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### 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.”

#### Specifically- drone strikes kill the president of Pakistan (Shariff’s) political legitimacy

Toosi ’13 (Nahal Toosi, Associated Press Editor, “Pakistan Summons U.S. Envoy Over Drone Strike”, <http://www.huffingtonpost.com/2013/06/08/pakistan-us-envoy-summoned_n_3407803.html>, June 8, 2013)

ISLAMABAD — Just days after taking power, Pakistan's new government summoned a top U.S. envoy Saturday to lodge a protest over a U.S. drone strike, suggesting that Prime Minister Nawaz Sharif's team fully intends to make good on its promise to aggressively push for an end to such strikes. Friday night's drone strike near the Afghan border, which was said to have killed seven militants, came two days after Sharif was sworn in as premier and the same day his Cabinet members took their oaths. Sharif's Pakistan Muslim League-N handily won general elections last month and is expected to govern with a relatively strong mandate because it doesn't need to rely on coalition partners. Sharif, who wants to pursue peace talks with militants threatening his country, has insisted the U.S. stop the drone strikes, saying they violate Pakistan's sovereignty and are counterproductive because they often kill innocent civilians and stoke anti-U.S. sentiment in this nation of 180 million. The U.S. insists the CIA-run strikes primarily kill al-Qaida and other militants who threaten the West as well as efforts to stabilize Afghanistan. In a recent speech, President Barack Obama pledged more transparency and restrictions on the highly secretive program. Sharif adviser Tariq Fatemi, acting on the premier's instructions, summoned U.S. Embassy Charge D'Affaires Richard Hoagland to the Foreign Office on Saturday to complain about the latest drone strike, according to a Pakistani government statement. U.S. Ambassador Richard Olson was out of Pakistan at the time. "The importance of bringing an immediate end to drone strikes was emphasized," the government statement said. "It was also stressed that these drone strikes have a negative impact on the mutual desire of both countries to forge a cordial and cooperative relationship and to ensure peace and stability in the region." A U.S. Embassy official confirmed the encounter but did not provide further details. He requested anonymity because he was not authorized to publicly talk about diplomatic discussions. Issuing the summons so quickly after taking power indicates Sharif wants to quickly carve out as much political space as he can – domestically and in his relations with the U.S. It could also be a fairly calculated move in this country, where the military retains significant power and where political rivals have gained traction by being even more vocal against drones. While the previous government of the Pakistan People's Party did, on occasion, summon U.S. envoys over drone strikes, it usually stuck to routine press releases denouncing them. It was also widely believed that many People's Party leaders privately supported the drone strikes. At the same time, Sharif has to strike a balance in his approach to a powerful ally such as the U.S., which has provided Pakistan with billions in military and humanitarian aid over the years, said Babar Sattar, a political and legal analyst in Pakistan. "Reaction more stringent than this with an ally and friend would obviously have the possibility of disrupting the relationship – and he's made it clear that's not what he wants," Sattar said, noting that Sharif has not, for example, backed calls by some activists that Pakistan shoot down the drones. Sharif also has been far more careful than his People's Party predecessors in his rhetoric about militancy in Pakistan and has said he wants to enter a dialogue with the Pakistani Taliban. That has raised concerns in the West that he might be too sympathetic to the Islamist extremists, but he also may simply want to exhaust the option of peace talks so as to later gain public support for military action, Sattar said. A stop to drone strikes could give him more space in that process. In its first drone strike in Pakistan after the country's recent election, the U.S. in late May killed Waliur Rehman, deputy leader of the Pakistani Taliban. The Pakistani Taliban, who have killed thousands of people in bombings and other attacks across the country, confirmed Rehman's death and promptly said they would not talk peace with Sharif. Sharif – while not naming Rehman or the Taliban – spoke out against that drone strike, and his party in a statement noted that it was "highly regrettable" that it came after Obama's speech. The drone strike Friday night struck a compound in Mangrothi village in the Shawal area, along the border dividing the North and South Waziristan tribal regions, two Pakistani intelligence officials said, speaking on condition of anonymity because they were not authorized to release the information on the record. The tribal regions are nearly impossible to access for foreign and many Pakistani journalists, so the report could not be independently confirmed. But North and South Waziristan are known to be havens for multiple militant groups, including the Pakistani Taliban. The U.S. has launched hundreds of drone strikes in Pakistan since 2008, though the frequency has fallen significantly in recent years. For all his rhetoric, it remains unclear if Sharif can actually stop the U.S. from using the drones to launch missiles at militants Washington believes are a threat. For one thing, despite his numbers in parliament, Sharif still has to contend with Pakistan's army for influence over security and foreign policies. And If he's unable to end the strikes in Pakistan as the months wear on, that could give more room to opposition politician Imran Khan, the former cricket star, to drain support from Sharif and his party. Khan has been especially strident in campaigning against the drone strikes.

#### Sharif solves Pakistan economic collapse and trading blocs- key to solve multiple scenarios for escalatory great power war

**Younus ‘13** [Uzair, international security studies analyst for the Fletcher Security Review, focusing on international trade in South West Asia, the Middle East, and North Africa, graduated summa cum laude from Bentley University, “PAKISTAN LOOKS TO NAWAZ SHARIF WITH HOPE,” June 10, http://foreignpolicy.com.pk/pakistan-looks-to-nawaz-sharif-with-hope/]

In his first speech as Prime Minister, Nawaz Sharif spoke with a seriousness rarely found in Pakistani politicians. He spoke of the crippling issues facing the country today and expressed the need for consensus in developing cohesive policies needed to rescue Pakistan. Unlike most Pakistani politicians, the PM has shown that he means what he says: he outrightly declined proposals of Maulana Fazlur Rehman to sideline PTI in Khyber-Pakhtunkhwa and made a brave decision in nominating Mr. Baloch as Chief Minister of Baluchistan.¶ REINVIGORATING A CRIPPLING ECONOMY WILL BE A TOUGH TEST¶ Nawaz Sharif’s biggest challenge will lie on the economic and foreign policy front and luckily or unluckily, the two are interconnected. The fact of the matter is that the Pakistani economy is on the brink of collapse: foreign exchange reserve are falling rapidly, the economy is stagnating due to energy shortfalls and poor law and order, and massive government debts and interest payments have left the new government with little room for expansionary policy.¶ The foreign policy of the government will determine whether Pakistan can develop a local environment where investment, development, and trade can flourish again. Popular discourse in Pakistan on foreign policy revolves mainly around drone strikes and the United States. This is a futile exercise and draws attention away from more serious issues. Fact of the matter is that the United States will slowly withdraw from Afghanistan but continue its much-despised drone strikes in the tribal belt. There is simply no alternative to this for the time being. However, Pakistan’s relations with its immediate neighbors in a post-NATO world will be key in determining the country’s future.¶ NAWAZ SHARIF MUST PROMOTE REGIONAL TRADE AND COOPERATION¶ For centuries, the land mass that we now call Pakistan has been used as a trade route connecting the landlocked countries of Central Asia and ancient Persia to the fertile and rich empires of India and China. It was from this region that trade flowed from the East to the West and vice versa, enabling everyone from Pashtun tribes, Punjabi Nobles, and Sindhi bankers to enrich themselves and develop their states. Poor relations between India and Pakistan and the collapse of Afghan society essentially froze this ancient route. This continues to be an issue today: India cannot get its products across Pakistan into Central Asia, Iran cannot sells its oil and gas to China and India, and Afghanistan is unable to use its land mass as a corridor for Central Asian gas and Chinese and Indian goods.¶ Nawaz Sharif has made statements about the need for developing strong and peaceful relations with India and hinted that trade-based solutions would be a good starting point. Afghanistan is also keen on being part of these developments, while the Iranians are watching with interest and would be interested in joining on as well. China has already bought up large chunks of mines in Afghanistan and would be a party to any trade agreements and would be keen on developing energy routes that reduce its dependence on the shipping lanes of the Indian Ocean. China’s continuing interest in Gwadar despite the poor law and order situation in Baluchistan is proof of this interest. Everyone in the region has something to gain from cooperation but so far, no one has been able to bring all parties to the table.¶ It is Pakistan today that holds the key to the reintegration of Central and Southwest Asia and Pakistani policymakers must realize that history can pave way for a prosperous future. For centuries the trading routes connecting Central Asia to China and India brought wealth, trade, and even war to this region. Today, these routes are virtually frozen and the development of a cohesive trading bloc could do wonders. The economic growth generated by just enabling trade between Afghanistan, Pakistan, and India would go a long way in diffusing tensions, militancy, and the current crisis that our region is in the midst of.¶ Nawaz Sharif has emphasized the need to bring all local stakeholders in Pakistan to the table in solving the country’s vast problems. A similar strategy of building rapport and asking all regional stakeholders to come to the table to discuss solutions would do wonders. Luckily for Mr. Sharif, regional and global leaders feel that he is someone that they can work with. Mr. Sharif must use this trust as a means to further Pakistan’s interests and move the region towards greater economic and trade cooperation.¶ REGIONAL INTEGRATION CAN DRAMATICALLY REDUCE TENSIONS¶ In a rapidly globalizing world, our region is one of the few in the world that is not integrated by trade. The animosity amongst all the neighboring countries creates a scenario where no one is better off. It also creates an environment where scarce resources are used to fund an arms-race that leads to further escalation in tensions. Pakistan, India, China, Iran, and now even Afghanistan are locked in a regional battle for supremacy and each government is increasingly more and more aggressive. Fostering greater trade and economic cooperation would reduce this animosity and if Nawaz Sharif really wants to take Pakistan forward, he must seriously develop a means to further trade between Pakistan’s neighbors. If he succeeds, then the Pakistani state would be very different than the one Mr. Sharif is ruling today. A failure to do so would all but guarantee further militancy, instability, and increases in defence spending.

#### Central Asian resource crunch causes war

Makarenko ‘9 (Dr Tamara Makarenko is Associate Lecturer, University of Dundee and Partner, West Sands Advisory LLP. She was also a key speaker at a NATO Science for Peace and Security workshop, “Central Asia: where power, politics and economics collide”, <http://www.nato.int/docu/review/2009/Asia/central_asian_geopolitics/EN/index.htm>, 2009)

Central Asia: where power, politics and economics collide

In an increasingly energy hungry world, Central Asia's resources are attracting growing interest Having been involved with Central Asia since 1998 on both an academic and professional level, I have concluded that the region provides exhaustive case studies of how relations between international interests, the legitimate economy, criminality and political violence collide and/or converge. This view originally resulted from my academic research on the crime-terror nexus – deducing in 2000 that the Islamic Movement of Uzbekistan gained momentum because Juma Namanganiy was able to weave (the façade of) legitimate business dealings with narcotics trafficking. Examples evolved into more sophisticated operations over the years as business, criminal and political interests increasingly converged. For example, evidence in Kyrgyzstan suggests that although key economic sectors are often intertwined with illegal activities, they are given carte blanche access to the banking system and attract foreign investment. Instead of adopting Western espoused and supported democratic ideals and market mechanisms as the a priori ways through which economic growth and political stability could be achieved, Central Asia has found its development constrained by the power amassed by authoritarian regimes, oligarchs, and criminal networks. Furthermore, despite regularly admonishing the region for their lack of democratic progress or their inability to establish control over criminality and rising extremism, the actions of external actors perpetuate autocratic rule and corruption, which subsequently feeds into a climate of economic, political and social instability. Central Asia is part of several struggles that intermittently see external actors compete for attention and ultimately for access to resources Geo-economics as the New Geopolitics Historically, Central Asia has been referred to in the context of its position at the crossroads of East and West, nestled between empires and bordering zones of conflict and insecurity (e.g. Afghanistan, China’s Xinjiang province, and Iran). Although the region was largely ignored throughout the Cold War, its vitality and importance was quickly rediscovered. Central Asia is continuously recognised as an important stakeholder in the Caspian energy game, a conduit to Chinese energy security, a playground of Russian power politics, and a transit area for criminal activity and religious fervour that is played out to its extreme in Afghanistan. Given these regional realities, Central Asia is part of several struggles that intermittently see external actors compete for attention and ultimately for access to resources. The competition for control over regional resources is often exemplified in bilateral and multilateral economic and military agreements that are negotiated with the Central Asian states. Although there is no illusion that external states are in a position to dictate terms of engagement, regional elites have recognised that they can leverage competing interests to their (often personal) advantage. As a result, concepts such as the rule of law, corporate governance, and transparency in commercial operations are often considered to be expendable in the national interest. Plays of power politics are no longer isolated to state actions alone, but incorporate the ability of states to use commercial interests and circumvent criminal control over economic spheres without creating greater short-term instability. Isolating the activities of China, Russia and the U.S., it may be argued that – in doing so - each of these states have helped sustain the status quo of the Central Asian republics. Access to resources and infrastructure have become prioritised as soft power tools through which they perceive to be able to incrementally increase their regional influence. China’s Extended Africa Strategy Involved in the region since the 1990s, the Chinese strategy in Central Asia is undoubtedly multifaceted. A key driver of China’s policy in the region, however, appears to be mirroring its Africa policy. In other words, China is steadily increasing its regional presence through the acquisition of stakes in energy and infrastructure assets, and by providing “no-strings attached” loans. For example, Beijing recently agreed to provide Astana with a U.S. $10 billion loan to be used exclusively for the development of the oil and gas industry: a move likely to be used to expand its energy links in the region. Although several bilateral agreements have been finalised between Beijing and Dushanbe, Tashkent, Almaty and Bishkek respectively and Beijing has attained a balanced position with Russia in the Shanghai Cooperation Organisation, its strongest foothold has been gained through a carefully targeted investment strategy. This is evident in Tajikistan, with Chinese participation in the aluminium industry and in Kazakhstan, with key commercial agreements signed with KazMunaiGaz and Kazatomprom. Europe has begun to note with concern China’s investment patterns, with Chinese foreign direct investment and long-term loans equalling an estimated U.S. $13 billion in the region. © Reuters/POOL New Leaders of countries in the Shanghai Cooperation Organisation (SCO) at a SCO meeting Russia’s Oligarch Power Plays Russia has also successfully managed to use the commercial sphere to consolidate its influence and power in Central Asia. This has been especially evident in Kazakhstan – arguably Russia’s only direct link to the other republics. Russia has made its initial inroads in the Kazakh banking system through state-owned banks – both through the direct and indirect acquisition of shares. In theory, this policy will allow Moscow to exert influence on the Kazakh economy by controlling access to loans, and decisions on commercial debt. Vnesheconombank, for example, gave Astana a U.S. $3.5 billion loan to be used solely to purchase Russian products. It is also likely that Kazakh BTA Bank will follow a restructuring path that involves a possible sale to Russia’s Sberbank. Despite a focus on cornering the financial market, Russia is also gaining influence in the energy and mining sectors. Companies including Polyus Gold and Polymetal have gained considerable leverage over gold and copper deposits; and LUKoil continues to expand its presence. For example, Moscow offered capital at a time of crisis to ensure that LUKoil could purchase BP’s stake in the Caspian Pipeline Consortium project. It is also worth noting that LUKoil was invited to sit on Kazakhstan’s Foreign Investments Council in 2003 by President Nursultan Nazarbayev. Both China and Russia, in following commercial strategies to gain influence in the region, have inadvertently contributed to securing the current political status quo. Investigating various business deals that have included Chinese or Russian interests has confirmed that in many instances the rule of law, corporate governance, and transparency of beneficial ownership are considered to be luxuries and thus dispensable. State involvement in commercial transactions thus has little to do with contributing to the creation of sustainable economic growth. In fact, several commercial transactions have merely worked to sustain the ‘shadow state’, ensuring that income generation is not tied to economic development but to securing regime survival. U.S. Focus on Security Priorities Unlike China and Russia whose engagement with Central Asia has not been constrained or driven by security considerations, much of U.S. involvement in the region post-9/11 has been focused on securing and managing military base agreements. It is in these commercial agreements that the U.S. has mirrored the actions of China and Russia – circumventing market mechanisms cherished in the West to secure its own national priorities. The example of Manas base in Kyrgyzstan is a well-documented case in point. In 2005 the FBI initiated an investigation that uncovered the embezzlement of millions of dollars from fuel contracts the Pentagon awarded to companies controlled by the then-President’s son and son-in-law. This trend merely continued after Bakiev replaced Akayev, with lucrative fuel contracts now going to companies allegedly controlled by the current President’s son. Not only did the U.S. pay a high financial price to secure access (commercial agreements combined with increased aid), but some also accused Washington of turning a blind eye to the many reported anomalies associated with the last Kyrgyz presidential elections. The heightened importance of Central Asia in the post-9/11 environment has created an altered reality Geo-economic Power Plays & Central Asian Security Security in Central Asia has most readily fallen under the rubric of geopolitics, territorially used as a stage upon which external actors could engage in games of power politics. The heightened importance of the region in the post-9/11 environment has created an altered reality; however one in which the fundamental games have not changed, merely the ways in which they are played. Although the immediate impact of this slight twist in context is not obvious, there is a danger that in building an economic house of cards, Central Asia will be in a position to affect regional instability more directly. Dr Tamara Makarenko The emergence of legitimate business interests and investment opportunities will undoubtedly continue to contribute to some form of widespread economic stability, as it has throughout Central Asia since independence. However, at the same time this commercial environment is being built on an unstable foundation – one layered with corruption, competing political interests, civil unrest and disappointment, and criminally induced instability. Affluence is still the domain of the influential, capital continues to be sent to offshore accounts (often facilitating the movement of illicitly gained money), and civil society is left watching internal and external political actors pursue contradictory policies. For as long as the U.S., Russia and China continue to play geo-economic games in the region, there will remain a semblance of stability. It is in their interests to ensure that this is the case. However, one must question the longevity of this policy, and recognise that any slight withdrawal of interests – for whatever reason – may act as the catalyst that leads the region to slide back into more overt instability.

#### 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.

#### Second Yemen-

#### 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 a new successful Counterterrorism strategy-

#### 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.

### 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?

#### A hard signal is key- exceptions break the norm- each strike goes loud

**Kels ‘12** [Maj. Charles G. Kels is an attorney for the Department of Homeland Security and an individual mobilization augmentee with the U.S. Air Force Office of the Judge Advocate General, “Mixed messages on drone strikes,” July 16, <https://wiki.nps.edu/display/CRUSER/2012/07/16/Mixed+messages+on+drone+strikes>]

Finally, the administration emphasizes its "rigorous standards and process of review ... when considering and authorizing strikes" outside of "hot" war zones. The State Department's Koh has insinuated that this robust vetting process is integral to validating our legitimate self-defense claim in each and every targeted killing operation. This is a somewhat disconcerting line of argument, because it is seemingly at odds with the government's overall assertion that we are in an armed conflict with al-Qaida. Self-defense is a jus ad bellum principle; once we are at war, the appropriate legal standards for applying force are guided by jus in bello. Applying a self-defense analysis to each individual drone strike - as opposed to the time-honored LOAC principles of war fighters - sends mixed signals about whether we really believe we are in an armed conflict.¶ Given that the lawful imperative of U.S. self-defense in World War II was the unconditional surrender of the Axis powers, we would seem to be on firm ground today by strictly maintaining that our right of self-defense, as triggered by the terrorist attacks of 9/11, is geared toward the much narrower goal of degrading or eliminating al-Qaida's capability to launch another deadly attack against the U.S. homeland. Within that framework, we are guided by LOAC in the conduct of hostilities. Indeed, the U.S. government clearly believes that drone warfare is particularly suited to the task of waging an armed conflict with limited goals, because the new technology enables to us to synergize the campaign's means and ends as never before.¶ At least in the context of an American citizen such as al-Awlaki, the attorney general has stated that on top of traditional LOAC principles, the elaborate "kill list" procedure considers the imminence of the threat posed by the individual, as well as the feasibility of capture in lieu of deadly force. Such robust executive deliberation, Holder argues, satisfies the Fifth Amendment's accordance of due process of law; this provides the context in which he famously said that "the Constitution guarantees due process, not judicial process." The attorney general has taken considerable heat for this statement, in large part because an ultra-secretive executive war-making function is an odd tool with which to safeguard constitutional rights. From an armed conflict perspective, however, law professor Jack Goldsmith is surely correct in his estimation that the current U.S. system, as described in the administration's speeches, "goes far beyond any process given to any target in any war in American history."¶ Does It Hold Water?¶ Taken individually, each of these arguments is reasonable, accurate and perhaps even persuasive. Viewed as a whole, however, the U.S. position suffers from a degree of cognitive dissonance which results from our trying to please everyone at once instead of holding firm to basic, time-tested principles. In the end, this scattershot approach risks undermining our legal authority and - ironically - pleasing no one. The problem emanates from attempting to superimpose legal doctrines on top of one another rather than insisting on their own internal logic. The net effect is to make us appear hesitant about the wisdom and legality of our own actions, which merely emboldens those critics whom we can never hope to satisfy anyway - at least not without compromising our own security.¶ To see why it's so crucial for us to speak boldly and plainly, it's important to understand what entities such as the U.N. Human Rights Council and the Red Cross are really trying to do. At base, these noble organizations - reflective of the international human rights law community as a whole, with a decidedly continental European outlook - believe that "sporadic, low-intensity attacks" from nonstate actors "do not rise to the level of armed attack" that would enable us to invoke the right of self-defense as a basis for resorting to force. As the aforementioned U.N. report approvingly remarks, "the legality of a defensive response must be judged in light of each armed attack, rather than by considering occasional, although perhaps successive, armed attacks in the aggregate."¶ In other words, the human rights community rejects our jus ad bellum argument that we are at war with al-Qaida wherever they may be. Moreover, these institutions deny that we are in an armed conflict at all - at least outside of "hot" war zones - both because al-Qaida is not cohesive enough and because the intensity and duration of the havoc it wreaks is insufficiently destructive. Thus, the applicable standard for applying force in each instance is not LOAC; jus in bello is out the window because there is no war. Rather, the peacetime model of human rights law prevails. This clearly is not a position that the U.S. can abide: first, because it eradicates any realistic deterrent for states to rein in terrorist attacks emanating from their territory; and second, because it effectively neuters our considerable national security apparatus as a counterterrorism asset. Simply put, it is an attempt to hem us in by wedding us to a police paradigm rather than a military one.¶ What To Do¶ This context illustrates precisely why the government has to stop straddling the fence and sending mixed messages about what we are doing. We must emphatically state that any complex vetting process undertaken by the president before targeting an individual terrorist is simply a matter of discretionary policy and grand strategy, not legal obligation. The bizarre "bureaucratic ritual" of White House "Terror Tuesday" meetings attended by high-level political advisers - as reported in a recent, much-publicized New York Times article - bears an unsettling resemblance to President Lyndon Johnson's well-documented "Tuesday lunches" reviewing target lists for Vietnam. Although the conflicts and eras clearly differ, the U.S. must not repeat the mistakes of the Rolling Thunder campaign by allowing overly restrictive and centralized targeting rules to degrade the efficient and lawful application of our military might.

