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### 1st Off

#### Interpretation – restriction requires *prohibition* of an *entire* topic list area

#### Restriction means prohibition

Corpus Juris Secundum 31

Volume 54, p. 735

RESTRICT: To confine; to limit; to prevent (a person or thing) from passing a certain limit in any kind of action; to restrain; to restrain without bounds.

#### “In the area” means all of the activities

United Nations 13

(United Nations Law of the Sea Treaty, http://www.un.org/depts/los/convention\_agreements/texts/unclos/part1.htm)

PART I¶ INTRODUCTION¶ Article 1

Use of terms and scope¶ 1. For the purposes of this Convention:¶ (1) "Area" means the seabed and ocean floor and subsoil thereof, beyond the limits of national jurisdiction;¶ (2) "Authority" means the International Seabed Authority;¶ (3) "activities in the Area" means all activities of exploration for, and exploitation of, the resources of the Area;

#### Violations – the affirmative doesn’t prohibit

--either it sets conditions that can be met, or just limits the scope

#### Voting issue –

#### Limits – absent prohibition of an area, every single condition or regulation acts as a functional restriction on some single process of war powers authority – dozens of tiny mechanisms and small subsets of areas create an infinite number of affs that core lit doesn’t check

#### Bidirectionality – absent a prohibition, the aff can create meaningless “conditions” that EXPAND presidential power – commission consultation proves

Wilson Center No Date

(War Powers Proposal Gives the President Even More Authority, http://www.wilsoncenter.org/publication/war-powers-proposal-gives-the-president-even-more-authority)

A privately organized Commission on War Powers recommended last week that the 1973 War Powers Resolution be repealed and replaced by a Congressional Joint Committee on Consultation and new procedures to approve or disapprove a "significant armed conflict."¶ The 12-member, bipartisan commission, co-chaired by former Secretaries of State Warren Christopher and James Baker, said the current law is flawed. In fact, every president since Richard Nixon has refused to comply with the War Powers Resolution on the grounds that it is an unconstitutional infringement on the president's powers as commander in chief. Among other things, the current act authorizes Congress to terminate combat operations by adopting a concurrent resolution. The Supreme Court ruled in the 1983 Chadha immigration case that one-house and two-house legislative vetoes do not conform to the Constitution's lawmaking requirements of two-house passage and presentment to the president. ¶ Under the substitute law proposed by the commission, the president must, prior to committing troops to "a significant armed conflict" (one likely to last more than a week), submit a classified report to the new joint committee justifying the need for action. The president is then required to consult at least once every 60 days with the committee. ¶ Within 30 days after the conflict begins, if Congress has not enacted a declaration of war or a law authorizing the use of force, a privileged concurrent resolution approving the troop commitment must be brought to a vote in both chambers. If either chamber rejects the approval resolution, any Member can then offer a privileged joint resolution disapproving the commitment. If the joint resolution is vetoed by the president, a two-thirds override vote by both chambers would be necessary to terminate the commitment. ¶ If I were either of the current presidential candidates, I would endorse the commission proposal in a heartbeat. It proposes to vastly expand presidential powers and options beyond current practice. In the "use of force" joint resolutions for Iraq (1991 and 2002) and Afghanistan (2001), Congress was able to negotiate conditions and limitations on the use of force with the president, who then signed the resolutions into law. ¶ That will not be the case if Congress uses the concurrent resolution of approval approach. No matter how many conditions Congress might try to place on the president's use of force in such a concurrent resolution, the president would be under no legal obligation to comply because the provisions would have no force or effect outside Congress. This is because concurrent resolutions are mere sense-of-Congress expressions. (Who's going to charge the president with failing to faithfully execute a non-law?) ¶ It stands to reason that, given this option, no future president will ask for a declaration of war or use of force law when the alternative is a nonbinding sense-of-Congress resolution approving the commitment of troops to combat. Never mind that such a resolution is probably unconstitutional under the Chadha decision requiring two-house passage and presentment to the president. (It's unlikely the court would directly rule on the issue since in recent times it has sidestepped war powers disputes between the branches on the grounds that they present political questions best left to the president and Congress to resolve.) ¶ Another clear advantage to the president presented by the commission's proposed law is the unique relationship that would be established with the 20-member, bipartisan joint committee. Its members would include the Speaker of the House, Senate Majority Leader, House and Senate Minority Leaders and the chairmen and ranking members of eight key committees. Whereas the administration must currently answer to several committees for its war policies, often in public hearings, the new arrangement will give the president both the incentive and justification to deal exclusively with the joint committee in closed sessions. This is something administrations have wanted for years given the burden of officials delivering duplicative testimony in open forums before multiple committees and subcommittees. ¶ The real losers in this new arrangement, of course, will be the rest of the House and Senate and the American people, all of whom will be left in the dark about what is said and done in the closed-door committee consultations with the president. They will be left to trust the judgment of committee members on the necessity for war and its subsequent conduct. ¶ The Commission on War Powers understandably reflects the leadership and views of two former secretaries of State who no doubt see Congress as many of their predecessors have: as an ill-informed, noisy, quarrelsome and meddling micro-manager when it comes to deciding the great issues of war and peace. If the administration must accommodate Congress in some way before making such decisions, they reason, it is best done among a few power elites in Congress, behind closed doors and shielded by classified briefings and documents.

**2nd Off**

#### The Executive Branch of the United States should announce that the United States will not employ preemptive use of large-scale cyber-attacks, except in direct support of authorized United States military operations.

#### The Department of Defense should substantially increase investment in domestic cyber defense measures.

#### Obama determines whether or not to carry out OCO

Sanger & Shanker 2013

[David E. Sanger is chief Washington correspondent of The New York Times., Thom Shanker, writer for nYT, February 3rd, 2013, Broad Powers Seen for Obama in Cyberstrikes, <http://www.nytimes.com/2013/02/04/us/broad-powers-seen-for-obama-in-cyberstrikes.html?pagewanted=all&_r=0>, uwyo//amp]

WASHINGTON — A secret legal review on the use of America’s growing arsenal of cyberweapons has concluded that President Obama has the broad power to order a pre-emptive strike if the United States detects credible evidence of a major digital attack looming from abroad, according to officials involved in the review. Related That decision is among several reached in recent months as the administration moves, in the next few weeks, to approve the nation’s first rules for how the military can defend, or retaliate, against a major cyberattack. New policies will also govern how the intelligence agencies can carry out searches of faraway computer networks for signs of potential attacks on the United States and, if the president approves, attack adversaries by injecting them with destructive code — even if there is no declared war. The rules will be highly classified, just as those governing drone strikes have been closely held. John O. Brennan, Mr. Obama’s chief counterterrorism adviser and his nominee to run the Central Intelligence Agency, played a central role in developing the administration’s policies regarding both drones and cyberwarfare, the two newest and most politically sensitive weapons in the American arsenal.

**3rd Off**

**[1.] Presidential power high now-historical precedent and Obama domestic and international expansion**

**Fein ‘12**

[Bruce Fein, associate deputy attorney general under President Reagan , A History of the Expansion of Presidential Power, <http://www.nytimes.com/2012/04/28/opinion/a-history-of-the-expansion-of-presidential-power.html>, uwyo//amp]

**The unilateral actions of** President **Obama in the domestic arena to circumvent Congress are** more than **matched by the president’s unilateralism in foreign affairs. Among** other things, President **Obama has unilaterally commenced war, authorized the assassination of American citizens abroad and denied the writ of habeas corpus to detainees** not accused of a crime. **Executive branch power** at the expense of Congress and the Constitution’s checks and balances **has mushroomed since World War II. Examples include** President **Truman’s undeclared war against North Korea**; President **Eisenhower’s executive agreements to defend Spain**; President **Johnson’s Gulf of Tonkin Resolution** regarding Vietnam; President **Nixon’s secret bombing of Cambodia and assertions of executive privilege**; President **Clinton’s undeclared war against Bosnia;** and President **Bush’s countless presidential signing statements**, Terrorist Surveillance Program, waterboarding and Iraq war.

**Lack of restrictions on OCO key to presidential flexibility**

**Lorber 2013**

[Eric Lorber, J.D. Candidate, University of Pennsylvania Law School, Ph.D Candidate, Duke University Department of Political Science, Jan 2013, EXECUTIVE WARMAKING AUTHORITY AND OFFENSIVE CYBER OPERATIONS: CAN EXISTING LEGISLATION SUCCESSFULLY CONSTRAIN PRESIDENTIAL POWER?, <https://www.law.upenn.edu/live/files/1773-lorber15upajconstl9612013>, uwyo//amp]

**The lack of congressional oversight of offensive cyber operations under the Intelligence Authorization Act also likely** does not seriously shift the balance between congressional and executive war-making powers**.** The reason is inherent in the limitations of the legislation itself: the Intelligence Authorization Act specifies reporting requirements, but does not require the non-use or withdrawal of forces.234 Further, these reports must be made in a “timely” fashion (the definition of which is undefined) and only to a small number of Congressmen (at most eight).235 **Thus even if the President had to report offensive cyber operations to Congress, it is unclear he would have to do so in a way that gave Congress an effective check, as these reports would be made only to a small group of Congressmen (**who would not be able to share the information, because of its classified nature, with other members of the legislature) **and could be done well after the employment of these capabilities**. **The resulting picture is one of increased presidential flexibility; the War Powers Resolution and the Intelligence Authorization Act**—while arguably ineffective in many circumstances**—provide increased congressional oversight of presidential war-making actions such as troop deployments and covert actions. Yet these statutes do not cover offensive cyber operations, giving the President an increasingly powerful foreign policy tool outside congressional reach.**

