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#### Interpretation: Targeted killings are strikes carried about against pre-meditated, individually designated targets---signature strikes are distinct.

Anderson, Professor at Washington College of Law, American University, ‘11

[Kenneth, Hoover Institution visiting fellow, Non-Resident Visiting Fellow at Brookings, “Distinguishing High Value Targeted Killing and ‘Signature’ Attacks on Taliban Fighters,” August 29 2011, http://www.volokh.com/2011/08/29/distinguishing-high-value-targeted-killing-and-signature-attacks-on-taliban-fighters/]

From the US standpoint, it is partly that it does not depend as much as it did on Pakistan’s intelligence. But it is also partly, as a couple of well-publicized incidents a few months ago made clear, that sharing targeting decisions with Pakistan’s military and ISI runs a very considerable possibility of having the targets tipped off (as even The Onion has observed). The article notes in this regard, the U.S. worries that “if they tell the Pakistanis that a drone strike is coming someone within Pakistani intelligence could tip off the intended target.” However, the Journal’s reporting goes from there to emphasize an aspect of targeted killing and drone warfare that is not sufficiently appreciated in public discussions trying to assess such issues as civilian collateral damage, strategic value and uses, and the uses of drones in counterterrorism and counterinsurgency as distinct activities. The article explains:¶ The CIA carries out two different types of drone strikes in the tribal areas of Pakistan—those against so-called high-value targets, including Mr. Rahman, and “signature” strikes targeting Taliban foot-soldiers who criss-cross the border with Afghanistan to fight U.S. forces there.¶ High-value targets are added to a classified list that the CIA maintains and updates. The agency often doesn’t know the names of the signature targets, but it tracks their movements and activities for hours or days before striking them, U.S. officials say.¶ Another way to put this is that, loosely speaking, the high value targets are part of a counterterrorism campaign – a worldwide one, reaching these days to Yemen and other places. It is targeted killing in its strict sense using drones – aimed at a distinct individual who has been identified by intelligence. The “signature” strikes, by contrast, are not strictly speaking “targeted killing,” because they are aimed at larger numbers of fighters who are targeted on the basis of being combatants, but not on the basis of individuated intelligence. They are fighting formations, being targeted on a mass basis as part of the counterinsurgency campaign in Afghanistan, as part of the basic CI doctrine of closing down cross-border safe havens and border interdiction of fighters. Both of these functions can be, and are, carried out by drones – though each strategic function could be carried out by other means, such as SEAL 6 or CIA human teams, in the case of targeted killing, or manned aircraft in the case of attacks on Taliban formations. The fundamental point is that they serve distinct strategic purposes. Targeted killing is not synonymous with drone warfare, just as counterterrorism is analytically distinct from counterinsurgency. (I discuss this in the opening sections of this draft chapter on SSRN.)¶ This analytic point affects how one sees the levels of drone attacks going up or down over the years. Neither the total numbers of fighters killed nor the total number of drone strikes – going up or down over months – tells the whole story. Total numbers do not distinguish between the high value targets, being targeted as part of the top down dismantling of Al Qaeda as a transnational terrorist organization, on the one hand, and ordinary Taliban being killed in much larger numbers as part of counterinsurgency activities essentially part of the ground war in Afghanistan, on the other. Yet the distinction is crucial insofar as the two activities are, at the level of truly grand strategy, in support of each other – the war in Afghanistan and the global counterterrorism war both in support of the AUMF and US national security broadly – but at the level of ordinary strategic concerns, quite distinct in their requirements and conduct. If targeted killing against AQ leadership goes well in Pakistan, those might diminish at some point in the future; what happens in the war against the Afghan Taliban is distinct and has its own rhythm, and in that effort, drones are simply another form of air weapon, an alternative to manned aircraft in an overt, conventional war. Rising or falling numbers of drone strikes in the aggregate will not tell one very much without knowing what mission is at issue.

#### Violation – The aff restricts signature strikes; these are not targeted killing.

#### Prefer our interp – allowing signature strikes in the topic destroys predictability, limits, and precision by allowing in mass attacks against enemy combatants and all kinds of air power weapons platforms

Anderson, Professor at Washington College of Law, American University, ‘11

[Kenneth, Hoover Institution visiting fellow, Non-Resident Visiting Fellow at Brookings, “Efficiency in Bello and ad Bellum: Targeted Killing Through Drone Warfare,” Sept 23 2011, http://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract\_id=1812124]

