror in U.S. history," said Ellison, D-Minn. "We have learned much since 9/11, and now it's time to take a more sober look at where we should be with use of force."

#### Obama asked for the plan- thumps the disad

Baker ’13 (Peter Baker, NY Times, “Pivoting From a War Footing, Obama Acts to Curtail Drones”, <http://www.nytimes.com/2013/05/24/us/politics/pivoting-from-a-war-footing-obama-acts-to-curtail-drones.html?pagewanted=all&_r=0>, May 23, 2013)

WASHINGTON — Nearly a dozen years after the hijackings that transformed America, President Obama said Thursday that it was time to narrow the scope of the grinding battle against terrorists and begin the transition to a day when the country will no longer be on a war footing. Declaring that “America is at a crossroads,” the president called for redefining what has been a global war into a more targeted assault on terrorist groups threatening the United States. As part of a realignment of counterterrorism policy, he said he would curtail the use of drones, recommit to closing the prison at Guantánamo Bay, Cuba, and seek new limits on his own war power. In a much-anticipated speech at the National Defense University, Mr. Obama sought to turn the page on the era that began on Sept. 11, 2001, when the imperative of preventing terrorist attacks became both the priority and the preoccupation. Instead, the president suggested that the United States had returned to the state of affairs that existed before Al Qaeda toppled the World Trade Center, when terrorism was a persistent but not existential danger. With Al Qaeda’s core now “on the path to defeat,” he argued, the nation must adapt. “Our systematic effort to dismantle terrorist organizations must continue,” Mr. Obama said. “But this war, like all wars, must end. That’s what history advises. It’s what our democracy demands.” The president’s speech reignited a debate over how to respond to the threat of terrorism that has polarized the capital for years. Republicans contended that Mr. Obama was declaring victory prematurely and underestimating an enduring danger, while liberals complained that he had not gone far enough in ending what they see as the excesses of the Bush era. The precise ramifications of his shift were less clear than the lines of argument, however, because the new policy guidance he signed remains classified, and other changes he embraced require Congressional approval. Mr. Obama, for instance, did not directly mention in his speech that his new order would shift responsibility for drones more toward the military and away from the Central Intelligence Agency. But the combination of his words and deeds foreshadowed the course he hopes to take in the remaining three and a half years of his presidency so that he leaves his successor a profoundly different national security landscape than the one he inherited in 2009. While President George W. Bush saw the fight against terrorism as the defining mission of his presidency, Mr. Obama has always viewed it as one priority among many at a time of wrenching economic and domestic challenges. “Beyond Afghanistan, we must define our effort not as a boundless ‘global war on terror,’ ” he said, using Mr. Bush’s term, “but rather as a series of persistent, targeted efforts to dismantle specific networks of violent extremists that threaten America.” “Neither I, nor any president, can promise the total defeat of terror,” he added. “We will never erase the evil that lies in the hearts of some human beings, nor stamp out every danger to our open society. But what we can do — what we must do — is dismantle networks that pose a direct danger to us, and make it less likely for new groups to gain a foothold, all the while maintaining the freedoms and ideals that we defend.” Some Republicans expressed alarm about Mr. Obama’s shift, saying it was a mistake to go back to the days when terrorism was seen as a manageable law enforcement problem rather than a dire threat. “The president’s speech today will be viewed by terrorists as a victory,” said Senator Saxby Chambliss of Georgia, the top Republican on the Senate Intelligence Committee. “Rather than continuing successful counterterrorism activities, we are changing course with no clear operational benefit.” Senator John McCain, Republican of Arizona, said he still agreed with Mr. Obama about closing the Guantánamo prison, but he called the president’s assertion that Al Qaeda was on the run “a degree of unreality that to me is really incredible.” Mr. McCain said the president had been too passive in the Arab world, particularly in Syria’s civil war. “American leadership is absent in the Middle East,” he said. The liberal discontent with Mr. Obama was on display even before his speech ended. Medea Benjamin, a co-founder of the antiwar group Code Pink, who was in the audience, shouted at the president to release prisoners from Guantánamo, halt C.I.A. drone strikes and apologize to Muslims for killing so many of them. “Abide by the rule of law!” she yelled as security personnel removed her from the auditorium. “You’re a constitutional lawyer!” Col. Morris D. Davis, a former chief prosecutor at Guantánamo who has become a leading critic of the prison, waited until after the speech to express disappointment that Mr. Obama was not more proactive. “It’s great rhetoric,” he said. “But now is the reality going to live up to the rhetoric?” Still, some counterterrorism experts saw it as the natural evolution of the conflict after more than a decade. “This is both a promise to an end to the war on terror, while being a further declaration of war, constrained and proportional in its scope,” said Juan Carlos Zarate, a counterterrorism adviser to Mr. Bush. The new classified policy guidance imposes tougher standards for when drone strikes can be authorized, limiting them to targets who pose “a continuing, imminent threat to Americans” and cannot feasibly be captured, according to government officials. The guidance also begins a process of phasing the C.I.A. out of the drone war and shifting operations to the Pentagon. The guidance expresses the principle that the military should be in the lead and responsible for taking direct action even outside traditional war zones like Afghanistan, officials said. But Pakistan, where the C.I.A. has waged a robust campaign of air assaults on terrorism suspects in the tribal areas, will be grandfathered in for a transition period and remain under C.I.A. control. That exception will be reviewed every six months as the government decides whether Al Qaeda has been neutralized enough in Pakistan and whether troops in Afghanistan can be protected. Officials said they anticipated that the eventual transfer of the C.I.A. drone program in Pakistan to the military would probably coincide with the withdrawal of combat units from Afghanistan at the end of 2014. Even as he envisions scaling back the targeted killing, Mr. Obama embraced ideas to limit his own authority. He expressed openness to the idea of a secret court to oversee drone strikes, much like the intelligence court that authorizes secret wiretaps, or instead perhaps some sort of independent body within the executive branch. He did not outline a specific proposal, leaving it to Congress to consider something along those lines. He also called on Congress to “refine and ultimately repeal” the authorization of force it passed in the aftermath of Sept. 11. Aides said he wanted it limited more clearly to combating Al Qaeda and affiliated groups so it could not be used to justify action against other terrorist or extremist organizations. In renewing his vow to close the Guantánamo prison, Mr. Obama highlighted one of his most prominent unkept promises from the 2008 presidential campaign. He came into office vowing to shutter the prison, which has become a symbol around the world of American excesses, within a year, but Congress moved to block him, and then he largely dropped the effort. With 166 detainees still at the prison, Mr. Obama said he would reduce the population even without action by Congress. About half of the detainees have been cleared for return to their home countries, mostly Yemen. Mr. Obama said he was lifting a moratorium he imposed on sending detainees to Yemen, where a new president has inspired more faith in the White House that he would not allow recidivism. The policy changes have been in the works for months as Mr. Obama has sought to reorient his national security strategy. The speech was his most comprehensive public discussion of counterterrorism since he took office, and at times he was almost ruminative, articulating both sides of the argument and weighing trade-offs out loud in a way presidents rarely do. He said that the United States remained in danger from terrorists, as the attacks in Boston and Benghazi, Libya, have demonstrated, but that the nature of the threat “has shifted and evolved.” He noted that terrorists, including some radicalized at home, had carried out attacks, but less ambitious than the ones on Sept. 11. “We have to take these threats seriously and do all that we can to confront them,” he said. “But as we shape our response, we have to recognize that the scale of this threat closely resembles the types of attacks we faced before 9/11.”