**Presidential power is zero-sum- the branches compete**

**Barilleaux and Kelley 2010** [Ryan J. , Professor of Political Science at Miami, OH; and Christopher S. , Lecturer (Political Science) at Miami, OH, The Unitary Executive and the Modern Presidency, Texas A&M Press, p. P 196-197, 2010// wyo-sc]

In their book *The Broken Branch,* Mann and Ornstein paint a different view. They discuss a wider range of public policy areas than just uses of force. Their argument is that although party is important as a conditioning factor for times when Congress might try to restrain an aggressive or noncompliant executive, **there has** also **been a broad**er **degrading of institutional power that has allowed,** **in a zero-sum context**, **the president to expand executive power at the expense of** **Congress**. Mann and Ornstein thus posit that congressional willingness to subordinate its collective power to that of the president has occurred across domestic politics and foreign affairs. They argue that a variety of factors are at fault for this trend, including the loss of institutional identity, the willingness to abdicate responsibility to the president, the demise of "regular order," and most importantly that **Congress has lost its one key advantage as a legislative body—the decay of the deliberative process.** Thus, they do recognize that party politics has played an important role in the degrading of congressional power, but they see a larger dynamic at work, one that reaches beyond partisanship. While we agree with Howell and Pevehouse that Congress retains important mechanisms for constraining the president, we tend to agree with the Mann and Ornstein view that there has been a significant and sustained decline in Congress's willingness to use these mechanisms to challenge presidential power. This tendency has been more prevalent in foreign affairs but has occurred noticeably across the spectrum of public policy issues. Building from both of those perspectives, and others, we argue that it is helpful to understand the pattern of congressional complicity in the rise of presidential power by viewing Congress's aiding and abetting as the logical outcomes of a collective action problem.31 By constitutional design, **the legislative** branch **is in competition with the president for** institutional **power**, **yet Congress is less than** ideally **suited for** such **a political conflict**. **Congress's** comparative **disadvantage begins with its 535 "interests**" **that are** very **rarely aligned,** and if so, only momentarily. **Because** individual **reelection overshadows all** other **goals**, members of Congress naturally seek to take as much credit and avoid as much blame from their constituencies as possible.32 The dilemma this creates for members is how to use or delegate its collective powers in order to maximize credit and minimize blame in the making of public policy. Congress can choose to delegate power internally to committees and party leaders or externally to the executive branch. **One can conceptualize** the strategic situation of members of **Congress** **in** terms of **a prisoner's dilemma**.33 **If members cooperate** (that is, in Mann and Ornstein's parlance, if members identify with the institution), **they could** maintain and **advance Congress's** institutional **power**. **But they would have to bypass** some potential **individual payoffs** **that could come from defection**, **such as "running against Congress" as an electoral strategy**. **A stronger institution should make** all members of **Congress better off, but it** also **makes them responsible for policymaking**. **If members defect** from the institution, **they** thus seek to **maximize constituency interests** either by simply allowing power to fall by the wayside or by simply **delegating it to the president**. **As more** and more **members choose to defect** over time, **the "public good" of a strong Congress is not provided** for or maintained—and **Congress's** institutional **authority** **erodes and presidential power fills in the gap**. Why, in other words, is congressional activism so often "less than meets the eye," as Barbara Hinckley maintained in her book by that title? Or why has the ''culture of deference" that Stephen Weissman identified developed as it has?34 We argue that the collective action problem that exists in Congress leads to the development of these trends away from meaningful congressional stewardship of foreign policy andspending**.**

**Strong executive key to contain WMD threat of North Korea/rogue states**

**Nzelibe & Yoo 06**

[Jide Nzelibe and John C. Yoo. , Yoo is a professor of law at the University of California at Berkeley School of Law , ,Rational war and constitutional design.(Symposium on Executive Power).

Yale Law Journal 115.9 (July 2006): p2512(30), uwyo//amp]

**The declining value of costly signals is counterbalanced by the benefit of using preemptive force against terrorists and rogue states**. As September 11 showed, terrorist attacks can occur without warning because their unconventional nature allows their preparation to be concealed within the normal activities of civilian life. Terrorists have no territory or regular armed forces from which to detect signs of an impending attack. To defend itself from such an enemy, the United States might need to use force earlier and more often than was the norm during a time when nation-states generated the primary threats to American national security. (63) As with terrorism, **the threat posed by rogue nations may again require the United States to use force earlier and more often** than it would like. (64**) Rogue nations may very well be immune to pressure short of force designed to stop their quest for WMD** or their threat to the United States. **Rogue nations**, for example, **have isolated themselves** from the international system, are less integrated into the international political economy, and repress their own populations. **This makes them less susceptible to** diplomatic or other means of resolving disputes short of force, such as economic **sanctions. Lack of concern for their own civilian populations renders the dictatorships that often govern rogue nations more resistant to deterrence. North Korea,** for example, **appears to have continued its development of nuclear weapons despite** years of diplomatic measures to change its course. (65) These new threats to American national security change the way we think about the relationship between the process and substance of the warmaking system. The international system as it existed at the end of the Cold War allowed the United States to choose a warmaking system that could have placed a premium on deliberation and the approval of multiple institutions, whether for purposes of political consensus (and hence institutional constraints that lower the expected value of war) or for purposes of signaling private information in the interests of reaching a peaceful bargain. If, however, the nature of threats has changed and the level of threats has increased, and military force is the most effective means for responding to those threats, then it may make more sense for the United States to use force preemptively. **Given the threats posed by WMD proliferation, rogue nations, and international terrorism**, at the very least it seems clear **that we should not adopt a warmaking process that contains a built-in presumption against using force abroad or that requires long and deliberate procedures. T**hese developments in the international system may demand that the United States have the ability to use force earlier and more quickly than in the past. In order to forestall a WMD attack, or to take advantage of a window of opportunity to strike at a terrorist cell**, the executive branch needs the flexibility to act quickly, possibly in situations in which congressional consent cannot be obtained in time to act on the intelligence**. These cases suggest that a permanent constitutional rule requiring **congressional permission to use force would be over-inclusive.** In certain situations, particularly when the United States is facing a nation-state with a similar political system or one that can draw on a sophisticated understanding of foreign nations, signaling through congressional participation may prove valuable. But **costly signals may prove ineffective in other situations, particularly when the opponent is a rogue state** or an international terrorist organization. There may be little value in revealing private information through legislative commitments if the opponent does not understand the meaning of congressional participation or does not share a common value system that would allow a bargain to be struck. In other words, the signaling model that underwrites the value of congressional participation breaks down when confronted with these opponents. In such cases, we might conclude that **the benefits of swift, even preemptive military action might outweigh the potential effectiveness of signaling.** These considerations suggest that a two-tier approach to war powers might be desirable, in which conflicts with similar nation-states should involve congressional authorization, which can only assist the executive branch in reaching a bargain with a foreign nation. But **if the opponent is a terrorist organization or a rogue nation, the United States might be better off retaining a system of executive initiative in war**. We should make an important clarification. Our argument does not preclude the possibility that some nondemocractic regimes could understand the informational value of legislative signaling, but it assumes that democratic regimes are more likely to appreciate such signals. In some circumstances, the President might seek legislative authorization for the use of force against nondemocractic states to improve the chances of a peaceful settlement. But it will depend on the circumstances and on whether the benefits of such a signal would be outweighed by the costs of delay. We believe that **the President is best suited, as a structural matter, to determine whether to seek to signal a nondemocractic regime with legislative authorization.**

**An unchecked North Korea causes global catastrophe**

**Hayes and Green, 10**

[\*Victoria University AND Executive Director of the Nautilus Institute (Peter and Michael, “-“The Path Not Taken, the Way Still Open: Denuclearizing the Korean Peninsula and Northeast Asia”, 1/5, http://www.nautilus.org/fora/security/10001HayesHamalGreen.pdf) uwyo//amp]

**The consequences of failing to address the proliferation threat posed by the North Korea developments, and related political and economic issues, are serious, not only for the Northeast Asian region but for the whole international community. At worst, there is the possibility of nuclear attack1, whether by intention, miscalculation, or merely accident, leading to the resumption of Korean War hostilities.** On the Korean Peninsula itself, **key population centres are well within short or medium range missiles.** **The whole of Japan is likely to come within North Korean missile range**. Pyongyang has a population of over 2 million, Seoul (close to the North Korean border) 11 million, and Tokyo over 20 million. **Even a limited nuclear exchange would result in a holocaust of unprecedented proportions. But the catastrophe within the region would not be the only outcome. New research indicates that even a limited nuclear war in the region would rearrange our global climate far more quickly than global warming.** Westberg draws attention to new studies modelling the effects of even a limited nuclear exchange involving approximately 100 Hiroshima-sized 15 kt bombs2 (by comparison it should be noted that the United States currently deploys warheads in the range 100 to 477 kt, that is, individual warheads equivalent in yield to a range of 6 to 32 Hiroshimas).The studies indicate that **the soot from the fires produced would lead to a decrease in global temperature by 1.25 degrees Celsius for a period of 6-8 years**.3 In Westberg’s view: **That is not global winter, but the nuclear darkness will cause a deeper drop in temperature than at any time during the last 1000 years.** The temperature over the continents would decrease substantially more than the global average. **A decrease in rainfall over the continents would also follow…The period of nuclear darkness will cause much greater decrease in grain production than 5% and it will continue for many years...hundreds of millions of people will die from hunger…To make matters even worse, such amounts of smoke injected into the stratosphere would cause a huge reduction in the Earth’s protective ozone.4** These, of course, are not the only consequences. **Reactors might also be targeted, causing further mayhem and downwind radiation effects, superimposed on a smoking, radiating ruin left by nuclear next-use.** Millions of refugees would flee the affected regions. **The direct impacts, and the follow-on impacts on the global economy via ecological and food insecurity, could make the present global financial crisis pale by comparison. How the great powers, especially the nuclear weapons states respond to such a crisis, and in particular, whether nuclear weapons are used in response to nuclear first-use, could make or break the global non proliferation and disarmament regimes. There could be many unanticipated impacts on regional and global security relationships5, with subsequent nuclear breakout and geopolitical turbulence, including possible loss-of-control over fissile material or warheads in the chaos of nuclear war, and aftermath chain-reaction affects involving other potential proliferant states.** The Korean nuclear proliferation issue is not just a regional threat but a global one that warrants priority consideration from the international community.