#### 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.

#### 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.

#### Two scenarios

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

Clayton ’12 (Nicholas Clayton, “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.

#### Russia war causes extinction

**Barrett et al. 1/6** (Anthony M. Barrett- Global Catastrophic Risk Institute, Seth D. Baum- Center for Research on Environmental Decisions, Columbia University, Kelly R. Hostetler- Department of Geography, Pennsylvania State University, 2013, “Analyzing and Reducing the Risks of Inadvertent Nuclear War Between the United States and Russia”, http://sethbaum.com/ac/fc\_NuclearWar.pdf)

War involving significant fractions of the U.S. and Russian nuclear arsenals, which are by far the largest of any nations, could have globally catastrophic effects such as severely reducing food production for years, 1,2,3,4,5,6 potentially leading to collapse of modern civilization worldwide and even the extinction of humanity. 7,8,9,10 Nuclear war between the US and Russia could occur by various routes, including accidental or unauthorized launch; deliberate first attack by one nation; and inadvertent attack. In an accidental or unauthorized launch or detonation, system safeguards or procedures to maintain control over nuclear weapons fail in such a way that a nuclear weapon or missile launches or explodes without direction from leaders. In a deliberate first attack, the attacking nation decides to attack based on accurate information about the state of affairs. In an inadvertent attack, the attacking nation mistakenly concludes that it is under attack and launches nuclear weapons in what it believes is a counterattack. 11,12 (Brinkmanship strategies incorporate elements of all of the above, in that they involve deliberate manipulation of the risk of otherwise unauthorized or inadvertent attack as part of coercive threats that “leave something to chance,” i.e., “taking steps that raise the risk that the crisis will go out of control and end in a general nuclear exchange.” 13,14 ) Over the years, nuclear strategy was aimed primarily at minimizing risks of intentional attack through development of deterrence capabilities, though numerous measures were also taken to reduce probabilities of accidents, unauthorized attack, and inadvertent war. 15,16,17 For purposes of deterrence, both U.S. and Soviet/Russian forces have maintained significant capabilities to have some forces survive a first attack by the other side and to launch a subsequent counter-attack. However, concerns about the extreme disruptions that a first attack would cause in the other side’s forces and command-and-control capabilities led to both sides’development of capabilities to detect a first attack and launch a counter-attack before suffering damage from the first attack. 18,19,20 Many people believe that with the end of the Cold War and with improved relations between the United States and Russia, the risk of East-West nuclear war was significantly reduced. 21,22 However, it has also been argued that inadvertent nuclear war between the United States and Russia has continued to present a substantial risk. 23,24,25,26,27,28,29,30,31,32,33 While the United States and Russia are not actively threatening each other with war, they have remained ready to launch nuclear missiles in response to indications of attack. 34,35,36,37,38 False indicators of nuclear attack could be caused in several ways. First, a wide range of events have already been mistakenly interpreted as indicators of attack, including weather phenomena, a faulty computer chip, wild animal activity, and control-room training tapes loaded at the wrong time. 39 Second, terrorist groups or other actors might cause attacks on either the United States or Russia that resemble some kind of nuclear attack by the other nation by actions such as exploding a stolen or improvised nuclear bomb, 40,41,42 especially if such an event occurs during a crisis between the United States and Russia. 43 A variety of nuclear terrorism scenarios are possible. 44 Al Qaeda has sought to obtain or construct nuclear weapons and to use them against the United States. 45,46,47 Other methods could involve attempts to circumvent nuclear weapon launch control safeguards or exploit holes in their security. 48,49 It has long been argued that the probability of inadvertent nuclear war is significantly higher during U.S.-Russian crisis conditions, 50,51,52,53 with the Cuban Missile Crisis being a prime historical example of such a crisis. 54,55,56,57,58 It is possible that U.S.-Russian relations will significantly deteriorate in the future, increasing nuclear tensions. 59 There are a variety of ways for a third party to raise tensions between the United States and Russia, making one or both nations more likely to misinterpret events as attacks. 60,61,62,63

#### Second- China and Asian drone wars

Brimley et al 9/17 (Shawn Brimley, Ben Fitzgerald, Ely Ratner, Shawn Brimley, Ben FitzGerald, and Ely Ratner are, respectively, vice president, director of the Technology and National Security Program, and deputy director of the Asia Program at the Center for a New American Security, Foreign Policy, “The Drone War Comes to Asia”, <http://www.foreignpolicy.com/articles/2013/09/17/the_drone_war_comes_to_asia>, September 17, 2013)

How China sparked a dangerous unmanned arms race. It's now been a year since Japan's previously ruling liberal government purchased three of the Senkaku Islands to prevent a nationalist and provocative Tokyo mayor from doing so himself. The move was designed to dodge a potential crisis with China, which claims "indisputable sovereignty" over the islands it calls the Diaoyus. Disregarding the Japanese government's intent, Beijing has reacted to the "nationalization" of the islands by flooding the surrounding waters and airspace with Chinese vessels in an effort to undermine Japan's de facto administration, which has persisted since the reversion of Okinawa from American control in 1971. Chinese incursions have become so frequent that the Japanese Air Self-Defense Forces (JASDF) are now scrambling jet fighters on a near-daily basis in response. In the midst of this heightened tension, you could be forgiven for overlooking the news early in September that Japanese F-15s had again taken flight after Beijing graciously commemorated the one-year anniversary of Tokyo's purchase by sending an unmanned aerial vehicle (UAV) toward the islands. But this wasn't just another day at the office in the contested East China Sea: this was the first known case of a Chinese drone approaching the Senkakus. Without a doubt, China's drone adventure 100-miles north of the Senkakus was significant because it aggravated already abysmal relations between Tokyo and Beijing. Japanese officials responded to the incident by suggesting that Japan might have to place government personnel on the islands, a red line for Beijing that would have been unthinkable prior to the past few years of Chinese assertiveness. But there's a much bigger and more pernicious cycle in motion. The introduction of indigenous drones into Asia's strategic environment -- now made official by China's maiden unmanned provocation -- will bring with it additional sources of instability and escalation to the fiercely contested South and East China Seas. Even though no government in the region wants to participate in major power war, there is widespread and growing concern that military conflict could result from a minor incident that spirals out of control. Unmanned systems could be just this trigger. They are less costly to produce and operate than their manned counterparts, meaning that we're likely to see more crowded skies and seas in the years ahead. UAVs also tend to encourage greater risk-taking, given that a pilot's life is not at risk. But being unmanned has its dangers: any number of software or communications failures could lead a mission awry. Combine all that with inexperienced operators and you have a perfect recipe for a mistake or miscalculation in an already tense strategic environment. The underlying problem is not just the drones themselves. Asia is in the midst of transitioning to a new warfighting regime with serious escalatory potential. China's military modernization is designed to deny adversaries freedom of maneuver over, on, and under the East and South China Seas. Although China argues that its strategy is primarily defensive, the capabilities it is choosing to acquire to create a "defensive" perimeter -- long-range ballistic and cruise missiles, aircraft carriers, submarines -- are acutely offensive in nature. During a serious crisis when tensions are high, China would have powerful incentives to use these capabilities, particularly missiles, before they were targeted by the United States or another adversary. The problem is that U.S. military plans and posture have the potential to be equally escalatory, as they would reportedly aim to "blind" an adversary -- disrupting or destroying command and control nodes at the beginning of a conflict. At the same time, the increasingly unstable balance of military power in the Pacific is exacerbated by the (re)emergence of other regional actors with their own advanced military capabilities. Countries that have the ability and resources to embark on rapid modernization campaigns (e.g., Japan, South Korea, Indonesia) are well on the way. This means that in addition to two great powers vying for military advantage, the region features an increasingly complex set of overlapping military-technical competitions that are accelerating tensions, adding to uncertainty and undermining stability. This dangerous military dynamic will only get worse as more disruptive military technologies appear, including the rapid diffusion of unmanned and increasingly autonomous aerial and submersible vehicles coupled with increasingly effective offensive cyberspace capabilities. Of particular concern is not only the novelty of these new technologies, but the lack of well-established norms for their use in conflict. Thankfully, the first interaction between a Chinese UAV and manned Japanese fighters passed without major incident. But it did raise serious questions that neither nation has likely considered in detail. What will constrain China's UAV incursions from becoming increasingly assertive and provocative? How will either nation respond in a scenario where an adversary downs a UAV? And what happens politically when a drone invariably falls out of the sky or "drifts off course" with both sides pointing fingers at one another? Of most concern, how would these matters be addressed during a crisis, with no precedents, in the context of a regional military regime in which actors have powerful incentives to strike first? These are not just theoretical questions: Japan's Defense Ministry is reportedly looking into options for shooting down any unmanned drones that enter its territorial airspace. Resolving these issues in a fraught strategic environment between two potential adversaries is difficult enough; the United States and China remain at loggerheads about U.S. Sensitive Reconnaissance Operations along China's periphery. But the problem is multiplying rapidly. The Chinese are running one of the most significant UAV programs in the world, a program that includes Reaper- style UAVs and Unmanned Combat Aerial Vehicles (UCAVs); Japan is seeking to acquire Global Hawks; the Republic of Korea is acquiring Global Hawks while also building their own indigenous UAV capabilities; Taiwan is choosing to develop indigenous UAVs instead of importing from abroad; Indonesia is seeking to build a UAV squadron; and Vietnam is planning to build an entire UAV factory. One could take solace in Asia's ability to manage these gnarly sources of insecurity if the region had demonstrated similar competencies elsewhere. But nothing could be further from the case. It has now been more than a decade since the Association of Southeast Asian Nations (ASEAN) and China signed a declaration "to promote a peaceful, friendly and harmonious environment in the South China Sea," which was meant to be a precursor to a code of conduct for managing potential incidents, accidents, and crises at sea. But the parties are as far apart as ever, and that's on well-trodden issues of maritime security with decades of legal and operational precedent to build upon. It's hard to be optimistic that the region will do better in an unmanned domain in which governments and militaries have little experience and where there remains a dearth of international norms, rules, and institutions from which to draw. The rapid diffusion of advanced military technology is not a future trend. These capabilities are being fielded -- right now -- in perhaps the most geopolitically dangerous area in the world, over (and soon under) the contested seas of East and Southeast Asia. These risks will only increase with time as more disruptive capabilities emerge. In the absence of political leadership, these technologies could very well lead the region into war.

#### That goes nuclear

Lowther ‘13 (William Lowther, Staff Rreporter in Washington, “Taiwan could spark nuclear war: report”, <http://www.taipeitimes.com/News/taiwan/archives/2013/03/16/2003557211>, March 16, 2013)

Taiwan is the most likely potential crisis that could trigger a nuclear war between China and the US, a new academic report concludes. “Taiwan remains the single most plausible and dangerous source of tension and conflict between the US and China,” says the 42-page report by the Washington-based Center for Strategic and International Studies (CSIS). Prepared by the CSIS’ Project on Nuclear Issues and resulting from a year-long study, the report emphasizes that Beijing continues to be set on a policy to prevent Taiwan’s independence, while at the same time the US maintains the capability to come to Taiwan’s defense. “Although tensions across the Taiwan Strait have subsided since both Taipei and Beijing embraced a policy of engagement in 2008, the situation remains combustible, complicated by rapidly diverging cross-strait military capabilities and persistent political disagreements,” the report says. In a footnote, it quotes senior fellow at the US Council on Foreign Relations Richard Betts describing Taiwan as “the main potential flashpoint for the US in East Asia.” The report also quotes Betts as saying that neither Beijing nor Washington can fully control developments that might ignite a Taiwan crisis. “This is a classic recipe for surprise, miscalculation and uncontrolled escalation,” Betts wrote in a separate study of his own. The CSIS study says: “For the foreseeable future Taiwan is the contingency in which nuclear weapons would most likely become a major factor, because the fate of the island is intertwined both with the legitimacy of the Chinese Communist Party and the reliability of US defense commitments in the Asia-Pacific region.” Titled Nuclear Weapons and US-China Relations, the study says disputes in the East and South China seas appear unlikely to lead to major conflict between China and the US, but they do “provide kindling” for potential conflict between the two nations because the disputes implicate a number of important regional interests, including the interests of treaty allies of the US. The danger posed by flashpoints such as Taiwan, the Korean Peninsula and maritime demarcation disputes is magnified by the potential for mistakes, the study says. “Although Beijing and Washington have agreed to a range of crisis management mechanisms, such as the Military Maritime Consultative Agreement and the establishment of a direct hotline between the Pentagon and the Ministry of Defense, the bases for miscommunication and misunderstanding remain and draw on deep historical reservoirs of suspicion,” the report says. For example, it says, it is unclear whether either side understands what kinds of actions would result in a military or even nuclear response by the other party. To make things worse, “neither side seems to believe the other’s declared policies and intentions, suggesting that escalation management, already a very uncertain endeavor, could be especially difficult in any conflict,” it says.

#### Law is key to modeling- only statutory restrictions scale-up

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.

### Contention {Z}: Solvency

#### Congress should restrict the use of remote controlled aerial vehicle targeted killings outside of geographic locations housing active American combat troops.

#### That solves- the executive branch being the arbiter is the problem

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 Constitutional and Counterterrorism Implications of Targeted Killing Testimony Before the Senate Judiciary Subcommittee on the Constitution, Civil Rights, and Human Rights April 23, 2013”, <http://www.lawfareblog.com/wp-content/uploads/2013/05/Brooks_05-16-13.pdf-> see the Appendix)

Here is an additional reason to worry about the U.S. overreliance on drone strikes: Other states will follow America's example, and the results are not likely to be pretty. Consider once again the Letelier murder, which was an international scandal in 1976: If the Letelier assassination took place today, the Chilean authorities would presumably insist on their national right to engage in “targeted killings” of individuals deemed to pose imminent threats to Chilean national security -- and they would justify such killings using precisely the same legal theories the U.S. currently uses to justify targeted killings in Yemen or Somalia. We should assume that governments around the world—including those with less than stellar human rights records, such as Russia and China—are taking notice. Right now, the United States has a decided technological advantage when it comes to armed drones, but that will not last long. We should use this window to advance a robust legal and normative framework that will help protect against abuses by those states whose leaders can rarely be trusted. Unfortunately, we are doing the exact opposite: Instead of articulating norms about transparency and accountability, the United States is effectively handing China, Russia, and every other repressive state a playbook for how to foment instability and –literally -- get away with murder. Take the issue of sovereignty. Sovereignty has long been a core concept of the Westphalian international legal order.79 In the international arena, all sovereign states are formally considered equal and possessed of the right to control their own internal affairs free of interference from other states. That's what we call the principle of non-intervention -- and it means, among other things, that it is generally prohibited for one state to use force inside the borders of another sovereign state. There are some well-established exceptions, but they are few in number. A state can lawfully use force inside another sovereign state with that state's invitation or consent, or when force is authorized by the U.N. Security Council, pursuant to the U.N. Charter, 80 or in self-defense "in the event of an armed attack." The 2011 Justice Department White Paper asserts that targeted killings carried out by the United States don't violate another state's sovereignty as long as that state either consents or is "unwilling or unable to suppress the threat posed by the individual being targeted." That sounds superficially plausible, but since the United States views itself as the sole arbiter of whether a state is "unwilling or unable" to suppress that threat, the logic is in fact circular. It goes like this: The United States -- using its own malleable definition of "imminent" -- decides that Person X, residing in sovereign State Y, poses a threat to the United States and requires killing. Once the United States decides that Person X can be targeted, the principle of sovereignty presents no barriers, because either 1) State Y will consent to the U.S. use of force inside its borders, in which case the use of force presents no sovereignty problems or 2) State Y will not consent to the U.S. use of force inside its borders, in which case, by definition, the United States will deem State Y to be "unwilling or unable to suppress the threat" posed by Person X and the use of force again presents no problem. This is a legal theory that more or less eviscerates traditional notions of sovereignty, and has the potential to significantly destabilize the already shaky collective security regime created by the U.N. Charter.81 If the U.S. is the sole arbiter of whether and when it can use force inside the borders of another state, any other state strong enough to get away with it is likely to claim similar prerogatives. And, of course, if the U.S. executive branch is the sole arbiter of what constitutes an imminent threat and who constitutes a targetable enemy combatant in an illdefined war, why shouldn’t other states make identical arguments—and use them to justify the killing of dissidents, rivals, or unwanted minorities?

#### 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.
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#### Outraged now – Iran and Syria

WSJ 9/29 (Wall Street Journal, U.S. Moves on Syria, Iran Anger Saudi Arabia, <http://online.wsj.com/article/SB10001424052702303643304579104910000148876.html>, September 29, 2013)

The Obama administration's handling of overtures on Syria and Iran have outraged regional ally Saudi Arabia, which is signaling it wants to do more to boost the power of armed Sunni rebel groups on the ground in Syria as the U.S. pursues diplomacy. Saudis fear that Syrian President Basher al-Assad will use the time afforded by U.S.- and U.N.-backed diplomacy on Syria "to impose more killing and to torture its people," Saudi Foreign Minister Saud al-Faisal said Thursday night in New York, in a warning that was overshadowed by the attention paid to the weekend's first public contacts in three decades between the presidents of Iran and the U.S. Accordingly, Saudi Arabia wants "intensification of political, economic and military support to the Syrian opposition…. to change the balance of powers on the ground" in Syria, Prince Saud said in his remarks to the Friends of Syria group, a coalition of Western and Gulf Arab countries and Turkey that supports the Syria opposition against Mr. Assad. The state-run Saudi Press Agency carried a transcript of his remarks. The Saudi government has had no public comment so far on the groundbreaking phone call Friday between U.S. President Barack Obama, whose country Saudi Arabia sees as the main military protector of its interests, and new Iranian President Hasan Rouhani, whose country Saudi Arabia sees as its main threat. Asharq al Awsat, one of Saudi Arabia's leading newspapers, led its front page the morning after the phone call with a photo of Mr. Rouhani, bowed over with laughter. The Saudi foreign minister's declaration is significant because Saudi Arabia, while one of the main suppliers of Syria's predominately Sunni opposition, up to now has heeded U.S. fears throughout the conflict that aid to Syrian rebels could strengthen armed, anti-Western Sunni factions. Shiite Muslim Iran backs Mr. Assad in the Syrian conflict, while most Sunni Muslim-ruled Gulf Arab states support the rebels fighting to overthrow Mr. Assad. Saudi Arabia, for example, long held off on supplying Stinger-style missiles to Syrian rebels because of U.S. worries the missiles could be used against Western targets, security analysts briefed by Saudi officials say. Saudi Arabia increased pressure on the U.S. to allow arming the rebels with antiaircraft weapons this summer, as larger numbers of Hezbollah fighters entered the conflict on the side of Mr. Assad's regime. Saudis now feel that the Obama administration is disregarding Saudi concerns over Iran and Syria, and will respond accordingly in ignoring "U.S. interests, U.S. wishes, U.S. issues" in Syria, said Mustafa Alani, a veteran Saudi security analyst with the Geneva-based Gulf Research Center. "They are going to be upset—we can live with that," Mr. Alani said Sunday of the Obama administration. "We are learning from our enemies now how to treat the United States."