#### PC theory is wrong- winners win

Hirsh ’13 (National Journal chief correspondent, citing various political scientists, Michael, former Newsweek senior correspondent, "There’s No Such Thing as Political Capital," National Journal, 2-9-13, www.nationaljournal.com/magazine/there-s-no-such-thing-as-political-capital-20130207, accessed 2-8-13, mss]

The idea of political capital—or mandates, or momentum—is so poorly defined that presidents and pundits often get it wrong. On Tuesday, in his State of the Union address, President Obama will do what every president does this time of year. For about 60 minutes, he will lay out a sprawling and ambitious wish list highlighted by gun control and immigration reform, climate change and debt reduction. In response, the pundits will do what they always do this time of year: They will talk about how unrealistic most of the proposals are, discussions often informed by sagacious reckonings of how much “political capital” Obama possesses to push his program through. Most of this talk will have no bearing on what actually happens over the next four years. Consider this: Three months ago, just before the November election, if someone had talked seriously about Obama having enough political capital to oversee passage of both immigration reform and gun-control legislation at the beginning of his second term—even after winning the election by 4 percentage points and 5 million votes (the actual final tally)—this person would have been called crazy and stripped of his pundit’s license. (It doesn’t exist, but it ought to.) In his first term, in a starkly polarized country, the president had been so frustrated by GOP resistance that he finally issued a limited executive order last August permitting immigrants who entered the country illegally as children to work without fear of deportation for at least two years. Obama didn’t dare to even bring up gun control, a Democratic “third rail” that has cost the party elections and that actually might have been even less popular on the right than the president’s health care law. And yet, for reasons that have very little to do with Obama’s personal prestige or popularity—variously put in terms of a “mandate” or “political capital”—chances are fair that both will now happen. What changed? In the case of gun control, of course, it wasn’t the election. It was the horror of the 20 first-graders who were slaughtered in Newtown, Conn., in mid-December. The sickening reality of little girls and boys riddled with bullets from a high-capacity assault weapon seemed to precipitate a sudden tipping point in the national conscience. One thing changed after another. Wayne LaPierre of the National Rifle Association marginalized himself with poorly chosen comments soon after the massacre. The pro-gun lobby, once a phalanx of opposition, began to fissure into reasonables and crazies. Former Rep. Gabrielle Giffords, D-Ariz., who was shot in the head two years ago and is still struggling to speak and walk, started a PAC with her husband to appeal to the moderate middle of gun owners. Then she gave riveting and poignant testimony to the Senate, challenging lawmakers: “Be bold.” As a result, momentum has appeared to build around some kind of a plan to curtail sales of the most dangerous weapons and ammunition and the way people are permitted to buy them. It’s impossible to say now whether such a bill will pass and, if it does, whether it will make anything more than cosmetic changes to gun laws. But one thing is clear: The political tectonics have shifted dramatically in very little time. Whole new possibilities exist now that didn’t a few weeks ago. Meanwhile, the Republican members of the Senate’s so-called Gang of Eight are pushing hard for a new spirit of compromise on immigration reform, a sharp change after an election year in which the GOP standard-bearer declared he would make life so miserable for the 11 million illegal immigrants in the U.S. that they would “self-deport.” But this turnaround has very little to do with Obama’s personal influence—his political mandate, as it were. It has almost entirely to do with just two numbers: 71 and 27. That’s 71 percent for Obama, 27 percent for Mitt Romney, the breakdown of the Hispanic vote in the 2012 presidential election. Obama drove home his advantage by giving a speech on immigration reform on Jan. 29 at a Hispanic-dominated high school in Nevada, a swing state he won by a surprising 8 percentage points in November. But the movement on immigration has mainly come out of the Republican Party’s recent introspection, and the realization by its more thoughtful members, such as Sen. Marco Rubio of Florida and Gov. Bobby Jindal of Louisiana, that without such a shift the party may be facing demographic death in a country where the 2010 census showed, for the first time, that white births have fallen into the minority. It’s got nothing to do with Obama’s political capital or, indeed, Obama at all. The point is not that “political capital” is a meaningless term. Often it is a synonym for “mandate” or “momentum” in the aftermath of a decisive election—and just about every politician ever elected has tried to claim more of a mandate than he actually has. Certainly, Obama can say that because he was elected and Romney wasn’t, he has a better claim on the country’s mood and direction. Many pundits still defend political capital as a useful metaphor at least. “It’s an unquantifiable but meaningful concept,” says Norman Ornstein of the American Enterprise Institute. “You can’t really look at a president and say he’s got 37 ounces of political capital. But the fact is, it’s a concept that matters, if you have popularity and some momentum on your side.” The real problem is that the idea of political capital—or mandates, or momentum—is so poorly defined that presidents and pundits often get it wrong. “Presidents usually over-estimate it,” says George Edwards, a presidential scholar at Texas A&M University. “The best kind of political capital—some sense of an electoral mandate to do something—is very rare. It almost never happens. In 1964, maybe. And to some degree in 1980.” For that reason, political capital is a concept that misleads far more than it enlightens. It is distortionary. It conveys the idea that we know more than we really do about the ever-elusive concept of political power, and it discounts the way unforeseen events can suddenly change everything. Instead, it suggests, erroneously, that a political figure has a concrete amount of political capital to invest, just as someone might have real investment capital—that a particular leader can bank his gains, and the size of his account determines what he can do at any given moment in history. Naturally, any president has practical and electoral limits. Does he have a majority in both chambers of Congress and a cohesive coalition behind him? Obama has neither at present. And unless a surge in the economy—at the moment, still stuck—or some other great victory gives him more momentum, it is inevitable that the closer Obama gets to the 2014 election, the less he will be able to get done. Going into the midterms, Republicans will increasingly avoid any concessions that make him (and the Democrats) stronger. But the abrupt emergence of the immigration and gun-control issues illustrates how suddenly shifts in mood can occur and how political interests can align in new ways just as suddenly. Indeed, the pseudo-concept of political capital masks a larger truth about Washington that is kindergarten simple: You just don’t know what you can do until you try. Or as Ornstein himself once wrote years ago, “Winning wins.” In theory, and in practice, depending on Obama’s handling of any particular issue, even in a polarized time, he could still deliver on a lot of his second-term goals, depending on his skill and the breaks. Unforeseen catalysts can appear, like Newtown. Epiphanies can dawn, such as when many Republican Party leaders suddenly woke up in panic to the huge disparity in the Hispanic vote. Some political scientists who study the elusive calculus of how to pass legislation and run successful presidencies say that political capital is, at best, an empty concept, and that almost nothing in the academic literature successfully quantifies or even defines it. “It can refer to a very abstract thing, like a president’s popularity, but there’s no mechanism there. That makes it kind of useless,” says Richard Bensel, a government professor at Cornell University. Even Ornstein concedes that the calculus is far more complex than the term suggests. Winning on one issue often changes the calculation for the next issue; there is never any known amount of capital. “The idea here is, if an issue comes up where the conventional wisdom is that president is not going to get what he wants, and [they]he gets it, then each time that happens, it changes the calculus of the other actors” Ornstein says. “If they think he’s going to win, they may change positions to get on the winning side. It’s a bandwagon effect.” ALL THE WAY WITH LBJ Sometimes, a clever practitioner of power can get more done just because [they’re]he’s aggressive and knows the hallways of Congress well. Texas A&M’s Edwards is right to say that the outcome of the 1964 election, Lyndon Johnson’s landslide victory over Barry Goldwater, was one of the few that conveyed a mandate. But one of the main reasons for that mandate (in addition to Goldwater’s ineptitude as a candidate) was President Johnson’s masterful use of power leading up to that election, and his ability to get far more done than anyone thought possible, given his limited political capital. In the newest volume in his exhaustive study of LBJ, The Passage of Power, historian Robert Caro recalls Johnson getting cautionary advice after he assumed the presidency from the assassinated John F. Kennedy in late 1963. Don’t focus on a long-stalled civil-rights bill, advisers told him, because it might jeopardize Southern lawmakers’ support for a tax cut and appropriations bills the president needed. “One of the wise, practical people around the table [said that] the presidency has only a certain amount of coinage to expend, and you oughtn’t to expend it on this,” Caro writes. (Coinage, of course, was what political capital was called in those days.) Johnson replied, “Well, what the hell’s the presidency for?” Johnson didn’t worry about coinage, and he got the Civil Rights Act enacted, along with much else: Medicare, a tax cut, antipoverty programs. He appeared to understand not just the ways of Congress but also the way to maximize the momentum he possessed in the lingering mood of national grief and determination by picking the right issues, as Caro records. “Momentum is not a mysterious mistress,” LBJ said. “It is a controllable fact of political life.” Johnson had the skill and wherewithal to realize that, at that moment of history, he could have unlimited coinage if he handled the politics right. He did. (At least until Vietnam, that is.)