### 4th Off

#### Obama has the upper hand on debt limit now but GOP demands could create a complicated battle

Kapur, 9/9 --- TPM’s senior congressional reporter and Supreme Court correspondent

(9/9/2013, Sahil, “Is House GOP Backing Down In Debt Limit Fight?” <http://tpmdc.talkingpointsmemo.com/2013/09/house-gop-cantor-memo-debt-ceiling-cr-sequester-immigration.php>)

¶ House Republicans are taming members’ expectations ahead of the debt limit showdown, signaling that they may not be able to extract significant concessions from Democrats.¶A Friday memo to GOP members by Majority Leader Eric Cantor (R-VA) says “the House will act to prevent a default on our obligations before” the mid-October deadline the Obama administration has established. “House Republicans,” he says, “will demand fiscal reforms and pro-growth policies which put us on a path to balance in ten years in exchange for another increase in the debt limit.”¶ The language is vague — intentionally so, in order to maintain wiggle room for Republicans to avert a disastrous debt default. President Barack Obama has vowed not to pay a ransom to ensure the U.S. can meet its obligations.¶ If and when they do cave, Republicans will be hard-pressed to show their base they got something in return for raising the debt ceiling. In January, they got Senate Democrats to agree to pass a non-binding budget resolution. This time around, the possibilities for symbolic concessions range from a doomed Senate vote to delay or defund Obamacare or instructions to initiate the process of tax reform.¶ There are a number of demands rank-and-file Republicans have urged leaders to make which could genuinely complicate the battle, such as dollar-for-dollar spending cuts or unwinding Obamacare. Cantor’s memo mentioned neither. GOP members have also called on leadership not to bring up any debt limit bill that lacks the support of half the conference. Boehner hasn’t committed to this and Cantor didn’t mention it in his memo.¶ There are several reasons Republicans will have a hard time extracting concessions. Back in January, when Obama held firm and refused to negotiate on the debt limit, Republicans folded and agreed to suspend the debt ceiling without substantial concessions but rather symbolic ones. And due to deep divisions within the conference, House Republicans will face enormous challenges in rounding up 218 votes to pass any conceivable debt limit hike.¶ The party’s top priority is to cut safety-net programs like Social Security and Medicare. But there’s no internal consensus on what to cut. And Republicans, whose constituents are disproportionately older, have generally refused to vote on entitlement cuts without bipartisan cover from Democrats. In this case Democrats are highly unlikely to give it to them, which complicates their task of passing a debt limit bill.¶ The Cantor memo makes it all but official that Republicans won’t seek to defund Obamacare in the fiscal battles. The strategy, pushed by conservative activists, to withhold support for keeping the government running after Sept. 30 unless Democrats agree to defund Obamacare. Instead it vows to “hold a series of strategic votes throughout the fall to dismantle, defund, and delay Obamacare.” The memo says Republicans “will continue to pursue the strategy of systematically derailing this train wreck and replacing it with a patient-centered system.”¶ The GOP’s big stand in the fiscal battles will be to force Obama to accept the lower spending levels ordered by sequestration — automatic spending cuts enacted in 2011 — in a measure to keep the government funded. Here Republicans will refuse to cede and the White House has not suggested it’ll veto a bill that maintains sequester spending levels, although Obama wants to cut a deal to replace the sequester.¶ “In signing a CR at sequester levels,” Cantor writes, “the President would be endorsing a level of spending that wipes away all the increases he and Congressional Democrats made while they were in charge and returns us to a pre-2008 level of discretionary spending.”

**Obama is pushing Congress to resolve the debt ceiling – political capital is key to success**

**Pace 9/12**

Julie, AP White House correspondent, Syria debate on hold, Obama refocuses on agenda, The Fresno Bee, 9/12/13, http://www.fresnobee.com/2013/09/12/3493538/obama-seeks-to-focus-on-domestic.html

**With** a military strike against **Syria on hold**, President Barack **Obama tried** Thursday **to reignite momentum for his second-term domestic agenda. But his progress could hinge on the strength of his standing on Capitol Hill** after what even allies acknowledge were missteps in the latest foreign crisis.¶ "It is still important to recognize that we have a lot of things left to do here in this government," **Obama** told his Cabinet, **starting a sustained White House push to refocus the nation on matters at home as key benchmarks on the budget** and health care rapidly approach.¶ "The American people are still interested in making sure that our kids are getting the kind of education they deserve, that we are putting people back to work," Obama said.¶ **The White House plans to use next week's five-year anniversary of the 2008 financial collapse to warn Republicans that shutting down the government or failing to raise the debt limit could drag down the still-fragile economy**. With Hispanic Heritage Month to begin Monday, Obama is also expected to press for a stalled immigration overhaul and urge minorities to sign up for health care exchanges beginning Oct. 1.¶ Among the events planned for next week is a White House ceremony highlighting Americans working on immigrant and citizenship issues. Administration officials will also promote overhaul efforts at naturalization ceremonies across the country. On Sept. 21, Obama will speak at the Congressional Black Caucus Gala, where he'll trumpet what the administration says are benefits of the president's health care law for African-Americans and other minorities.¶ Two major factors are driving Obama's push to get back on track with domestic issues after three weeks of Syria dominating the political debate. **Polls show the economy, jobs and health care remain Americans' top concerns**. And **Obama has a limited window to make progress on those matters in a second term, when lame-duck status can quickly creep up on presidents, particularly if they start losing public support**.¶ Obama already is grappling with some of the lowest approval ratings of his presidency. A Pew Research Center/USA Today poll out this week put his approval at 44 percent. That's down from 55 percent at the end of 2012.¶ Potential military intervention in Syria also is deeply unpopular with many Americans, with a Pew survey finding that 63 percent opposing the idea. And the president's publicly shifting positions on how to respond to a deadly chemical weapons attack in Syria also have confused many Americans and congressional lawmakers.¶ "In times of crisis, the more clarity the better," said Sen. Lindsey Graham, R-S.C., a strong supporter of U.S. intervention in Syria. "This has been confusing. For those who are inclined to support the president, it's been pretty hard to nail down what the purpose of a military strike is."¶ For a time, the Obama administration appeared to be barreling toward an imminent strike in retaliation for the Aug. 21 chemical weapons attack. But Obama made a sudden reversal and instead decided to seek congressional approval for military action.¶ Even after administration officials briefed hundreds of lawmakers on classified intelligence, there appeared to be limited backing for a use-of-force resolution on Capitol Hill. Rather than face defeat, **Obama asked lawmakers this week to postpone any votes while the U.S. explores the viability of a deal to secure Syria's chemical weapons** stockpiles.¶ **That pause comes as a relief to Obama and many Democrats eager to return to issues more in line with the public's concerns**. The most pressing matters are a Sept. 30 deadline to approve funding to keep the government open — the new fiscal year begins Oct. 1 — and the start of sign-ups for health care exchanges, a crucial element of the health care overhaul.¶ On Wednesday, a revolt by tea party conservatives forced House Republican leaders to delay a vote on a temporary spending bill written to head off a government shutdown. Several dozen staunch conservatives are seeking to couple the spending bill with a provision to derail implementation of the health care law.¶ **The White House** also **may face a fight with Republicans over raising the nation's debt ceiling this fall. While Obama has insisted he won't negotiate over the debt limit**, House Speaker John **Boehner** on Thursday **said the GOP will insist on curbing spending**.

#### OCO causes contentious debates in congress-last year proves

Munoz 12

(Carlo, Staff Writer - Defense/Nat'l Security at The Hill. “Obama authorizes new cyber warfare directive” 11-4-12 http://thehill.com/blogs/defcon-hill/policy-and-strategy/267879-report-obama-authorizes-new-cyber-warfare-directive//wyoccd)

The White House has, for the first time, laid out specific ground rules for how and when the U.S. military can carry out offensive and defensive cyber operations against foreign threats. ¶ The guidelines were codified in a new White House directive signed by President Obama in mid-October, according to the The Washington Post. A senior Obama administration official confirmed to The Hill that the president has signed a directive on “cyber operations.”¶ “This step is part of the administration’s focus on cybersecurity as a top priority. The cyber threat has evolved since 2004, and we have new experiences to take into account,” the official said.¶ The senior administration official stressed that the directive does not create new powers for federal agencies or the military. ¶ “The directive establishes principles and processes for the use of cyber operations so that cyber tools are integrated with the fully array of national security tools we have at our disposal,” the official said. “It provides a whole-of-government approach consistent with the values that we promote domestically and internationally as we have previously articulated in the International Strategy for Cyberspace.”¶ The cyber rules of engagement, known inside the White House and Pentagon as Presidential Policy Directive 20, is the latest step by the administration to take the fight to state and non-state actors looking to attack U.S. government and civilian networks. ¶ The new directive also closes a critical policy gap at the DOD on cyber warfare that Congress failed to close earlier this year. ¶ In August, White House chief counterterrorism adviser John Brennan told reporters that the administration was considering exercising presidential authority to impose cybersecurity mandates after lawmakers failed to adopt legislation to implement those measures. ¶ Passing cybersecurity legislation was near the top of Defense Secretary Leon Panetta's legislative to-do list for Congress in the lame-duck session, behind a sequestration deal and approval of a Defense authorization bill. ¶ A cybersecurity bill co-sponsored by Sens. Joe Lieberman (I-Conn.) and Susan Collins (R-Maine) has remained stalled on Capitol Hill for months. ¶ Senate Majority Leader Harry Reid (D-Nev.) has called for a vote on the legislation in November, but observers are not optimistic that a final product will reach the president's desk, given ongoing partisan fighting over the legislation. ¶