Although targeted killing and drone warfare are often closely connected, they are not the same and are not always associated with each other. We need to disaggregate the practices of targeted killing from the technologies of drone warfare.¶ Targeted killing consists of using deadly force, characterized by the identification of and then strike against an individual marked to be killed. It is distinguished, among other things, by making an individualized determination of a person to be killed, rather than simply identifying, for example, a mass of enemy combatants to attack as a whole. Since it is a practice that involves the determination of an identified person, rather than a mass of armed and obvious combatants, it is a use of force that is by its function integrated with intelligence work, whether the intelligence actors involved are uniformed military or a civilian agency such as the CIA.¶ Targeted killing might (and does) take place in the course of conventional warfare, through special operations or other mechanisms that narrowly focus operations through intelligence. But it might also take place outside of a conventional conflict, or perhaps far from the conventional battlefields of that conflict, sufficiently so operationally to best be understood as its own operational category of the use of force – “intelligence-driven,” often covert, and sometimes non-military intelligence agency use of force, typically aimed at “high value” targets in global counterterrorism operations. It might be covert or it might not – but it will be driven by intelligence, because of necessity it must identify and justify the choice of target (on operational, because resources are limited; or legal grounds; or, in practice, both).¶ Targeted killing might use a variety of tactical methods by which to carry out the attack. The method might be by drones firing missiles – the focus of discussion here. But targeted killing – assassination, generically – is a very old method for using force and drones are new. Targeted killing in current military and CIA doctrine might, and often does, take place with covert civilian intelligence agents or military special operations forces – a human team carrying out the attack, rather than a drone aircraft operated from a distance. The Bin Laden raid exemplifies the human team-conducted targeted killing, of course, and in today’s tactical environment, the US often uses combined operations that have available both human teams and drones, to be deployed according to circumstances.¶ Targeted killing is thus a tactic that might be carried out either by drones or human teams. If there are two ways to do targeted killing, there are also two functions for the use of drones – targeted killing as part of an “intelligence-driven” discrete use of force, on the one hand, and a role (really, roles) in conventional warfare. Drones have a role in an ever-increasing range of military operations that have no connection to “targeted killing.” For many reasons ranging from cost-effectiveness to mission-effectiveness, drones are becoming more ramified in their uses in military operations, and will certainly become more so. This is true starting with their fundamental use in surveillance, but is also true when used as weapons platforms.¶ From the standpoint of conventional military operations and ordinary battlefields, drones are seen by the military as simply an alternative air weapons platform. One might use an over-the-horizon manned aircraft – or, depending on circumstances, one might instead use a drone as the weapons platform. It might be a missile launched from a drone by an operator, whether sitting in a vehicle near the fighting or farther away; it might be a weapon fired from a helicopter twenty miles away, but invisible to the fighters; it might be a missile fired from a US Navy vessel hundreds of miles away by personnel sitting at a console deep inside the ship. Future air-to-air fighter aircraft systems are very likely to be remotely piloted, in order to take advantage of superior maneuverability and greater stresses endurable without a human pilot. Remotely-piloted aircraft are the future of much military and, for that matter, civil aviation; this is a technological revolution that is taking place for reasons having less to do with military aviation than general changes in aviation technology.¶ Missiles fired from a remotely-piloted standoff platform present the same legal issues as any other weapons system – the law of war categories of necessity and proportionality in targeting. To military professionals, therefore, the emphasis placed on “remoteness” from violence of drone weapons operators, and presumed psychological differences in operators versus pilots, is misplaced and indeed mystifying. Navy personnel firing missiles from ships are typically just as remote from the fighting, and yet one does not hear complaints about their indifference to violence and their “Playstation,” push-button approach to war. Air Force pilots more often than not fire from remote aircraft; pilots involved in the bombing campaign over Serbia in the Kosovo war sometimes flew in bombers taking off from the United States; bomber crews dropped their loads from high altitudes, guided by computer, with little connection to the “battlefield” and little conception of what they – what their targeting computers - were aiming at. Some of the crews in interviews described spending the flights of many hours at a time, flying from the Midwest and back, as a good chance to study for graduate school classes they were taking – not Playstation, but study hall. In many respects, the development of new sensor technologies make the pilots, targeters, and the now-extensive staff involved in a decision to fire a weapon from a drone far more aware of what is taking place at the target than other forms of remote targeting, from Navy ships or high altitude bombing.¶ Very few of the actors on a technologically advanced battlefield are personally present in a way that makes the destruction and killing truly personal – and that is part of the point. Fighting up close and personal, on the critics’ psychological theories, seems to mean that it has greater significance to the actors and therefore leads to greater restraint. That is extremely unlikely and contrary to the experience of US warfighters. Lawful kinetic violence is more likely to increase when force protection is an issue, and overuse of force is more likely to increase when forces are under personal pressure and risk. The US military has known since Vietnam at least that increased safety for fighting personnel allows them greater latitude in using force, encourages and permits greater willingness to consider the least damaging alternatives, and that putting violence at a remove reduces the passions and fears of war and allows a coolly professional consideration of what kinds, and how much, violence is required to accomplish a lawful military mission. Remote weapon systems, whether robotic or simply missiles launched from a safe distance, in US doctrine are more than just a means for reducing risk to forces – they are an integral part of the means of allowing more time to consider less-harmful alternatives.¶ This is an important point, given that drones today are being used for tasks that involve much greater uses of force than individualized targeted killing. Drones are used today, and with increasing frequency, to kill whole masses of enemy columns of Taliban fighters on the Pakistan border – in a way that would otherwise be carried out by manned attack aircraft. This is not targeted killing; this is conventional war operations. It is most easily framed in terms of the abstract strategic division of counterinsurgency from counterterrorism (though in practice the two are not so distinct as all that). In particular, drones are being deployed in the AfPak conflict as a counterinsurgency means of going after Taliban in their safe haven camps on the Pakistan side of the border. A fundamental tenet of counterinsurgency is that the safe havens have to be ended, and this has meant targeting much larger contingents of Taliban fighters than previously understood in the “targeted killing” deployment. This could be – and in some circumstances today is – being done by the military; it is also done by the CIA under orders of the President partly because of purely political concerns; much of it today seems to be a combined operation of military and CIA.¶ Whoever conducts it and whatever legal issues it might raise, the point is that this activity is fundamentally counterinsurgency. The fighters are targeted in much larger numbers in the camps than would be the case in “targeted killing,” and this is a good instance of how targeted killing and drone warfare need to be differentiated. The targets are not individuated, either in the act of targeting or in the decision of who and where to target: this is simply an alternative air platform for doing what might otherwise be done with helicopters, fixed wing aircraft, or ground attack, in the course of conventional counterinsurgency operations. But it also means that the numbers killed in such operations are much larger, and consist often of ordinary fighters who would otherwise pile into trucks and cross back into Afghanistan, rather than individualized “high value” targets, whether Taliban or Al Qaeda.

#### D. T is a voter in order to preserve fairness and education

### 2

#### Immigration reform passage likely- GOP support growing, activism, legalization compromises and leadership from Obama.

Lopez, 1-1

[Oscar, “New Year 2014: 4 Reasons Immigration Reform Will Pass In 2014”, 1-1-14, Latin Times,

<http://www.latintimes.com/new-year-2014-4-reasons-immigration-reform-will-pass-2014-141778>, RSR]

Immigration reform is set to be the key issue of 2014. Following Mitt Romney's dismal performance among Latino voters in the 2012 election, both sides of the Government woke up to the necessity for comprehensive reform on immigration. Indeed, in his State of the Union address in February, President Obama declared that “the time has come to pass comprehensive immigration reform.” Yet with the House divided over Obamacare and the budget crisis, the Government Shutdown let immigration reform die. 2014 will change that: and here are 4 Reasons Why. 1. Republican Support: A fundamental lack of support from the GOP has always been one of the major obstacles for passing comprehensive reform legislation, and indeed this seemed to be the case this year after the Bill passed by the Senate was struck down by Congress. However, more and more GOP members are realizing the significance of the Latino vote and understanding that passing comprehensive immigration reform is the most significant way of securing support from Latino voters. A July poll from Latino Decisions found that immigration reform was the most important issue facing the Latino community for 60 percent of those surveyed. The poll also found that 70 percent of those questioned were dissatisfied with the job Republicans were doing on the issue. The survey also found the 39 percent would be more likely to support a Republican congressional candidate if immigration reform was passed with Republican leadership. Republican candidates have become aware of the significance of immigration reform for the party. Even in traditionally conservative Republican strongholds like Texas, candidates are turning towards immigration reform. According to Republican strategist and CNN en Español commentator Juan Hernandez, "it also wouldn’t surprise me if after the primary, the candidates move to the center and support reform. For Republicans to stay in leadership in Texas, we must properly address immigration.” The March 2014 primaries will be a key moment in determining how reform progresses: Republican Strategist John Feehery suggests, “The timing on this is very important. What was stupid to do becomes smart to do a little bit later in the year.” Once the primaries are over, GOP members will have the chance to implement reform legislation without fear of challenges from the right. 2. Legalization Over Citizenship: While the Senate’s 2013 immigration reform bill was struck down by Congress, GOP party members have indicated that they will support legislation which favors legalization of undocumented immigrants over a path to citizenship. Meanwhile, a recent survey from Pew Research Hispanic Trends Project demonstrated that 55 percent of Hispanic adults believe that legalizing immigrants and removing the fear of deportation is more important than a pathway to citizenship (although citizenship is still important to 89 percent of Latinos surveyed.) As CBS suggests, “Numbers like these could give leverage to lawmakers who are interested in making some reforms to the legal immigration system, but not necessarily offering any kind of citizenship.” If House Republicans offered legalization legislation for the undocumented community, this could put pressure on the President to compromise. And while this kind of reform would not be as comprehensive as the Senate’s bill, a bipartisan agreement would be a significant achievement towards accomplishing reform. 3. Activism Steps Up: 2013 saw one of the biggest surges in grassroots activism from immigration supporters, and political leaders started to listen. The hunger strike outside the White House was a particularly significant demonstration and drew visits of solidarity from a number of leaders from both sides of Congress, including the President and First Lady. Immigration reform activists have promised "we will be back in 2014." Indeed, 2014 promises to be a year of even greater activism. Activist Eliseo Medina has pledged that immigrant advocacy groups would visit “as many congressional districts as possible” in 2014 to ensure further support. Protests, rallies and marchers are likely to increase in 2014, putting greater pressure on Congress to pass legislation. Such visual, vocal protests will be key in ensuring comprehensive reform. 4. Leadership: As immigration reform comes to the fore, party leaders will step up in 2014 to ensure change is achieved. While President Obama has made clear his support for comprehensive reform, House Speaker John Boehner previously stated that he had “no intention” of negotiating with the Senate on their comprehensive immigration bill. However, towards the end of 2013, it seemed that Representative Boehner was changing his tune. In November, President Obama revealed that “the good news is, just this past week Speaker Boehner said that he is “hopeful we can make progress” on immigration reform.” As if to prove the point, Boehner has recently hired top aide Rebecca Tallent to work on immigration reform. With bipartisan leadership firmly focused on immigration reform and party members on both sides realizing the political importance of the issue, comprehensive legislation is one thing we can be sure of in 2014.