#### Drones irrelevant- Defense cooperation inevitable

Ryan ’13 (Patrick W. Ryan, SUSRIS, “Drone Basing Revelation Underscores Strong Defense and Security Bonds”, <http://susris.com/2013/02/07/drone-basing-revelation-underscores-strong-defense-and-security-bonds/>, February 7, 2013)

The strength of the defense and security relationship between the United States and Saudi Arabia was highlighted this week with new reports about expanded cooperation in countering Al Qaeda in the Arabian Peninsula (AQAP) militants through the use of armed, remotely piloted aircraft based in the Kingdom. The information, which had been protected by several media outlets, came out as long simmering criticism of the strategy, tactics and legality of using U.S. drones to attack terrorists, especially American citizens among them, came to a head with disclosure of a secret Justice Department memo and in anticipation of today’s confirmation hearing for White House counter terror advisor John Brennan to be Director of the CIA. Brennan, who previously served as CIA station chief in Riyadh, is the principal US official behind the secretive drone program that has become a main element of the American war against Al Qaeda. “…[American officials] describe an arrangement that has evolved since the frantic, ad hoc early days of America’s war [in Yemen]. The first strike in Yemen ordered by the Obama administration, in December 2009, was by all accounts a disaster. American cruise missiles carrying cluster munitions killed dozens of civilians, including many women and children. Another strike, six months later, killed a popular deputy governor, inciting angry demonstrations and an attack that shut down a critical oil pipeline. Not long afterward, the C.I.A. began quietly building a drone base in Saudi Arabia to carry out strikes in Yemen. American officials said that the first time the C.I.A. used the Saudi base was to kill Mr. Awlaki in September 2011…” [Drone Strikes’ Risks to Get Rare Moment in the Public Eye – NYTimes.com] The New York Times and Washington Post broke their self-imposed silence to discuss the drone basing arrangement. It was reported as early as 2011 by the Washington Post but the role of Saudi Arabia was subsequently protected. This week Washington Post blogger Erik Wemple assembled an insightful report on the “informal arrangement” among media – The New York Times, The Washington Post and AP – and the U.S. Government to protect the location of the Arabian Peninsula drone base. Wemple blogged yesterday that Washington Post reporters Greg Miller and Karen DeYoung provided background on the disclosure: “The Washington Post had refrained from disclosing the location at the request of the administration, which cited concern that exposing the facility would undermine operations against an al-Qaeda affiliate regarded as the network’s most potent threat to the United States, as well as potentially damage counterterrorism collaboration with Saudi Arabia.” However, Miller reported, with Craig Whitlock, in the Washington Post in September 2011, that, “The CIA is building a secret airstrip in the Arabian Peninsula so it can deploy armed drones over Yemen.” Other media were providing similar reports in 2011 including the Times (UK): “The CIA has set up a network of secret drone bases in Arab states in a major intensification of its campaign against al-Qaeda militants in Yemen. Sources in the Gulf say that the agency is now massed along Yemen’s borders, launching daily missions with unmanned Predator aircraft from bases in Saudi Arabia, Oman, Djibouti and the United Arab Emirates.” The current controversy is centered on the Obama Administration’s targeting of Americans using armed drones, especially in light of the leaked Justice Department memo. The case in question is the 2011 drone attack in Yemen that killed Anwar Awlaki, a US citizen who became a key Al Qaeda leader. That attack was the first lethal use of a Saudi-based American drone according to US officials cited by The New York Times. A Legacy of Engagement Apart from the U.S. domestic controversy, the report of Saudi cooperation with US counter terrorism efforts is consistent with the long history of collaboration between the partners in the areas of defense and security. It stretches back to the earliest days of the relationship and forms a key element of Riyadh-Washington ties. Defense cooperation in the earlier days of the relationship were built on understandings such as the Truman pledge of 1950, that was carried forward by subsequent administrations, noted Ambassador Parker Hart, in his book “Saudi Arabia and the United States: Birth of a Security Partnership”: “Faisal and Kennedy had but one encounter, on October 5, 1962. They never again met face-to-face. Nonetheless, the indelible impression each made upon the other was positive… …Kennedy reaffirmed the Truman pledge of 1950 that any threat to the independence and integrity of Saudi Arabia would be a matter of deep and immediate concern to the US government, which would take measures to counter such a threat.” Defense and security cooperation continued in many spheres including the U.S. commitment to military assistance – arms sales, logistics support, and training – across the board in ground, naval and air forces. These included creation of the US Military Training Mission to work with Saudi armed forces and the Office of the Program Manager to work with the Saudi Arabian National Guard. In more recent years the U.S. has supported creation of the OPM-FSF, the Facilities Security Force, a 35,000-man force to provide additional protection to internal infrastructure in the Kingdom. There was, of course, no greater example of the cooperation, coordination and commitment between the United States and Saudi Arabia than the deployment of a half million American soldiers, sailors, airmen and marines to the Kingdom in 1990 as part of the Operation Desert Shield coalition, deterring Saddam Hussein from extending his invasion of Kuwait into the Eastern Province, and the subsequent fighting alongside one another in Operation Desert Storm to reverse Iraqi aggression. In the aftermath of the Gulf war Saudi Arabia hosted an American air wing in Dhahran and joint task force headquarters near Riyadh to enforce UN resolutions in the Iraqi “No-Fly Zone” and check further Iraqi moves. In 1996 the U.S. air elements were relocated to Prince Sultan Airbase at Al Kharj where they remained until the invasion and occupation of Iraq in 2003 ended the mission requirement for operational U.S. air units in the Kingdom. The military to military engagement and cooperation was summed up by Dr. Anthony Cordesman, Arleigh Burke Chair in Strategy at the Center for Strategic and International Studies, in an exclusive interview with SUSRIS in 2004 (“Why Reforge the U.S. and Saudi Relationship? An Interview with Anthony Cordesman”): “We do need to recognize that the U.S. troop presence in Saudi Arabia, which was essentially dominated by air forces, with a limited presence of Patriot surface-to-air missiles, was a source of serious debate and to some extent instability within Saudi Arabia. It was one of the cardinal arguments made by extremists. “It is a fact that the United States did not ever reach an agreement to have bases in Saudi Arabia and went into Saudi Arabia basically to defend it and to liberate Kuwait. But, we have to bear in mind the fact that when the Iraq War occurred, Saudi Arabia did provide a great deal of cooperation with the United States. It allowed U.S. Special Forces units to operate out of Arar. While U.S. troops and their units were no longer operating actively in the country they still flew other kinds of support missions extensively during the Iraq War. The command and control for some of these that the U.S. created outside Riyadh were used to a great degree. There was airborne refueling and overflight rights. Basically, while Saudi Arabia did not allow the U.S. to use its bases formally, it cooperated virtually in every other way. “Now, today, the United States has no combat forces in Saudi Arabia, but it still plays a vital advisory role. Saudi Arabia uses U.S. military equipment. A lot of that equipment is still in delivery or is still being absorbed by Saudi forces. Saudi Arabia would find much of that equipment impossible to use if it could not make use of U.S. military advice. It needs the kind of expertise that the U.S. can provide to improve its training standards, to improve its readiness and to move its forces forward to become the kind of forces that can actively defend the Kingdom. It also has good reason to see the U.S. presence in Bahrain, Kuwait, Qatar, and Oman as a basic shield between Saudi Arabia and Iran, which seems to be acquiring nuclear weapons and as a way of protecting the Kingdom if Iraq does not move forward towards a more stable and more friendly state. “These are realities where the Kingdom benefits from the U.S. role, and the U.S. obviously benefits from the stability of Saudi Arabia and the knowledge that in an emergency the cooperation we saw in the Iraq War would probably be repeated again. “But, it doesn’t mean that the United States has to have an active military presence in Saudi Arabia in essentially peacetime or that we need to go back to the kind of relationships we had immediately after the Gulf War. Saddam Hussein’s Iraq was one of the largest military powers in the developing world. Iraqi military forces, despite all that happened in the Gulf War, totalled hundreds of thousands of men, and they still had very large armored forces and a very large number of combat aircraft. The fact that threat is gone has helped, but for all the reasons I’ve outlined earlier, it’s scarcely eliminated every threat that calls for U.S. and Saudi cooperation.” The secrecy surrounding the drone basing arrangement points to the obvious sensitivity of intelligence and counter terrorism work but also the penchant for Riyadh to avoid the limelight in taking credit for support. In the case of intelligence cooperation, “The Kingdom has been cooperating with the United States for decades,” according to Prince Turki Al Faisal, former Director of Saudi Intelligence in an exclusive SUSRIS interview in 2010. US-Saudi collaboration over activities in Yemen is not a new feature of the relationship as evidenced by the reference he made without getting too specific: “Yemen, which is in the news lately, was a perfect example. Back at the time South Yemen was a Marxist regime under the guidance of the Soviets it was doing harm in North Yemen. In those days there was the exchange of information on both sides that helped in certain instances prevent or overcome or challenge some of the difficulties that were on both sides, whether it was Saudi interests that were being affected, or American interests. Al Qaeda regional leader Anwar Awlaki was an American citizen killed by a drone strike in Yemen in 2011. The need to bring counterterrorism cooperation to bear in the case of Yemen may be due in part to the successes both the United States and Saudi Arabia have had in their individual battles against Al Qaeda. The U.S. Operation Enduring Freedom, the post-9/11 war on terrorism, was successful in dislodging and disrupting Al Qaeda in Afghanistan and elsewhere in Southwest Asia. The Saudi counterterrorism program launched in response to Al Qaeda’s campaign in the Kingdom that began in 2003 has also been successful in quashing the threat inside the borders. The result was that Al Qaeda regrouped in an unstable Yemen and has since constituted a threat to Saudi Arabia and to the United States. In May 2012 U.S. Assistant Secretary of State for Near Eastern Affairs Jeffrey Feltman told a Congressional committee, “…bringing political stability to Yemen is critical in the fight against Al Qaeda in the Arabian Peninsula (AQAP). Last year’s political crisis allowed AQAP to seize territory in southern Yemen, attract new recruits, and expand its presence. We will continue to provide security and counterterrorism support to combat the common threat of violent extremism…” In 2009 Al Qaeda in the Arabian Peninsula, which remained the backbone of militant threats against the Kingdom, launched an assassination attempt against Prince Mohammed bin Nayef, then a senior official in the Interior Ministry. He was named Interior Minister in November 2012. In 2011 the Saudi Embassy in Washington summarized counterterrorism cooperation between the U.S. and the Kingdom up to that point: Saudi Arabia and the U.S. have established two Joint Task Forces—one to combat terrorists, another to combat terror financing. Experts from both governments work side-by-side, sharing real-time information about terror networks. The Saudi government has increased the size, training and professionalism of its security forces, which are now seasoned by direct experience in Saudi Arabia. Saudi security forces have trained alongside American counterterrorism forces in the U.S. This experience and training has led to the arrest and conviction of hundreds of wanted terrorists and the destruction of most of the known terrorist cells in the Kingdom. The Saudi-U.S. Strategic Dialogue, a counterterrorism working group created following September 11, 2001, continues to help ensure the governments’ efforts and resources are aligned. This year, Custodian of the Two Holy Mosques King Abdullah bin Abdulaziz Al-Saud met with U.S. Assistant to the President for Homeland Security and Counterterrorism John Brennan while President Obama met with the Assistant Minister of Interior for Security Affairs Prince Mohammad bin Nayef bin Abdulaziz. These visits are part of ongoing consultations and exchange of views between the two countries. In October 2010, Saudi intelligence provided key information to American officials that foiled an attempted terrorist plot involving bombs heading to the United States that originated in Yemen. The bombs were found and defused before reaching their targets. To that list is added the successful interdiction by Saudi intelligence assets of an attack against the U.S. launched from Al Qaeda in Yemen last year. In that case an improved version of the infamous “underwear bomb” was to be used against a U.S. bound aircraft, but the attack was thwarted by a Saudi-born double agent. The earlier effort, the unsuccessful 2009 Christmas Day “underwear bomb” attack by Nigerian citizen Umar Farouk Abdulmutallab, is believed to have been aided by AQAP’s Anwar Awlaki, the first target of a Saudi-based American drone strike. The recent news reports that American remotely operated aircraft are operating against Al Qaeda targets in Yemen should come as no surprise to those who have followed the close collaboration between the United States and Saudi Arabia over the course of the historic relationship. The revelations may be uncomfortable to those who seek to keep these sensitive operations under wraps but the disclosure underscores the importance of the defense and security cooperation measures between Washington and Riyadh.

## Warfighting

### 1NC

#### Syria thumps their impact

Alterman 9/4 (Jon B. Alterman holds the Zbigniew Brzezinski Chair in Global Security and Geostrategy and directs the Middle East program at the Center for Strategic and International Studies (CSIS). Prior to joining CSIS in 2002, he served as a member of the Policy Planning staff at the US Department of State and as a special assistant to the assistant secretary of state for Near Eastern affairs. In addition to his policy work, he teaches Middle Eastern studies at the Johns Hopkins School of Advanced International Studies and George Washington University, ‘US-Iran Nuclear Deal Hinges”, <http://www.al-monitor.com/pulse/originals/2013/09/us-iran-nuclear-deal-hinges-on-syria-vote.html>, September 4, 2013)

Many have pointed out that the Iranian government is watching closely what the Barack Obama administration does in Syria. With the president having declared a year ago that the Syrian government’s use of chemical weapons “would be a game changer,” the Iranian government wonders what the new game will be. It does so not only out of interest in its clients in Syria, but more important, to judge what Obama’s reaction might be if Iran acquires a nuclear weapons capability, which the president has declared as another red line. Focusing solely on events in Syria, however, misses a large part of the Iranian calculus, if not the largest. What really matters to Iran is how successful Obama is in winning congressional support for his Syria policy. If he fails, it will deal a double blow to the president. Not only will the Iranian government dismiss the possibility of negotiations with his administration, it will also conclude that Obama can be defied with impunity. The international cost of domestic political failure would be profound. To start, it is worth noting the extent to which foreign governments are sophisticated consumers of American political information. Decades of international cable news broadcasts and newspaper websites have brought intimate details of US politics into global capitals. Foreign ministers in the Middle East and beyond are US news junkies, and they seem increasingly distrustful of their embassies. For key US allies, the foreign minister often seems to have made him- or herself the US desk officer. Most can have a quite sophisticated discussion on congressional politics and their impact on US foreign relations. The Iranian government is no exception. While former president Mahmoud Ahmedinejad was emotional and shrill in his opposition to the United States, there remains in Iran a cadre of Western-trained technocrats, fluent in English and nuanced in their understanding of the world. President Hassan Rouhani has surrounded himself with such people, and Supreme Leader Ayatollah Ali Khamenei has charged them with investigating a different relationship between Iran and the United States. As they do so, they cannot help but be aware that on the eve of Rouhani’s inauguration, the US House of Representatives voted 400–20 to impose stiff additional sanctions on Iran. The House saw Rouhani’s electoral victory as a call for toughness, not potential compromise. If Iran were to make concessions in a negotiation with the United States, they would surely seek sanctions relief and other actions requiring congressional approval. To make such concessions to Obama, they would need some confidence that he can deliver. A president who cannot bring around a hostile Congress is not a president with whom it is worth negotiating. In this respect, Syria is a dry run for Obama's lobbying ability on foreign policy. Until now, his record with Congress has been checkered. Congressional representatives complain that the White House has given them the cold shoulder time after time, and there seems to be little warmth between the president and his former colleagues in the legislature. Persuading Congress to back a military action that the majority of the public opposes will require presidential charm, pressure, and a good measure of buttonholing and jawboning. Based on his past performance, Obama appears to be neither a joyful nor an especially skillful practitioner of these political arts. As difficult as it is for Obama to persuade Congress to fight another battle in the Middle East, it would be even more difficult to persuade it to accept a negotiated deal with Iran. Suspicions about Iran run deep in the United States, as well as among many US allies in the Middle East. Should the White House decide to focus principally on the president’s domestic legacy, it may seem less costly to deter Iran and maintain that no clear nuclear threshold has been crossed than to sell a deal to a skeptical Congress. That would then put the onus on Iran to make any approach to the United States sufficiently attractive to gain the president’s attention. Iranians will surely view a demonstration of the president’s inability to bring Congress along on Syria as a sign that there is no hope of his delivering Congress on Iran. US-Iranian negotiations, surely in the offing for later this year, would be stillborn. There is, however, an even more stark consequence of Obama losing the Syria vote in Congress. Should the White House, with its immense power and prestige, fail to build sufficient support, leaders around the world will conclude that this president can be defied with impunity. If he cannot win the support of those close to him, what hope does he have of winning over those at a distance? The consequence here would be a combination of much more difficult diplomacy and even more bad behavior around the world that requires diplomacy to address. Hard-liners in Iran and their allies around the Middle East would certainly be emboldened, and regional states would be far less likely to rely on US cues in managing their own issues. Arab-Israeli negotiations, as well, would be dealt a fundamental blow, as each party would retreat to its own maximal position. China, Russia and a host of other countries are watching closely as well. Whether seeking congressional approval for military action against Syria was the right decision, it is a gambit President Obama cannot afford to lose. What he has done is raise the stakes, not only for the remaining years of his presidency, but also for the US role in the world. For a president who has sought to end unnecessary US entanglements in the Middle East, his entire foreign policy legacy hinges on persuading Congress that one more entanglement is necessary. If he cannot do that, the results will resound for years to come.

#### They’re irrelevant

Ingersoll ‘12 (Geoffrey Ingersoll, “Today's Unmanned Aerial Vehicles Will Be Totally Useless In The Pacific Theater”, December 7, 2012)

The vast fleet of military drones the Pentagon has at its disposal will likely be worth very little in the Pacific, against more advanced, capable enemies, according to a report by Dave Majumdar of the site Flight Global. "We are now shifting to a theatre where there is an adversary out there who is going to have a vote on whether I have that staring eye over the battlefield 24[hours], seven [days a week], 365 [days a year], and pretty certain they are not going to allow that to happen," says Gen Mike Hostage, commander of Air Combat Command, speaking at the Center for Strategic and International Studies (CSIS). That "vote" is a reference to the capabilities of potential enemies in that area of operations. Majumdar notes that "a drawdown is all but inevitable" and that these unused drones will have "to be parked" somewhere — in all likelihood here at home, parked in the skies.

#### The president himself is inept- doesn’t act alone to begin with

Wehner ’13 (Peter Wehner, “Barack Obama’s Staggering Incompetence”, <http://www.commentarymagazine.com/2013/09/02/barack-obamas-staggering-incompetence/>, September 2, 2013)

It’s reported that President Obama was ready to order a military strike against Syria, with or without Congress’s blessing, but “on Friday night, he suddenly changed his mind.” According to the Huffington Post: Senior administration officials describing Obama’s about-face Saturday offered a portrait of a president who began to wrestle with his own decision – at first internally, then confiding his views to his chief of staff, and finally summoning his aides for an evening session in the Oval Office to say he’d had a change of heart. In light of all this, it’s worth posing a few questions: 1. Why didn’t the president seek congressional authority before the administration began to beat the war drums this past week? Did the idea not occur to him? It’s not as if this is an obscure issue. When you’re in the White House and preparing to launch military force against a sovereign nation, whether or not to seek the approval of Congress is usually somewhere near the top of the to-do list. And why has the urgency to act that we saw from the administration during the last week–when Assad’s use of chemical weapons was referred to by the secretary of state as a “moral obscenity”–given way to an air of casualness, with Obama not even calling Congress back into session to debate his military strike against Syria? 2. The president didn’t seek congressional approval for his military strike in Libya. Why does he believe he needs it in Syria? 3. Mr. Obama, in his Rose Garden statement on Saturday, still insisted he has the authority to strike Syria without congressional approval. So what happens if Congress votes down a use-of-force resolution? Does the president strike Syria anyway? If so, will it be an evanescent bombing, intended to be limited in scope and duration, while doing nothing to change the war’s balance of power? Or does the president completely back down? Does he even know? Has he thought through in advance anything related to Syria? Or is this a case of Obama simply making it up as he goes along? This latest volte-face by the president is evidence of a man who is completely overmatched by events, weak and confused, and deeply ambivalent about using force. Yet he’s also desperate to get out of the corner he painted himself into by declaring that the use of chemical weapons by the Assad regime would constitute a “red line.” As a result he’s gone all Hamlet on us. Not surprisingly, Obama’s actions are being mocked by America’s enemies and sowing doubt among our allies. (Read this New York Times story for more.) What explains this debacle? It’s impossible for us to know all the reasons, but one explanation appears to be a CYA operation. According to Politico, “At the very least, Obama clearly wants lawmakers to co-own a decision that he can’t back away from after having declared last year that Assad would cross a ‘red line’ if he used chemical weapons against his own people.” And the Washington Post reports: Obama’s proposal to invite Congress dominated the Friday discussion in the Oval Office. He had consulted almost no one about his idea. In the end, the president made clear he wanted Congress to share in the responsibility for what happens in Syria. As one aide put it, “We don’t want them to have their cake and eat it, too.” Get it? The president of the United States is preparing in advance to shift the blame if his strike on Syria proves to be unpopular and ineffective. He’s furious about the box he’s placed himself in, he hates the ridicule he’s (rightly) incurring, but he doesn’t see any way out. What he does see is a political (and geopolitical) disaster in the making. And so what is emerging is what comes most naturally to Mr. Obama: Blame shifting and blame sharing. Remember: the president doesn’t believe he needs congressional authorization to act. He’s ignored it before. He wants it now. For reasons of political survival. To put it another way: He wants the fingerprints of others on the failure in Syria. Rarely has an American president joined so much cynicism with so much ineptitude.