#### No impact

O'Toole 9/30/13 (James, CNN Money Writer, "Rating Agencies An Afterthought in Debt Ceiling Fight")

No one can predict exactly what the consequences of a missed payment would be, but analysts agree it's [a terrifying prospect](http://money.cnn.com/2013/09/27/news/economy/debt-ceiling-faqs/index.html?iid=EL). Another downgrade alone, however, is unlikely to make much difference.¶ "At the end of the day, even with a downgrade, the U.S. Treasury is still the safest game in town," said Michael Brown, an economist at Wells Fargo ([WFC](http://money.cnn.com/quote/quote.html?symb=WFC&source=story_quote_link), [Fortune 500](http://money.cnn.com/magazines/fortune/fortune500/2012/snapshots/2578.html?iid=EL)). Rates are also being held lower by the Federal Reserve's bond-buying program, he added.¶ New downgrades could raise borrowing costs years down the line, but "in the immediate term, I don't think you'd see a massive movement of rates," Brown said. Some investment firms operate under guidelines that prohibit them from holding securities that aren't rated AAA by one, two or all three of the major rating agencies. They could therefore be forced to sell them following a downgrade, creating upward pressure on yields.¶ But among buyers of Treasuries, these firms are "very, very small relative to those that don't have a ratings threshold," Brothers said.¶ "There are ramifications if U.S. Treasury debt isn't AAA, but I don't think that would create a cascade of selling," he said.

#### Obama executive order solves

Weisenyhal 9/30 (Joe Weisenthal 9/30, Executive Editor for Business Insider, “It Increasingly Looks Like Obama Will Have To Raise The Debt Ceiling All By Himself,” <http://www.businessinsider.com/it-increasingly-looks-like-obama-will-have-to-raise-the-debt-ceiling-all-by-himself-2013-9>)

With no movement on either side and the debt ceiling fast approaching, there's increasing talk that the solution will be for Obama to issue an executive order and require the Treasury to continue paying U.S. debt holders even if the debt ceiling isn't raised.¶ Here's Greg Valliere at Potomac Research:¶ HOW DOES THIS END? What worries many clients we talk with is the absence of a clear end-game. We think three key elements will have to be part of the final outcome: First, a nasty signal from the stock market. Second, a daring move from Barack Obama to raise the debt ceiling by executive order if default appears to be imminent. Third, a capitulation by Boehner, ending the shut-down and debt crisis in an arrangement between a third of the House GOP and virtually all of the Democrats. ¶ Valliere isn't the only one seeing this outcome.¶ Here's David Kotok at Cumberland Advisors:¶ We expect this craziness to last into October and run up against the debt limit fight. In the final gasping throes of squabbling, we expect President Obama to use the President Clinton designed executive order strategy so that the US doesn’t default. There will then ensue a protracted court fight leading to a Supreme Court decision. The impasse may go that far. This is our American way. “Man Plans and God Laughs” says the Yiddish Proverb.¶ Indeed, back in 2011, Bill Clinton said he'd raise the debt ceiling by invoking the 14th Amendment rather than negotiate with the House GOP.¶ This time around, again, Clinton is advising Obama to call the GOP's bluff.