#### Having to defend authority saps Obama’s PC.

Kriner 10 Douglas L. Kriner (assistant professor of political science at Boston University) “After the Rubicon: Congress, Presidents, and the Politics of Waging War”, University of Chicago Press, Dec 1, 2010, page 68-69.

While congressional support leaves the president’s reserve of political capital intact, congressional criticism saps energy from other initiatives on the home front by forcing the president to expend energy and effort defending his international agenda. Political capital spent shoring up support for a president’s foreign policies is capital that is unavailable for his future policy initiatives. Moreover, any weakening in the president’s political clout may have immediate ramifications for his reelection prospects, as well as indirect consequences for congressional races.59 Indeed, Democratic efforts to tie congressional Republican incumbents to President George W. Bush and his war policies paid immediate political dividends in the 2006 midterms, particularly in states, districts, and counties that had suffered the highest casualty rates in the Iraq War. 60 In addition to boding ill for the president’s perceived political capital and reputation, such partisan losses in Congress only further imperil his programmatic agenda, both international and domestic. Scholars have long noted that President Lyndon Johnson’s dream of a Great Society also perished in the rice paddies of Vietnam. Lacking the requisite funds in a war-depleted treasury and the political capital needed to sustain his legislative vision, Johnson gradually let his domestic goals slip away as he hunkered down in an effort first to win and then to end the Vietnam War. In the same way, many of President Bush’s highest second-term domestic proprieties, such as Social Security and immigration reform, failed perhaps in large part because the administration had to expend so much energy and effort waging a rear-guard action against congressional critics of the war in Iraq.61 When making their cost-benefit calculations, presidents surely consider these wider political costs of congressional opposition to their military policies. If congressional opposition in the military arena stands to derail other elements of his agenda, all else being equal, the president will be more likely to judge the benefits of military action insufficient to its costs than if Congress stood behind him in the international arena.

#### Political capital is key

Orlando Sentinel 11-1-13 "What we think: It'll take both parties to clear immigration logjam" articles.orlandosentinel.com/2013-11-01/news/os-ed-immigration-reform-congress-20131031\_1\_immigration-reform-comprehensive-reform-house-republicans

For those who thought the end of the government shutdown would provide a break from the partisan bickering in Washington, think again. The battle over comprehensive immigration reform could be every bit as contentious. Polls show the popular momentum is there for comprehensive reform, which would include a path to citizenship for many of the nation's 11 million undocumented immigrants. But it'll take plenty of political capital from President Obama and leaders in both parties on Capitol Hill to make it happen. Immigration-reform activists, who have been pushing for reform for years, are understandably impatient. This week police arrested 15 who blocked traffic at a demonstration in Orlando. There are plenty of selling points for comprehensive immigration reform. An opportunity for millions of immigrants to get on the right side of the law. Stronger border security. The chance for law enforcement to focus limited resources on real threats to public safety, instead of nannies and fruit pickers. A more reliable work force to meet the needs of key industries. Reforms to let top talent from around the world stay here after studying in U.S. universities. The Senate passed its version of comprehensive immigration in June. It includes all of the benefits above. Its path to citizenship requires undocumented immigrants to pay fines, learn English, pass a criminal background check and wait more than a decade. So far, House Republicans have balked, taking a piecemeal rather than comprehensive approach. Many members fear being challenged from the right for supporting "amnesty." Yet polls show the public supports comprehensive reform. In June, a Gallup poll found 87 percent of Americans — including 86 percent of Republicans — support a pathway to citizenship like the one outlined in the Senate bill. Florida Republican Sen. Marco Rubio took flak from tea-party supporters for spearheading the comprehensive bill. Now, apparently aiming to mend fences, he says immigration should be handled piecemeal. He's politically savvy enough to know that's a dead end. But comprehensive reform won't have a chance without President Obama making full use of his bully pulpit to promote it, emphasizing in particular all that undocumented immigrants would need to do to earn citizenship. House Democratic leaders will have to underscore the president's message.

#### Immigration reform key to US lead on biotech innovation

Scullion ’13 (Christine, “Manufacturers Take the Lead In STEM Education”, January 8, <http://www.shopfloor.org/2013/01/manufacturers-take-the-lead-in-stem-education/27254>, CMR)

The U.S. the leading producer of cutting-edge products such as those on display at the Consumer Electronics Show. Whether it’s in IT, biotech, aerospace, medical devices or heavy machinery, US companies will be the ones to constantly and consistently create new and better things. This future promises to be bright, but only if we have the workforce capable of pushing that leading-edge. And right now, that doesn’t look like a very good bet. The lack of a skilled workforce is a constant threat to manufacturing growth. In fact in a recent survey 82% of manufacturers reported a moderate-to-serious shortage in skilled production labor. Worker shortages abound not only among machinists and welders but also in occupations requiring expertise in the fields of science, technology, engineering and math (STEM), where the unemployment rate today lies well below 4%.¶ The US needs to refocus our workforce training resources and reform our immigration system to continue to grow and innovate. Immigration reform is a serious issue for Manufacturers not only in the High-tech arena but across manufacturing sectors. Without a skilled workforce – from the PhDs to production labor, the nation’s economy will suffer and jobs will be moved overseas. Access to the right individual with the right skills at the right time will ensure that the US remains a global innovation leader.

#### Biotech innovation key to solve bioterror

Chyba & Greninger, 4 - Co-Director of the Center for International Security and Cooperation (CISAC), Stanford Institute for International Studies, and an Associate Professor at Stanford University

[Christopher & Alex, “Biotechnology and Bioterrorism: An Unprecedented World” Survival, 46:2, Summer 2004]