**Failure collapses the economy – goes global and past events don’t disprove**

**Davidson 9/10**

Adam, co-founder of NPR’s “Planet Money,” Our Debt to Society, New York Times, 9/10/13, http://www.nytimes.com/2013/09/15/magazine/our-debt-to-society.html?pagewanted=all

**If the debt ceiling isn’t lifted** again **this fall, some serious financial decisions will have to be made**. Perhaps the government can skimp on its foreign aid or furlough all of NASA, but **eventually the big-ticket items**, like Social Security and Medicare, **will have to be cut**. At some point, **the government won’t be able to pay interest on its bonds** and will enter what’s known as sovereign default, **the ultimate national financial disaster achieved by countries like Zimbabwe, Ecuador and Argentina** (and now Greece). **In the case of the United States**, though, **it won’t be an isolated national crisis. If the American government can’t stand behind the dollar, the world’s benchmark currency, then the global financial system will very likely enter a new era in which there is much less trade and much less economic growth. It would be**, by most accounts, **the largest self-imposed financial disaster in history.¶ Nearly everyone involved predicts that someone will blink before this disaster occurs. Yet a small number of House Republicans** (one political analyst told me it’s no more than 20) **appear willing to see what happens if the debt ceiling isn’t raised** — at least for a bit. This could be used as leverage to force Democrats to drastically cut government spending and eliminate President Obama’s signature health-care-reform plan. In fact, Representative Tom Price, a Georgia Republican, told me that the whole problem could be avoided if the president agreed to drastically cut spending and lower taxes. Still, it is hard to put this act of game theory into historic context. Plenty of countries — and some cities, like Detroit — have defaulted on their financial obligations, but only because their governments ran out of money to pay their bills. No wealthy country has ever voluntarily decided — in the middle of an economic recovery, no less — to default. And there’s certainly no record of that happening to the country that controls the global reserve currency.¶ Like many, I assumed a self-imposed U.S. debt crisis might unfold like most involuntary ones. If the debt ceiling isn’t raised by X-Day, I figured, **the world’s investors would begin to see America as an unstable investment and rush to sell their Treasury bonds. The U.S. government**, desperate to hold on to investment, **would then raise interest rates far higher**, hurtling up rates on credit cards, student loans, mortgages and corporate borrowing — **which would effectively put a clamp on all trade and spending. The U.S. economy would collapse far worse than anything we’ve seen in the past several years**.¶ Instead, Robert Auwaerter, head of bond investing for Vanguard, the world’s largest mutual-fund company, told me that the collapse might be more insidious. “You know what happens when the market gets upset?” he said. “There’s a flight to quality. Investors buy Treasury bonds. It’s a bit perverse.” In other words, **if the U.S. comes within shouting distance of a default** (which Auwaerter is confident won’t happen), **the world’s investors** — absent a safer alternative, given the recent fates of the euro and the yen — **might actually buy even more Treasury bonds**. Indeed, interest rates would fall and the bond markets would soar.¶ While **this possibility might not sound so bad, it’s really far more damaging than the apocalyptic one I imagined**. Rather than resulting in a sudden crisis, failure to raise the debt ceiling would lead to a slow bleed. Scott Mather, head of the global portfolio at Pimco, **the world’s largest private bond fund, explained that while governments and institutions might go on a U.S.-bond buying frenzy in the wake of a debt-ceiling panic, they would eventually recognize that the U.S. government was not going through an odd, temporary bit of insanity. They would eventually conclude that it had become permanently less reliable**. Mather imagines institutional investors and governments turning to a basket of currencies, putting their savings in a mix of U.S., European, Canadian, Australian and Japanese bonds. Over the course of decades, **the U.S. would lose its unique role in the global economy**.¶ **The U.S. benefits enormously from its status as global reserve currency and safe haven**. Our interest and mortgage rates are lower; companies are able to borrow money to finance their new products more cheaply. As a result, there is much more economic activity and more wealth in America than there would be otherwise. **If that status erodes, the U.S. economy’s peaks will be lower and recessions deeper**; future generations will have fewer job opportunities and suffer more when the economy falters. And, Mather points out, **no other country would benefit from America’s diminished status. When you make the base risk-free asset more risky, the entire global economy becomes riskier and costlier**.

**Nuclear war**

**Friedberg and Schoenfeld 8**

Aaron, Prof. Politics. And IR @ Princeton’s Woodrow Wilson School and Visiting Scholar @ Witherspoon Institute, and Gabriel, Senior Editor of Commentary and Wall Street Journal, “The Dangers of a Diminished America” <http://online.wsj.com/article/SB122455074012352571.html>

Then **there are** the dolorous **consequences of a** potential **collapse of the world's financial architecture**. For decades now, Americans have enjoyed the advantages of being at the center of that system. The worldwide use of the dollar, and the stability of our economy, among other things, made it easier for us to run huge budget deficits, as we counted on foreigners to pick up the tab by buying dollar-denominated assets as a safe haven. Will this be possible in the future? Meanwhile, traditional foreign-policy challenges are multiplying. The threat from al Qaeda and Islamic terrorist affiliates has not been extinguished. **Iran and North Korea are continuing on their bellicose paths**, while **Pakistan and Afghanistan are progressing** smartly **down the road to chaos. Russia's new militancy and China's seemingly relentless rise also give cause for concern**. If America now tries to pull back from the world stage, it will leave a dangerous power vacuum. The stabilizing effects of our presence in Asia, our continuing commitment to Europe, and our position as defender of last resort for Middle East energy sources and supply lines could all be placed at risk. In such a scenario **there are shades of the 1930s, when global trade** and finance **ground** nearly **to a halt,** the peaceful democracies failed to cooperate, a**nd aggressive powers led by** the remorseless **fanatics** who **rose up on the crest of economic disaster exploited their divisions**. Today we run the risk that **rogue states may** choose to **become** ever more **reckless with their nuclear toys**, just at our moment of maximum vulnerability. The aftershocks of the financial crisis will almost certainly rock our principal strategic competitors even harder than they will rock us. The dramatic free fall of the Russian stock market has demonstrated the fragility of a state whose economic performance hinges on high oil prices, now driven down by the global slowdown. China is perhaps even more fragile, its economic growth depending heavily on foreign investment and access to foreign markets. Both will now be constricted, inflicting economic pain and perhaps even sparking unrest in a country where political legitimacy rests on progress in the long march to prosperity. **None of this is good news if the authoritarian leaders of these countries seek to divert attention from internal travails with external adventures**.

### Adv 3

#### 1. Lack of OCO oversight doesn’t disrupt SOP and plan makes OCO’s ineffective

Lorber ‘13

[Eric, J.D. Candidate, University of Pennsylvania Law School, Ph.D Candidate, Duke University

Department of Political Science. Journal Of Constitutional Law 15.3 <https://www.law.upenn.edu/live/files/1773-lorber15upajconstl9612013>. ETB]

This Comment provides an initial answer to the question of whether ¶ current U.S. law can effectively govern the Executive’s use of OCOs.17 It ¶ explores the interaction between this new tool and the current statutory ¶ limits on presidential war-making authority, with a particular focus on ¶ whether the two current federal laws meant to restrict executive power in ¶ this field—the War Powers Resolution18 and the Intelligence Authorization ¶ Act19—apply to a wide range of potential offensive cyber operations ¶ undertaken by the executive branch. Beyond suggesting that neither the ¶ War Powers Resolution nor the Intelligence Authorization Act can effectively ¶ regulate most types of offensive cyber operations, this Comment suggests ¶ that while marginally problematic for a proper balance of war-making power ¶ between the executive and legislative branches, this lack of oversight does ¶ not fundamentally shift the current alignment. It does argue, however, ¶ that—given this lack of regulatory oversight—the President now has another ¶ powerful war-making tool to use at his discretion. Finally, the Comment ¶ suggests that this lack of limitation may be positive in some ways, as laying ¶ down clear legal markers before having a developed understanding of these ¶ capabilities may problematically limit their effective use.