#### No econ decline war – recession disproves

Drezner ’12 (Daniel W. Drezner, Professor, The Fletcher School of Law and Diplomacy, Tufts University, “The Irony of Global Economic Governance: The System Worked,” <http://www.globaleconomicgovernance.org/wp-content/uploads/IR-Colloquium-MT12-Week-5_The-Irony-of-Global-Economic-Governance.pdf>, October 2012)

The final outcome addresses a dog that hasn’t barked: the effect of the Great Recession on cross-border conflict and violence. During the initial stages of the crisis, multiple analysts asserted that the financial crisis would lead states to increase their use of force as a tool for staying in power.37 Whether through greater internal repression, diversionary wars, arms races, or a ratcheting up of great power conflict, there were genuine concerns that the global economic downturn would lead to an increase in conflict. Violence in the Middle East, border disputes in the South China Sea, and even the disruptions of the Occupy movement fuel impressions of surge in global public disorder. ¶ The aggregate data suggests otherwise, however. The Institute for Economics and Peace has constructed a “Global Peace Index” annually since 2007. A key conclusion they draw from the 2012 report is that “The average level of peacefulness in 2012 is approximately the same as it was in 2007.”38 Interstate violence in particular has declined since the start of the financial crisis – as have military expenditures in most sampled countries. Other studies confirm that the Great Recession has not triggered any increase in violent conflict; the secular decline in violence that started with the end of the Cold War has not been reversed.39 Rogers Brubaker concludes, “the crisis has not to date generated the surge in protectionist nationalism or ethnic exclusion that might have been expected.”40¶ None of these data suggest that the global economy is operating swimmingly. Growth remains unbalanced and fragile, and has clearly slowed in 2012. Transnational capital flows remain depressed compared to pre-crisis levels, primarily due to a drying up of cross-border interbank lending in Europe. Currency volatility remains an ongoing concern. Compared to the aftermath of other postwar recessions, growth in output, investment, and employment in the developed world have all lagged behind. But the Great Recession is not like other postwar recessions in either scope or kind; expecting a standard “V”-shaped recovery was unreasonable. One financial analyst characterized the post-2008 global economy as in a state of “contained depression.”41 The key word is “contained,” however. Given the severity, reach and depth of the 2008 financial crisis, the proper comparison is with Great Depression. And by that standard, the outcome variables look impressive. As Carmen Reinhart and Kenneth Rogoff concluded in This Time is Different: “that its macroeconomic outcome has been only the most severe global recession since World War II – and not even worse – must be regarded as fortunate.”42

#### Food shortages won’t cause war

Allouche 11, research Fellow – water supply and sanitation @ Institute for Development Studies, frmr professor – MIT

(Jeremy, “The sustainability and resilience of global water and food systems: Political analysis of the interplay between security, resource scarcity, political systems and global trade,” Food Policy, Vol. 36 Supplement 1, p. S3-S8, January)

The question of resource scarcity has led to many debates on whether scarcity (whether of food or water) will lead to conflict and war. The underlining reasoning behind most of these discourses over food and water wars comes from the Malthusian belief that there is an imbalance between the economic availability of natural resources and population growth since while food production grows linearly, population increases exponentially. Following this reasoning, neo-Malthusians claim that finite natural resources place a strict limit on the growth of human population and aggregate consumption; if these limits are exceeded, social breakdown, conflict and wars result. Nonetheless, it seems that most empirical studies do not support any of these neo-Malthusian arguments. Technological change and greater inputs of capital have dramatically increased labour productivity in agriculture. More generally, the neo-Malthusian view has suffered because during the last two centuries humankind has breached many resource barriers that seemed unchallengeable. Lessons from history: alarmist scenarios, resource wars and international relations In a so-called age of uncertainty, a number of alarmist scenarios have linked the increasing use of water resources and food insecurity with wars. The idea of water wars (perhaps more than food wars) is a dominant discourse in the media (see for example Smith, 2009), NGOs (International Alert, 2007) and within international organizations (UNEP, 2007). In 2007, UN Secretary General Ban Ki-moon declared that ‘water scarcity threatens economic and social gains and is a potent fuel for wars and conflict’ (Lewis, 2007). Of course, this type of discourse has an instrumental purpose; security and conflict are here used for raising water/food as key policy priorities at the international level. In the Middle East, presidents, prime ministers and foreign ministers have also used this bellicose rhetoric. Boutrous Boutros-Gali said; ‘the next war in the Middle East will be over water, not politics’ (Boutros Boutros-Gali in Butts, 1997, p. 65). The question is not whether the sharing of transboundary water sparks political tension and alarmist declaration, but rather to what extent water has been a principal factor in international conflicts. The evidence seems quite weak. Whether by president Sadat in Egypt or King Hussein in Jordan, none of these declarations have been followed up by military action. The governance of transboundary water has gained increased attention these last decades. This has a direct impact on the global food system as water allocation agreements determine the amount of water that can used for irrigated agriculture. The likelihood of conflicts over water is an important parameter to consider in assessing the stability, sustainability and resilience of global food systems. None of the various and extensive databases on the causes of war show water as a casus belli. Using the International Crisis Behavior (ICB) data set and supplementary data from the University of Alabama on water conflicts, Hewitt, Wolf and Hammer found only seven disputes where water seems to have been at least a partial cause for conflict (Wolf, 1998, p. 251). In fact, about 80% of the incidents relating to water were limited purely to governmental rhetoric intended for the electorate (Otchet, 2001, p. 18). As shown in The Basins At Risk (BAR) water event database, more than two-thirds of over 1800 water-related ‘events’ fall on the ‘cooperative’ scale (Yoffe et al., 2003). Indeed, if one takes into account a much longer period, the following figures clearly demonstrate this argument. According to studies by the United Nations Food and Agriculture Organization (FAO), organized political bodies signed between the year 805 and 1984 more than 3600 water-related treaties, and approximately 300 treaties dealing with water management or allocations in international basins have been negotiated since 1945 (FAO, 1978 and FAO, 1984). The fear around water wars have been driven by a Malthusian outlook which equates scarcity with violence, conflict and war. There is however no direct correlation between water scarcity and transboundary conflict. Most specialists now tend to agree that the major issue is not scarcity per se but rather the allocation of water resources between the different riparian states (see for example Allouche, 2005, Allouche, 2007 and [Rouyer, 2000] ). Water rich countries have been involved in a number of disputes with other relatively water rich countries (see for example India/Pakistan or Brazil/Argentina). The perception of each state’s estimated water needs really constitutes the core issue in transboundary water relations. Indeed, whether this scarcity exists or not in reality, perceptions of the amount of available water shapes people’s attitude towards the environment (Ohlsson, 1999). In fact, some water experts have argued that scarcity drives the process of co-operation among riparians (Dinar and Dinar, 2005 and Brochmann and Gleditsch, 2006). In terms of international relations, the threat of water wars due to increasing scarcity does not make much sense in the light of the recent historical record. Overall, the water war rationale expects conflict to occur over water, and appears to suggest that violence is a viable means of securing national water supplies, an argument which is highly contestable. The debates over the likely impacts of climate change have again popularised the idea of water wars. The argument runs that climate change will precipitate worsening ecological conditions contributing to resource scarcities, social breakdown, institutional failure, mass migrations and in turn cause greater political instability and conflict (Brauch, 2002 and Pervis and Busby, 2004). In a report for the US Department of Defense, Schwartz and Randall (2003) speculate about the consequences of a worst-case climate change scenario arguing that water shortages will lead to aggressive wars (Schwartz and Randall, 2003, p. 15). Despite growing concern that climate change will lead to instability and violent conflict, the evidence base to substantiate the connections is thin ( [Barnett and Adger, 2007] and Kevane and Gray, 2008).