In the absence of a comprehensive and effective system of global review of potential high-consequence research, we are instead trapped in a kind of offence–defence arms race. Even as legitimate biomedical researchers develop defences against biological pathogens, bad actors could in turn engineer countermeasures in a kind of directed version of the way natural pathogens evolve resistance to anti-microbial drugs. The mousepox case provides a harbinger of what is to come: just as the United States was stockpiling 300m doses of smallpox vaccine as a defence against a terrorist smallpox attack, experimental modification of the mousepox virus showed how the vaccine could possibly be circumvented. The United States is now funding research on antiviral drugs and other ways of combating smallpox that might be effective against the engineered organism. Yet there are indications that smallpox can be made resistant to one of the few known antiviral drugs. **The future has the appearance of an** eternal arms race of measures and countermeasures. The ‘arms race’ metaphor should be used with caution; it too is in danger of calling up misleading analogies to the nuclear arms race of the Cold War. First, the biological arms race is an offence–defence race, rather than a competition between offensive means. Under the BWC, only defensive research is legitimate. But more fundamentally, the driver of de facto offensive capabilities in this arms race is not primarily a particular adversary, but rather the ongoing global advance of microbiological and biomedical research. Defensive measures **are in** a race with nefarious applications of basic research, much of which is itself undertaken for protection against natural disease. In a sense, we are in an arms race with ourselves. It is hard to see how this arms race is stable – an offence granted comparable resources would seem to be necessarily favoured. As with ballistic missile defence, particular defensive measures may be defeated by offensive countermeasures. **In the biological case, implementing defensive measures will require** not only **research** but drug development and distribution plans. Offensive measures need not exercise this care, although fortunately they will likely face comparative resource constraints (especially if not associated with a state programme), and may find that some approaches (for example, to confer antibiotic resistance) have the simultaneous effect of inadvertently reducing a pathogen’s virulence. The defence must always guard against committing the fallacy of the last move, whereas the offence may embrace the view of the Irish Republican Army after it failed to assassinate the British cabinet in the 1984 Brighton bombing: ‘Today we were unlucky, but remember we have only to be lucky once – you will have to be lucky always’.40 At the very least, the defence will have to be vigilant and collectively smarter than the offence. **The only way for the defence to win** convincingly in the biological arms race **would** seem to **be to succeed in discovering and implementing** certain de facto last-move defences, at least on an organism-by-organism basis. Perhaps there are defences, or a web of defences, that will prove too difficult for any plausible non-state actor to engineer around. Whether **such defences** exist is unclear at this time, but their exploration **should be a long-term research goal of US biodefence** efforts. Progress might also have an important impact on international public health. One of the ‘Grand Challenges’ identified by the Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation in its $200m initiative to improve global health calls for the discovery of drugs that minimise the emergence of drug resistance – a kind of ‘last move’ defence against the evolutionary countermeasures of natural microbes.41 **Should** a collection of such **defensive moves prove possible**, **bioterrorism might ultimately succumb to** a kind of globalised **dissuasion by denial**:42 non-state groups would calculate that they could not hope to achieve dramatic results through biological programmes and would choose to direct their efforts elsewhere.

#### That results in extinction.

Steinbruner 97 John D. Steinbruner, Brookings senior fellow and chair in international security, vice chair of the committee on international security and arms control of the National Academy of Sciences, Winter 1997, Foreign Policy, “Biological weapons: a plague upon all houses,” n109 p85(12), infotrac

Although human pathogens are often lumped with nuclear explosives and lethal chemicals as potential weapons of mass destruction, there is an obvious, fundamentally important difference: Pathogens are alive, weapons are not. Nuclear and chemical weapons do not reproduce themselves and do not independently engage in adaptive behavior; pathogens do both of these things. That deceptively simple observation has immense implications. The use of a manufactured weapon is a singular event. Most of the damage occurs immediately. The aftereffects, whatever they may be, decay rapidly over time and distance in a reasonably predictable manner. Even before a nuclear warhead is detonated, for instance, it is possible to estimate the extent of the subsequent damage and the likely level of radioactive fallout. Such predictability is an essential component for tactical military planning. The use of a pathogen, by contrast, is an extended process whose scope and timing cannot be precisely controlled. For most potential biological agents, the predominant drawback is that they would not act swiftly or decisively enough to be an effective weapon. But for a few pathogens - ones most likely to have a decisive effect and therefore the ones most likely to be contemplated for deliberately hostile use - the risk runs in the other direction. A lethal pathogen that could efficiently spread from one victim to another would be capable of initiating an intensifying cascade of disease that might ultimately threaten the entire world population. The 1918 influenza epidemic demonstrated the potential for a global contagion of this sort but not necessarily its outer limit.

### 3

#### CP Text: The Executive branch of the United States should limit targeted killings to individuals who U.S. officials claim are being targeted, provide a public accounting of how it meets the principles of distinction and proportionality that the Obama administration claims, review its current policy whereby the executive authority for drone strikes is split between the CIA and JSOC, provide information to the public, Congress and UN special rapporteurs on what procedures exist to prevent harm to civilians, ban the use of signature strikes and never conduct non battlefield targeted killings without an accountable human being authorizing the strike.

#### Self-Restraint solves

Zenko 13 (Micah, Dr. Zenko is a Douglas Dillon fellow in the Center for Preventive Action (CPA) at the Council on Foreign Relations (CFR), he worked for five years at Harvard University’s Kennedy School of Government, and in Washington, DC, at the Brookings Institution, Congressional Research Service, and State Department's Office of Policy Planning, Council Special Report No.65, January 2013, Reforming US Drone Strike Policies, i.cfr.org/content/publications/attachments/Drones\_CSR65.pdf)

History shows that how states adopt and use new military capabilities is often influenced by how other states have—or have not—used them in the past. Furthermore, norms can deter states from acquiring new technologies.72 Norms—sometimes but not always codified as legal regimes—have dissuaded states from deploying blinding lasers and landmines, as well as chemical, biological, and nuclear weapons. A well-articulated and internationally supported normative framework, bolstered by a strong U.S. example, can shape armed drone prolifera- tion and employment in the coming decades. Such norms would not hinder U.S. freedom of action; rather, they would internationalize already-necessary domestic policy reforms and, of course, they would be acceptable only insofar as the limitations placed reciprocally on U.S. drones furthered U.S. objectives. And even if hostile states do not accept norms regulating drone use, the existence of an international norma- tive framework, and U.S. compliance with that framework, would pre- serve Washington’s ability to apply diplomatic pressure. Models for developing such a framework would be based in existing international laws that emphasize the principles of necessity, proportionality, and distinction—to which the United States claims to adhere for its drone strikes—and should be informed by comparable efforts in the realms of cyber and space.¶ In short, a world characterized by the proliferation of armed drones—used with little transparency or constraint—would under- mine core U.S. interests, such as preventing armed conflict, promoting human rights, and strengthening international legal regimes. It would be a world in which targeted killings occur with impunity against anyone deemed an “enemy” by states or nonstate actors, without accountability for legal justification, civilian casualties, and proportionality. Perhaps more troubling, it would be a world where such lethal force no longer heeds the borders of sovereign states. Because of drones’ inherent advantages over other weapons platforms, states and nonstate actors would be much more likely to use lethal force against the United States and its allies.¶ Much like policies governing the use of nuclear weapons, offensive cyber capabilities, and space, developing rules and frameworks for innovative weapons systems, much less reaching a consensus within the U.S. government, is a long and arduous process. In its second term, the Obama administration has a narrow policy window of opportunity to pursue reforms of the targeted killings program. The Obama admin- istration can proactively shape U.S. and international use of armed drones in nonbattlefield settings through transparency, self-restraint, and engagement, or it can continue with its current policies and risk the consequences. To better secure the ability to conduct drone strikes, and potentially influence how others will use armed drones in the future, the United States should undertake the following specific policy recommendations.¶ The president of the United States should ■■ limit targeted killings to individuals who U.S. officials claim are being targeted—the leadership of al-Qaeda and affiliated forces or individ- uals with a direct operational role in past or ongoing terrorist plots against the United States and its allies—and bring drone strike prac- tices in line with stated policies; ■■ either end the practice of signature strikes or provide a public account- ing of how it meets the principles of distinction and proportionality that the Obama administration claims; ■■ review its current policy whereby the executive authority for drone strikes is split between the CIA and JSOC, as each has vastly different legal authorities, degrees of permissible transparency, and oversight; ■■ provide information to the public, Congress, and UN special rappor- teurs—without disclosing classified information—on what proce- dures exist to prevent harm to civilians, including collateral damage mitigation, investigations into collateral damage, corrective actions based on those investigations, and amends for civilian losses; and ■■ never conduct nonbattlefield targeted killings without an account- able human being authorizing the strike (while retaining the poten- tial necessity of autonomous decisions to use lethal force in warfare in response to ground-based antiaircraft fire or aerial combat).