#### 2. OCO’s don’t undermine SOP, but plan kills presidential flexibility

**Lorber ‘13**

[Eric, J.D. Candidate, University of Pennsylvania Law School, Ph.D Candidate, Duke University

Department of Political Science. Journal Of Constitutional Law 15.3 <https://www.law.upenn.edu/live/files/1773-lorber15upajconstl9612013>. ETB]

This analysis suggests that, given inherent weaknesses in the underlying ¶ statutory schemes, excluding offensive cyber operations from their scope ¶ does not substantially shift the balance of war-making authority between the ¶ President and Congress. This exclusion does, however, provide the ¶ President additional, powerful means by which to conduct military action ¶ without congressional oversight. ¶ Based on analysis of the War Powers Resolution, the lack of oversight for ¶ OCOs does not radically shift the balance between the legislative and ¶ executive branches’ war-making authority. Most notably, because the War ¶ Powers Resolution itself has proven ineffective in providing Congress with a ¶ powerful tool to govern presidential use of force, bringing OCOs under the ¶ War Powers Resolution’s statutory umbrella likely would not provide the ¶ possibility of such oversight. However, insofar as the President has ¶ increasingly turned to covert action since the passage of the War Powers ¶ Resolution to avoid its reporting requirements,233 offensive cyber operations provide the President another means by which to continue this trend. ¶ OCOs therefore may give the President substantially more flexibility than he ¶ already has under the War Powers Resolution by adding what will become an ¶ increasingly frequent tool of warfare to his option-set. The lack of congressional oversight of offensive cyber operations under ¶ the Intelligence Authorization Act also likely does not seriously shift the ¶ balance between congressional and executive war-making powers. The ¶ reason is inherent in the limitations of the legislation itself: the Intelligence § Marked 19:01 § ¶ Authorization Act specifies reporting requirements, but does not require the ¶ non-use or withdrawal of forces.234 Further, these reports must be made in a ¶ “timely” fashion (the definition of which is undefined) and only to a small ¶ number of Congressmen (at most eight).235 Thus even if the President had ¶ to report offensive cyber operations to Congress, it is unclear he would have ¶ to do so in a way that gave Congress an effective check, as these reports ¶ would be made only to a small group of Congressmen (who would not be ¶ able to share the information, because of its classified nature, with other ¶ members of the legislature) and could be done well after the employment of ¶ these capabilities. The resulting picture is one of increased presidential ¶ flexibility; the War Powers Resolution and the Intelligence Authorization ¶ Act—while arguably ineffective in many circumstances—provide increased ¶ congressional oversight of presidential war-making actions such as troop ¶ deployments and covert actions. Yet these statutes do not cover offensive ¶ cyber operations, giving the President an increasingly powerful foreign ¶ policy tool outside congressional reach.

#### Data disproves hegemony impacts

Fettweis, 11

Christopher J. Fettweis, Department of Political Science, Tulane University, 9/26/11, Free Riding or Restraint? Examining European Grand Strategy, Comparative Strategy, 30:316–332, EBSCO

It is perhaps worth noting that there is no evidence to support a direct relationship between the relative level of U.S. activism and international stability. In fact, the limited data we do have suggest the opposite may be true. During the 1990s, the United States cut back on its defense spending fairly substantially. By 1998, the United States was spending $100 billion less on defense in real terms than it had in 1990.51 To internationalists, defense hawks and believers in hegemonic stability, this irresponsible “peace dividend” endangered both national and global security. “No serious analyst of American military capabilities,” argued Kristol and Kagan, “doubts that the defense budget has been cut much too far to meet America’s responsibilities to itself and to world peace.”52 On the other hand, if the pacific trends were not based upon U.S. hegemony but a strengthening norm against interstate war, one would not have expected an increase in global instability and violence. The verdict from the past two decades is fairly plain: The world grew more peaceful while the United States cut its forces. No state seemed to believe that its security was endangered by a less-capable United States military, or at least none took any action that would suggest such a belief. No militaries were enhanced to address power vacuums, no security dilemmas drove insecurity or arms races, and no regional balancing occurred once the stabilizing presence of the U.S. military was diminished. The rest of the world acted as if the threat of international war was not a pressing concern, despite the reduction in U.S. capabilities. Most of all, the United States and its allies were no less safe. The incidence and magnitude of global conflict declined while the United States cut its military spending under President Clinton, and kept declining as the Bush Administration ramped the spending back up. No complex statistical analysis should be necessary to reach the conclusion that the two are unrelated. Military spending figures by themselves are insufficient to disprove a connection between overall U.S. actions and international stability. Once again, one could presumably argue that spending is not the only or even the best indication of hegemony, and that it is instead U.S. foreign political and security commitments that maintain stability. Since neither was significantly altered during this period, instability should not have been expected. Alternately, advocates of hegemonic stability could believe that relative rather than absolute spending is decisive in bringing peace. Although the United States cut back on its spending during the 1990s, its relative advantage never wavered. However, even if it is true that either U.S. commitments or relative spending account for global pacific trends, then at the very least stability can evidently be maintained at drastically lower levels of both. In other words, even if one can be allowed to argue in the alternative for a moment and suppose that there is in fact a level of engagement below which the United States cannot drop without increasing international disorder, a rational grand strategist would still recommend cutting back on engagement and spending until that level is determined. Grand strategic decisions are never final; continual adjustments can and must be made as time goes on. Basic logic suggests that the United States ought to spend the minimum amount of its blood and treasure while seeking the maximum return on its investment. And if the current era of stability is as stable as many believe it to be, no increase in conflict would ever occur irrespective of U.S. spending, which would save untold trillions for an increasingly debt-ridden nation. It is also perhaps worth noting that if opposite trends had unfolded, if other states had reacted to news of cuts in U.S. defense spending with more aggressive or insecure behavior, then internationalists would surely argue that their expectations had been fulfilled. If increases in conflict would have been interpreted as proof of the wisdom of internationalist strategies, then logical consistency demands that the lack thereof should at least pose a problem. As it stands, the only evidence we have regarding the likely systemic reaction to a more restrained United States suggests that the current peaceful trends are unrelated to U.S. military spending. Evidently the rest of the world can operate quite effectively without the presence of a global policeman. Those who think otherwise base their view on faith alone.

Strong pres key to solve every existential threat

Weinberger 09

[Seth Weinberger is Assistant Professor in the Department of Politics and Government at the University of Puget Sound. , 2009, Balancing War Powers in an Age of Terror, The Good Society, Vol. 18, Issue 2, Project Muse, uwyo//amp]

When the president wants to take, pursuant to his powers as commander-in-chief of the armed forces, an action that is inherently legislative in nature, he must have explicit permission from "an Act of Congress or from the Constitution itself."24 Since, as Justice Black notes, the Constitution refutes the idea that the president can have legislative powers, the permission must come from an Act of Congress. Without such permission, a president is not allowed to seize steel mills to ensure that the supply of war-essential materiel is not threatened, conduct warrantless wiretapping of American citizens, indefinitely detain without challenge those suspected of involvement in international terrorist organizations, or change the rules governing the procedures for military commissions. In wartime, however, it may be neither expedient nor strategically sound for the president to be forced to come before Congress for permission for each and every legislative action deemed necessary for the war effort. Circumstances in war are fluid and unpredictable, and legislation passed at one time may quickly become irrelevant or obsolete. The deliberation and compromise that are the hallmarks of congressional legislation may be ill-suited to war, which demands swift and decisive action to keep on top of rapidly shifting military situations. As one scholar puts it, "Congress at war is not a pretty sight. The legislative branch can be questioning and judgmental, impatient for victories yet free with inexpert advice, slow to provide the men and material for combat, reluctant to vote the taxes needed to pay for the war, critical of generals, and careless with secrets."25 In times in which the country faces an existential, or otherwise exceedingly dangerous, threat, it may not behoove the president, the military, or the nation as a whole to require the president to ask Congress time and time again to enact laws to advance the war effort.

#### Prez will circumvent-

#### [1.] invokes state secrets to avoid oversight

Posner and Vermeule 2010 [Eric A. , Professor of Law at the University of Chicago Law School and Editor of The Journal of Legal Studies; Adrian , Harvard Law Professor, The Executive Unbound: After the Madisonian Republic, Oxford Press, p. 24//wyo-sc]

Monitoring the executive requires expertise in the area being monitored. In many cases, Congress lacks the information necessary to monitor discretionary policy choices by the executive. Although the committee system has the effect, among others, of generating legislative information and expertise,18 and although Congress has a large internal staff, there are domains in which no amount of legislative expertise suffices for effective oversight. Prime among these are areas of foreign policy and national security. Here the relative lack of legislative expertise is only part of the problem; what makes it worse is that the legislature lacks the raw information that experts need to make assessments. The problem would disappear if legislators could cheaply acquire information from the president, but they cannot. One obstacle is a suite of legal doctrines protecting executive secrecy and creating deliberative privileges— doctrines that may or may not be justified from some higher-order systemic point of view as means for producing optimal deliberation within the executive branch. Although such privileges are waivable, the executive often fears to set a bad institutional precedent. Another obstacle is the standard executive claim that Congress leaks like a sieve, so that sharing secret information with legislators will result in public disclosure. The problem becomes most acute when, as in the recent controversy over surveillance by the National Security Agency, the executive claims that the very scope or rationale of a program cannot be discussed with Congress, because to do so would vitiate the very secrecy that makes the program possible and beneficial. In any particular case the claim might be right or wrong; legislators have no real way to judge, and they know that the claim might be made either by a wellmotivated executive or by an ill-motivated executive, albeit for very different reasons.