#### Economic collapse is inevitable for several reasons- expert predictions

Investment bank over-loaning, billionaires dumping stocks, global recessions spillover now

**Shjarback 9-13**-13 [Jeff, M.B.A. from Pfeiffer University, Award winning internet marketing consultant specializing in SEO Search Engine Optimization, “Is A Financial Collapse Imminent For U.S. Economy?” http://wallstreetsectorselector.com/2013/09/is-a-financial-collapse-imminent-for-u-s-economy/]

The American government and economy is in rather dire circumstances due to an overwhelming series of decisions which are shaping our entire country for the next few decades and likely beyond. As we take a look at the overall track record of our economy, we find that a financial collapse is more than just likely – it may be highly imminent. But why? Why is our government, as massive and established as it is, finding itself in a downward trajectory with little to stop it? Since 1776, we have continuously built up efforts towards being a global powerhouse, and circa-1944 around the close of World War II, we arguably achieved it. Reinstating Israel. Destroying the Nazis. Rebuilding Japan. The United States became the heartfelt center of our entire world. However, politics continued and finances became less stable, causing inflation to rise to astounding rates. Our financial collapse could be quite imminent and three core trends lead us to this theory. Billionaires Dumping Their Stocks A financial collapse would undoubtedly consist of billionaires unloading their stocks in droves. Unfortunately, this is already occurring. On the surface, the stock market (NYSEARCA:DIA) is surfacing from an ugly few years. Numbers are steadily rising, and the stability in the stock market is starting to be set once again. But this trickle-down effect applies in the market. Arguably, the greatest stock investor is Warren Buffet. For better or worse, millions follow his steps because he is so unbelievably successful, and billionaire stock investors follow his investment moves. So when Warren Buffet sells $19 million worth of stock in Johnson & Johnson (NYSE:JNJ) and 21% of his overall stock in consumer spending, others follow suit with the same general strategies. Billionaire, John Paulson, also unloaded 14 million shares in JPMorgan Chase (NYSE:JPM), as reported at Money News. The World is Suffering Financially The overall predictions state that the stock market may witness a 90% overall collapse. Though many are aghast at the numbers, those who predicted this have been notoriously accurate in the past. Robert Weidemer, PHD is open about this prediction. His acclaimed team predicted the sub prime mortgage crisis and consumer spending collapse a few years earlier. When the financial system collapses, other countries will follow suit with their own level of disaster. Unfortunately, again, this is already occurring at alarming rates. Greece has been essentially bankrupt for close to five years running. According to Simon Black of the Economic Collapse Blog, the situation is dire in the country. ‘There are roughly 11 million people in this country. 3.4 million of them are employed, of which roughly one third work for the government.’ These unemployment rates are shocking. Italy is no better off. The country’s unemployment rate is currently 12.2%, the highest in 35 years. Furthermore, Italy witnesses 134 retail closings each and every day. Doing the math, one can calculate close to 1,000 employees are becoming not-so-much employed every single day. Investment Bank Over-Loaning and Over-Spending This specific situation is astonishingly convoluted, and would take a series of books and essays and documentaries to even scratch the surface. But in its purest form, the investment banking companies are simply spending money they do not have. Due to excessive loan expenditures in the last decade plus, banks found they were not earning the income back. This, of course, caused the massive mortgage crisis that almost ended the country financially, however, the banks are not out of the situation yet. They still spend more than what is being brought in, and their overall closing of the doors for loans is destroying small business. Furthermore, Jim Willie, popular economist, is reporting that Deutsche Bank is on the brink of a full collapse. Considering their magnitude in the financial sphere, this could send momentous shockwaves throughout the economy. There is a light at the end of the tunnel, if we take serious steps immediately to rectify the situation. However, with each passing day, the light closes and we are further left in the dark emptiness of financial ruin if we continue on this path.

## 1AR
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#### Their card concludes aff

Spiro, 93

Peter J. Spiro, Associate Professor of Law, Hofstra University, New York University Law Review, December, 1993, lexis

HISTORY AS LAW Ultimately, war powers law does not lend itself to refined parchment solutions. It is rather the "court of history," n70 an accretion of interactions among the branches, that gives rise to basic norms governing the branches' behavior in the area. The process is marked by debate and disagreement, accommodation and acquiescence. Controversies become precedents. There may be no final word or neutral treatment on the significance of each, nothing in the way of a court's opinion, but that does not make custom unworkable as the basis of law. While demanding more facets than the common law methodology of judicial decisionmaking, interbranch episodes can be meaningfully disentangled so as to define the line between acceptable and unacceptable action on war powers questions. To follow Professor Glennon in borrowing from the international legal doctrine of opinio juris, n71 the legal significance of any such episode will hinge on three elements. First, it is actions that count, not words; mere assertions of executive or legislative authority are largely irrelevant in the long run, the chaff of institutional bravado. Second, in order to take on lawmaking significance, the conduct must be known to the other branch; secret operations will have no constitutional significance until they are made known to Congress and it has had an opportunity to respond. Third, the other branch must have accepted or acquiesced in the action. n72 Any conduct that satisfies (or even arguably satisfies) these requirements will become part of the precedential mix; a single historical episode can create incremental elements of custom in the same way that a single judicial decision will incrementally change court-made doctrine. n73 Individual episodes will, of course, have more or less weight in the same way that decisions from some courts are more meaningful than from others, and in this respect such factors as frequency, consistency, and regularity will be important to determining the constitutional probity of a particular practice. By itself, congressional acquiescence in the invasion of Grenada may have been of middling significance; but added to dozens of similar cases spanning almost the full length of American history, it served to confirm the President's capacity to undertake such incursions without prior legislative approval. Likewise, the invasion of Panama added a new element insofar as it was justified by the arrest of a foreign leader for violation of U.S. drug laws and itself could thus be used to justify similar operations in the future. The near-uniform practice of securing congressional approval for large-scale operations n74 sets another line of precedent, as does the emerging phenomenon of accepted congressional constraints on defensive deployments. Hence the typology set forth above, delimiting the predominant historical treatment (as a separation-of-powers matter) of the three basic categories of combat engagements, marks the basic contours of history as law with respect to war powers. n75 Henry Adams and others aside, n76 lawyers are capable of undertaking the sort of historical analysis demanded by this approach. n7

#### Proves transparency key – CP doesn’t do that --- only aff does it

Kiel Brennan-Marquez 13, Visiting Human Rights Fellow at Yale Law School, 5/24/13, “A Progressive Defense of Drones,” <http://www.salon.com/2013/05/24/a_progressive_defense_of_drones/>