### 4

#### The aff’s production of risk is used to maintain the stranglehold of expertism that decides the future of government policy. They prop up social inequalities around us and normalize every day violence that occurs around us in the name of market opportunities.

Beck, Professor of Sociology at the Ludwig-Maximilians-University Munich, ‘92

[Ulrich, Risk Society: Towards a New Modernity, Published in association with Theory, Culture & Society, pgs. 44-46, RSR] (We do not endorse the ableist language)

Inequalities in class and risk society can therefore overlap and condition one another: the latter can produce the former. The unequal distribution of social wealth offers impregnable defensive walls and justifications for the production of risks. Here a precise distinction must be made between the cultural and political attention to risks and their actual diffusion. Class societies are societies where, across all the gaps between classes, the main concern is the visible satisfaction of material needs. Here, hunger and surplus or power and weakness confront each other. Misery needs no self-confirmation. It exists. Its directness and visibility correspond to the material evidence of wealth and power. The certainties of class societies are in this sense the certainties of a culture of visibility: emaciated hunger contrasts with plump satiety; palaces with hovels, splendor with rags. These evident qualities of the tangible no longer hold in risk societies. What escapes perceptibility no longer coincides with the unreal, but can instead even possess a higher degree of hazardous reality. Immediate need competes with the known element of risk. The world of visible scarcity or surplus grows dim under the predominance of risks. The race between perceptible wealth and imperceptible risks cannot be won by the latter. The visible cannot compete with the invisible. Paradox decrees that for that very reason the invisible risks win the race. The ignoring of risks that are in any case imperceptible, which always finds its justification in the elimination of tangible need - and in fact actually has that justification (see the Third World!) - is the cultural and political soil on which the risks and hazards grow, bloom and thrive. In the overlap and competition between the problems of class, industrial and market society on one side and those of the risk society on the other, the logic of wealth production always wins, in accordance with the power relationships and standards of relevance - and for that very reason the risk society is ultimately victorious. The tangibility of need suppresses the perception of risks, but only the perception, not their reality or their effects; risks denied grow especially quickly and well. At a certain stage of social production, characterized by the development of the chemical industry, but also by reactor technology, microelectronics, and genetic technology, the predominance of the logic and conflicts of wealth produc- tion, and thus the social invisibility of the risk society, is no proof of its unreality; on the contrary, it is a motor for the origin of the risk society and thus a proof that it is becoming real. This is what the overlapping and amplification of class and risk posi- tions in the Third World teaches; the same can be said, however, of action and thought in the wealthy industrial countries. Protecting economic recovery and growth still enjoys unchallenged first priority. The threatening loss of jobs is played up, in order to keep the loopholes in prescribed emissions regulations wide and their enforcement lax, or to prevent any investigation into certain toxic residues in foodstuffs. No records are kept on entire families of chemicals out of consideration for the economic consequences; they do not exist legally and can be freely circulated for that very reason. The contradiction that fighting environmental risks has itself become a flourishing branch of industry that guarantees many millions of people secure (all too secure) jobs in Germany is passed over in silence. At the same time the instruments of definitional risk 'management' are being sharpened and the relevant axes are being swung. Those who point out risks are defamed as 'alarmists' and risk producers. Their presentation of the hazards is considered 'unproven'. The effects on man and animals they demonstrate are called 'outrageously exaggerated'. More research is required, they say, before one can be sure what the situation is and take the appropriate measures. Only a rapidly growing gross national product could create the prerequisites for improved environmental protection. They invoke trust in science and research. Their rationality has so far found solutions to every problem, the argument goes. Critique of science and anxieties about the future are stigmatized in contrast as 'irra- tionalism'. They are supposed to be the real roots of the evils. Risk belongs to progress as much as a bow-wave belongs to a speeding ship. Risk is no invention of modern times. It is tolerated in many areas of social life. The deaths from traffic accidents, for instance. Every year a middle-sized city in Germany disappears without a trace, so to speak. People have even got used to that. So there is plenty of free space and air for little mini-catastrophes with radioactive material or waste or such (these are in any case extremely unlikely, considering German safety technology). Even the dominance of this interpretation cannot delude us as to its loss of reality. Its victory is a Pyrrhic one. Where it prevails it produces what it denies, the risk society. But there is no consolation in that; on the contrary there is a growing danger. Thus it is also and especially in denial and non-perception that the objec- tive community of a global risk comes into being. Behind the variety of interests, the reality of risk threatens and grows, knowing no social or national differences anymore. Behind the walls of indifference, danger runs wild. Of course, this does not mean that a grand harmony will break out in the face of the growing risks of civilization. Precisely in dealing with risks, a variety of new social differentiations and conflicts emerge. These no longer adhere to the plan of class society. They arise above all from the double face of risks in late industrial society: risks are no longer the dark side of opportunities, they are also market opportunities. As the risk society develops, so does the antagonism between those afflicted by risks and those who profit from them. The social and economic impor- tance of knowledge grows similarly, and with it the power over the media to structure knowledge (science and research) and disseminate it (mass media). The risk society is in this sense also the science, media and infor- mation society. Thus new antagonisms open up between those who produce risk definitions and those who consume them.

#### The alternative is to rethink the risk society – developing alternative frames that reject expertism and future risks is key to prevent the aff from becoming a self-fulfilling prophecy.

Beck, Professor of Sociology at the Ludwig-Maximilians-University Munich, ‘92

[Ulrich, Risk Society: Towards a New Modernity, Published in association with Theory, Culture & Society, pgs.175-176, RSR]

Thus there are fundamentally two options confronting each other in dealing with civilizational risks: removing causes in primary industrialization, or the secondary industrialization of consequences and symptoms, which tends to expand markets. To this point, the second route has been taken almost everywhere. It is cost-intensive, leaves the causes obscure and permits the transformation of mistakes and problems into market booms. The learning process is systematically foreshortened and prevented. The self-origination of the threats of modernization is submerged under the selective consideration and treatment of symptoms. This can be illustrated with the example of the treatment of diseases of civilization, such as diabetes, cancer or heart disease. These illnesses could be fought where they originate: by reducing the stresses of work or the pollution of the environment, or through a healthy way of life and a nutritious diet. Or the symptoms can be alleviated through chemical preparations. The different schools of fighting illness do not of course exclude one another, but one cannot actually speak of a cure through the second method. Nonetheless, we have so far generally opted for the medical and chemical 'solution'. In more and more areas, industry is beginning to profit from its secondary problems, ignoring its own role in their origin. This once again raises alternative decisions for science and its research: either it delivers the appropriate risk definitions and causal interpretations for this in its isolated specialization, or it breaks through this cost-intensive controlling of the symptoms and develops independent, theoretically sound alternative perspectives that demonstrate and illuminate the sources of problems and their elimination in industrial development itself. In the first case science becomes the participant and the legitimating agency for continuing chains of 'objective constraints'; in the second case, it demonstrates starting points and ways to break these chains and thus gain a bit of sovereignty within modernization over modernization. In this sense the risk society is potentially also a self-critical society. Reference points and presuppositions of critique are always being produced there in the form of risks and threats. The critique of risks is not a normative critique of values. Precisely where traditions and hence values have deteriorated, risks come into being. The basis for critique is less the traditions of the past than the threats of the future. What is needed to recognize toxic substances in the air, the water and food, is not so much established values as, rather, expensive measuring instruments and methodological and theoretical knowledge. Determinations of risk thus oddly straddle the distinction between objec- tive and value dimensions. They do not assert moral standards openly, but in the form of a quantitative, theoretical and causal implicit morality. Correspondingly, in the investigation of risks with a generally conventional understanding of science, a kind of 'objectified causal morality’ is being undertaken. Statements on risk are the moral statements of scientized society. All these things - reference points and object of critique, the possibilities of discovering and grounding - are themselv.es produced m the modernization process on a large and a small scale. In this sense, therefore, a detraditionalized and self-critical society also comes into being along with the risk society, at least potentially. The concept of risk is like a probe which permits us over and over again to investigate the entire construction plan, as well as every individual speck of cement in the structure of civilization for potentials of self-endangerment.