#### The squo is reverse proliferating- no impact

Kahl et. al 13 (Colin H., Senior Fellow at the Center for a New American Security and an associate professor in the Security Studies Program at Georgetown University’s Edmund A. Walsh School of Foreign Service, Melissa G. Dalton, Visiting Fellow at the Center for a New American Security, Matthew Irvine, Research Associate at the Center for a New American Security, February, “If Iran Builds the Bomb, Will Saudi Arabia Be Next?” <http://www.cnas.org/files/documents/publications/CNAS_AtomicKingdom_Kahl.pdf>, 2013)

\*\*\*cites Jacques Hymans, USC Associate Professor of IR\*\*\*

I I I . LESSONS FRO M HISTOR Y Concerns over “regional proliferation chains,” “falling nuclear dominos” and “nuclear tipping points” are nothing new; indeed, reactive proliferation fears date back to the dawn of the nuclear age.14 Warnings of an inevitable deluge of proliferation were commonplace from the 1950s to the 1970s, resurfaced during the discussion of “rogue states” in the 1990s and became even more ominous after 9/11.15 In 2004, for example, Mitchell Reiss warned that “in ways both fast and slow, we may very soon be approaching a nuclear ‘tipping point,’ where many countries may decide to acquire nuclear arsenals on short notice, thereby triggering a proliferation epidemic.” Given the presumed fragility of the nuclear nonproliferation regime and the ready supply of nuclear expertise, technology and material, Reiss argued, “a single new entrant into the nuclear club could catalyze similar responses by others in the region, with the Middle East and Northeast Asia the most likely candidates.”16 Nevertheless, predictions of inevitable proliferation cascades have historically proven false (see The Proliferation Cascade Myth text box). In the six decades since atomic weapons were first developed, nuclear restraint has proven far more common than nuclear proliferation, and cases of reactive proliferation have been exceedingly rare. Moreover, most countries that have started down the nuclear path have found the road more difficult than imagined, both technologically and bureaucratically, leading the majority of nuclear-weapons aspirants to reverse course. Thus, despite frequent warnings of an unstoppable “nuclear express,”17 William Potter and Gaukhar Mukhatzhanova astutely note that the “train to date has been slow to pick up steam, has made fewer stops than anticipated, and usually has arrived much later than expected.”18 None of this means that additional proliferation in response to Iran’s nuclear ambitions is inconceivable, but the empirical record does suggest that regional chain reactions are not inevitable. Instead, only certain countries are candidates for reactive proliferation. Determining the risk that any given country in the Middle East will proliferate in response to Iranian nuclearization requires an assessment of the incentives and disincentives for acquiring a nuclear deterrent, the technical and bureaucratic constraints and the available strategic alternatives. Incentives and Disincentives to Proliferate Security considerations, status and reputational concerns and the prospect of sanctions combine to shape the incentives and disincentives for states to pursue nuclear weapons. Analysts predicting proliferation cascades tend to emphasize the incentives for reactive proliferation while ignoring or downplaying the disincentives. Yet, as it turns out, instances of nuclear proliferation (including reactive proliferation) have been so rare because going down this road often risks insecurity, reputational damage and economic costs that outweigh the potential benefits.19 Security and regime survival are especially important motivations driving state decisions to proliferate. All else being equal, if a state’s leadership believes that a nuclear deterrent is required to address an acute security challenge, proliferation is more likely.20 Countries in conflict-prone neighborhoods facing an “enduring rival”– especially countries with inferior conventional military capabilities vis-à-vis their opponents or those that face an adversary that possesses or is seeking nuclear weapons – may be particularly prone to seeking a nuclear deterrent to avert aggression.21 A recent quantitative study by Philipp Bleek, for example, found that security threats, as measured by the frequency and intensity of conventional militarized disputes, were highly correlated with decisions to launch nuclear weapons programs and eventually acquire the bomb.22 The Proliferation Cascade Myth Despite repeated warnings since the dawn of the nuclear age of an inevitable deluge of nuclear proliferation, such fears have thus far proven largely unfounded. Historically, nuclear restraint is the rule, not the exception – and the degree of restraint has actually increased over time. In the first two decades of the nuclear age, five nuclear-weapons states emerged: the United States (1945), the Soviet Union (1949), the United Kingdom (1952), France (1960) and China (1964). However, in the nearly 50 years since China developed nuclear weapons, only four additional countries have entered (and remained in) the nuclear club: Israel (allegedly in 1967), India (“peaceful” nuclear test in 1974, acquisition in late-1980s, test in 1998), Pakistan (acquisition in late-1980s, test in 1998) and North Korea (test in 2006).23 This significant slowdown in the pace of proliferation occurred despite the widespread dissemination of nuclear know-how and the fact that the number of states with the technical and industrial capability to pursue nuclear weapons programs has significantly increased over time.24 Moreover, in the past 20 years, several states have either given up their nuclear weapons (South Africa and the Soviet successor states Belarus, Kazakhstan and Ukraine) or ended their highly developed nuclear weapons programs (e.g., Argentina, Brazil and Libya).25 Indeed, by one estimate, 37 countries have pursued nuclear programs with possible weaponsrelated dimensions since 1945, yet the overwhelming number chose to abandon these activities before they produced a bomb. Over time, the number of nuclear reversals has grown while the number of states initiating programs with possible military dimensions has markedly declined.26 Furthermore – especially since the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty (NPT) went into force in 1970 – reactive proliferation has been exceedingly rare. The NPT has near-universal membership among the community of nations; only India, Israel, Pakistan and North Korea currently stand outside the treaty. Yet the actual and suspected acquisition of nuclear weapons by these outliers has not triggered widespread reactive proliferation in their respective neighborhoods. Pakistan followed India into the nuclear club, and the two have engaged in a vigorous arms race, but Pakistani nuclearization did not spark additional South Asian states to acquire nuclear weapons. Similarly, the North Korean bomb did not lead South Korea, Japan or other regional states to follow suit.27 In the Middle East, no country has successfully built a nuclear weapon in the four decades since Israel allegedly built its first nuclear weapons. Egypt took initial steps toward nuclearization in the 1950s and then expanded these efforts in the late 1960s and 1970s in response to Israel’s presumed capabilities. However, Cairo then ratified the NPT in 1981 and abandoned its program.28 Libya, Iraq and Iran all pursued nuclear weapons capabilities, but only Iran’s program persists and none of these states initiated their efforts primarily as a defensive response to Israel’s presumed arsenal.29 Sometime in the 2000s, Syria also appears to have initiated nuclear activities with possible military dimensions, including construction of a covert nuclear reactor near al-Kibar, likely enabled by North Korean assistance.30 (An Israeli airstrike destroyed the facility in 2007.31) The motivations for Syria’s activities remain murky, but the nearly 40-year lag between Israel’s alleged development of the bomb and Syria’s actions suggests that reactive proliferation was not the most likely cause. Finally, even countries that start on the nuclear path have found it very difficult, and exceedingly time consuming, to reach the end. Of the 10 countries that launched nuclear weapons projects after 1970, only three (Pakistan, North Korea and South Africa) succeeded; one (Iran) remains in progress, and the rest failed or were reversed.32 The successful projects have also generally needed much more time than expected to finish. According to Jacques Hymans, the average time required to complete a nuclear weapons program has increased from seven years prior to 1970 to about 17 years after 1970, even as the hardware, knowledge and industrial base required for proliferation has expanded to more and more countries.33 Yet throughout the nuclear age, many states with potential security incentives to develop nuclear weapons have nevertheless abstained from doing so.34 Moreover, contrary to common expectations, recent statistical research shows that states with an enduring rival that possesses or is pursuing nuclear weapons are not more likely than other states to launch nuclear weapons programs or go all the way to acquiring the bomb, although they do seem more likely to explore nuclear weapons options.35 This suggests that a rival’s acquisition of nuclear weapons does not inevitably drive proliferation decisions. One reason that reactive proliferation is not an automatic response to a rival’s acquisition of nuclear arms is the fact that security calculations can cut in both directions. Nuclear weapons might deter outside threats, but leaders have to weigh these potential gains against the possibility that seeking nuclear weapons would make the country or regime less secure by triggering a regional arms race or a preventive attack by outside powers. Countries also have to consider the possibility that pursuing nuclear weapons will produce strains in strategic relationships with key allies and security patrons. If a state’s leaders conclude that their overall security would decrease by building a bomb, they are not likely to do so.36 Moreover, although security considerations are often central, they are rarely sufficient to motivate states to develop nuclear weapons. Scholars have noted the importance of other factors, most notably the perceived effects of nuclear weapons on a country’s relative status and influence.37 Empirically, the most highly motivated states seem to be those with leaders that simultaneously believe a nuclear deterrent is essential to counter an existential threat and view nuclear weapons as crucial for maintaining or enhancing their international status and influence. Leaders that see their country as naturally at odds with, and naturally equal or superior to, a threatening external foe appear to be especially prone to pursuing nuclear weapons.38 Thus, as Jacques Hymans argues, extreme levels of fear and pride often “combine to produce a very strong tendency to reach for the bomb.”39 Yet here too, leaders contemplating acquiring nuclear weapons have to balance the possible increase to their prestige and influence against the normative and reputational costs associated with violating the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty (NPT). If a country’s leaders fully embrace the principles and norms embodied in the NPT, highly value positive diplomatic relations with Western countries and see membership in the “community of nations” as central to their national interests and identity, they are likely to worry that developing nuclear weapons would damage (rather than bolster) their reputation and influence, and thus they will be less likely to go for the bomb.40 In contrast, countries with regimes or ruling coalitions that embrace an ideology that rejects the Western dominated international order and prioritizes national self-reliance and autonomy from outside interference seem more inclined toward proliferation regardless of whether they are signatories to the NPT.41 Most countries appear to fall in the former category, whereas only a small number of “rogue” states fit the latter. According to one count, before the NPT went into effect, more than 40 percent of states with the economic resources to pursue nuclear programs with potential military applications did so, and very few renounced those programs. Since the inception of the nonproliferation norm in 1970, however, only 15 percent of economically capable states have started such programs, and nearly 70 percent of all states that had engaged in such activities gave them up.42 The prospect of being targeted with economic sanctions by powerful states is also likely to factor into the decisions of would-be proliferators. Although sanctions alone proved insufficient to dissuade Iraq, North Korea and (thus far) Iran from violating their nonproliferation obligations under the NPT, this does not necessarily indicate that sanctions are irrelevant. A potential proliferator’s vulnerability to sanctions must be considered. All else being equal, the more vulnerable a state’s economy is to external pressure, the less likely it is to pursue nuclear weapons. A comparison of states in East Asia and the Middle East that have pursued nuclear weapons with those that have not done so suggests that countries with economies that are highly integrated into the international economic system – especially those dominated by ruling coalitions that seek further integration – have historically been less inclined to pursue nuclear weapons than those with inward-oriented economies and ruling coalitions.43 A state’s vulnerability to sanctions matters, but so too does the leadership’s assessment regarding the probability that outside powers would actually be willing to impose sanctions. Some would-be proliferators can be easily sanctioned because their exclusion from international economic transactions creates few downsides for sanctioning states. In other instances, however, a state may be so vital to outside powers – economically or geopolitically – that it is unlikely to be sanctioned regardless of NPT violations. Technical and Bureaucratic Constraints In addition to motivation to pursue the bomb, a state must have the technical and bureaucratic wherewithal to do so. This capability is partly a function of wealth. Richer and more industrialized states can develop nuclear weapons more easily than poorer and less industrial ones can; although as Pakistan and North Korea demonstrate, cash-strapped states can sometimes succeed in developing nuclear weapons if they are willing to make enormous sacrifices.44 A country’s technical know-how and the sophistication of its civilian nuclear program also help determine the ease and speed with which it can potentially pursue the bomb. The existence of uranium deposits and related mining activity, civilian nuclear power plants, nuclear research reactors and laboratories and a large cadre of scientists and engineers trained in relevant areas of chemistry and nuclear physics may give a country some “latent” capability to eventually produce nuclear weapons. Mastery of the fuel-cycle – the ability to enrich uranium or produce, separate and reprocess plutonium – is particularly important because this is the essential pathway whereby states can indigenously produce the fissile material required to make a nuclear explosive device.45 States must also possess the bureaucratic capacity and managerial culture to successfully complete a nuclear weapons program. Hymans convincingly argues that many recent would-be proliferators have weak state institutions that permit, or even encourage, rulers to take a coercive, authoritarian management approach to their nuclear programs. This approach, in turn, politicizes and ultimately undermines nuclear projects by gutting the autonomy and professionalism of the very scientists, experts and organizations needed to successfully build the bomb.46 Alternative Sources of Nuclear Deterrence Historically, the availability of credible security guarantees by outside nuclear powers has provided a potential alternative means for acquiring a nuclear deterrent without many of the risks and costs associated with developing an indigenous nuclear weapons capability. As Bruno Tertrais argues, nearly all the states that developed nuclear weapons since 1949 either lacked a strong guarantee from a superpower (India, Pakistan and South Africa) or did not consider the superpower’s protection to be credible (China, France, Israel and North Korea). Many other countries known to have pursued nuclear weapons programs also lacked security guarantees (e.g., Argentina, Brazil, Egypt, Indonesia, Iraq, Libya, Switzerland and Yugoslavia) or thought they were unreliable at the time they embarked on their programs (e.g., Taiwan). In contrast, several potential proliferation candidates appear to have abstained from developing the bomb at least partly because of formal or informal extended deterrence guarantees from the United States (e.g., Australia, Germany, Japan, Norway, South Korea and Sweden).47 All told, a recent quantitative assessment by Bleek finds that security assurances have empirically significantly reduced proliferation proclivity among recipient countries.48 Therefore, if a country perceives that a security guarantee by the United States or another nuclear power is both available and credible, it is less likely to pursue nuclear weapons in reaction to a rival developing them. This option is likely to be particularly attractive to states that lack the indigenous capability to develop nuclear weapons, as well as states that are primarily motivated to acquire a nuclear deterrent by security factors (as opposed to status-related motivations) but are wary of the negative consequences of proliferation.

### Addon- Bioweapons (AQAP)

Al Qaeda is developing nuclear and biological weapons

Heidi Blake et al**.** is an investigative reporter for The Daily Telegraph. She was nominated for Young Journalist of the Year and Scoop of the Year in the 2010 British Press Awards Daily Telegraph, “WikiLeaks: al-Qaeda 'is planning a dirty bomb'”, February 2011, <http://www.telegraph.co.uk/news/worldnews/wikileaks/8296956/WikiLeaks-al-Qaeda-is-planning-a-dirty-bomb.html>

Al-Qaida is on the verge of producing radioactive weapons after sourcing nuclear material and recruiting rogue scientists to build “dirty” bombs, according to leaked diplomatic documents. A leading atomic regulator has privately warned that the world stands on the brink of a “nuclear 9/11″. Security briefings suggest that jihadi groups are also close to producing “workable and efficient” biological and chemical weapons that could kill thousands if unleashed in attacks on the West. Thousands of classified American cables obtained by the WikiLeaks website and passed to The Daily Telegraph detail the international struggle to stop the spread of weapons-grade nuclear, chemical and biological material around the globe. At a Nato meeting in January 2009, security chiefs briefed member states that al-Qaida was plotting a program of “dirty radioactive IEDs”, makeshift nuclear roadside bombs that could be used against British troops in Afghanistan. As well as causing a large explosion, a “dirty bomb” attack would contaminate the area for many years. The briefings also state that al-Qaida documents found in Afghanistan in 2007 revealed that “greater advances” had been made in bioterrorism than was previously realized. An Indian national security adviser told American security personnel in June 2008 that terrorists had made a “manifest attempt to get fissile material” and “have the technical competence to manufacture an explosive device beyond a mere dirty bomb”. Alerts about the smuggling of nuclear material, sent to Washington from foreign U.S. embassies, document how criminal and terrorist gangs were trafficking large amounts of highly radioactive material across Europe, Africa and the Middle East. The alerts explain how customs guards at remote border crossings used radiation alarms to identify and seize cargoes of uranium and plutonium. Freight trains were found to be carrying weapons-grade nuclear material across the Kazakhstan-Russia border, highly enriched uranium was transported across Uganda by bus, and a “small time hustler” in Lisbon offered to sell radioactive plates stolen from Chernobyl. In one incident in September 2009, two employees at the Rossing Uranium Mine in Namibia smuggled almost half a ton of uranium concentrate powder – yellowcake – out of the compound in plastic bags. “Acute safety and security concerns” were even raised in 2008 about the uranium and plutonium laboratory of International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA), the nuclear safety watchdog. Tomihiro Taniguchi, the deputy director general of the IAEA, has privately warned America that the world faces the threat of a “nuclear 9/11″ if stores of uranium and plutonium were not secured against terrorists. But diplomats visiting the IAEA’s Austrian headquarters in April 2008 said that there was “no way to provide perimeter security” to its own laboratory because it has windows that leave it vulnerable to break-ins. Senior British defence officials have raised “deep concerns” that a rogue scientist in the Pakistani nuclear program “could gradually smuggle enough material out to make a weapon”, according to a document detailing official talks in London in February 2009. Agricultural stores of deadly biological pathogens in Pakistan are also vulnerable to “extremists” who could use supplies of anthrax, foot and mouth disease and avian flu to develop lethal biological weapons. Anthrax and other biological agents including smallpox, and avian flu could be sprayed from a shop-bought aerosol can in a crowded area, leaked security briefings warn. The security of the world’s only two declared smallpox stores in Atlanta, America, and Novosibirsk, Russia, has repeatedly been called into doubt by “a growing chorus of voices” at meetings of the World Health Assembly documented in the leaked cables. The alarming disclosures come after Barack Obama, the U.S. president, last year declared nuclear terrorism “the single biggest threat” to international security with the potential to cause “extraordinary loss of life”.

CBW attacks ensure multiple scenarios for extinction

Kellman ‘8 (Barry Kellman is the director of the International Weapons Control Center, “Bioviolence: A Growing Threat”, The Futurist, May-June 2008, http://www.wfs.org/March-April09/MJ2008\_Kellman.pdf)