#### [2.] constraints make Presidents more assertive

Barilleaux and Kelley 2010 [Ryan J. , Professor of Political Science at Miami, OH; and Christopher S. , Lecturer (Political Science) at Miami, OH, The Unitary Executive and the Modern Presidency, Texas A&M Press, p. 225-226, 2010// wyo-sc]

Congress, following the logic of Daniel Patrick Moynihan's "Iron Law of Emulation" (which holds that what one branch of government does will be emulated by another), responded to the enlargement of the presidency and its powers by undertaking a number of actions in the 1970s to enable itself to be a more active and assertive player in the making of national policy.11 It gave itself a large professional staff, reformed its budget process, developed tools for more oversight of the executive, passed legislation to gain more information about the conduct of foreign policy and influence over it (the Case-Zablocki Act, the War Powers Resolution, and other laws), and at times acted aggressively to challenge presidential policy (in the mid-1970s and again in the late 1990s and after the 2006 midterm elections). In less than forty years, Congress has moved toward impeaching one president (Nixon, whom it ultimately drove from office), legislated an end to the Vietnam War, prohibited American intervention in the civil war in Angola (1975), impeached another president (Clinton), shut down the government in a duel with the White House over the federal budget (1995), investigated the Iran-Contra affair and other incidents, passed a bill to require a timetable for withdrawing U.S. forces from Iraq (2007), tried several times to bring the president to heel on the use of force, and balked when the Bush administration tried to have its first financial industry bailout plan passed summarily in 2008. These and other incidents have made the legislature a full player in the separated system of American government, but they have also stimulated presidents to seek greater autonomy from legislative constraints. The unilateral presidency is the result of this stimulation. Barack Obama follows in this line of presidents seeking to accomplish something in office and feeling the urgency of their task. In his victory speech on election night in 2008, he told the assembled crowd that "this is our time—to put our people back to work and open doors of opportunity for our kids; to restore prosperity and promote the cause of peace; to reclaim the American Dream and reaffirm that fundamental truth—that out of many, we are one; that while we breathe, we hope, and where we are met with cynicism, and doubt, and those who tell us that we can't, we will respond with that timeless creed that sums up the spirit of a people: Yes We Can."12 There is no reason to think that he or any subsequent president will be passive in the conduct of office. Congressional responses to executive unilateralism will be too late *and too strong* andwill *in turn* stimulate a new round of executive assertiveness*.* In the 1960s and 1970s Congress bridled at the growth of presidential power but acquiesced to it until legislators finally decided that they had seen enough. Beginning in the mid-1970s, Congress reacted with a spate of president-curbing legislation (the War Powers Resolution, the CaseZablocki Act, the Budget and Impoundment Act), the near-impeachment of Richard Nixon, a legislated end to the Vietnam War, an investigation of the CIA, and other actions to restrict presidential autonomy. The consequence, to some extent described in this volume, was the rise of executive unilateralism as a way to circumvent Congress.

#### [3.] Empirics on presidents ignoring WPR prove the trend

Isaacs 2011

[John Isaacs, 2011, executive director of Council for a Livable World, War Powers Resolution consistently ignored, <http://thehill.com/blogs/congress-blog/foreign-policy/172803-war-powers-resolution-consistently-ignored>, uwyo//amp]

President Harry F. Truman ignored Congress when in 1950 he sent troops to Korea to stave off a North Korean advance into the South. Almost 1.8 million Americans fought in Korea, with some 33,600 American deaths. But there never was a congressional authorization, and Congress continued to appropriate funds to prosecute the war. The War Powers Resolution also appeared to be a check against Nixon’s power, a President recently overwhelmingly re-elected who was becoming more and more enmeshed in the Watergate scandal. Indeed, I played only a bit role, helping to convince some liberals such as Representatives Bella Abzug (D-NY) and Robert Drinan (D-Mass.) that Congress was not ceding additional power to the President by giving him or her 60 or 90 days to conduct war without approval of Congress. Fast forward to today. Every President since 1973, including Barack Obama, has decided to ignore the law as an unconstitutional assertion of power.

#### [4.] Cancels testimony, Justice Department ignores oversight requests

Victor ‘03

[Kirk Victor, writer for government executive.com, 2003, Congress in eclipse as power shifts to executive branch, <http://www.govexec.com/management/2003/04/congress-in-eclipse-as-power-shifts-to-executive-branch/13800/>, uwyo//amp]

Senate Finance Committee Chairman Charles Grassley, R-Iowa, agreed in an interview that "getting information from the Justice Department under Ashcroft is like pulling teeth." But Grassley sees it as an institutional problem, and said it had also been difficult to get responses when Janet Reno led the department. Grassley said he has had no problem in asserting his oversight powers with the executive branch. As for his colleagues who worry about presidential usurpation of Congress's powers, Grassley added, "It doesn't matter to me what the president thinks, unless I want to take it into consideration. He didn't elect me-the people of Iowa elected me. I am a trustee of the people, not a messenger boy for the president." But Leahy had a far more negative, withering take on the Bush administration's actions to avoid oversight. He and some other Senate Judiciary Committee members have sent the Justice Department 28 requests for oversight information, dating back to July 2001. The department has not responded to any of them. Ashcroft "basically ignores most of the requests, but at least I give him credit for being bipartisan-he ignores Republican requests, too," Leahy said in the interview. "And this is the man who [when he was a senator] thought he should hold up judicial nominations and everything else when the attorney general didn't give us what we wanted." Several members of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee also reacted angrily when the administration canceled, at the last minute, testimony by the top official in charge of reconstruction and humanitarian assistance in Iraq, who was to appear at a March 11 hearing. They also were surprised to learn from that day's newspapers that the administration was seeking bids from U.S. corporations on reconstruction contracts for Iraq.

### Adv 1

#### 1. US can’t solve modeling – the development of offensive capabilities is inevitable.

Libicki 2009

(Martin, Senior Management Scientist at the RAND Corporation, "Cyberdeterrence and Cyberwar", http://www.rand.org/content/dam/rand/pubs/monographs/2009/RAND\_MG877.pdf)

Historically, arms control has always gone hand in hand with deter- rence and crisis stability, but it would be difficult to be optimistic about its prospects in cyberspace. A good deal depends on what one means by arms control. If the model were to be something like the treaties signed between the United States–NATO and the Soviet Union– Warsaw Pact, which limited certain classes of weapons and banned others, there is little basis for hope. 1 If, instead, the goal were a framework of international agreements and norms that could raise the diffi- culty of certain types of cyberattacks, some progress can be made. Why is it nearly impossible to limit or ban cyberweapons? First, although the purpose of “limiting” arms is to put an inventory-based lid on how much damage they can do in a crisis, such a consideration is irrelevant in a medium in which duplication is instantaneous. 2 Second, banning attack methods is akin to banishing “how-to” information, which is inherently impossible (like making advanced mathematics illegal). The same holds for banning knowledge about vulnerabilities. Third, banning attack code is next to impossible. Such code has many legitimate purposes, not least of which is in building defenses against attack from others. These others include individuals and nonstate actors, so the argument that one does not need defenses because offenses have been outlawed is unconvincing. In many, per- haps most cases, such attack code is useful for espionage, an activity that has yet to be banned by treaty. Furthermore, finding such code is a hopeless quest. The world’s information storage capacity is immense; much of it is legitimately encrypted; and besides, bad code does not emit telltale odors. If an enforcement entity could search out, read, and decrypt the entire database of the world, it would doubtless find far more interesting material than malware. Exhuming digital informa- tion from everyone else’s systems is hard enough when the authorities with arrest powers try it; it may be virtually impossible when outsiders try. The only barely feasible approach is to ban the activity of writing attack code, then hope that the fear of being betrayed by an insider who goes running to international authorities prevents governments from organizing small groups of elite hackers from engaging in such nefarious activities. If the international community had the manpower and access to enforce such norms, it could probably enforce a great many other, and more immediately practical, norms (e.g., against cor- ruption). Such a world does not exist.

#### 2. No first use fails with cyber operations – leave us defenseless and no clear definition of use.

Clarke and Knake ‘12

(Richard (former National Coordinator for Security, Infrastructure Protection, and Counter-terrorism for the United States) and Robert (Cybersecurity and homeland security expert at the Council on Foreign Relations), Cyber War: The Next Threat to National Security and What to Do About It, Harper Collins Books, 2012, RSR)

However, forswearing the use of cyber weapons until they have been used on us could mean¶ that if a conventional war broke out, we would not defend our forces by such things as cyber¶ attacks on our opponent’s antiaircraft missile systems. The initial use of cyber war in the South¶ China Sea scenario was a psychological operation on China’s internal military network, sending a¶ harassing e-mail with a picture of a sinking Chinese ship. Should that be considered a first use of¶ cyber war?¶ Moreover, the scenario presented a problem that if you do not go first in cyberspace, your¶ ability to conduct cyber attack may be reduced by the other side stepping up both its defensive¶ measures (for example, China cutting off its cyberspace from the rest of the world) and its¶ offensive measures (including attacks that disrupted U.S. networks that may be necessary for¶ some of the U.S. attacks to be launched). Whether we say it publicly or maintain it as an internal¶ component of our strategy, if we were to accept the concept of No First Use in cyber war we¶ would require a clear understanding of what constitutes “use.” Is penetration of a network a¶ cyber war act? When the network penetration goes beyond just collecting information, does the¶ act then move from intelligence operations to cyber war? Any ban on “first use” would prils obably¶ only apply prior to kinetic shooting. Once a war goes kinetic, most bets are off.