#### Case

### Solvency

#### The US is ending signature strikes now

Brown 13 (Report: U.S. Drops Signature Strikes In Pakistan¶ By Hayes Brown on July 25, 2013 at 3:00 pm, http://thinkprogress.org/security/2013/07/25/2356391/pakistan-drones-signature-strikes/)

The United States has ended the use of so-called signature drone strikes in Pakistan, and the total number of incidents involving armed unmanned aerial vehicles there has plummeted, according to a new report from the Associated Press.¶ In gathering hours upon hours of footage of a given location, drones allow analysts to piece together “pattern of life” data, which are then examined for clues that suspected terrorists are using the area for planning or staging purposes. The evidence used to justify strikes against these locations — “signature strikes” — doesn’t include the appearance of known terrorists, but rather often circumstantial proof such as large gatherings of men between the ages of 16-55, where they’ve traveled while under surveillance and whether or not they were in the vicinity of known targets when the strike occurred.¶ According to the Obama administration, however, drone strikes carried out since the president took office have all been against high-level members of the Taliban and al-Qaeda, making these drones a valuable tool in the fight against terrorism. Despite that insistence, President Obama announced in May that the use of drone strikes and other applications of force in fighting terrorism will be streamlined to a more limited set of targets, with a higher level of scrutiny applied when determining them. That decision was codified in the administration’s new “playbook” on counterterrorism tactics around the same time. According to a letter from Attorney General Eric Holder to Congress, in future drone strikes “will impose the same standard for strikes on foreign enemies now used only for American citizens deemed to be terrorists.”¶ That choice has apparently resulted in a corresponding drop in strikes within Pakistan, long the primary theater for Central Intelligence Agency-flown unmanned aerial vehicles. So far in 2013, there have been only 16 drone strikes carried out in Pakistan, compared to estimates of a peak of 122 in 2010 and 48 over the course of last year. Obama’s pledge and the drop in strikes suggests that the controversial — and until recently unacknowledged — method of targeting potential terrorists for execution is winding down.

#### Congress won’t enforce the ban.

Druck, JD – Cornell Law, ‘12

[Judah, 98 Cornell L. Rev. 209]

Of course, despite these various suits, Congress has received much of the blame for the WPR's treatment and failures. For example, Congress has been criticized for doing little to enforce the WPR in using other Article I tools, such as the "power of the purse," n76 or by closing the loopholes frequently used by presidents to avoid the WPR [\*221] in the first place. n77 Furthermore, in those situations where Congress has decided to act, it has done so in such a disjointed manner as to render any possible check on the President useless. For example, during President Reagan's invasion of Grenada, Congress failed to reach an agreement to declare the WPR's sixty-day clock operative, n78 and later faced similar "dead-lock" in deciding how best to respond to President Reagan's actions in the Persian Gulf, eventually settling for a bill that reflected congressional "ambivalence." n79 Thus, between the lack of a "backbone" to check rogue presidential action and general ineptitude when it actually decides to act, n80 Congress has demonstrated its inability to remedy WPR violations. Worse yet, much of Congress's interest in the WPR is politically motivated, leading to inconsistent review of presi-dential military decisions filled with post-hoc rationalizations. Given the political risk associated with wartime deci-sions, n81 Congress lacks any incentive to act unless and until it can gauge public reaction - a process that often occurs after the fact. n82 As a result, missions deemed successful by the public will rarely provoke "serious congressional con-cern" about presidential compliance with the WPR, while failures will draw scrutiny. n83 For example, in the case of the Mayaguez, "liberals in the Congress generally praised [President Gerald Ford's] performance" despite the constitutional questions surrounding the conflict, simply because the [\*222] public deemed it a success. n84 Thus, even if Congress was effective at checking potentially unconstitutional presidential action, it would only act when politically safe to do so. This result should be unsurprising: making a wartime decision provides little advantage for politicians, especially if the resulting action succeeds. n85 Consequently, Congress itself has taken a role in the continued disregard for WPR enforcement. The current WPR framework is broken: presidents avoid it, courts will not rule on it, and Congress will not enforce it. This cycle has culminated in President Obama's recent use of force in Libya, which created little, if any, controversy, n86 and it provides a clear pass to future presidents, judges, and congresspersons looking to continue the system of pas-sivity and deferment.

#### Obama will circumvent the plan

Anita Kumar 13, White House correspondent for McClatchy Newspapers, former writer for The Washington Post, covering Virginia politics and government, and spent a decade at the St. Petersburg Times, writing about local, state and federal government both in Florida and Washington, “Obama turning to executive power to get what he wants,” 3/19 <http://www.mcclatchydc.com/2013/03/19/186309/obama-turning-to-executive-power.html#.Ue18CdK1FSE>