In this respect, drones represent a welcome shift of paradigm: they stand to clarify the moral stakes of state-sponsored violence by eliminating the dynamic of attachment that has traditionally accompanied it. By itself, of course, this proposition does not entail that drone strikes are preferable to traditional troop deployments. What it does entail, however, is that the benefits of moral clarity should be weighed, in practice, against the drawbacks of less circumspect decision-making. As much as drones are liable to desensitize leaders, making violence easier to employ, the outrage they produce is also likely to have a chilling effect in the other direction. Which way will this calculus ultimately run? We exercise an important threshold of control over this question. Whether the anesthetic effect of machine-induced violence will outstrip the sense of outrage that violence-by-machines provoke, or vice versa, is not a static political fact to which we must be resigned – it’s a hard issue for us to deliberate with care. One thing, however, is certain. Moral clarity in the face of drone strikes, as compared to troop deployments, is only politically worthwhile — indeed, only possible — insofar as members of the public are kept informed about when drone strikes are happening, and what damage they cause. Transparency is a precondition of outrage – and of accountability.¶ Importantly, this does not necessarily mean that information about drone strikes should be publicized, and subject to approval, before the fact. The question of ex ante oversight, which has begotten protracted debate in the popular media and academic circles alike, is an incredibly difficult one – as ever with respect to decisions that bear on national security. Many proposals have emerged, running the gamut from leaving the president and military leaders unfettered to make strategic decisions — as in traditional theaters of war — to full-blown judicial review of drone strikes. Sound arguments exist on both sides of this debate, and they are the usual arguments that tend to sprout up around wartime violence. Make leaders too accountable, one side laments, and their decisions will blow in the political wind, reflecting external pressures rather than national security interests. But grant leaders too much discretion, the other side rejoins, and the power they wield — the most tremendous power of all, over life and death — will transform from a means of protection into a wellspring of abuse.¶ I take no position in this debate – not because I don’t have my own view, which of course I do, but because part of my effort here is to disentangle the question of oversight beforehand from the question of transparency afterward. This distinction is not always drawn with care, and my claim about moral clarity is addressed toward the latter, not the former. To insist that information about drone strikes be made transparent to the public, ensuring that we have an opportunity to scrutinize it with the unrelenting moral clarity that violence-by-machines makes possible, does not depend on the existence of oversight beforehand. Nor is it undermined by the absence of such oversight. The two simply operate on different dimensions. Thus, even if we ultimately decide that it’s wise, for national security reasons, to insulate drone strikes from oversight by Congress, the judiciary or any other governmental body, we should still insist that information about drone strikes be made publicly available after the fact. In other words, regardless of our collective decision, whatever it ends up being, about whether to insulate drone strikes from review, there’s a different ideal of accountability — transparency — that simultaneously deserves our attention. Amid all the discussion of institutionalized oversight, we should not lose sight of what is, in the longer arc of our democracy, the most potent oversight of all: popular disapproval.¶ This defense of transparency may seem cold comfort, little as it does to ensure that any given drone strike will be executed with the rectitude demanded by instruments-of-death. Yet irresponsible decisions are perennially a risk during wartime, whether it’s machines or troops that carry out the violence. The problem of how to ensure that decisions in the interest of national security are made responsibly — whether the answer is prophylactic oversight, or precisely its absence — is a grave and timeless problem. It yields to no easy answer. And drones neither exacerbate nor attenuate its difficulty. The issue of transparency after the fact, by contrast, is much simpler. In fact, I would go so far as to call it an obvious issue. Transparency ought to exist. Period. Even if there are good reasons to prohibit the American people — or their institutional representatives: legislators and judges — from vetoing individual drone strikes, we nevertheless have a right to know what is happening, once it has happened, and to decide for ourselves whether the results are acceptable.¶ It is in this respect, if only this respect, that drones are a welcome development in the history of war making. They make possible what to date has been, for all intents and purposes, a fantasy: the irruption of moral truth in a domain — the battlefield — traditionally overrun by mysticism and lies.

#### Doesn’t solve signal

Sullivan ’13 (Andrew Sullivan, Obama’s War On Terror Speech: Reax II, <http://dish.andrewsullivan.com/2013/05/24/obamas-war-on-terror-speech-reax-ii/>, Freddie deBoer wants more than words, May 24, 2013)

We have lived with this “war on terror” for a third of my life. And liberals: speeches do not walk the dog anymore. The time for flowery speeches is over. It’s time for action. Saying “we’re going to end the AUMF eventually” is not enough. Talking about closing Guantanamo is not enough. It has to actually happen. Like Anthony Romero of the ACLU says, actions are more important than words. If Obama actually closes Guantanamo, I promise I will applaud. If Obama actually reduces or ends the drone campaign, I will celebrate. But those specific policies will only be valuable if they are part of a broad attempt to end the hostilities between the United States and the Muslim world. Given that every Muslim terrorist who announces their motives says that they are based on our incursions into the Muslim world, that can only happen if we withdraw. Yes and yes. My support yesterday for the arguments of the speech is, of course, contingent on actual progress. Friedersdorf is in the same ballpark: All things considered, Thursday’s developments were an improvement on the status quo. Obama constrained himself rhetorically in ways he hadn’t before, expressed agreement with core civil libertarian critiques, and signalled that future policy will shift in that direction as a result. But talk is cheap, Obama has a history of breaking promises to civil libertarians, and drone strikes remain surrounded in enough secrecy that it will remain difficult to verify what’s going on. Moreover, policies implemented at the president’s prerogative can be changed on his determination too. There remains an urgent need for Congress to step into the breach and constrain the president, even if only in the ways that Obama says that he has constrained himself.

#### Obama secrecy kills solvency and cred- Congress key

Hersch ’13 (Joshua Hersh, “Obama Drone Program Secrecy Reaches 'Alice-in-Wonderland' Extremes”, <http://www.huffingtonpost.com/2013/02/06/obama-drone-program-targeted-killing_n_2631425.html>, February 6, 2013)