A looming danger confronts the world—the threat of bioviolence. It is a danger that will only grow in the future, yet we are increasingly failing to confront it. With every passing day, committing a biocatastrophe becomes a bit easier, and this condition will perpetuate for as long as science progresses. Biological warfare is as old as conflict, of course, but in terms of the objectives of traditional warfare— gaining territory or resources, compelling the surrender of an opposing army—biological weapons weren’t very effective. If the objective is to inflict mass death and panic on a mixed population, however, emerging bioweapons offer remarkable potential. We would be irresponsible to presume that radical jihadists like al Qaeda have ignored said potential. What’s New in Bioviolence? Bioviolence refers to the many ways to inflict disease as well as the many people who might choose to do so, whether heads of states, criminals, or fanatics. Fortunately, doing bioviolence is technically far more difficult than using conventional explosives. Natural pathogens like anthrax are difficult to weaponize. Smallpox remains unavailable (presumably); plague is readily treatable; Ebola k i l l s t o o q u i c k l y t o i g n i t e a p a ndemic. But emerging scientific disciplines—notably genomics, nanotechnology, and other microsciences— could alter these pathogens for use as weapons. These scientific disciplines offer profound benefits for humanity, yet there is an ominous security challenge in minimizing the danger of their hostile application. For exampl e , highly dangerous agents can be made resistant to vaccines or antibiotics. In Australia, scientists introduced a gene into mousepox (a cousin of smallpox) to reduce pest populations—it worked so well that it wiped out 100% of affected mice, even those that had immunity against the disease. Various bacterial agents, such as plague or tularemia (rabbit fever), could be altered to increase their lethality or to evade antibiotic treatment. Diseases once thought to be eradicated can now be resynthesized, enabling them to spread in reg ions where there is no natural immunity. The polio virus has been synthesized from scratch; its creators called it an “animate chemical.” Soon, it may be resynthesized into a form that is contagious even among vaccinated popu l a t i o n s . Recreation of long eradicated livestock diseases could ravage herds severely lacking in genetic diversity, damage food supplies , and cause devastating economic losses. Perhaps the greatest biothreat is the manipulation of the flu and other highly contagious viruses, such as Ebola. Today, scientists can change parts of a virus’s genetic material so that it can perform specific functions. The genomic sequence of the Spanish flu virus that killed upwards of 40 million people nearly a century ago has been widely published; any savvy scientist could reconstruct it. The avian flu is even more lethal, albeit not readily contagious via casual aerosol delivery. A malevolent bioscientist might augment its contagiousness. The Ebola virus might be manipulat ed so that i t ki l l s more slowly, allowing it to be spread farther before its debilitating effects altogether consume its carrier. A bit further off is genetic manipulation of the measles virus—one of the great killers in human history—rendering useless the immunizations that most of us receive in early childhood. Soon , laboratory resynthesis of smallpox may be possible. Advanced drug delivery systems can be used to disseminate lethal agent s to broad populations . Bioregulators — small organic compounds that modify body systems— could enhance targeted delivery technologies. Some experts are concerned that new weapons could be aimed at the immune, neurological, and neuroendocrine systems. Nanotechnology that lends itself to mechanisms for advanced disease detection and drug delivery—such as gold nanotubes that can administer drugs directly into a tumor—could also deliver weaponized agents deep into the body, substantially raising the weapon’s effectiveness. Altogether, techniques that were on the frontiers of science only a decade or two ago are rapidly mutating as progress in the biological sciences enables new ways to produce lethal catastrophe. Today, they are on the horizon. Within a decade, they will be pedestrian. According to the National Academies of Science, “The threat spectrum is broad and evolving—in some ways predictably, in other ways unexpectedly. In the future, genetic engineering and other technologies may lead to the development of pathogenic organisms with unique, unpredictable characteristics.” For as far into the future as we can possibly see, every passing day it becomes slightly easier to commit a violent catastrophe than it was the day before. Indeed, the rapid pace of advancing science helps explain why policies to prevent such a catastrophe are so complicated. Bioviolence Jihad? Some experts argue that terrorists and fanatics are not interested in bioviolence and that the danger might therefore be overblown. Since there have been no catastrophic bioviolence attacks, these experts argue, terrorists lack the intention to make bioweapons. Hopefully, they are correct. But an enormous amount of evidence suggests they are wrong. From the dawn of biology’s ability to isolate pathogens, people have pursued hostile applications of biological agents. It is perilous to ignore this extensive history by presuming that today’s villains are not fervent about weaponizing disease. Not a single state admits to having a bioweapons program, but U.S. int e l l i g e n c e o f f i c i a l s a s s e r t t h a t a s many as 10 states might have active programs, including North Korea, Iran, and Syria. Moreover, many terrorist organizations have expressed interest in acquiring biological weapons. Whatever weight the taboo against inflicting disease might have for nation-states, it is obviously irrelevant to terrorists, criminals, and lunatics. Deterrence by threat of retaliation is essentially meaningless for groups with suicidal inclinations who are likely to intermingle with innocent civilians. Al -Qaeda and aff i l iat ed I s lami c fundamentalist organizations have overtly proclaimed their intention to develop and use bioweapons. The 11th volume of al-Qaeda’s Encyclopedia of Jihad is devoted to chemical and biological weapons. Indeed, alQaeda has acknowledged that “biological weapons are considered the least complicated and easiest to manufacture of all weapons of mass destruction.” Al-Qaeda is widely reported to have acquired legal pathogens via publicly available scientific sources. Before 9/11, al-Qaeda operatives reportedly purchased anthrax and plague from arms dealers in Kazakhstan, and the group has repeatedly urged followers to recruit microbiology and biotechnology experts. Follow ing th e Ta l iban ’ s fa l l , f iv e a l Qaeda biologi cal weapons labs in Afghanistan tested positive for anthrax. Documents calculating aerial dispersal methods of anthrax via balloon were discovered in Kabul, along with anthrax spore concentrate at a nearby vaccine laboratory. According to a lengthy fatwa commissioned by Osama bin Laden, jihadists are entitled to use weapons of mass destruction against the infidels, even if it means killing innocent women, children, and Muslims. No matter that these weapons cannot be specifically targeted. “[N]othing is a greater duty, after faith itself, than repelling an enemy attacker who sows corruption to religion and the world.” According to the fatwa, “No conditions limit this: one repels the enemy however one can.” The sentiment might be reprehen sible, but it is certainly not irrational. Even the most passionate terrorists must realize that conventional attacks are not bringing the West to its knees. The 9/11 strikes, the bombing of the Madrid and London subways, and numerous smaller attacks have all put civilization on edge, but history marches inexorably forward. A few thousand people can be killed, yet Western armies still traverse the world, and Western economies still determine winners and losers. From this perspective, the stakes must be raised. Bioviolence is perhaps the most dire, easiest means to execute existential danger. What Might Bioviolence Accomplish? Envision a series of attacks against capitals of developing states that have close diplomatic linkages with the United States. The attacks would carry a well-publicized yet simple warning: “If you are a friend of the United States, receive its officials, or suppo r t i t s po l i c i e s , thou sand s o f y o u r p e o p l e wi l l g e t s i c k . ” How many a t ta ck s in how many c i t i e s would it take before international diplomacy, to say nothing of international transit, comes to a crashing halt? In comparison to use of conventional or chemical weapons, the potential death toll of a bioattack could be huge . Al though the numbe r of victims would depend on where an attack takes place, the type of pathogen, and the sophistication of the weapons maker, there is widespread consensus among experts that a heightened attack would inflict casualties exceedable only by nuclear weapons. In comparison to nuclear weapons, bioweapons are far easier and cheaper to make and transport, and they can be made in facilities that are far more difficult to detect. The truly unique characteristic of c e r t a i n bioweapons t h a t d i s t i nguishes them from every other type of weapon is contagion. No other type of weapon can replicate itself and spread. Any other type of attack, no matter how severe, occurs at a certain moment in time at an identifiable place. If you aren’t there, you are angry and upset but not physically injured by the attack. An attack with a contagious agent can uniquely spread, potentially imperiling target populations far from where the agents are released. A b i o - o ff e n d e r c o u l d i n f e c t h i s minions with a disease and send them across borders before symptoms are obvious. Carriers will then spread it to other unsuspecting victims who would themselves become extended bioweapons, carrying the disease indiscriminately. There are challenges in executing such an attack, but fanatical terrorist organizations seem to have an endless supply of willing suicide attackers. All this leads to the most important characteristic of bioviolence: It raises incomparable levels of panic. Contagious bioviolence means that planes fly empty or perhaps don’t fly at all. People cancel vacation and travel plans and refuse to interact with each other for fear of unseen affliction. Public entertainment events are canceled; even going to a movie becomes too dangerous. Ultimately, bioviolence is about hiding our children as everyone becomes vulnerable to our most fundamental terror: the fear of disease. For people who seek to rattle the pillars of modern civilization and perhaps cause it to collapse, effective use of disease would set in motion political, economic, and health consequences so severe as to call into question the ability of existing governments to maintain their citizens’ security. In an attack’s wake, no one would know when it is over, and no government could credibly tell an anxious population where and when it is safe to resume normal life. While it is difficult to specify when this danger will strike, there should be no doubt that we are vulnerable to a rupture. Just as planes flying into the Twin Towers on September 11, 2001, instantly became a historical marker dividing strategic perspectives before from after, the day that disease is effectively used as an instrument of hate will profoundly change everything. If you want to stop modern civilization in its tracks, bioviolence is the way to go. The notion that no one will ever commit catastrophic bioviolence is simply untenable. What Can We Do? How can we confront these growing dangers? First, we must appreciate the global nature of the problem. Perpetrators from anywhere can get p a t h o g e n s f ro m v i r t u a l l y e v e r ywhe re . Biore s earch labs that onc e were concentrated in about two dozen developed states are proliferating, expanding the risk that lethal agents could be diverted and misused. The knowledge needed to weaponize pathogens is available on the Internet. An attack can be prep a r e d t h ro u g h e a s y n e tw o r k s o f transnational communication. Once a bioweapon is prepared, terrorists or other perpetrators from anywhere can slide across national boundaries and release disease anonymously. Once released, a contagious agent would spread without regard for boundaries, race, religion, or nationality. Public health responses would have to be internationally coordinated. New modes of international l egal coope rat ion would immediately be needed to investigate the crime. Thus, bioviolence dangers shrink the planet into an interdependent neighborhood. It makes no sense for any particular country to try to insulate its homeland from these dangers. No missile defense system will p ro t e c t u s f rom b i o v i o l e n c e . Improved border security will not keep disease at bay. National efforts to enhan c e m ed i ca l p repa redn e s s hav e virtues, but these defenses can be readily circumvented. To prevent bioviolence requires policies that focus on humanity as a species and that are implemented everywhere with centralized governance. Antibioviolence policies must be global. Ye t , advanc ing ant i -bioviol enc e policies is what the international community does worst. Bioviolence dangers are unnecessarily high because national and international antibioviolence strategies are gap-ridden, often incoherent, and not globally observed. As a result, we are all virtually naked in the face of unacceptable dangers. No ot her t hreat pre s ent s such a s tark cont ras t between severity of harm and a failure of leadership to reduce risks. Most important, existing institutional arrangements are inadequate. In sharp contrast to most other global security challenges, there is no responsible international authority that defines relevant prohibitions and responsibilities, implements policies over time, or evaluates whether obligations are being fulfilled. With regard to global bioviolence prevent i o n p o l i c i e s , t h e r e ’ s n o b o d y i n charge. No one is responsible; no one is accountable. The absence of authority is profoundly dangerous. Bioviolence prevention and preparedness requires a sizable orchestra, made up of various instruments, to play complicated music in harmony. Today, there is not a bad “conductor”, there is no conductor at all. The result is cacophony. Simply stated, bioviolence is the dark s ide of global izat ion, ye t int e rna tional alarms of bioviolence ring nowhere! We need a comprehensive national and international strategy for bioviol enc e prevent ion . [Se e box: “Five S t r a t e g i e s f o r P r e v e n t i n g B i oviolence,” page 30.] Policies should be pursued within an integrated approach that enables each policy to gain strength from all the others. Such policies are potentially available and effective, but they demand progressive changes in our global order. The Security Mission Global bioviolence prevention and preparedness policies are imperative, but also imperative is recognition that the world faces natural disease horrors. Where mass public health challenges are daily phenomena, the risks of terrorists using pathogens must be weighed against more tangible natural threats. Simply stated, it is illegitimate to insist that every nation adopt policies for preventing human-inflicted disease without acknowledging the silent genocide of natural disease that is responsible for millions of deaths. But neither is it legitimate to view bioviolence dangers as distractions from efforts to combat natural disease and therefore to put off beneficial measures until those afflictions are defeated. To do so frustrates forward movement on cost-effective initiatives that could help build an international security architecture for advancing science and health. Thus, bioviolence prevention must be a facet of a broad international commitment to: 1. Prevent the spread of disease ( e .g. , through publ i c -heal th measures). 2. Enhance protection against and cures for disease (e.g., through vaccination and drug therapies). 3. Supervise the conduct of biological science. 4. Criminalize unauthorized or improper use of pathogens. From this foundation should flow a policy commitment to the growth of bioscience as a global public good. Policies to encourage its worldwide spread deserve vigorous support. This governance mission should, therefore, be conceived as a global covenant . As bios c i enc e goe s forward as a fundamental pillar of human progress, all nations must undertake common responsibilities to prevent bioviolence even as the burdens associated with those responsibilities are differentiated according to wealth and capability. From everyone according to their abilities—to all for the benefit of all. The United Nations’ Importance The United Nations represents the b e s t venu e fo r a new gove rnanc e platform that can accommodate the need for an integrated global strategy agains t bioviol enc e . Only the United Nations has the necessary in ternational legitimacy, and only the Uni t ed Nat ions can int egrat e the many sectors—health, law enforcement, science, military, emergency preparedness—that must devote expertise and resources. A primary consideration here is to minimize any bureaucratic reshuffling. There is certainly no need to modify or replicate existing capabilities. Many relevant governance tasks are already addressed by one or more international organizations. For example, the World Health Organization should continue to be responsible for addressing the health implications of a pandemic, whether natural or malevolent. Interpol should continue to be responsible for a d d re s s i n g b i o v i o l e n c e ’ s l aw e nforcement implications. Indeed, the UN’s role should be only to coordinate the performance of these tasks. Broadly viewed, the United Nations should be able to undertake three functions: First, a specific UN agency should stimulate bioscience development by incorporating security concerns into the fabric of scientific undertakings and by assisting countries in using bioscience in ways that are consistent with policies for preventing bioviolence. Because science, development, and security can and must be mutually reinforcing, this agency’s primary responsibilities would be to promote and distribute knowledge and build capacity to fulfill obligations, especially in developing nations. Second, a UN office should coordinate activities among the relevant international/regional organizations, professional networks, and expert bodies. For example, three major international organizations focus on health (World Health Organization, Animal Health Organization, and the Food and Agriculture Organization); Interpol and Europol both focus on law enforcement; a large array of organizations focus on conveyance of dangerous items (e.g., International Maritime Organization, International Civil Aviation Organization). This UN office should be a steering mechanism to engage each of these orga nizations’ specialized expertise and to identify synergies. Third, a Security Council Committee should be authorized to investigate bioviolence preparations as well as respond and coordinate assistance to a bioviolence attack. Situations that call for investigation or response arise rarely, but they carry disproportionate significance for international peace and security. The Security Council Committee should not advance programmatic agendas, but it should be able to wield expertise and political muscle in volatile situations. Its primary mission would be to enable the international community to sustain global order in the face of a bioviolence challenge. Ever since someone harnessed a new technology to create a weapon with more devastating effects, there has been a link—a double helix—between the progress of science and the pursuit of security. This is inevitable. These dangers of bioviolence do not a rg u e f o r re l i n q u i s h i n g s c i e n t i f i c progress, but they disprove notions tha t n ew cha l l eng e s can b e e ff e ct ive ly addre s s ed wi th ye s t e rday’ s policies. At bottom is a condition unique to this historical era: Scientific progress is intertwined with escalating malevolence threatening human security. Progressing capabilities improve our l ive s and ye t , inext r i cably, enable truly harmful weapons against humanity. Here are the challenges to international peace and security at the beginning of the third millennium. Failing to do the right thing in response to these challenges could have dire consequences for all humanity.

### Addon- Horn of Africa (AQAP)

Instability spills over to the entire Horn of Africa

Ginny Hill, “Yemen: Fear of Failure; Middle East and North Africa Programme”, Chatham House, January 2010, http://reliefweb.int/sites/reliefweb.int/files/resources/22924953ECE8BBF1492576EA000E8E41-Full\_Report.pdf

Future instability in Yemen could expand a lawless zone stretching from northern Kenya, through Somalia and the Gulf of Aden, to Saudi Arabia. Piracy, smuggling and violent jihad would flourish, with implications for the security of shipping routes and the transit of oil through the Suez Canal. State failure in Yemen would reduce any chance of progress towards peace in Somalia and further endanger the security of countries throughout the Arabian Peninsula and the Horn of Africa

Causes major power wars

Glick ‘7 (Dec. 10, 2007 Caroline Glick , THE JERUSALEM POST)

The Horn of Africa is a dangerous and strategically vital place. Small wars, which rage continuously, can easily escalate into big wars. Local conflicts have regional and global aspects. All of the conflicts in this tinderbox, which controls shipping lanes from the Indian Ocean into the Red Sea, can potentially give rise to regional, and indeed global conflagrations between competing regional actors and global powers. The Horn of Africa includes the states of Eritrea, Djibouti, Ethiopia, Somalia, Sudan and Kenya. Eritrea, which gained independence from Ethiopia in 1993 after a 20-year civil war, is a major source of regional conflict. Eritrea has a hot border dispute with Ethiopia which could easily ignite. The two countries fought a bloody border war from 1998-2000 over control of the town of Badme. Although a UN mandated body determined in 2002 that the disputed town belonged to Eritrea, Ethiopia has rejected the finding and so the conflict festers. Eritrea also fights a proxy war against Ethiopia in Somalia and in Ethiopia's rebellious Ogaden region**. In Somalia, Eritrea is the primary sponsor of the al-Qaida-linked Islamic Courts Union** which took control of Somalia in June, 2006. In November 2006, the ICU government declared jihad against Ethiopia and Kenya. Backed by the US, Ethiopia invaded to restore the recognized Transitional Federal Government to power which the ICU had deposed. Although the Ethiopian army successfully ousted the ICU from power in less than a week, **backed by massive military and financial assistance from Eritrea, as well as Egypt and Libya, the ICU has waged a brutal insurgency against the TFG and the Ethiopian military for the past year**. THE SENIOR ICU leadership, including Sheikh Hassan Dahir Aweys and Sheikh Sharif Ahmed have received safe haven in Eritrea. In September, the exiled ICU leadership held a nine-day conference in the Eritrean capital of Asmara where they formed the Alliance for the Re-Liberation of Somalia headed by Ahmed. Eritrean President-for-life Isaias Afwerki declared his country's support for the insurgents stating, "The Eritrean people's support to the Somali people is consistent and historical, as well as a legal and moral obligation." Although touted in the West as a moderate, Ahmed has openly supported jihad and terrorism against Ethiopia, Kenya and the West. Aweys, for his part, is wanted by the FBI in connection with his role in the bombing of the US embassies in Kenya and Tanzania in 1998. Then there is Eritrea's support for the Ogaden separatists in Ethiopia. The Ogaden rebels are Somali ethnics who live in the region bordering Somalia and Kenya. The rebellion is run by the Ogaden National Liberation Front (ONLF) which uses terror and sabotage as its preferred methods of warfare. It targets not only Ethiopian forces and military installations, but locals who wish to maintain their allegiance to Ethiopia or reach a negotiated resolution of the conflict. In their most sensationalist attack to date, in April ONLF terror forces attacked a Chinese-run oil installation in April killing nine Chinese and 65 Ethiopians.

## XO

### Intra-Executive (Geo)

#### 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.

### Kickout

#### 1AC Markey evidence says Paki military radicals will kick us out- one method through shooting down US drones

#### Independently- that kickout causes US-Pakistan war

Chussodovsky ’11 (Prof Michel Chossudovsky, Michel Chossudovsky is an award-winning author, Professor of Economics (emeritus) at the University of Ottawa, Founder and Director of the Centre for Research on Globalization (CRG), Montreal and Editor of the globalresearch.ca website. He is the author of The Globalization of Poverty and The New World Order (2003) and America’s “War on Terrorism”(2005). His most recent book is entitled Towards a World War III Scenario: The Dangers of Nuclear War (2011), “Pakistan’s Decision to Shoot Down America’s Drones: Prelude to an All Out US-Pak War?”, http://www.globalresearch.ca/pakistan-s-decision-to-shoot-down-america-s-drones-prelude-to-an-all-out-us-pak-war/28162, Global Research, December 12, 2011)

Pakistan's Decision to Shoot Down America's Drones: Prelude to an All Out US-Pak War? Remember Pearl Harbor, remember the Gulf of Tonkin… Throughout history, America has sought to provoke its enemies into ‘initiating a war”, with a view to justifying the launching of an all out out war using the pretext of “self defense”. America’s war on Pakistan is already de facto. It is a war of stealth. The “war on terrorism” allegedly directed against Al Qaeda, the illusive “outside enemy” (created by the CIA) is is an obvious smokescreen. What is required is to portray Pakistan as “the aggressor” rather than the victim of US military aggression. US military planners have examined all possible scenarios. Military escalation is on the drawing board of the Pentagon. US “counter-terrorism” operations are carried out with a view to inciting the enemy as well as triggering a process of military escalation. Is the objective of the drone attacks to provoke a response by the Pakistani military, thereby justifying a formal declaration of war by the US and its allies? In this regard, the recent decision taken by Pakistan to “shoot down any US drone that intrudes its airspace as per new directives”, could be the prelude to an all out war between Pakistan and US-NATO forces. Pakistan’s defence policy states that: “Any object entering into our airspace, including US drones, will be treated as hostile and be shot down,” “The policy change comes just weeks after a deadly NATO attack on Pakistani military checkpoints killed 24 Pakistani soldiers, prompting Pakistani officials to order all US personnel out of a remote airfield in Pakistan. The government had told the United States to vacate the Shamsi airbase by December 11. The Frontier Corps took control of the Shamsi airbase on Saturday evening after most US military personnel left, sources said. Chief of the Army Staff Gen Ashfaq Pervaiz Kayani had issued multiple directives since the November 26 NATO attack, which included orders to shoot down US drones, senior military officials confirmed to NBC News. It was unclear whether orders to fire upon incoming US drones were part of the initial orders. The Pakistani airbase had been used by US forces, including the CIA, to stage elements of a clandestine US counter-terrorism operation to attack militants linked to al Qaeda, the Taliban and Haqqani network, using unmanned drone aircraft armed with missiles. Since 2004, US drones have carried out more than 300 attacks inside Pakistan. (See dailytimes.com.pk/default.asp?page=2011\12\12\story\_12-12-2011\_pg1\_5) In the wake of this incident, ”Pakistan has closed supply routes that allow U.S. and coalition military convoys to cross into Afghanistan”. Also of significance, on December 11, Pakistan took possession of the Shamsi air base in Balochistan on the the border with Iran. While the base was leased to the United Arab Emirates (UAE), it had been used by US air force personnel. The downing of a US drone would be used by Washington as a propaganda ploy. It would contribute to triggering a “useful wave of indignation” across America. It would be heralded by the US Congress as an act of aggression, as an encroachment in the conduct of America’s “War on Terrorism”. Pakistan would be accused of “siding with the terrorists”, thereby providing Washington with a justification to intervene. The broader repercussions of this staged confrontation between the US and Pakistan must be understood. US-NATO military deployments in Afghanistan and Pakistan are coordinated with ongoing war plans and covert operations directed against Iran. They also have a bearing on relations between the US and China. It should be noted that in a recent meeting of the Shanghai Cooperation Organization (SCO), Moscow called for Pakistan to become a full member of the SCO. Pakistan has the status of an Obsever in the SCO. Military confrontation in Pakistan could contribute to a process of military escalation in the broader Middle East Central Asia South Asia region.

### Afghan

#### Pakistan backlash to drones causes failure in Afghanistan

Mullikin ’11 (Andrew Mullkin, Behind the Wire, Georgetown, School of Foreign Service, “Mullikin: Drone Attacks Critical to American Success in Afghanistan”, <http://www.thehoya.com/mullikin-drone-attacks-critical-to-american-success-in-afghanistan-1.2164554#.UfqSRazCbbo>, April 14, 2011)

The Pakistani government recently called for a halt to American clandestine operations in the country's northwest, including unmanned aerial vehicle or drone strikes that have been a crucial element of American tactics in the region. These strikes have targeted Islamic militants in the mostly lawless border regions with Afghanistan that since 2004 have been home to training camps and safe havens for multiple extremist organizations including al-Qaeda and the Afghan Taliban. Unfortunately this change in the Pakistani-American strategic alliance comes at a critical time in the war in Afghanistan. As insurgent strikes against International Security Assistance Force units heat up as part of this year's spring offensive, a Taliban tactic has become a fixture of military operations in the country. As political pressure in the United States steps up to end the war in Afghanistan as quickly as possible, now is the time to ask: What does a change in Pakistan signal for American regional operations? UAV strikes have been a critical element in the Obama administration's tactics against regional extremists. According to the New America Foundation's "The Year of the Drone" project, roughly 748 militants were killed in the 118 drone strikes that were confirmed in 2010. These attacks on high-value targets such as extremist leadership elements, training camps and convoys have been highly successful according to Administration officials. There is little collateral damage in terms of both civilian lives lost and infrastructure damage, and residents in the region have repeatedly said that they support the American use of drone strikes. According to interviews, they believe that American strikes keep them safe from local militants. On the other hand, the Pakistani government views these strikes as a violation of their sovereignty and claims that collateral damage is too high despite American efforts to protect noncombatants as much as possible. After meeting with American intelligence officials Monday, a Pakistani general in charge of intelligence efforts in the country demanded that UAV strikes be stopped immediately. He also called for all clandestine U.S. operatives working in Pakistan — including CIA officers, special operations forces and civilian contractors working for the CIA — be immediately withdrawn. The new Pakistani demands signal a major setback in the war in Afghanistan. Effectively waging a counterinsurgency campaign in Afghanistan means being able to provide security and well-being for local Afghans. With Taliban and other extremist militants operating within easy striking distance of Afghan towns, ISAF troops cannot provide that security. Not only is time on the militants' side, so are tactics, including the safe havens for training and operational planning that insurgents and terrorists have used so effectively in Waziristan and other parts of Pakistan's Federally Administrated Tribal Areas give them a secure base from which to launch strikes across the Durand Line into Afghan territory. Without negating the strategic benefit of these safe havens, American operations in Afghanistan will be doomed to failure. For now, drone strikes are the only means American commanders have at their disposal for negating the benefits of these safe havens. Without putting boots on the ground in a counterinsurgency campaign, there is no way to effectively prevent militants from striking into Afghanistan while using Pakistani territory as a staging ground. Simply stepping up border defense is ineffective — not only is the border between northeastern Afghanistan and FATA extremely rugged and operationally challenging, the border itself is very hard to find. Without a geographic boundary between the two nations, it is far too difficult to operate exclusively in Afghanistan while working to combat extremist militants. American success in Afghanistan is rooted in a successful strategy for combating the militants who operate out of Waziristan and other Pakistani border areas. Without drone strikes, the United States and its allies are left without an effective means to counter these modern-day outlaws. To succeed in Afghanistan, we are left with no more viable option than to use drones in Pakistan. Thus, if Pakistan keeps to its desire to stop UAV strikes in border areas, our prospects for success in Afghanistan will continue to dim.