Yet Obama’s use of power echoes that of his predecessors. For example, he signed 145 executive orders in his first term, putting him on track to issue as many as the 291 that Bush did in two terms.¶ John Yoo, who wrote the legal opinions that supported an expansion of presidential power after the 2001 terrorist attacks, including harsh interrogation methods that some called torture, said he thought that executive orders were sometimes appropriate – when conducting internal management and implementing power given to the president by Congress or the Constitution – but he thinks that Obama has gone too far.¶ “I think President Obama has been as equally aggressive as President Bush, and in fact he has sometimes used the very same language to suggest that he would not obey congressional laws that intrude on his commander-in-chief power,” said Yoo, who’s now a law professor at the University of California at Berkeley. “This is utterly hypocritical, both when compared to his campaign stances and the position of his supporters in Congress, who have suddenly discovered the virtues of silence.”¶ Most of Obama’s actions are written statements aimed at federal agencies that are published everywhere from the White House website to the Federal Register. Some are classified and hidden from public view.¶ “It seems to be more calculated to prod Congress,” said Phillip J. Cooper, the author of “By Order of the President: The Use and Abuse of Executive Direct Action.” “I can’t remember a president being that consistent, direct and public.”¶ Bush was criticized for many of his actions on surveillance and interrogation techniques, but attention has focused on Obama’s use of actions mostly about domestic issues.¶ In his first two years in the White House, when fellow Democrats controlled Capitol Hill, Obama largely worked through the regular legislative process to try to achieve his domestic agenda. His biggest achievements – including a federal health care overhaul and a stimulus package designed to boost the economy –came about with little or no Republican support.¶ But Republicans took control of the House of Representatives in 2010, making the task of passing legislation all the more difficult for a man with a detached personality who doesn’t relish schmoozing with lawmakers. By the next year, Obama wasn’t shy about his reasons for flexing his presidential power.¶ In fall 2011, he launched the “We Can’t Wait” campaign, unveiling dozens of policies through executive orders – creating jobs for veterans, adopting fuel efficiency standards and stopping drug shortages – that came straight from his jobs bills that faltered in Congress.¶ “We’re not waiting for Congress,” Obama said in Denver that year when he announced a plan to reduce college costs. “I intend to do everything in my power right now to act on behalf of the American people, with or without Congress. We can’t wait for Congress to do its job. So where they won’t act, I will.”¶ When Congress killed legislation aimed at curbing the emissions that cause global warming, Obama directed the Environmental Protection Agency to write regulations on its own incorporating some parts of the bill.¶ When Congress defeated pro-union legislation, he had the National Labor Relations Board and the Labor Department issue rules incorporating some parts of the bill.¶ “The president looks more and more like a king that the Constitution was designed to replace,” Sen. Charles Grassley, R-Iowa, said on the Senate floor last year.¶ While Republicans complain that Obama’s actions cross a line, experts say some of them are less aggressive than they appear.¶ After the mass shooting in Newtown, Conn., in December, the White House boasted of implementing 23 executive actions to curb gun control. In reality, Obama issued a trio of modest directives that instructed federal agencies to trace guns and send information for background checks to a database.¶ In his State of the Union address last month, Obama instructed businesses to improve the security of computers to help prevent hacking. But he doesn’t have the legal authority to force private companies to act.¶ “The executive order can be a useful tool but there are only certain things he can do,” said Melanie Teplinsky, an American University law professor who’s spoken extensively on cyber-law.¶ Executive actions often are fleeting. They generally don’t settle a political debate, and the next president, Congress or a court may overturn them.¶ Consider the so-called Mexico City policy. With it, Reagan banned federal money from going to international family-planning groups that provide abortions. Clinton rescinded the policy. George W. Bush reinstated it, and Obama reversed course again.¶ But congressional and legal action are rare. In 1952, the Supreme Court threw out Harry Truman’s order authorizing the seizure of steel mills during a series of strikes. In 1996, the District of Columbia Court of Appeals dismissed an order by Clinton that banned the government from contracting with companies that hire workers despite an ongoing strike.¶ Obama has seen some pushback.¶ Congress prohibited him from spending money to move inmates from the Guantanamo Bay U.S. naval base in Cuba after he signed an order that said it would close. A Chinese company sued Obama for killing its wind farm projects by executive order after he said they were too close to a military training site. A federal appeals court recently ruled that he’d exceeded his constitutional powers when he named several people to the National Labor Relations Board while the Senate was in recess.¶ But Obama appears to be undaunted.¶ “If Congress won’t act soon to protect future generations,” he told Congress last month, “I will.”

### Norms

#### Double bind - either

#### A) Fears of international backlash and creating a precedent for U.S. strikes prevent China drone use

**Erickson ‘13** – associate professor at the Naval War College and an Associate in Research at Harvard University’s Fairbank Center (Andrew, and Austin Strange, researcher at the Naval War College’s China Maritime Studies Institute and a graduate student at Zhejiang University, “China Has Drones. Now What?”, 2013, <http://www.foreignaffairs.com/articles/139405/andrew-erickson-and-austin-strange/china-has-drones-now-what?page=show>)

Indeed, the time to fret about when China and other authoritarian countries will acquire drones is over: they have them. The question now is when and how they will use them. But as with its other, less exotic military capabilities, **Beijing has cleared only a technological hurdle** -- **and its behavior will continue to be constrained by politics**.¶ China has been developing a drone capacity for over half a century, starting with its reverse engineering of Soviet Lavochkin La-17C target drones that it had received from Moscow in the late 1950s. Today, Beijing’s opacity makes it difficult to gauge the exact scale of the program, but according to Ian Easton, an analyst at the Project 2049 Institute, by 2011 China’s air force alone had over 280 combat drones. In other words, its fleet of unmanned aerial vehicles is already bigger and more sophisticated than all but the United States’; in this relatively new field Beijing is less of a newcomer and more of a fast follower. And the force will only become more effective: the Lijian (“sharp sword” in Chinese), a combat drone in the final stages of development, will make China one of the very few states that have or are building a stealth drone capacity.¶ This impressive arsenal may tempt China to pull the trigger. The fact that a Chinese official acknowledged that Beijing had considered using drones to eliminate the Burmese drug trafficker, Naw Kham, made clear that it would not be out of the question for China to launch a drone strike in a security operation against a nonstate actor. Meanwhile, as China’s territorial disputes with its neighbors have escalated, there is a chance that Beijing would introduce unmanned aircraft, especially since India, the Philippines, and Vietnam distantly trail China in drone funding and capacity, and would find it difficult to compete. Beijing is already using drones to photograph the Senkaku/Diaoyu Islands it disputes with Japan, as the retired Chinese Major General Peng Guangqian revealed earlier this year, and to keep an eye on movements near the North Korean border.¶ **Beijing**, however, **is unlikely to use its drones lightly**. **It already faces tremendous criticism** from much of the international community **for its perceived brazenness in** continental and maritime **sovereignty disputes**. **With its leaders attempting to allay notions that China’s rise poses a threat** to the region, **injecting drones** conspicuously into these disputes **would prove counterproductive. China also fears setting a precedent for the use of drones in East Asian hotspots that the U**nited **S**tates **could eventually exploit**. For now, **Beijing** is showing that it **understands these risks, and** to date it **has limited its use of drones** in these areas to surveillance, according to recent public statements from China’s Defense Ministry.¶ What about using drones outside of Chinese-claimed areas? **That China did not**, in fact, launch a drone **strike** on **the Burmese drug criminal underscores its caution**. According to Liu Yuejin, the director of the antidrug bureau in China’s Ministry of Public Security, **Beijing considered using a drone** carrying a 20-kilogram TNT payload **to bomb Kham’s mountain** redoubt in northeast Myanmar. Kham had already evaded capture three times, so a drone strike may have seemed to be the best option. The authorities apparently had at least two plans for capturing Kham. The method they ultimately chose was to send Chinese police forces to lead a transnational investigation that ended in April 2012 with Kham’s capture near the Myanmar-Laos border. **The** ultimate **decision to refrain** from the strike **may reflect** both **a fear of political reproach and a lack of confidence in untested drones, systems, and operators**.¶ **The restrictive position** that **Beijing takes on sovereignty in international forums will further constrain its use of drones**. **China is not likely to publicly deploy drones** for precision strikes or in other military assignments **without first having been granted a credible mandate to do so**. The gold standard of such an authorization is a resolution passed by the UN Security Council, the stamp of approval that has permitted Chinese humanitarian interventions in Africa and antipiracy operations in the Gulf of Aden. China might consider using drones abroad with some sort of regional authorization, such as a country giving Beijing explicit permission to launch a drone strike within its territory. But **even with** the **endorsement** of the international community or specific states, **China would have to weigh any benefits of a drone strike** abroad **against the potential for mishaps and perceptions** that **it was infringing on other countries’ sovereignty -- something Beijing regularly decries** when others do it.¶ The **limitations** on China’s drone use **are reflected in the country’s academic literature** on the topic. The bulk of Chinese drone research is dedicated to scientific and technological topics related to design and performance. The articles that do discuss potential applications primarily point to major combat scenarios -- such as a conflagration with Taiwan or the need to attack a U.S. aircraft carrier -- which would presumably involve far more than just drones. **Chinese researchers have thought a great deal about the utility of drones** **for** domestic **surveillance and law enforcement**, as well as for non-combat-related tasks near China’s contentious borders. **Few scholars**, **however**, **have** publicly **considered** the **use of drone strikes overseas**.¶ Yet there is a reason why the United States has employed drones extensively despite domestic and international criticism: it is much easier and cheaper to kill terrorists from above than to try to root them out through long and expensive counterinsurgency campaigns. Some similar challenges loom on China’s horizon. Within China, Beijing often considers protests and violence in the restive border regions, such as Xinjiang and Tibet, to constitute terrorism. It would presumably consider ordering precision strikes to suppress any future violence there. **Even if** such **strikes are operationally prudent, China’s leaders understand** that **they would damage the country’s image abroad**, but they prioritize internal stability above all else. Domestic surveillance by drones is a different issue; there should be few barriers to its application in what is already one of the world’s most heavily policed societies. China might also be willing to use stealth drones in foreign airspace without authorization if the risk of detection were low enough; it already deploys intelligence-gathering ships in the exclusive economic zones of Japan and the United States, as well as in the Indian Ocean.¶ Still, although China enjoys a rapidly expanding and cutting-edge drone fleet, it is bound by the same rules of the game as the rest of the military’s tools. Beyond surveillance, the other non-lethal military actions that China can take with its drones are to facilitate communications within the Chinese military, support electronic warfare by intercepting electronic communications and jamming enemy systems, and help identify targets for Chinese precision strike weapons, such as missiles. **Beijing’s overarching approach remains** one of **caution** -- something Washington must bear in mind with its own drone program.