WASHINGTON -- In October 2011, Scott Shane, a national security reporter for The New York Times, sent an email to a branch of the Department of Justice that deals with Freedom of Information Act requests, to check on one of his FOIA filings. Sixteen months earlier, Shane had asked that DOJ's Office of Legal Counsel -- which advises the White House on the legality of government actions -- release any memoranda it had relating to the president's top-secret program of targeted killing of suspected terrorists, much of which was understood to be conducted by drones. President Barack Obama's drone and targeted killing program, which has remained highly obscure despite expanding rapidly under his watch, burst into the public discourse again on Monday after a DOJ briefing paper, outlining the executive branch's interpretation of its powers to kill extrajudicially, was published by NBC News. But back in late 2011, the program, and its possible reach, was just starting to receive attention. That September, an American citizen named Anwar al-Awlaki, who had become a significant figure in al Qaeda in the Arab Peninsula, was killed in a CIA drone strike in Yemen. President Obama hailed the killing in a public address (see the video below). A week later, Charles Savage, another national security reporter at the Times, wrote that Awlaki's killing -- and the killing, more broadly, of any American with close ties to al Qaeda -- had been authorized by a secret memo from the Office of Legal Counsel. Shane pushed the Justice Department about his aging FOIA request. In June 2010, his request had been immediately accepted and granted "expedited processing," but now Shane wanted, as the OLC's FOIA officer later wrote to a colleague, "an explanation of why it had taken a year and a half to respond." "We are almost finished processing his request," the colleague, OLC lawyer Peter Finn, wrote back. A few days later, a response finally arrived in Shane's mailbox: Not only was the OLC denying his request, but it refused to acknowledge if the documents he'd requested even existed. "The very fact of the existence or nonexistence of such documents," the letter said, "is itself classified." For the past three years, delays and convoluted explanations of this sort have been the response of the Obama administration to any effort to learn anything about the targeted killing program. For years, the government described any such program, and particularly the CIA's role in it, as so sensitive that it couldn't even be discussed. But long after the practice of targeted killing became a matter of widespread discussion -- and the president himself addressed targeting decisions in an informal Google hangout -- the administration has continued to use elaborate legal rationales and the blanket assertion of national security needs, to prevent any releases. "To say that there is little transparency about the CIA's role in this is a real understatement," said Jameel Jaffer, a lawyer for the American Civil Liberties Union, which has had several FOIA requests denied on similar grounds. "We really have nothing at all, from the CIA itself, about its role, about the standards, about the process used to add people to kill lists, about number killed, about anything." Every administration guards its secrets, but on his first day in the Oval Office, Obama promised to deliver a new era of government openness and ordered that FOIA requests be met quickly and generously. Instead, the administration has thrown up roadblocks at every effort to learn about the targeted killing program. Court filings have been greeted with assertions of executive privilege or national security exemptions. Human rights researchers have been ignored. And at least a dozen formal inquiries from Congress have been met with silence.

FOIA experts have explored every avenue to squeeze out information. Jason Leopold, an investigative reporter with Truthout, has even asked for the emails behind the government's decisions to deny other FOIA filings. (It was one of Leopold's requests, shared with The Huffington Post, that revealed the OLC exchange about Shane.) The administration's effort not to answer has been so convoluted and shrouded in obfuscation that one federal judge recently decried its "Alice-in-Wonderland nature," even as she concluded there was no way around the administration's arguments. The lack of information affects not just legal watchdogs and government oversight; it also limits outside attempts to measure the efficacy of the program. James Cavallaro, a human rights researcher at Stanford, recently spent six months attempting to meet with members of Obama's national security team before publishing a study that revealed the deadly consequences of the U.S. drone program in Pakistan. He never received a reply. "It's disconcerting that there's not greater transparency and really unacceptable," Cavallaro said. In his research on human rights violations around the world, Cavallaro noted that it's not uncommon for host countries to rebuff his requests for access and interviews (although he's had luck in some unlikely places, like Panama and Cambodia). "But here's the kicker," he said. "Is that the standard that should apply in the United States? The standards of the many abusive governments that commit rights violations? If that's the standard the U.S. should hold itself to, then they're doing a fine job." The ACLU had no better luck when it brought a lawsuit in mid-2010 against the government to prevent the killing of Awlaki, with his father as the plaintiff. The government responded in part that the case should be dismissed on the grounds that defending itself would require acknowledging a classified program. The case died a few months later. But with every new speech by an administration official discussing the program, the blanket claim that the government cannot respond to FOIA requests or defend itself in court "becomes substantially less plausible," said Micah Zenko, an expert on targeted killing at the Council on Foreign Relations who has closely followed the secrecy debate. "Every administration wants maximum power and minimum oversight," Zenko said. "Nobody wants to have their homework graded. But the whole point of the Constitution is that the president has his homework graded." The Awlaki killing was the first known time an American citizen was deliberately killed by a U.S.-controlled drone strike. Two weeks later, his 16-year-old son, Abdulrahman al-Awlaki, was killed in a separate attack in Yemen. As Zenko has noted, administration officials initially claimed the boy was "in his mid-twenties" and "of military age," before being confronted with his true date of birth. The State Department still refuses to address the killing, saying that it has yet to receive proof of his death from Yemeni authorities. The DOJ briefing paper published on Monday offers yet another twist in the saga. It is not the OLC memo on which Savage had reported in 2011, but is instead an unclassified summary of the memo that was given to Congress last summer. But when a handful of journalists, learning about the existence of the paper last year, sent a FOIA request for a copy, they were told that it was just an unfinished part of the government's internal deliberation process. In other words, they were told it was a draft -- and not subject to FOIA release.

### da

### Impact D

#### No debt ceiling econ impact

Tom Raum 11, AP, “Record $14 trillion-plus debt weighs on Congress”, Jan 15, <http://www.mercurynews.com/news/ci_17108333?source=rss&nclick_check=1>

Democrats have use doomsday rhetoric about a looming government shutdown and comparing the U.S. plight to financial crises in Greece and Portugal. It's all a bit of a stretch. "We can't do as the Gingrich crowd did a few years ago, close the government," said Senate Majority Leader Harry Reid (D-Nev.), referring to government shutdowns in 1995 when Georgia Republican Newt Gingrich was House speaker. But those shutdowns had nothing to do with the debt limit. They were caused by failure of Congress to appropriate funds to keep federal agencies running. And there are many temporary ways around the debt limit. Hitting it does not automatically mean a default on existing debt. It only stops the government from new borrowing, forcing it to rely on other ways to finance its activities. In a 1995 debt-limit crisis, Treasury Secretary Robert Rubin borrowed $60 billion from federal pension funds to keep the government going. It wasn't popular, but it helped get the job done. A decade earlier, James Baker, President Ronald Reagan's treasury secretary, delayed payments to the Civil Service and Social Security trust funds and used other bookkeeping tricks to keep money in the federal till. Baker and Rubin "found money in pockets no one knew existed before," said former congressional budget analyst Stanley Collender. Collender, author of "Guide to the Federal Budget," cites a slew of other things the government can do to delay a crisis. They include leasing out government-owned properties, "the federal equivalent of renting out a room in your home," or slowing down payments to government contractors. Now partner-director of Qorvis Communications, a Washington consulting firm, Collender said such stopgap measures buy the White House time to resist GOP pressure for concessions. "My guess is they can go months after the debt ceiling is not raised and still be able to come up with the cash they need. But at some point, it will catch up," and raising the debt limit will become an imperative, he suggested.