#### Afghanistan withdrawal key to prevent nuclear war

Cronin 13 (Audrey Kurth Cronin is Professor of Public Policy at George Mason University and author of How Terrorism Ends and Great Power Politics and the Struggle over Austria. Thinking Long on Afghanistan: Could it be Neutralized? Center for Strategic and International Studies The Washington Quarterly • 36:1 pp. 55\_72 <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/0163660X.2013.751650>)

With ISAF withdrawal inevitable, a sea change is already underway: the question is whether the United States will be ahead of the curve or behind it. Under current circumstances, key actions within Afghanistan by any one state are perceived to have a deleterious effect on the interests of other competing states, so the only feasible solution is to discourage all of them from interfering in a neutralized state. As the United States draws down over the next two years, yielding to regional anarchy would be irresponsible. Allowing neighbors to rely on bilateral measures, jockey for relative position, and pursue conflicting national interests without regard for dangerous regional dynamics will result in a repeat of the pattern that has played out in Afghanistan for the past thirty years\_/except this time the outcome could be not just terrorism but nuclear war.

### Egypt/ Israel

#### Norms solve Israel strikes in the Sinai which causes conflict with Egypt

Schenker 13 (David Schenker is director of the Program on Arab Politics at the Washington Institute for Near East Policy., 8/13/2013, "How the Israeli Drone Strike in the Sinai Might Backfire", www.theatlantic.com/international/archive/2013/08/how-the-israeli-drone-strike-in-the-sinai-might-backfire/278628/)

In April 1982, Israel withdrew the last of its military forces from Egypt's Sinai Peninsula. On Friday, for the first time in more than 30 years, Israeli military assets reportedly reentered Egyptian territory. On August 9, an Israeli drone operating in Sinai airspace with Egyptian approval killed five militants preparing to launch a rocket into Israel. The proactive Israeli action may herald a positive new dynamic in Israeli-Egyptian relations. But for the Egyptian military--which depends on popular goodwill to govern post-coup Egypt--enhanced security coordination with Israel might not be politically sustainable. Already, this unprecedented move has provoked a backlash against the generals. Ever since the toppling of Egypt's longtime President Hosni Mubarak in 2011, security in the Sinai--a region long underserved by Cairo--has become precarious. During the revolution, Egyptian intelligence, which had previously been responsible for securing the Sinai, was routed, leaving the task to the military -- the country's sole remaining, functioning national institution. Unenthusiastic about and ill-equipped for the mission, the military did little and security in the Sinai rapidly deteriorated. In a matter of months, Al-Qaeda and other dangerous Islamist elements started to take root among the increasingly radicalized local Bedouins. Over the past two years, Egyptian and foreign jihadis--as well as Palestinian terrorists entering the Sinai via tunnels from Gaza-- have launched dozens of attacks in the Peninsula. While most of the operations have targeted Egyptian police and border guards, on occasion soldiers have been killed and kidnapped and tourists abducted. Militants have also assaulted and snatched troops in the Multinational Force Observers or MFO, which are deployed in the Sinai to monitor the terms of the Israeli-Egyptian peace treaty. More potentially destabilizing, these terrorists have infiltrated Israel--killing six civilians and two soldiers in one August 2011 operation--and fired rockets across the border. Friday's drone strike came just one day after an unprecedented temporary closure of Israel's Eilat airport. At the time, militants in the Sinai were believed to be preparing to target Israeli civilian aircraft with rockets or shoulder fired missiles procured from post-Qaddafi's Libya. On the positive side, the Israeli strike suggests extremely close security and intelligence coordination between the Israeli Defense Force (IDF) and the Egyptian military. The cooperation comes as little surprise: both sides quietly say that mil-to-mil cooperation has never been better. Confidence is so high that just last month Israel authorized Egypt to deploy two addition infantry battalions to the Sinai to counter the terrorist threat. This comes after the militaries negotiated more than two dozen Egyptian requests since 2011 to move supplemental troops and equipment, including tanks, into the desert. In the past month, the Egyptian military has engaged in a crackdown on Sinai terrorism that reportedly killed some 60 militants. This is great news, particularly given that since the revolution, official civilian government-to-government contact has practically ceased to exist. At the same time, however, the high level of cooperation poses some potential challenges for Egypt's military. The Egyptian military--and especially its commanding General Abdul Fattah al Sisi--currently enjoys great popularity and a level of legitimacy that will be required to navigate this sensitive period of political transition following last month's coup that removed the democratically elected Islamist president. A majority of the population appears to support the president's ouster, but many people clearly do not. While Egyptians remain divided about the coup, however, Israel remains a consensus issue: most Egyptians loathe Israel and find the notion of ongoing security cooperation with the Jewish state to be extremely distasteful. Since the revolution, one of the more resonant tropes of populist politicians in Egypt has been the call to "renegotiate" the Camp David treaty with Israel --and particularly the Sinai security provisions, which many Egyptians consider to be an unacceptable legal surrender of national sovereignty. News of the Israeli drone strike has reignited anger over perceived slights to Egyptian self-determination in the Sinai. Muslim Brotherhood spokesman Ahmed Arif, for example, described the Israeli attack as "a national disaster and a flagrant violation of all the principals and traditions of the military." Meanwhile, the Foreign Affairs committee of the now-defunct upper house of parliament known as the Shura Council has condemned the "Zionist violation of Egyptian territory." These statements were echoed by Ansar Beit Muqaddas, the terrorist organization targeted in the attack, which issued a statement asking "What is greater treason than the Egyptian army allowing the Zionist drones to violate Egyptian airspace now and then?" In addition to raising questions about Egyptian authority over the Sinai, the Israeli drone attack will foster the unflattering perception that the Egyptian military is unable alone to contain the terrorist threat on its soil. To date, Egyptian supporters of the military's ouster of the Islamist president have refrained from criticizing the Israeli action in the Sinai. The prominent author Alaa Al-Aswany, a leading voice in this camp, has even gone so far as to accuse the Muslim Brotherhood of "exploiting" the strike for political gain. But it's not clear how long this cohort will continue to tolerate the collaboration. Al-Aswany's Twitter account is replete with condemnations of Israel and Zionists. The Egyptian military is no doubt aware that its leading supporters will not abide Israeli drones over Sinai airspace indefinitely. Clearly concerned about the impact of the reports, the military denied Israeli involvement in the Sinai incident in a statement on its Facebook page on Friday afternoon--just hours after the reports of the drone strike appeared. Highlighting this sensitivity, shortly after the bombing, mobile phone service in the Sinai was interrupted--most likely by the military--to limit further damaging reporting of the story. While this one incident may not have a lasting impact on the Egyptian military's popularity or local legitimacy, should Israeli strikes in the Sinai be sustained, it could erode some of the institution's luster. It could also undermine Sisi's popularity, and if he indeed harbors them, his hopes of becoming Egypt's next president. More troubling, though, if Israel continues to act as Egypt's proxy terrorist hunters, it could have the unintended effect of drawing even more militants looking to wage a jihad against Israel from this lawless desert expanse.

Extinction

Zitun 9/5/11

<http://www.ynetnews.com/articles/0,7340,L-4118220,00.html>

staff writer, quoting Senior IDF officer

IDF general: Likelihood of regional war growing Senior IDF officer warns of 'radical Islamic winter' that may lead to regional war, could prompt use of WMDs; new, more lethal weapons discovered in hands of terrorists during latest round of fighting in Gaza, Major General Eisenberg says Recent revolutions in the Arab world and the deteriorating ties with Turkey are raising the likelihood of a regional war in the Middle East, IDF Home Front Command Chief, Major General Eyal Eisenberg warned Monday. "It looks like the Arab Spring, but it can also be a radical Islamic winter," he said in a speech at the Institute for National Security Studies in Tel Aviv. "This leads us to the conclusion that through a long-term process, the likelihood of an all-out war is increasingly growing," the IDF general said. "Iran has not abandoned its nuclear program. The opposite it true; it continues full steam ahead," he said. "In Egypt, the army is collapsing under the burden of regular security operations, and this is reflected in the loss of control in the Sinai and the turning of the border with Israel into a terror border, with the possibility that Sinai will fall under the control of an Islamic entity." IDF general: Likelihood of regional war growing Senior IDF officer warns of 'radical Islamic winter' that may lead to regional war, could prompt use of WMDs; new, more lethal weapons discovered in hands of terrorists during latest round of fighting in Gaza, Major General Eisenberg says Recent revolutions in the Arab world and the deteriorating ties with Turkey are raising the likelihood of a regional war in the Middle East, IDF Home Front Command Chief, Major General Eyal Eisenberg warned Monday. In Lebanon, Hezbollah is growing stronger within government arms, but it has not lost its desire to harm Israel, and the ties with Turkey aren't at their best," Major General Eisenberg added. Weapons of mass destruction? Referring to what he characterized as the possibility of a "radical Islamic winter," Major-General Eisenberg said: "This raises the likelihood of an all-out, total war, with the possibility of weapons of mass destruction being used." During his address, the senior IDF official revealed that new, more lethal arms surfaced in the hands of Gaza terror groups during the latest round of fighting in the area. As result of the disturbing development, Israeli civilians were instructed to adopt greater precautions, he said. "We discovered a new weapon, and as result of this we instructed the public to hide under two roofs, rather than only one," he said. Eisenberg added that some 25% of local authorities in Israel are ill prepared to face emergency situations. However, Major General Eisenberg's words infuriated some security and defense officials, who slammed the senior IDF officer for revealing classified information and provoking regional tensions. "It's unclear why an IDF general heats up tensions in the region and why he exposes secret intelligence information about new Palestinian capabilities," one official said. Notably, Eisenberg's remarks were approved for publication by censorship officials.

## CIR

### 2AC- Uniqueness

Won’t Pass- Boehner, election year, and immense conservative opposition

Weisman 2/6 (Jonathan, staff writer for the New York Times, February 6, 2014, “Boehner Doubts Immigration Overhaul Will Pass This Year”, <http://www.nytimes.com/2014/02/07/us/politics/boehner-doubts-immigration-overhaul-will-pass-this-year.html///TS>)

WASHINGTON — Facing growing resistance from conservatives, Speaker John A. Boehner on Thursday cast strong doubt that he could pass an overhaul of the nation’s immigration laws this year, leaving it to President Obama to win the trust of his balking Republicans. Mr. Boehner began his weekly news conference by saying that for 15 months he had pressed for immigration measures to address border security, new worker programs and the 11 million illegal immigrants in the country. But, he added, “I’ve never underestimated the difficulty in moving forward this year.” “The American people, including many of my members, don’t trust that the reform that we’re talking about will be implemented as it was intended to be,” he said, citing executive actions by the Obama administration that have changed or delayed implementation of the president’s health care law. “There’s widespread doubt about whether this administration can be trusted to enforce our laws, and it’s going to be difficult to move any immigration legislation until that changes.” The comments came two days after Senator Mitch McConnell of Kentucky, the Senate Republican leader, cited “irresolvable conflict” between the House and the Senate and said, “I don’t see how you get to an outcome this year with the two bodies in such a different place.” Even Republicans modestly supportive of immigration legislation have said this election year is not the time to move forward. Doing so, they say, would only splinter the party and detract from the attention Republican candidates are trying to focus on Mr. Obama’s health care law and sagging approval ratings. By casting the issue as one of trust in the president, Mr. Boehner tried to lay the blame at the White House’s feet for what appears to be a quickly flagging immigration push. “The reason I said we need a step-by-step common-sense approach to this is so we can build trust with the American people that we’re doing this the right way,” Mr. Boehner said. “And, frankly, one of the biggest obstacles we face is the one of trust.” At their retreat last week, many Republicans rejected the House leadership’s one-page “standards for immigration reform” outright, and others said now was not the time for a legislative push on a number of contentious issues in an election year with trends going their way. More-conservative members in the House reject conferring a path to citizenship for illegal immigrants, calling it “amnesty” for those who have broken the law. The opposition has grown more fierce. The conservative activist L. Brent Bozell called for the entire House Republican leadership to be replaced, and on Wednesday, his group, ForAmerica, blitzed the speaker's office with thousands of phone calls to jam the lines and protest his immigration push. Representative Raúl Labrador of Idaho, an early negotiator on immigration and now a fierce opponent, told the newspaper The Hill that a Boehner immigration push this year “should cost him his speakership.” Asked what he thought Congress could accomplish this year, the speaker cited legislation to permanently block sharp cuts to Medicare health providers that have been looming for years, a change to the federal flood insurance program, and terrorism risk insurance.

#### Obama asked for the plan

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.”

#### Midterms thumps

Malone 1/29 (Jim Malone, “Obama’s Risky Go-it-Alone Strategy”, <http://www.voanews.com/content/obamas-risky-go-it-alone-strategy/1840414.html>, January 29, 2014

The Republican backlash

The Republican reaction to the president’s ‘Go it alone’ strategy has been predictable. Florida Senator Marco Rubio, a possible presidential contender in 2016, described the approach as “borderline unconstitutional.” Writing in the Wall Street Journal, Texas Senator and Tea Party favorite Ted Cruz decried the president’s “persistent pattern of lawlessness.” Since the earliest days of his presidency, many Republicans, especially those aligned with the Tea Party, have promoted the narrative that Obama is bent on pursuing an ‘imperial presidency.’ They point to the enactment of the health care law as the prime example of the president running roughshod over the objections of the tens of millions of Americans represented by Republicans in Congress. No Republicans supported the law when it passed Congress in 2010. The Republicans will try to turn the executive order strategy against the president and Democrats in the November elections. And they will continue to focus on what they contend is the failure of Obamacare in this year’s campaign, even though the president made it clear in his State of the Union that he believes voters are not interested in refighting old battles over health care again in 2014 and he will resist any effort to kill the law. It’s really about November In any election year, the president’s State of the Union serves as a blueprint for his party’s campaign strategy. For Democrats in 2014, the emphasis will be on bolstering the middle class with practical government assistance that includes raising the minimum wage across the board, extending unemployment benefits for the jobless, greater access to college and funding pre-school programs. Polls show these types of initiatives are popular not only with Democrats but with independent voters, a group that has vacillated in its support of the president in the past. Obama and the Democrats are trying to tap into a growing sense of middle class angst that is leftover from the last recession, the fear that the American Dream is in decline and that our children will not have it as good as we had it. It’s the same fear that underlines poll numbers that show for the past 10 years, Americans have generally felt the country is headed in the wrong direction. It’s also partly why Obama’s approval rating is mired down in the low to mid-40s even though there are numerous signs of an improving national economy in terms of job growth and a strengthening housing market. Republicans are trying to tap into the same fears. Their pitch will be to limit the government’s involvement in the lives of Americans and rely more on individual initiative and the power of the free market. They will point over and over again to the flaws of the president’s health care law as the best example of government overreach. And so the midterm battle begins with significant political stakes for the president and for both political parties. If the Republicans can hold or increase their majority in the House of Representatives and also gain the six seats they need to take control of the Senate, they will be able to block anything the president wants to do in his final two years, rendering him a true ‘lame duck.’ Democrats are panicked at the thought of losing the Senate and will pour all the resources they have into holding enough seats to keep their majority. Their problem is that many of the key Senate races this year are in Republican-leaning states that have soured on Obama. If the president’s poll ratings stay low, history tell us that Democrats could have a long and difficult night when the elections are held on November 4.

#### Unemployment thumps

O’Keefe 1/31 (Ed O’Keefe, Washington Post, <http://www.washingtonpost.com/politics/unemployment-benefits-dominate-the-agenda/2014/01/31/3a63a70a-8659-11e3-b85b-b305db87fb90_story.html>, January 31, 2014)

Unemployment benefits dominate the agenda. Stephanie Ransom is 30, single and the mother of a 3-year-old girl. She has thousands of dollars in credit-card debt and suffers from a rare thoracic disorder that causes severe pain in her neck and shoulders. In July, Ransom lost the job she’d had for nine years at a parts manufacturer in Walworth, Wis., and has not been able to find another one. That prolonged joblessness has become the defining feature of her life. “For the people who are struggling, who can’t get a job out there because they don’t have the qualifications or who have to explain that they don’t have certain qualifications — it’s hard,” she said. This puts Ransom center stage in the political drama about whether Congress should extend unemployment benefits that began expiring just after Christmas for millions of people. Democrats favor an extension, while Republicans are reluctant to pass one without a plan to pay for it. The issue has dominated the political agenda in recent weeks, and President Obama called on Congress on Friday to extend the benefits as he announced that hundreds of businesses have agreed not to discriminate against people who have been unemployed for long periods of time. “Giving up on the unemployed creates a drag on the economy we cannot tolerate,” Obama said. Democratic and Republican senators have begun working on a new proposal to extend the benefits after not advancing a similar plan a few weeks ago. In a key concession, Democrats are now proposing to pay for the $6 billion extension with “pension smoothing,” which would temporarily increase tax collections from employers by allowing them to pay less now into employee pension funds. A handful of GOP senators are open to the idea but also want to be able to offer other amendments to the plan. If an agreement is reached, votes could be held as soon as next week, said aides familiar with the talks. As the talks continue, people such as Ransom who have been out of work longer than six months are caught in the middle. “Congress has to act. We’re the only barrier right now to making sure that people get these benefits,” Rep. Mark Pocan (D-Wis.) said after meeting with Ransom and other unemployed people last week at Blackhawk Technical College. The federal government and states historically have provided out-of-work Americans with up to 26 weeks of unemployment insurance that is paid for with payroll taxes. But Congress has voted several times to extend the federal benefits, at times for up to 99 weeks, since the economic downturn in 2008. The latest federal extension expired just after Christmas, and aid has now ended for more than 1.6 million long-term unemployed workers who had been receiving payments for more than 26 weeks. Pocan thinks that showcasing the people who would suffer may encourage his GOP colleagues to approve an extension. “We need to put the human face on this,” he said. “It’s one thing to say that 1,600 a week in Wisconsin — 72,000 people a week across the country — are going to lose benefits, but it’s another thing to talk about real stories from real people.” That’s where people like Ransom come in; her problems are real. In the weeks since her benefits expired, her car was destroyed by a hit-and-run driver. And after years of surgery had brought her pain under control, it flared up again a few weeks ago when she slipped and fell on ice. “I’m going to keep trying my hardest and complete my schooling and hopefully better my education,” she said. “I hope that unemployment [benefits] will extend for a couple of more months so that it will help me get up on my feet, and get a vehicle and help me get transportation to find the job that I need.” “All I can do is keep my head up,” she added later. But beneficiaries nationwide understand that they are caught in the crossfire of a huge political fight, and that powerful arguments are being made against extending their benefits.

#### XO strategy tanks capital

Scheiber, 2-4 -- New Republic staff

[Noam, "Don't Go It Alone, Obama," New Republic, 2-4-14, www.newrepublic.com/article/116475/obamas-executive-action-approach-political-mistake, accessed 2-7-14]

Still, the White House made a mistake when it settled on unilateral action as its frame for 2014. It’s not that I have concerns about the balance of power between the executive branch and Congress, or the constitutionality of a presidency-by-executive fiat, which Republicans have sniffed about. (The orders Obama has vowed to sign, like raising the minimum wage for federal contractors, clearly fall within his constitutional prerogatives.) It’s not even that the executive actions he’s contemplating are too marginal to matter,1 which Obama seems to acknowledge with his tortured locution. The problem is that the go-it-alone motif misunderstands his biggest political need. The best distillation of White House thinking on this comes care of Jonathan Chait, who’s generally more sanguine about Obama’s instincts than I am. After last week’s State of the Union speech, Chait explained Obama’s dilemma thus: The American public expects its president to improve the economy; the president is mostly powerless to do this as long as Republicans control the House and can filibuster in the Senate, and as long as they see no percentage in cooperating. Ideally, Americans would grasp this dynamic and apportion blame accordingly. Alas, they’re generally incapable of such nuance—“they lack a detailed understanding of the situation in Washington,” Chait writes. And so Obama is left with second-best options. Most recently, this means making it look like he’s taking action on his own, even if that action won’t amount to much. Unfortunately, if Chait has correctly diagnosed the problem—and I think he has—Obama’s turn toward unilateralism won’t help his standing and could easily worsen it. Consider: Chait and I and the White House (if Chait is right) all assume these unilateral maneuvers will be highly limited in their substantive impact. Their only real value is signaling that Obama believes he can exert his will on the economy without Congress and is working really hard to do that. But if that’s the effect, then they only exacerbate Obama’s dilemma by further persuading voters he has influence over the economy we just agreed he doesn’t have.

#### Keystone thumps

Micharl Mann 2/6/14 “"Climate Hubs" a Good Step, but Obama's Policies Still Leading to Climate Disaster“ ( Distinguished Professor of Meteorology Director, Earth System Science Center Contact) http://truth-out.org/news/item/21703-climate-hubs-a-good-step-but-obamas-policies-still-leading-to-climate-disaster

Well, you know, I'm sure that the president faces pressure from all sides. And I don't envy the position that he's in. And, of course, there is quite a bit of pressure by special interest groups like the Koch brothers, who stand to make billions of dollars if the Keystone XL Pipeline is built. Of course there's pressure from industry groups, front groups, right-wing foundations advocating for the fossil fuel industry. And the president understands that. He's got a certain amount of political capital, and he has to calculate how much of that he's willing to expend on this particular issue.¶ That having been said, he made a commitment in his State of the Union address last week. He basically said that he will do all he can to make sure that we don't look back decades from now and have to explain to our children and grandchildren that we made this tragic decision: at a time where we needed to be ramping down our fossil fuel burning and our carbon emissions to avoid dangerous and potentially irreversible climate change, at that pivotal moment we gave in to the pressure and we opened the floodgates for this dirty fossil fuel energy that will commit us to even more climate change.