#### 3. Status quo solves limits for cyber aggression

Nakashima 2012

(Ellen, Washington Post staff writer, November 14, "Obama signs secret directive to help thwart cyberattacks", http://www.washingtonpost.com/world/national-security/obama-signs-secret-cybersecurity-directive-allowing-more-aggressive-military-role/2012/11/14/7bf51512-2cde-11e2-9ac2-1c61452669c3\_story.html)

President Obama has signed a secret directive that effectively enables the military to act more aggressively to thwart cyber­attacks on the nation’s web of government and private computer networks. Presidential Policy Directive 20 establishes a broad and strict set of standards to guide the operations of federal agencies in confronting threats in cyberspace, according to several U.S. officials who have seen the classified document and are not authorized to speak on the record. The president signed it in mid-October. The new directive is the most extensive White House effort to date to wrestle with what constitutes an “offensive” and a “defensive” action in the rapidly evolving world of cyberwar and cyberterrorism, where an attack can be launched in milliseconds by unknown assailants utilizing a circuitous route. For the first time, the directive explicitly makes a distinction between network defense and cyber-operations to guide officials charged with making often-rapid decisions § Marked 19:03 § when confronted with threats. The policy also lays out a process to vet any operations outside government and defense networks and ensure that U.S. citizens’ and foreign allies’ data and privacy are protected and international laws of war are followed. “What it does, really for the first time, is it explicitly talks about how we will use cyber- operations,” a senior administration official said. “Network defense is what you’re doing inside your own networks. . . . Cyber-operations is stuff outside that space, and recognizing that you could be doing that for what might be called defensive purposes.” The policy, which updates a 2004 presidential directive, is part of a wider push by the Obama administration to confront the growing cyberthreat, which officials warn may overtake terrorism as the most significant danger to the country. “It should enable people to arrive at more effective decisions,” said a second senior administration official. “In that sense, it’s an enormous step forward.” Legislation to protect private networks from attack by setting security standards and promoting voluntary information sharing is pending on the Hill, and the White House is also is drafting an executive order along those lines. James A. Lewis, a cybersecurity expert at the Center for Strategic and International Studies, welcomed the new directive as bolstering the government’s capability to defend against “destructive scenarios,” such as those that Defense Secretary Leon E. Panetta recently outlined in a speech on cybersecurity. “It’s clear we’re not going to be a bystander anymore to cyberattacks,” Lewis said. The Pentagon is expected to finalize new rules of engagement that would guide commanders on when and how the military can go outside government networks to prevent a cyberattack that could cause significant destruction or casualties. The presidential directive attempts to settle years of debate among government agencies about who is authorized to take what sorts of actions in cyberspace and with what level of permission. An example of a defensive cyber-operation that once would have been considered an offensive act, for instance, might include stopping a computer attack by severing the link between an overseas server and a targeted domestic computer. “That was seen as something that was aggressive,” said one defense official, “particularly by some at the State Department” who often are wary of actions that might infringe on other countries’ sovereignty and undermine U.S. advocacy of Internet freedom. Intelligence agencies are wary of operations that may inhibit intelligence collection. The Pentagon, meanwhile, has defined cyberspace as another military domain — joining air, land, sea and space — and wants flexibility to operate in that realm. But cyber-operations, the officials stressed, are not an isolated tool. Rather, they are an integral part of the coordinated national security effort that includes diplomatic, economic and traditional military measures. Offensive cyber actions, outside of war zones, would still require a higher level of scrutiny from relevant agencies and generally White House permission.

#### won’t disclose

Kenyon ‘11

[Henry Kenyon, contributing writer, Jan. 14th, 2011, Congress examines undisclosed military cyber ops, <http://defensesystems.com/articles/2011/01/14/congress-examines-undisclosed-military-cyber-operations.aspx>, uwyo//amp]

In a sign of continuing tensions between the military and civilian sides of government regarding oversight of covert operations in cyberspace, a recent Senate document noted that the Defense Department did not disclose clandestine cyber activities in a report to Congress. The disclosure emerged from a written exchange between Senate Armed Services Committee staffers and Michael Vickers, assistant undersecretary of Defense for special operations.

#### [5.] claims laws don’t include OCO’s

Kenyon ‘11

[Henry Kenyon, contributing writer, Jan. 14th, 2011, Congress examines undisclosed military cyber ops, <http://defensesystems.com/articles/2011/01/14/congress-examines-undisclosed-military-cyber-operations.aspx>, uwyo//amp]

In 33 pages of Senate documentation obtained by the Associated Press, lawmakers expressed concern about cyberspace operations that were not included in the quarterly report on secret military activity. The documents were Vickers' answers to senators' questions in preparation for his nomination hearing to be undersecretary of Defense for intelligence. The exchange between Vickers and the Senate panel also discussed a variety of other intelligence issues. No date has yet been set for the hearing. The Associated Press reported that the exchange did not describe the undisclosed cyber activities. However, experts told the Associated Press that they might include secret operations in Iraq, Afghanistan, Yemen and Somalia. Although DOD has established a Cyber Command, clear definitions for offensive and defensive cyber operations have yet to be set down. In his answer to the Senate, Vickers said those types of operations are not specifically described in the law, the Associated Press reported. Current legal requirements specify and describe missions by human operatives, not digital tools. Vickers said he would review and support expanding the requirement for cyber operations to be included in the quarterly military report.

### Adv 2

#### [1.] Obama cites AUMF and avoids public scrutiny by using cyber ops instead of troops

Cohen 2012

[Michael A. Cohen, fellow at the Century Foundation., July 24th, 2012, The Imperial Presidency: Drone Power and Congressional Oversight, <http://www.worldpoliticsreview.com/articles/12194/the-imperial-presidency-drone-power-and-congressional-oversight>, uwyo//amp]

Ironically, however, the administration stands on firmer legal ground here than it did on Libya. It has used the Authorization of Military Force (AUMF) granted in 2001 by Congress to justify nearly every aspect of these operations, including targeted killing campaigns carried out by both the military and the CIA, and the continued detention of prisoners in Guantanamo Bay and Afghanistan. As Yale Law School professor Bruce Ackerman told me, “The AUMF was a response to a real problem, namely the attacks of Sept. 11. It is now being transformed into a tool for fighting a 100-year war against terrorists.” In a sense we are witnessing a perfect storm of executive branch power-grabbing: a broad authorization of military force giving the president wide-ranging discretion to act, combined with a set of tools -- drones, special forces and cyber technology § Marked 19:03 § -- that allows him to do so in unprecedented ways. And since few troops are put in harm’s way, there is barely any public scrutiny.

#### [2.] won’t report operations b/c they’re not part of the WPR

Healey &Wilson 2013

[Jason Healey is the director of the Cyber Statecraft Initiative at the Atlantic Council. A.J. Wilson is a visiting fellow at the Atlantic Council. Thanks to Jason Thelen of the Atlantic Council for his contributions., 2013, uwyo//amp]

As remote war-fighting technology becomes ever more capable, reliable, and ubiquitous, the administration’s restrictive definition of “hostilities” could open up a huge area of unchecked executive power. For example, neither the current administration nor its immediate predecessor has reported under the WPR any of the hundreds of remote drone strikes carried out in Pakistan, Yemen, or Somalia over the past decade. Likewise, the Pentagon has made clear its position that other forms of remote warfare, cyber operations, are also not covered by the WPR.

#### [3.] He’ll decline to acknowledge OCO’s

Nakashima 2013

[Ellen Nakashima, August 30th, 2013, U.S. spy agencies mounted 231 offensive cyber-operations in 2011, documents show, <http://articles.washingtonpost.com/2013-08-30/world/41620705_1_computer-worm-former-u-s-officials-obama-administration>, uwyo//amp]

U.S. intelligence services carried out 231 offensive cyber-operations in 2011, the leading edge of a clandestine campaign that embraces the Internet as a theater of spying, sabotage and war, according to top-secret documents obtained by The Washington Post. That disclosure, in a classified intelligence budget provided by NSA leaker Edward Snowden, provides new evidence that the Obama administration’s growing ranks of cyberwarriors infiltrate and disrupt foreign computer networks. Additionally, under an extensive effort code-named GENIE, U.S. computer specialists break into foreign networks so that they can be put under surreptitious U.S. control. Budget documents say the $652 million project has placed “covert implants,” sophisticated malware transmitted from far away, in computers, routers and firewalls on tens of thousands of machines every year, with plans to expand those numbers into the millions. Ads by Google Earn an IS Security Cert.Become an IS Security Professional. Certification Training, 100% Online www.InformationSecurityCourses.com The documents provided by Snowden and interviews with former U.S. officials describe a campaign of computer intrusions that is far broader and more aggressive than previously understood. The Obama administration treats all such cyber-operations as clandestine and declines to acknowledge them.

#### 1. The risk of a cyber war is low due to technological barriers and a lack of motivation from the states actually capable

Gartzke 12

(Erik, Associate Professor in Political Science at UC-San Diego. “The Myth of Cyberwar” Page 1 12-7-12 http://dss.ucsd.edu/~egartzke/papers/cyberwar\_12062012.pdf//wyoccd)

A blitz of media, punditry and public pronouncements inform interested observers and policy¶ makers that the next war is likely to be won or lost on the internet. Indeed, events such as the¶ coordinated cyber attacks on Estonia and the Stuxnet worm seem to indicate that cyberwar has¶ already begun. The sense of urgency surrounding cyberwar appears to be tied to perceptions that¶ internet con¶ ict is the newest phase in the ongoing revolution in military a airs, only this time the¶ threat is directed at the sophisticated technological civilizations of the West, rather than at poor¶ developing states or the recipients of inferior second-world military hardware.1 To believe a growing¶ number of pundits and practitioners, cyberwar threatens to render existing military advantages¶ impotent, exposing those nations most dependent on comprehensive information infrastructures to¶ devastating and unpredictable attacks. If powerful states largely immune to terrestrial invasion¶ can have their military might blunted and their factories and cities idled by foreign hackers, then¶ perhaps this latest technological revolution really does presage a \Pearl Harbor" in which the¶ United States and other great powers will be targets, rather than perpetrators, of shock and awe.¶ There is a problem with the growing consensus of impending cyber apocalypse, however: it is¶ far from clear that con¶ ict over the internet can actually function as war. Discussions of cyberwar¶ commit a common fallacy of arguing from opportunity to outcome, rather than considering whether¶ something that could happen is at all likely, given the motives of those who are able to act.¶ Cyber pessimism rests heavily on capabilities (means), with little thought to a companion logic of¶ consequences § Marked 19:03 § (ends). Much that could happen in the world fails to occur, largely because those¶ capable of initiating action discern no benefit from doing so. Put another way, advocates have yet¶ to work out how cyberwar actually accomplishes the objectives that typically sponsor terrestrial¶ military violence. Absent a logic of consequences, it is di cult to believe that cyberwar will proveas devastating for world a airs and for developed nations in particular as many seem to believe.