#### Empirics

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

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

### 1AR- Econ Collapse

#### Interest rates cause collapse

Reeves, 13 -- Raleigh Metro Magazine editor

[Bernie, "The Debt Ceiling Is a Red Herring," American Thinker, 9-27-13, www.americanthinker.com/2013/09/the\_debt\_ceiling\_is\_a\_red\_herring.html, accessed 10-4-13, mss]

The Debt Ceiling Is a Red Herring

Federal Reserve chairman Ben Bernanke announced last week the US central bank will continue its "quantitative easing" program, basically printing money like an African dictatorship to buy US debt. The harsh truth behind Bernanke's action makes the upcoming debate on raising the **debt ceiling a red herring** that diverts attention away from reality: the US ship of state has hit a giant financial iceberg. Captain Bernanke's response is to continue to bail water. The Federal Reserve buys billions of dollars of US debt at near-zero interest to fund the ever-increasing deficit to keep up the charade that the good faith and credit of the nation is intact. In effect, Fed policy is a lie surrounding a bigger lie -- that Obama's economic recovery plan is on course. If the Fed does not step up and purchase US debt at ridiculously low interest, rates would have to float upwards dramatically to attract the usual buyers. Interest on the debt is already running at $26 billion per month; an increase caused by allowing rates to equate to investor requirements could easily double the staggering current monthly outlay. And what is the effect of squandering the US money supply on US debt that provides scant return? The rate the US should have to pay in the real world to sell our debt would translate to rates charged to Fed member banks, who add vigorish for themselves and lend it out. But despite Fed rates artificially kept below one percent by Bernanke's sleight-of-hand, lending in the US to small businesses is at a 12-year low. If the Fed rate followed the appropriate level needed to attract buyers of our national debt, **interest rates** on bank lending will rise dramatically. The already suffering **small business** sector, which represents **90 percent of the economy** and provides **all new jobs**, will be facing ruin.

#### Global short-term alt causes- China, Europe, commodity prices

Korea Herald, 13 -- citing Harry Dent, financial newsletter writer

["Next global crash could come next year," 8-13-13, l/n, accessed 10-4-13, mss]

Despite the continued economic stimulus policies across the world since the 2008 financial crisis, the global economy is likely to face another crash next year, according to U.S.-based economic forecaster Harry Dent. He says the world faces three major short-term risks: falling commodity prices, a depression in southern Europe and the bursting of China's real estate bubble. Regarding the outlook for the U.S. economy, Dent, who has for decades followed the booms and busts of the global economy, remained skeptical. Baby boomers who led consumption will cut back their spending with retirement, regardless of any kind of stimulus packages. Falling consumption linked with the changing demographic trends will dampen the U.S. economy once again, Dent predicted. In response to rising concerns over an imminent exit plan by the U.S. Federal Reserve, he said it was not likely that the U.S. Fed would drop its quantitative easing policies soon, as it was not certain that the housing market, a key indicator of economic recovery, would remain as strong as it had been. Dent also predicted a hard landing for the Chinese economy, pointing to over-investments in every type of infrastructure, in particular the real estate sector and its shadow banking system. He said China may be the most likely trigger for the next global financial crisis. When it comes to the outlook for the Japanese economy, Dent, who predicted Japan's decade-long slump in the late 1980s, forecast that the government's expansionary economic policies, dubbed Abenomics, would have a temporary positive effect on its economy because its demographic trends do point up into 2020. But he warned that continued high levels of stimulus would be dangerous, especially if inflation did rise to Japan's targeted 2 percent. Japanese bond rates would rise, and then Japan would feel the weight of its massive debt. Based on his famous demographics method, Dent said Korea shows similar demographic trends with those of Japan, but 22 years behind. Korea's demographic trends plateau into 2018, then turn negative decades, he added. The high level of debt of Korean households, will challenge positive short-term demographic trends, Dent noted, saying the 136 percent debt-to-GDP ratio in Korea's household sector is higher than in most other advanced nations. To cope with remaining uncertainties, Dent advised Korean companies to get lean and mean quickly. He advised companies to cut fixed costs as much as possible and weed out weak product lines or sell marginal businesses before the next crash. Cash and cash flow are king in a deflationary downturn such as in the 1930s or 2008-2009, he added. Following are excerpts of an email interview with Harry Dent on the outlook for the global and Korean economy based on demographic trends and economic cycles. Harry Dent Outlook for global economy Q: U.S. Federal Reserve Chairman Ben Bernanke mentioned a possible exit plan from the Fed's monetary easing policy in June for the first time. When do you expect the U.S. Fed to move toward the exit policy? What does the Fed's exit mode mean for the U.S. and the global economy? A: The U.S. Fed will only exit if the economy stays strong and it is not clear yet whether housing will stay as strong as it has been as investors seem to be backing away from housing, and rising mortgage rates are likely to hurt sales to consumers. If the economy slows a bit then the Fed will not taper its $85 billion per month; it may even increase it. But an increase in stimulus would likely cause interest rates to keep rising and that would not be good for housing or stocks. Hence, I think that the Fed is getting boxed in here. If the economy grows too fast, it will have to taper its quantitative easing policies, and the demographic trends are such that the economy would slow and stocks would correct if the Fed does taper. If the economy slows, then it is a sign that the quantitative easing is not working, more like in Europe, and that could cause market weakness. Q: The risk of a hard landing of China's economy was not envisaged at the latest Group of 20 ministerial meeting. Do you agree with the G20's stance? What are some implications of slower growth of China for the global economy? A: I think China may be the most likely trigger for the next global financial crash that I see as very likely in 2014. China has been seriously overbuilding everything â€• factories, housing, offices, malls, roads, railways, etc. Now their shadow banking system is getting out of control, like the U.S. into 2008. There is a vicious cycle of falling commodity prices that hurt the export growth of emerging countries, and that in turn hurts China's exports to such countries. Then China slows, and that causes commodity prices to fall further and so on.

### 1AR- FERC

#### Obama is engaging

Dinan 9/26 (Stephen Dinan, “Obama energy nominee Ron Binz becomes climate change battleground”, <http://www.washingtontimes.com/news/2013/sep/26/obama-energy-nominee-climate-change-battleground/>, September 26, 2013)

President Obama’s nominee to head an obscure but powerful energy panel is in deep trouble on Capitol Hill, but the White House said Thursday it is standing by Ron Binz in what is shaping up to be a major battle over Mr. Obama’s climate agenda. The Senate Energy Committee said it has been informed that there is a search for other names that could be sent over in lieu of Mr. Binz, whom Mr. Obama nominated in June to be chairman of the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission. “The committee is aware that other candidates are being considered to lead FERC,” said Keith Chu, a spokesman for the Senate Energy Committee, where Mr. Binz’s nomination has stalled amid questions of his truthfulness and whether he is open to the continued use of fossil fuels in American energy production. But hours later, the White House said Mr. Binz is still their man and should be confirmed. “Ron Binz is a very qualified candidate for the position he’s been nominated for. He’s qualified and the Senate ought to act on his nomination,” press secretary Jay Carney told reporters at the White House. The back-and-forth suggests the high stakes on Mr. Binz’s nomination, which some on Capitol Hill see as one of the battlegrounds in the fight against Mr. Obama’s plans to try to limit greenhouse gas emissions by shifting from fossil fuels.