#### Obama pushing CIR fails

Brune 1/28 (Tom Brune, “Obama expresses hope for immigration reform”, <http://www.newsday.com/news/nation/obama-expresses-hope-for-immigration-reform-1.6898164>, January 28, 2014)

WASHINGTON -- Amid Republican opposition to most of his initiatives and gridlock in Congress, President Barack Obama Tuesday night held out hope for bipartisan progress on one priority: immigration legislation. Obama gave House Republicans who blocked the Senate-passed comprehensive bill last year a nudge "to fix our broken immigration system," but he made no attack on them. "Republicans and Democrats in the Senate have acted. I know that members of both parties in the House want to do the same," he said. "So let's get immigration reform done this year." Sen. Charles Schumer (D-N.Y.), who led the immigration bill through the Senate, said, "I'm glad he talked about immigration reform. He did it the right way by supporting our overall goal but not getting into specifics -- he's letting Congress take the lead." Backers of the bill say they're encouraged that House Speaker John Boehner (R-Ohio) plans to test his caucus' views by outlining "principles for reform" of immigration at a House GOP retreat Thursday. Rep. Cathy McMorris Rodgers (R-Wash.) described the approach in the Republican response to Obama's speech. "We're working on a step-by-step solution to immigration reform by first securing our borders and making sure America will always attract the best, brightest, and hardest working from around the world," she said. Rep. Peter King (R-Seaford) also said Obama struck the right tone on immigration. But King warned Obama could derail the process by trying to be "a one-man good cop-bad cop" -- reaching out to Republicans on immigration, but vowing to get around them by issuing executive orders or setting aside parts of laws. House Republicans are expected to offer citizenship for children brought here illegally by their parents, but only a path to legalization short of full citizenship for 11 million other undocumented immigrants. "If someone is going to support immigration reform, they should accept legalization and not hold out for citizenship," said King. Maryann Sinclair Slutsky, executive director of Long Island Wins, a pro-immigrant advocacy group, said of the Republican idea, "It's a step, but we're staying true to our own principles" -- including the path to citizenship.

#### The clean tech bubble burst has burst- investment dead

Nordan 3/27 (Mathew Nordan, Guest Contributor, Matthew Nordan is an energy VC investor at Venrock, one of the oldest and best-performing VC firms. Earlier, he co-founded and led the energy tech analyst firm Lux Research and forecasted technology futures at Forrester. There’s more where this came from at mnordan.com, “The state of cleantech venture capital: what lies ahead”, <http://gigaom.com/2013/03/27/the-state-of-cleantech-venture-capital-what-lies-ahead/>, March 27, 2013)

Cleantech VC is receding because of poor short-term performance – no surprise in a post-bubble field with outsized time and money requirements. The category is about to go on a walk in the woods, where innovators will blaze a new trail. tweet this In late 2011 I decided to write up an internal analysis I’d done at Venrock about the state of cleantech venture capital and make it available broadly. I’m a fact-based, research-driven guy, so I tried to shine the light of data on myths and realities in the field. My macro conclusion was that while it was really early, investment returns to date were on par with VC overall. Much has changed since then. With 2012 numbers done and dusted, I figure it’s time to revisit this topic – again, under the light of data. I’ll frame this analysis with the questions I’ve gotten from VCs and entrepreneurs who’ve asked me for an update. What’s happening to cleantech venture capital? It’s receding. TSOCVC\_fig1 Investment fell 30% in 2012 – and even further at the early stage. The Moneytree survey numbers had cleantech VC investment falling from $4.6 billion in 2011 to $3.3 billion in 2012 – a 28% drop. Further, they showed first-time funding of new start-ups plummeting 58% to just $216 million, and shrinking as the year progressed: By Q4, first-time funding was just 4% of capital invested. Limited partners are backing off. VC firms get the money they invest from limited partners (LPs) like foundations and pension funds. Last December Preqin called up 31 LPs that were invested in at least one cleantech-focused fund and asked if they planned to back any new ones in 2013. Only 22% said yes (down from 31% a year before). The people are changing. Many VC firms parted ways with their cleantech teams in 2012. While February’s ARPA-E conference had a record number of attendees, venture investors were scarce – replaced by a bumper crop of corporate types. Why is this happening? Cleantech VC performance is substantially lagging venture capital as a whole. This wasn’t true in 2011, but things changed fast in 2012. I arrive at this conclusion by comparing two data sets. On one hand, we have data on the interim performance of 19 cleantech-only VC funds as reported by the California Public Employees’ Retirement System (CalPERS), a big LP. On the other, we have equivalent data for the entire universe of VC funds from the National Venture Capital Association. (The data are expressed as “value to paid-in capital, net to LPs,” which means “the current value of the funds divided by the money put into them, accounting for what VCs pay themselves.”) By comparing cleantech-only fund performance with the full VC universe at the same points in time, we can see whether cleantech is doing better or worse than the asset class. The answer is that cleantech went sideways in 2012 while VC overall did well. In September 2010, the cleantech VC funds were worth 0.90x the money paid into them while comparable VC funds overall were at 0.96x – roughly the same. Six months later the gap had widened, but both had risen in value and remained within spitting distance. By June of 2012, however (the most recent data available), the cleantech funds had declined slightly while the overall VC universe climbed to 1.23x. TSOCVC\_fig2 This is why investment is stalling, LPs are hesitating, and cleantech VCs are thinning: Capital invested in other domains is showing a greater near-term return. If minimal money had gone into cleantech, or if the macro environment were rosier, there might be more willingness to forge ahead. But today, fund managers assess the $25 billion worth of cleantech VC invested since 2003 against a backdrop of shale gas and climate apathy – and tighten the purse strings. OK, but why is that happening? What’s driving weak cleantech VC performance? Two factors. First, there have been too few exits. Let’s consider the gold standard of VC wins – an IPO on a major exchange. When I last did this analysis, cleantech was overperforming on the IPO front: In 2009, 2010, and 2011, cleantech’s share of VC-backed IPOs exceeded its share of VC funding. (Note: One must apply an appropriate time lag applied to the latter – I used five years, which is informed by deal-by-deal fundraising data by cleantech start-ups). This ended in 2012. Just as in the prior year, three cleantech IPOs took place out of about 50 VC-backed IPOs in total (6%). But cleantech’s corresponding share of VC funding rose to 10% – so cleantech was now underperforming on exits relative to capital invested, instead of overperforming. (Of course, most VC-backed companies exit through acquisition, not an IPO. But the M&A front looks no better for cleantech. When merchant bank Jane Capital counted up every acquisition of a VC-backed cleantech start-up worth more than $50 million in the last 10 years, it found just 27 of them.) Second, the winners have disappointed post-IPO. When a start-up goes public, its VC investors rarely get to sell their shares immediately: They have to wait out a lockup period that typically lasts six months. Of the nine VC-backed cleantech start-ups that have done major-market IPOs since 2010 and have been public for more than six months, eight were trading below their IPO price at the 180-day mark. In four of those cases, the 180-day share price was also lower than the price at the last venture round. That means VCs who bought shares in that round were under water when the lockup expired. So is the pullback in cleantech VC justified? Well, it’s certainly expected. The cleantech gold rush of the late 2000s saw hundreds of start-ups funded – many with identical propositions – that greatly exceeded the carrying capacity of their industries: For example, there’s no way that more than a handful of the 219 solar start-ups counted by Greentech Media in 2009 could possibly succeed. This dynamic isn’t unique to cleantech. The Internet VC bubble of the late 90s was the same story, albeit on a much larger scale. But just as the boom-and-bust in dot com investment didn’t mean this whole Internet thing was a waste, the same is true for energy and environmental technologies. It’s very likely that multiple billion-dollar companies lurk among today’s cleantech VC portfolios. The question is – given the current retrenchment of capital from the field – how many of them will get the fuel to reach the finish line. In the main, energy and environmental start-ups need outsized time, money, and risk tolerance to reach a big outcome. (That’s not true of IT-meets-energy “cleanweb” companies like Opower or Venrock-backed Nest Labs, but it holds for the deep-tech start-ups that comprise most of the category.) As our case study, let’s take First Solar, the pioneering thin-film solar maker. The company’s first instantiation was founded in 1990; it took 12 years to ship a product, was restarted in 1999, and consumed $150 million of equity investment (all Walton family money) before its 2007 IPO. But at that outcome, First Solar was worth $1.4 billion valuing the Walton stake at 8.4x. Two years later at the peak of the solar boom, it was worth 199x! If this is what success looks like – that is, if the majority of cleantech start-ups will need more time and money to reach big outcomes compared with VC-backed companies overall – a few conclusions follow: Funds focused solely on cleantech will have a longer and deeper “J-curve” of returns compared with VC as a whole. When they reach the same final return multiple, they will take longer to do so (impacting IRR). Midway through the journey, their performance will look like an “L-curve.” To the extent that cleantech start-ups’ time to exit will be 10 years or more, it’s too early to call success or failure on the current crop – because most of them were founded in 2007 or later. Check back in five years. Because the time frames to an outcome are longer and the amounts of capital required are greater, cleantech investment should be less spikey compared with investment in, say, Internet start-ups. And lo and behold, that’s pretty much what we see: Cleantech VC now is like Internet VC in 2001: on the downward slope of a bubble, albeit with a more gradual climb and a gentler descent. Note that Facebook was conceived in 2003 – the lowest point for Internet investing post-bust – and that in 2004, Google’s IPO kicked off the renaissance that persists today. So is the cleantech pullback justified? The data says it’s too early to call. However, it also suggests that the time frame required to reach a conclusion will greatly stretch 10-year closed-ended funds. (A diligent reader may point out my own numbers showing that when VC-backed cleantech start-ups have gone public, they’ve mostly done so in less than 10 years. My take is that most of these companies were rushed to public markets before they were ready – explaining the awful aftermarket performance.) What happens now? Cleantech innovation is about to take a walk in the woods. Justified or not, the established path of VC-backed investment is narrowing for a generation of start-ups. Some of those companies – and some of the investment managers that have backed them – will break off into the wilderness to find a new route.

#### 1) Immigrants will be employed in jobs that waste their potential.

Bárbara **Castelletti**, economist at the OECD Development Centre, **et al.**, Jeff Dayton-Johnson, head of the OECD development Centre, and Ángel Melguizo, economist at the OECD Development Centre, “Migration in Latin America: Answering old questions with new data,” 3/19/**2010**, http://www.voxeu.org/index.php?q=node/4764

Most research on migration assumes that workers are employed in activities that correspond to their skill level. In practice workers may be employed in sectors characterised by skill requirements different from their educational or training background. In particular, migrants may be overqualified for the work they do. As Mattoo et al. (2005) show, this is the case for Mexicans, Central Americans and Andean university-educated migrants working in the US. Despite their tertiary degrees, these groups rarely hold highly skilled jobs. Worse, they may even be at the lower rungs of the skill ladder; 44% of tertiary-educated Mexicans migrants in the US are working in unskilled jobs. This equilibrium represents a lose-lose-lose situation. The home country loses human capital (brain drain), the host country and the migrant him/herself are not fully employed (brain waste), and the low skilled workers in host countries (both earlier migrants and natives) can be pushed out of the market (given that they compete with these higher-educated workers for jobs).

To illustrate this phenomenon for South-South flows, we follow OECD (2007) and compare the education level (primary, secondary and tertiary) of migrants in Argentina, Costa Rica and Venezuela with their category of job qualification (low, intermediate and high skilled). Figure 3 shows the share of over-qualified migrants and native workers, residing in different countries, and the comparison between foreign-born and natives.

Over-qualification rates vary sharply among countries, ranging from 5% in Costa Rica and Venezuela to 14% in Argentina. While lower than in the US, Canada and Spain where the over-qualification rates are above 15%, these results point to a high degree of over-qualification among immigrants compared to the native-born in Latin American countries. While there are possible omitted variables, it is likely that some part of the brain waste observed is because of the non-recognition of foreign qualifications or excessive requalification requirements for foreigners.

#### We adapt

Mendelsohn ‘9 – Robert O. Mendelsohn 9, the Edwin Weyerhaeuser Davis Professor, Yale School of Forestry and Environmental Studies, Yale University, June 2009, “Climate Change and Economic Growth,” online: <http://www.growthcommission.org/storage/cgdev/documents/gcwp060web.pdf>

These statements arelargely alarmist and misleading. Although climate change is a serious problem that deserves attention, society’s immediate behavior has an extremely low probability of leading to catastrophic consequences**.** The science and economicsof climate change is quite clear that emissions over the next few decades will lead to onlymild consequences. The severe impacts predicted by alarmists require a century (or two in the case of Stern 2006) of no mitigation. Many of the predicted impacts assume there will be no or little adaptation. The net economic impacts from climate change over the next 50 years will be small regardless. Most of the more severe impacts will take more than a century or even a millennium to unfold and many of these **“**potential” impacts will never occur because people will adapt. It is not at all apparent that immediate and dramatic policies need to be developed to thwart long‐range climate risks. What is needed are long‐run balanced responses.
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#### Roleplaying is key

McClean ‘1 (David E. “The Cultural Left and the Limits of Social Hope,” Am. Phil. Conf., [www.american-philosophy.org/archives/past\_conference\_programs/pc2001/Discussion%20papers/david\_mcclean.htm](http://www.american-philosophy.org/archives/past_conference_programs/pc2001/Discussion%20papers/david_mcclean.htm))

Yet for some reason, at least partially explicated in Richard Rorty's Achieving Our Country, a book that I think is long overdue, leftist critics continue to cite and refer to the eccentric and often a priori ruminations of people like those just mentioned, and a litany of others including Derrida, Deleuze, Lyotard, Jameson, and Lacan, who are to me hugely more irrelevant than Habermas in their narrative attempts to suggest policy prescriptions (when they actually do suggest them) aimed at curing the ills of homelessness, poverty, market greed, national belligerence and racism. I would like to suggest that it is time for American social critics who are enamored with this group, those who actually want to be relevant, to recognize that they have a disease, and a disease regarding which I myself must remember to stay faithful to my own twelve step program of recovery. The disease is the need for elaborate theoretical "remedies" wrapped in neological and multi-syllabic jargon. These elaborate theoretical remedies are more "interesting," to be sure, than the pragmatically settled questions about what shape democracy should take in various contexts, or whether private property should be protected by the state, or regarding our basic human nature (described, if not defined (heaven forbid!), in such statements as "We don't like to starve" and "We like to speak our minds without fear of death" and "We like to keep our children safe from poverty"). As Rorty puts it, "When one of today's academic leftists says that some topic has been 'inadequately theorized,' you can be pretty certain that he or she is going to drag in either philosophy of language, or Lacanian psychoanalysis, or some neo-Marxist version of economic determinism. . . . These futile attempts to philosophize one's way into political relevance are a symptom of what happens when a Left retreats from activism and adopts a spectatorial approach to the problems of its country. Disengagement from practice produces theoretical hallucinations"(italics mine).(1) Or as John Dewey put it in his The Need for a Recovery of Philosophy, "I believe that philosophy in America will be lost between chewing a historical cud long since reduced to woody fiber, or an apologetics for lost causes, . . . . or a scholastic, schematic formalism, unless it can somehow bring to consciousness America's own needs and its own implicit principle of successful action." Those who suffer or have suffered from this disease Rorty refers to as the Cultural Left, which left is juxtaposed to the Political Left that Rorty prefers and prefers for good reason. Another attribute of the Cultural Left is that its members fancy themselves pure culture critics who view the successes of America and the West, rather than some of the barbarous methods for achieving those successes, as mostly evil, and who view anything like national pride as equally evil even when that pride is tempered with the knowledge and admission of the nation's shortcomings. In other words, the Cultural Left, in this country, too often dismiss American society as beyond reform and redemption. And Rorty correctly argues that this is a disastrous conclusion, i.e. disastrous for the Cultural Left. I think it may also be disastrous for our social hopes, as I will explain. Leftist American culture critics might put their considerable talents to better use if they bury some of their cynicism about America's social and political prospects and help forge public and political possibilities in a spirit of determination to, indeed, achieve our country - the country of Jefferson and King; the country of John Dewey and Malcom X; the country of Franklin Roosevelt and Bayard Rustin, and of the later George Wallace and the later Barry Goldwater. To invoke the words of King, and with reference to the American society, the time is always ripe to seize the opportunity to help create the "beloved community," one woven with the thread of agape into a conceptually single yet diverse tapestry that shoots for nothing less than a true intra-American cosmopolitan ethos, one wherein both same sex unions and faith-based initiatives will be able to be part of the same social reality, one wherein business interests and the university are not seen as belonging to two separate galaxies but as part of the same answer to the threat of social and ethical nihilism. We who fancy ourselves philosophers would do well to create from within ourselves and from within our ranks a new kind of public intellectual who has both a hungry theoretical mind and who is yet capable of seeing the need to move past high theory to other important questions that are less bedazzling and "interesting" but more important to the prospect of our flourishing - questions such as "How is it possible to develop a citizenry that cherishes a certain hexis, one which prizes the character of the Samaritan on the road to Jericho almost more than any other?" or "How can we square the political dogma that undergirds the fantasy of a missile defense system with the need to treat America as but one member in a community of nations under a "law of peoples?" The new public philosopher might seek to understand labor law and military and trade theory and doctrine as much as theories of surplus value; the logic of international markets and trade agreements as much as critiques of commodification, and the politics of complexity as much as the politics of power (all of which can still be done from our arm chairs.) This means going down deep into the guts of our quotidian social institutions, into the grimy pragmatic details where intellectuals are loathe to dwell but where the officers and bureaucrats of those institutions take difficult and often unpleasant, imperfect decisions that affect other peoples' lives, and it means making honest attempts to truly understand how those institutions actually function in the actual world before howling for their overthrow commences. This might help keep us from being slapped down in debates by true policy pros who actually know what they are talking about but who lack awareness of the dogmatic assumptions from which they proceed, and who have not yet found a good reason to listen to jargon-riddled lectures from philosophers and culture critics with their snobish disrespect for the so-called "managerial class."

#### Simulation allows us to influence state policy AND is key to agency

**Eijkman 12**

The role of simulations in the authentic learning for national security policy development: Implications for Practice / Dr. Henk Simon Eijkman. [electronic resource] <http://nsc.anu.edu.au/test/documents/Sims_in_authentic_learning_report.pdf>. Dr Henk Eijkman is currently an independent consultant as well as visiting fellow at the University of New South Wales at the Australian Defence Force Academy and is Visiting Professor of Academic Development, Annasaheb Dange College of Engineering and Technology in India. As a sociologist he developed an active interest in tertiary learning and teaching with a focus on socially inclusive innovation and culture change. He has taught at various institutions in the social sciences and his work as an adult learning specialist has taken him to South Africa, Malaysia, Palestine, and India. He publishes widely in international journals, serves on Conference Committees and editorial boards of edited books and international journal

However, whether as an approach to learning, innovation, persuasion or culture shift, policy simulations derive their power from two central features: their combination of simulation and gaming (Geurts et al. 2007). 1. The simulation element: the unique combination of simulation with role-playing.The unique simulation/role-play mix enables participants to create **possible futures** relevant to the topic being studied. This is diametrically opposed to the more traditional, teacher-centric approaches in which a future is produced for them. In policy simulations, possible futures are much more than an object of tabletop discussion and verbal speculation. ‘**No other technique** allows a group of participants to engage in collective action in a safe environment to create and analyse the futures they want to explore’ (Geurts et al. 2007: 536). 2. **The game element:** the interactive and tailor-made modelling and design of the policy game. The actual run of the policy simulation is only one step, though a most important and visible one, in a collective process of investigation, communication, and evaluation of performance. In the context of a post-graduate course in public policy development, for example, a policy simulation is a dedicated game constructed in collaboration with practitioners to achieve a high level of proficiency in relevant aspects of the policy development process. To drill down to a level of finer detail, **policy** development simulations—as forms of interactive or participatory modelling— are particularly effective in developing participant knowledge and skills in the five key areas of the policy development process (and success criteria), namely: Complexity, Communication, Creativity, Consensus, and Commitment to action (‘the five Cs’). The capacity to provide effective learning support in these five categories has proved to be particularly helpful in strategic decision-making (Geurts et al. 2007). Annexure 2.5 contains a detailed description, in table format, of the synopsis below.
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#### their agency arguments are utopian and can’t do anything about violence--it would require massive social engineering to make everyone think the way that idiots like bleiker and george do

**O'Callaghan, 02** (Terry , lecturer in the school of International Relations at the University of South Australia, International Relations and the third debate, ed: Jarvis, 2002, p. 79-80)

Moving beyond realism, for George, also suggests the possibility of moving beyond conflict, into a new postmodern era that transcends the dialectic of opposition and confrontation. For George, thinking is a constructivist phenomenon that constitutes our reality: thinking makes it so. If the outcome of realism has been the transmutation of reality into a war system, then it follows that postmodern thinking, with its emphasis on tolerance, emancipation, and equality, would help to transform this system into one that is dignified, peaceful, and substantially "less dangerous." But whatever one says about radical human agency and of its prospects for liberation, in practice emancipation will involve some degree of social engineering: inequalities have to be corrected, wrongs made right, and injustices corrected. The agents of global change, whoever they might be, will have to force some individuals and groups to do their bidding. In the end, **legislative reform and the forced direction of groups and individuals are unavoidable realities**. (George, 1994:219). Moreover, in situations where entrenched cultural and historical values collide, and this is a likely possibility from a theory that seeks to "help others speak for themselves," we might reasonably expect some degree of violence and have to tolerate it. George, however, refuses to explore these probabilities. Do the advocates of postmodern values, for example, take up arms against those who are unwilling to let "others" speak for themselves? If they do not, then their case has no real teeth. But if they do, they must, at some stage, sanction the use of force. This is a conundrum endemic to the theoretical architecture of postmodernism, and one George fails to tackle, indeed is reticent even to acknowledge. Clearly, however, George wants to defend the proposition that his "new world order" will be less than the new/old one of George Bush senior, the Clinton or of George Bush junior and the realists. But, again, he fails to demonstrate how his version of postmodernism can prevent the intrusion and corruption of its schema by violence or else justify the use of violence in pursuit of those ends he otherwise champions. He does neither.