#### 2. Escalation is unlikely due to deterrence and international checks

Gartzke 12

(Erik, Associate Professor in Political Science at UC-San Diego. “The Myth of Cyberwar” Page 23 12-7-12 http://dss.ucsd.edu/~egartzke/papers/cyberwar\_12062012.pdf//wyoccd)

An open question exists in any crisis about how far competitors are willing to escalate, but an¶ ability to counter cyber attack with other, more kinetic forms of military violence serves alternately¶ to deter or to facilitate the use of cyber capabilities, giving those nations with terrestrial military¶ power yet another option that, even if available to their opponents, may prove extraordinarily¶ dangerous to practice. As we see today with U.S. drone attacks and special operations raids on¶ foreign sovereign territory, the power to do much more ensures that an opponent maintains a level¶ of discretion in its response to provocation. Few can doubt the reaction of the United States, for¶ example, if Pakistan were to attempt to conduct a commando raid on U.S. territory. Nations that¶ can physically punish others for transgressions in any domain, electronic or otherwise, are better¶ able to operate in all domains. Once one distinguishes between simple vulnerability and actual¶ threats, terrestrial capabilities become pivotal in determining who exercises cyber capabilities.¶

#### 3. The impacts of a cyber attack would be small and temporary

Gartzke 12

(Erik, Associate Professor in Political Science at UC-San Diego. “The Myth of Cyberwar” Page 15-16 12-7-12 http://dss.ucsd.edu/~egartzke/papers/cyberwar\_12062012.pdf//wyoccd)

Beyond questions of means and motive, two basic features make cyber warfare di erent from other¶ types of con¶ ict. First, the bulk of damage contemplated by cyberwar is in all likelihood temporary.¶ The assumption among many cyber-pessimists that the potential for creating harm is sufficient to¶ make cyber space a suitable substitute for, or at least an alternative to, terrestrial conflict is simply¶ incorrect. Shutting down the power grid, or preventing communication could be tremendously¶ costly, but most such damage can be corrected quickly and with comparatively modest investment¶ of tangible resources. Regardless, damage of this type is sunk. Losses experienced over a given time¶ interval cannot be recovered whatever one's reactions and so should not have much direct impact on subsequent policy behavior. Harm inflicted over the internet or through any other medium¶ will matter politically when it involves changes to the subsequent balance of power, or when it¶ indicates enemy capabilities that must be taken into account in future plans. Precisely because¶ cyberwar does not involve bombing cities or devastating armored columns, the damage inflicted¶ will have a short-term impact on targets.10 To accomplish meaningful objectives, cyber attacks¶ must contribute to other aspects of a more conventional war e ort. In order to a ect the long-term¶ balance-of-power, for instance, cyberwar must be joined to other, more traditional, forms of war.

#### 4. Cyber war is already happening – proves no escalation

Francis 13

[Francis, David: national correspondent for The Fiscal Times, written for the Christian Science Monitor, contributed to World Politics Review, and holds a master’s from Georgetown University; “Chinese Attacks Reveal an Undeclared Global Cyber War,” TheFiscalTimes, 2/19/13; http://www.thefiscaltimes.com/Articles/2013/02/19/Chinese-Attacks-Reveals-an-Undeclared-Global-Cyber-War.aspx#page1,]

With the news that the Chinese military conducted more than 140 cyber attacks on U.S. government agencies and companies, it’s now evident that China, the United States and other countries around the world are in an undeclared and largely unseen state of cyber war. A report by Mandiant, a cyber security firm based in Alexandria, found that a group of Chinese hackers who are part of the Chinese military have been conducting attacks on American interests over the last seven years. The report claims repeated denials of hacking activities by Chinese officials are lies. The attacks outlined by Mandiant are the latest in a series of revealed global cyber attacks. According to reports, an attack by the United States and Israel crippled a nuclear facility in Iran. The New York Times, Google and the Wall Street Journal have recently been targets of hackers suspected to be Chinese. Long-time foes India and Pakistan are also actively engaged in cyber warfare against one another, while France has accused the Tunisian military of attacking its networks. Russia used cyber warfare against Georgia during their war in 2008. But it was the attack on Estonia in 2007 that got the world’s attention. Jaak Aavisksoo, Estonia’s minister of defense, knew there was trouble when he kept getting error messages every time he tried to access a newspaper one morning. He told Wired Magazine, “The attacks were aimed at the essential electronic infrastructure of the Republic of Estonia. All major commercial banks, telcos, media outlets, and name servers — the phone books of the Internet — felt the impact, and this affected the majority of the Estonian population. This was the first time that a botnet threatened the national security of an entire nation." Wired called it Web War One.

#### Economy is resilient and decline doesn’t cause war

Zakaria 9

Editor of Newsweek, BA from Yale, PhD in pol sci, Harvard. He serves on the board of Yale University, The Council on Foreign Relations, The Trilateral Commission, and Shakespeare and Company. Named "one of the 21 most important people of the 21st Century" (Fareed, December 12, 2009, “The Secrets of Stability: Why terrorism and economic turmoil won't keep the world down for long” Newsweek, <http://www.newsweek.com/2009/12/11/the-secrets-of-stability.print.html>)

One year ago, **the world seemed as if it might be coming apart. The global financial system**, which had fueled a great expansion of capitalism and trade across the world, **was crumbling. All the certainties of the age of globalization**—about the virtues of free markets, trade, and technology—**were being called into question. Faith in the American model had collapsed. The financial industry had crumbled**. Once-roaring emerging markets like China, India, and Brazil were sinking. Worldwide trade was shrinking to a degree not seen since the 1930s. Pundits whose bearishness had been vindicated predicted we were doomed to a long, painful bust, with cascading failures in sector after sector, country after country. In a widely cited essay that appeared in The Atlantic this May, Simon Johnson, former chief economist of the International Monetary Fund, wrote: "The conventional wisdom among the elite is still that the current slump 'cannot be as bad as the Great Depression.' This view is wrong. What we face now could, in fact, be worse than the Great Depression." **Others predicted that these economic shocks would lead to political instability and violence in the worst-hit countries**. At his confirmation hearing in February, the new U.S. director of national intelligence, Adm. Dennis Blair, cautioned the Senate that "the financial crisis and global recession are likely to produce a wave of economic crises in emerging-market nations over the next year." Hillary Clinton endorsed this grim view. And she was hardly alone. Foreign Policy ran a cover story predicting serious unrest in several emerging markets. Of one thing everyone was sure: nothing would ever be the same again. Not the financial industry, not capitalism, not globalization. One year later, **how much has the world really changed**? Well, Wall Street is home to two fewer investment banks (three, if you count Merrill Lynch). Some regional banks have gone bust. There was some turmoil in Moldova and (entirely unrelated to the financial crisis) in Iran. **Severe problems remain, like high unemployment in the West, and we face new problems caused by responses to the crisis—soaring debt and fears of inflation. But overall, things look nothing like they did in the 1930s. § Marked 19:04 § The predictions of economic and political collapse have not materialized at all.** A key measure of fear and fragility is the ability of poor and unstable countries to borrow money on the debt markets. So consider this: the sovereign bonds of tottering Pakistan have returned 168 percent so far this year. All this doesn't add up to a recovery yet, but it does reflect a return to some level of normalcy. And that rebound has been so rapid that even the shrewdest observers remain puzzled. "The question I have at the back of my head is 'Is that it?' “says Charles Kaye, the co-head of Warburg Pincus. "We had this huge crisis, and now we're back to business as usual?" **This revival did not happen because markets managed to stabilize themselves on their own. Rather, governments, having learned the lessons of the Great Depression, were determined not to repeat the same mistakes once this crisis hit. By massively expanding state support for the economy—through central banks and national treasuries—they buffered the worst of the damage**. (Whether they made new mistakes in the process remains to be seen.) **The extensive social safety nets that have been established across the industrialized world also cushioned the pain felt by many**. Times are still tough, but things are nowhere near as bad as in the 1930s, when governments played a tiny role in national economies. It's true that the massive state interventions of the past year may be fueling some new bubbles: the cheap cash and government guarantees provided to banks, companies, and consumers have fueled some irrational exuberance in stock and bond markets. Yet these rallies also demonstrate the return of confidence, and confidence is a very powerful economic force. When John Maynard Keynes described his own prescriptions for economic growth, he believed government action could provide only a temporary fix until the real motor of the economy started cranking again—the animal spirits of investors, consumers, and companies seeking risk and profit. Beyond all this, though, I believe **there's a fundamental reason why we have not faced global collapse in the last year. It is the same reason that we weathered the stock-market crash of 1987, the recession of 1992, the Asian crisis of 1997, the Russian default of 1998, and the tech-bubble collapse of 2000. The current global economic system is inherently more resilient than we think.** The world today is characterized by three major forces for stability, each reinforcing the other and each historical in nature.

#### historical arguments are wrong

Ferguson 6

(Niall, MA, D.Phil., is the Laurence A. Tisch Professor of History at Harvard University. He is a resident faculty member of the Minda de Gunzburg Center for European Studies. He is also a Senior Reseach Fellow of Jesus College, Oxford University, and a Senior Fellow of the Hoover Institution, Stanford University, Foreign Affairs, Sept/Oct)

**Nor can economic crises explain** the **bloodshed**. What may be **the most familiar causal chain in modern historiography links the Great Depression to** the rise of **fascism and** the outbreak of **World War II. But** that simple story leaves too much out. **Nazi Germany started the war** in Europe **only after its economy** had **recovered. Not all** the **countries affected by the** Great **Depression were taken over by fascist regimes, nor did all such regimes start wars** of aggression. In fact, **no general relationship between economics and conflict is discernible** for the century as a whole. **Some wars came after periods of growth, others were the causes rather than the consequences of economic catastrophe, and some severe economic crises were not followed by wars.**