#### Attrocities are inevitable and require a response—language has the power to facilitate or confront attrocity. Their alt breeds cynicism and nihilism that greases the wheels to further attrocities

**Ketels, 96** (Violet, professor of English at Temple University, The Annals of The American Academy of Political and Social Science, November, lexis)

 [\*46]  THE political bestiality of our age is abetted by our willingness to tolerate the deconstructing of humanist values. The process begins with the cynical manipulation of language. It often ends in stupefying murderousness before which the world stands silent, frozen in impotent "attentism"--a wait-and-see stance as unsuited to the human plight as a pacifier is to stopping up the hunger of a starving child. We have let lapse our pledge to the 6 million Jewish victims of the Holocaust that their deaths might somehow be transfiguring for humankind. We allow "slaughterhouse men" tactical status at U.N. tables and "cast down our eyes when the depraved roar past." [1](http://www.lexis.com/research/retrieve?_m=1fdf65367957929014062cbd6ec20591&docnum=1&_fmtstr=FULL&_startdoc=1&wchp=dGLbVtz-zSkAz&_md5=379d63c16278cd52310a5c612eb51a93&focBudTerms=havel%20to%20the%20castle&focBudSel=all#n1) Peacemakers, delegated by us and circumscribed by our fears, temporize with thugs who have revived lebensraum claims more boldly than Hitler did. In the Germany of the 1930s, a demonic idea was born in a demented brain; the word went forth; orders were given, repeated, widely broadcast; and men, women, and children were herded into death camps. Their offshore signals, cries for help, did not summon us to rescue. We had become inured to the reality of human suffering. We could no longer hear what the words meant or did not credit them or not enough of us joined the chorus. Shrieking victims perished in the cold blankness of inhumane silence. We were deaf to the apocalyptic urgency in Solzhenitsyn's declaration from the Gulag that we must check the disastrous course of history. We were heedless of the lesson of his experience that only the unbending strength of the human spirit, fully taking its stand on the shifting frontier of encroaching violence and declaring "not one step further," though death may be the end of it--only this unwavering firmness offers any genuine defense of peace for the individual, of genuine peace for mankind at large. [2](http://www.lexis.com/research/retrieve?_m=1fdf65367957929014062cbd6ec20591&docnum=1&_fmtstr=FULL&_startdoc=1&wchp=dGLbVtz-zSkAz&_md5=379d63c16278cd52310a5c612eb51a93&focBudTerms=havel%20to%20the%20castle&focBudSel=all#n2) In past human crises, writers and thinkers strained language to the breaking point to keep alive the memory of the unimaginable, to keep the human conscience from forgetting. In the current context, however, intellectuals seem more devoted to abstract assaults on values than to thoughtful probing of the moral dimensions of human experience. "Heirs of the ancient possessions of higher knowledge and literacy skills," [3](http://www.lexis.com/research/retrieve?_m=1fdf65367957929014062cbd6ec20591&docnum=1&_fmtstr=FULL&_startdoc=1&wchp=dGLbVtz-zSkAz&_md5=379d63c16278cd52310a5c612eb51a93&focBudTerms=havel%20to%20the%20castle&focBudSel=all#n3) we seem to have lost our nerve, and not only because of Holocaust history and its tragic aftermath. We feel insecure before the empirical absolutes of hard science. We are intimidated by the "high modernist rage against mimesis and content," [4](http://www.lexis.com/research/retrieve?_m=1fdf65367957929014062cbd6ec20591&docnum=1&_fmtstr=FULL&_startdoc=1&wchp=dGLbVtz-zSkAz&_md5=379d63c16278cd52310a5c612eb51a93&focBudTerms=havel%20to%20the%20castle&focBudSel=all#n4) monstrous progeny of the union between Nietzsche and philosophical formalism, the grim proposal we have bought into that there is no truth, no objectivity, and no disinterested knowledge. [5](http://www.lexis.com/research/retrieve?_m=1fdf65367957929014062cbd6ec20591&docnum=1&_fmtstr=FULL&_startdoc=1&wchp=dGLbVtz-zSkAz&_md5=379d63c16278cd52310a5c612eb51a93&focBudTerms=havel%20to%20the%20castle&focBudSel=all#n5) Less certain about the power of language, that "oldest flame of the  [\*47]  humanist soul," [6](http://www.lexis.com/research/retrieve?_m=1fdf65367957929014062cbd6ec20591&docnum=1&_fmtstr=FULL&_startdoc=1&wchp=dGLbVtz-zSkAz&_md5=379d63c16278cd52310a5c612eb51a93&focBudTerms=havel%20to%20the%20castle&focBudSel=all#n6) to frame a credo to live by or criteria to judge by, we are vulnerable even to the discredited Paul de Man's indecent hint that "wars and revolutions are not empirical events . . . but 'texts' masquerading as facts." [7](http://www.lexis.com/research/retrieve?_m=1fdf65367957929014062cbd6ec20591&docnum=1&_fmtstr=FULL&_startdoc=1&wchp=dGLbVtz-zSkAz&_md5=379d63c16278cd52310a5c612eb51a93&focBudTerms=havel%20to%20the%20castle&focBudSel=all#n7) Truth and reality seem more elusive than they ever were in the past; values are pronounced to be mere fictions of ruling elites to retain power. We are embarrassed by virtue. Words collide and crack under these new skeptical strains, dissolving into banalities the colossal enormity of what must be expressed lest we forget. Remembering for the future has become doubly dispiriting by our having to remember for the present, too, our having to register and confront what is wrong here and now. The reality to be fixed in memory shifts as we seek words for it; the memory we set down is flawed by our subjectivities. It is selective, deceptive, partial, unreliable, and amoral. It plays tricks and can be invented. It stops up its ears to shut out what it does not dare to face. [8](http://www.lexis.com/research/retrieve?_m=1fdf65367957929014062cbd6ec20591&docnum=1&_fmtstr=FULL&_startdoc=1&wchp=dGLbVtz-zSkAz&_md5=379d63c16278cd52310a5c612eb51a93&focBudTerms=havel%20to%20the%20castle&focBudSel=all#n8) Lodged in our brains, such axioms, certified by science and statistics, tempt us to concede the final irrelevance of words and memory. We have to get on with our lives. Besides, memories reconstructed in words, even when they are documented by evidence, have not often changed the world or fended off the powerful seductions to silence, forgetting, or denying. Especially denying, which, in the case of the Holocaust, has become an obscene industry competing in the open market of ideas for control of our sense of the past. It is said that the Holocaust never happened. Revisionist history with a vengeance is purveyed in words; something in words must be set against it. Yet what? How do we nerve to the task when we are increasingly disposed to cast both words and memory in a condition of cryogenic dubiety? Not only before but also since 1945, the criminality of governments, paraded as politics and fattening on linguistic manipulation and deliberately reimplanted memory of past real or imagined grievance, has spread calamity across the planet. "The cancer that has eaten at the entrails of Yugoslavia since Tito's death [has] Kosovo for its locus," but not merely as a piece of land. The country's rogue adventurers use the word "Kosovo" to reinvoke as sacred the land where Serbs were defeated by Turks in 1389! [9](http://www.lexis.com/research/retrieve?_m=1fdf65367957929014062cbd6ec20591&docnum=1&_fmtstr=FULL&_startdoc=1&wchp=dGLbVtz-zSkAz&_md5=379d63c16278cd52310a5c612eb51a93&focBudTerms=havel%20to%20the%20castle&focBudSel=all#n9) Memory of bloody massacres in 1389, sloganized and distorted in 1989, demands the bloody revenge of new massacres and returns civilization not to its past glory but to its gory tribal wars. As Matija Beckovic, the bard of Serb nationalism, writes, "It is as if the Serbian people waged only one battle--by widening the Kosovo charnel-house, by adding wailing upon wailing, by counting new martyrs to the martyrs of Kosovo. . . . Kosovo is the Serbianized  [\*48]  history of the Flood--the Serbian New Testament." [10](http://www.lexis.com/research/retrieve?_m=1fdf65367957929014062cbd6ec20591&docnum=1&_fmtstr=FULL&_startdoc=1&wchp=dGLbVtz-zSkAz&_md5=379d63c16278cd52310a5c612eb51a93&focBudTerms=havel%20to%20the%20castle&focBudSel=all#n10) A cover of Suddeutsche Zeitung in 1994 was printed with blood donated by refugee women from Bosnia in an eerily perverse afterbirth of violence revisited. [11](http://www.lexis.com/research/retrieve?_m=1fdf65367957929014062cbd6ec20591&docnum=1&_fmtstr=FULL&_startdoc=1&wchp=dGLbVtz-zSkAz&_md5=379d63c16278cd52310a5c612eb51a93&focBudTerms=havel%20to%20the%20castle&focBudSel=all#n11) We stand benumbed before multiplying horrors. As Vaclav Havel warned more than a decade ago, regimes that generate them "are the avant garde of a global crisis in civilization." The depersonalization of power in "system, ideology and apparat," pathological suspicions about human motives and meanings, the loosening of individual responsibility, the swiftness by which disastrous events follow one upon another "have deprived us of our conscience, of our common sense and natural speech and thereby, of our actual humanity." [12](http://www.lexis.com/research/retrieve?_m=1fdf65367957929014062cbd6ec20591&docnum=1&_fmtstr=FULL&_startdoc=1&wchp=dGLbVtz-zSkAz&_md5=379d63c16278cd52310a5c612eb51a93&focBudTerms=havel%20to%20the%20castle&focBudSel=all#n12) Nothing less than the transformation of human consciousness is likely to rescue us.

#### Alt fails – individual change can’t stop violence – broad change necessary

Gelber 95 (Dr. Kath, Professor of Social Sciences and Political Studies – University of New South Wales, “The Will to Oversimplify”, Green Left Online, 8-16, http://www.greenleft.org.au/1995/198/11413)

The Will to Violence presents a powerful and one-sided critique of the forces which enable violence between individuals to occur. Violence between individuals is taken in this context to mean all forms of violence, from personal experiences of assault to war. Kappeler's thesis is that violence in all these cases is caused in the final instance by one overriding factor -- the individual choice to commit a violent act. Of course, in one sense that is true. Acknowledging alternative models of human behaviour and analyses of the social causes of violence, Kappeler dismisses these as outside her subject matter and exhorts her readers not to ignore the “agent's decision to act as he [sic] did”, but to explore “the personal decision in favour of violence”. Having established this framework, she goes on to explore various aspects of personal decisions to commit violence. Ensuing chapters cover topics such as love of the “other”, psychotherapy, ego-philosophy and the legitimation of dominance. However, it is the introduction which is most interesting. Already on the third page, Kappeler is dismissive of social or structural analyses of the multiple causes of alienation, violence and war. She dismisses such analyses for their inability to deal with the personal decision to commit violence. For example, “some left groups have tried to explain men's sexual violence as the result of class oppression, while some Black theoreticians have explained the violence of Black men as a result of racist oppression”. She continues, “The ostensible aim of these arguments may be to draw attention to the pervasive and structural violence of classism and racism, yet they not only fail to combat such inequality, they actively contribute to it” [my emphasis]. Kappeler goes on to argue that, “although such oppression is a very real part of an agent's life context, these `explanations' ignore the fact that not everyone experiencing the same oppression uses violence”, i.e. the perpetrator has decided to violate. Kappeler's aim of course was to establish a framework for her particular project: a focus on the individual and the psychological to “find” a cause for violence. However, her rejection of alternative analyses not only as of little use, but as actively contributing to the problem, frames her own thesis extremely narrowly. Her argument suffers from both her inability, or unwillingness, to discuss the bigger picture and a wilful distortion of what she sees as her opponents' views. The result is less than satisfactory. Kappeler's book reads more as a passionate plea than a coherent argument. Her overwhelming focus on the individual, rather than providing a means with which to combat violence, in the end leaves the reader feeling disempowered. After all, there must be huge numbers of screwed up and vengeful people in the world to have chosen to litter history with war, environmental destruction and rape. Where do we go from here? Those lucky enough to have read Kappeler's book are supposed to “decide not to use violence ourselves”. A worthy endeavour, but hardly sufficient to change the world.

#### Proves why perm solves best

Kappeler 95 (Susanne, Associate Professor – Al-Akhawayn University, The Will to Violence: The Politics of Personal Behavior, p. 8)

Moreover, personal behavior is no alternative to ‘political action’; there is no question of either/or. My concern, on the contrary, is the connection between these recognized forms of violence and the forms of everyday behavior which we consider ‘normal’ but which betray our own will to violence- the connection, in other words, between our own actions and those acts of violence which are normally the focus of our political critiques. Precisely because there is no choice between dedicating oneself either to ‘political issues’ or to ‘personal behavior’, the question of the politics of personal behavior has (also) to be moved into the centre of our politics and our critique.

### Against link to the aff

#### Our norms advantage does not lead to violence—alternative is militarized violence

Charles Kels, attorney for the Department of Homeland Security and a major in the Air Force Reserve, 12/6/12, THe Perilous Position of the Laws of War, harvardnsj.org/2012/12/the-perilous-position-of-the-laws-of-war/

The real nub of the current critique of U.S. policy, therefore, is that the Bush administration’s war on terror and the Obama administration’s war on al Qaeda and affiliates constitute a distinction without a difference. The latter may be less rhetorically inflammatory, but it is equally amorphous in application, enabling the United States to pursue non-state actors under an armed conflict paradigm. This criticism may have merit, but it is really about the use of force altogether, not the parameters that define how force is applied. It is, in other words, an ad bellum argument cloaked in the language of in bello.

LOAC is apolitical. Adherence to it does not legitimize an unlawful resort to force, just as its violation—unless systematic—does not automatically render one’s cause unjust. The answer for those who object to U.S. targeted killing and indefinite detention is not to apply a peace paradigm that would invalidate LOAC and undercut the belligerent immunity of soldiers, but to direct their arguments to the political leadership regarding the decision to use force in the first place. Attacking LOAC for its perceived leniency and demanding the “pristine purity” of HRL in military operations is actually quite dangerous and counterproductive from a humanitarian perspective, because there remains the distinct possibility that the alternative to LOAC is not HRL but “lawlessness.” While there are certainly examples of armies that have acquitted themselves quite well in law enforcement roles—and while most nations do not subscribe to the strict U.S. delineation between military and police forces—the vast bulk of history indicates that in the context of armed hostilities, LOAC is by far the best case scenario, not the worst.

Transnational terrorist networks pose unique security problems, among them the need to apply preexisting legal rubrics to an enemy who is dedicated to undermining and abusing them. Vital to meeting this challenge—of “building a durable framework for the struggle against al Qaeda that [draws] upon our deeply held values and traditions”—is to refrain from treating the deeply-ingrained tenets of honorable warfare as a mere mechanism for projecting force. The laws of war are much more than “lawyerly license” to kill and detain, subject to varying levels of application depending upon political outlook. They remain a bulwark against indiscriminate carnage, steeped in history and tried in battle.

### Reps

#### Their use of the word “fuck” engages in a culture of violence—vote negative to rethink language and its relation to violence – it’s a DRule

Schwyzer 9—community college history and gender studies professor.  DPhil, Berkley (Hugo,  “Penetrate” v. “Engulf” and the multiple meanings of the “f” word: a note on feminist language, 4 November 2009, <http://hugoschwyzer.net/2009/11/04/penetrate-v-engulf-and-the-multiple-meanings-of-the-f-word-a-note-on-feminist-language/>)

In every women’s studies class I’ve taught here at PCC, and in many guest lectures about feminism I’ve given elsewhere, I use the “penetrate” versus “engulf” image to illustrate a basic point about the way in which our language constructs and maintains male aggression and female passivity. Even those who haven’t had heterosexual intercourse can, with only a small degree of imagination required, see how “envelop” might be just as accurate as “enter”. “A woman’s vagina engulfs a man’s penis during intercourse” captures reality as well as “A man’s penis penetrates a woman’s vagina.” Of course, most het folks who have intercourse are well aware that power is fluid; each partner can temporarily assert a more active role (frequently by being on top) — as a result, the language used to describe what’s actually happening could shift. Except, of course, in our sex ed textbooks and elsewhere, that shift never happens. If the goal of sex education is to provide accurate information to young people before they become sexually active, we do a tremendous disservice to both boys and girls through our refusal to use language that honors the reality of women’s sexual agency. We set young women up to be afraid; we set young men up to think of women’s bodies as passive receptacles. While changing our language isn’t a panacea for the problem of sexual violence (and joyless, obligatory intercourse), it’s certainly a promising start. As another part of my introductory lecture on language, I talk about “fuck”. I first dispell the urban legends that it’s an acronym (I’m amazed at how persistent the belief is that the word stands for “for unlawful carnal knowledge” or “fornication under the consent of the king”; I have students every damn year who are convinced the word is derived from one of those two sources.) I then ask at what age young people in English-speaking culture first encounter the word. Most of my students had heard the word by age five or six; many had started using it not long thereafter. I then ask how old they were when they realized that “fuck” has multiple meanings, and that its two most common uses are to describe intercourse and to express rage. There’s a pause at this point. Here’s the problem: long before most kids in our culture become sexually active, the most common slang word in the American idiom has knit together two things in their consciousness: sex and rage. If “fucking” is the most common slang term for intercourse, and “fuck you” or “fuck off”the most common terms to express contempt or rage, what’s the end result? A culture that has difficulty distinguishing sex from violence. In a world where a heartbreakingly high percentage of women will be victims of rape, it’s not implausible to suggest that at least in part, the language itself normalizes sexual violence. I challenge my students. I don’t ask them to give up all the satisfactions of profanity; rather I challenge them to think about words like “fuck” or “screw” and then make a commitment to confine the use of those words to either a description of sex (”We fucked last night”) or to express anger or extreme exasperation (”I’m so fucking furious with you right now!”) but not, not, not, both. Rage and lust are both normal human experiences; we will get angry and we will be sexual (or want to be) over and over again over the course of our lives. But we have a responsibility, I think, to make a clear and bright line between the language of sexual desire and the language of contempt and indignation. Pick one arena of human experience where that most flexible term in the English vernacular will be used, and confine it there. Words matter, I tell my students. We’re told over and over again that “a picture is worth a thousand words” — but we forget that words have the power to paint pictures in our minds of how the world is and how it ought to be. The language we use for sexuality, the words we use for rage and longing — these words construct images in our heads, in our culture, and in our lives. We have an obligation to rethink how we speak as part of building a more pleasurable, safe, just and egalitarian world.

#### Or we’ll take the trade that reps don’t shape reality

**Taft-Kaufman, 95** (Jill, professor, Department of Speech Communication And Dramatic Arts, at Central Michigan University, Southern Communication Journal, Spring, proquest)

The postmodern passwords of "polyvocality," "Otherness," and "difference," unsupported by substantial analysis of the concrete contexts of subjects, creates a solipsistic quagmire. The political sympathies of the new cultural critics, with their ostensible concern for the lack of power experienced by marginalized people, aligns them with the political left. Yet, despite their adversarial posture and talk of opposition, their discourses on intertextuality and inter-referentiality isolate them from and ignore the conditions that have produced leftist politics--conflict, racism, poverty, and injustice. In short, as Clarke (1991) asserts, postmodern emphasis on new subjects conceals the old subjects, those who have limited access to good jobs, food, housing, health care, and transportation, as well as to the media that depict them. Merod (1987) decries this situation as one which leaves no vision, will, or commitment to activism. He notes that academic lip service to the oppositional is underscored by the absence of focused collective or politically active intellectual communities. Provoked by the academic manifestations of this problem Di Leonardo (1990) echoes Merod and laments: Has there ever been a historical era characterized by as little radical analysis or activism and as much radical-chic writing as ours? Maundering on about Otherness: phallocentrism or Eurocentric tropes has become a lazy academic substitute for actual engagement with the detailed histories and contemporary realities of Western racial minorities, white women, or any Third World population. (p. 530) Clarke's assessment of the postmodern elevation of language to the "sine qua non" of critical discussion is an even stronger indictment against the trend. Clarke examines Lyotard's (1984) The Postmodern Condition in which Lyotard maintains that virtually all social relations are linguistic, and, therefore, it is through the coercion that threatens speech that we enter the "realm of terror" and society falls apart. To this assertion, Clarke replies: I can think of few more striking indicators of the political and intellectual impoverishment of a view of society that can only recognize the discursive. If the worst terror we can envisage is the threat not to be allowed to speak, we are appallingly ignorant of terror in its elaborate contemporary forms. It may be the intellectual's conception of terror (what else do we do but speak?), but its projection onto the rest of the world would be calamitous....(pp. 2-27) The realm of the discursive is derived from the requisites for human life, which are in the physical world, rather than in a world of ideas or symbols.(4) Nutrition, shelter, and protection are basic human needs that require collective activity for their fulfillment. Postmodern emphasis on the discursive without an accompanying analysis of how the discursive emerges from material circumstances hides the complex task of envisioning and working towards concrete social goals (Merod, 1987). Although the material conditions that create the situation of marginality escape the purview of the postmodernist, the situation and its consequences are not overlooked by scholars from marginalized groups. Robinson (1990) for example, argues that "the justice that working people deserve is economic, not just textual" (p. 571). Lopez (1992) states that "the starting point for organizing the program content of education or political action must be the present existential, concrete situation" (p. 299). West (1988) asserts that borrowing French post-structuralist discourses about "Otherness" blinds us to realities of American difference going on in front of us (p. 170). Unlike postmodern "textual radicals" who Rabinow (1986) acknowledges are "fuzzy about power and the realities of socioeconomic constraints" (p. 255), most writers from marginalized groups are clear about how discourse interweaves with the concrete circumstances that create lived experience. People whose lives form the material for postmodern counter-hegemonic discourse do not share the optimism over the new recognition of their discursive subjectivities, because such an acknowledgment does not address sufficiently their collective historical and current struggles against racism, sexism, homophobia, and economic injustice. They do not appreciate being told they are living in a world in which there are no more real subjects. Ideas have consequences. Emphasizing the discursive self when a person is hungry and homeless represents both a cultural and humane failure. The need to look beyond texts to the perception and attainment of concrete social goals keeps writers from marginalized groups ever-mindful of the specifics of how power works through political agendas, institutions, agencies, and the budgets that fuel them.

## 1AR