#### OR

#### B) Actors can’t be checked which makes drone prolif and use inevitable

Wood 12 (David, American Drones Ignite New Arms Race From Gaza To Iran To China, Huffington Post, 27 November 2012, http://www.huffingtonpost.com/2012/11/27/american-drones\_n\_2199193.html, da 8-2-13) PC

Obama administration officials have said they are weighing various options to codify the use of armed U.S. drones, because the increased use of drones has been driven more by perceived necessity than by deliberative policy. But that effort is complicated by the wildfire spread of drone technology: how could the U.S. restrict its use of armed drones if others do not?¶ Already, the Pentagon is worried that China not only is engaged in an "alarming" effort to develop and field high-tech drones, but it intends to sell drone technology abroad, according to the Pentagon report.¶ Indeed, the momentum of the drone wars seems irresistible. "The increasing worldwide focus on unmanned systems highlights how U.S. military success has changed global strategic thinking and spurred a race for unmanned aircraft," the Pentagon study reported.¶ Modern drones were first perfected by Israel, but the U.S. Air Force took the first steps in 2001 to mount sophisticated drones with precision weapons. Today the U.S. fields some 8,000 drones and plans to invest $36.9 billion to boost its fleet by 35 percent over the next eight years.¶ Current research on next-generation drones seems certain to exacerbate the drone arms race. The U.S. and other countries are developing "nano" drones, tiny weapons designed to attack in swarms. Both the U.S. and China are working to incorporate "stealth" technology into micro drones. The Pentagon is fielding a new weapon called the Switchblade, a 5.5-pound precision-attack drone that can be carried and fired by one person -- a capability sure to be envied by terrorists.¶ "This is a robotics revolution, but it's not just an American revolution -- everyone's involved, from Hezbollah to paparazzi," Singer, the Brookings Institution expert, told The Huffington Post. "This is a revolution in which billions and trillions of dollars will be made. To stop it you'd have to first stop science, and then business, and then war."

#### All their “precedent” evidence relies on the assertion that there’s a causal link between U.S. drone doctrine and other’ countries choices---that’s not true---no tangible evidence

Kenneth Anderson 11, Professor of International Law at American University, 10/9/11, “What Kind of Drones Arms Race Is Coming?,” <http://www.volokh.com/2011/10/09/what-kind-of-drones-arms-race-is-coming/#more-51516>

New York Times national security correspondent Scott Shane has an opinion piece in today’s Sunday Times predicting an “arms race” in military drones. The methodology essentially looks at the US as the leader, followed by Israel – countries that have built, deployed and used drones in both surveillance and as weapons platforms. It then looks at the list of other countries that are following fast in US footsteps to both build and deploy, as well as purchase or sell the technology – noting, correctly, that the list is a long one, starting with China. The predicament is put this way: ¶ Eventually, the United States will face a military adversary or terrorist group armed with drones, military analysts say. But what the short-run hazard experts foresee is not an attack on the United States, which faces no enemies with significant combat drone capabilities, but the political and legal challenges posed when another country follows the American example. The Bush administration, and even more aggressively the Obama administration, embraced an extraordinary principle: that the United States can send this robotic weapon over borders to kill perceived enemies, even American citizens, who are viewed as a threat. ¶ “Is this the world we want to live in?” asks Micah Zenko, a fellow at the Council on Foreign Relations. “Because we’re creating it.” ¶ By asserting that “we’re” creating it, this is a claim that there is an arms race among states over military drones, and that it is a consequence of the US creating the technology and deploying it – and then, beyond the technology, changing the normative legal and moral rules in the international community about using it across borders. In effect, the combination of those two, technological and normative, forces other countries in strategic competition with the US to follow suit. (The other unstated premise underlying the whole opinion piece is a studiously neutral moral relativism signaled by that otherwise unexamined phrase “perceived enemies.” Does it matter if they are not merely our “perceived” but are our actual enemies? Irrespective of what one might be entitled to do to them, is it so very difficult to conclude, even in the New York Times, that Anwar al-Awlaki was, in objective terms, our enemy?) ¶ It sounds like it must be true. But is it? There are a number of reasons to doubt that moves by other countries are an arms race in the sense that the US “created” it or could have stopped it, or that something different would have happened had the US not pursued the technology or not used it in the ways it has against non-state terrorist actors. Here are a couple of quick reasons why I don’t find this thesis very persuasive, and what I think the real “arms race” surrounding drones will be. ¶ Unmanned aerial vehicles have clearly got a big push from the US military in the way of research, development, and deployment. But the reality today is that the technology will transform civil aviation, in many of the same ways and for the same reasons that another robotic technology, driverless cars (which Google is busily plying up and down the streets of San Francisco, but which started as a DARPA project). UAVs will eventually move into many roles in ordinary aviation, because it is cheaper, relatively safer, more reliable – and it will eventually include cargo planes, crop dusting, border patrol, forest fire patrols, and many other tasks. There is a reason for this – the avionics involved are simply not so complicated as to be beyond the abilities of many, many states. Military applications will carry drones many different directions, from next-generation unmanned fighter aircraft able to operate against other craft at much higher G stresses to tiny surveillance drones. But the flying-around technology for aircraft that are generally sizes flown today is not that difficult, and any substantial state that feels like developing them will be able to do so. ¶ But the point is that this was happening anyway, and the technology was already available. The US might have been first, but it hasn’t sparked an arms race in any sense that absent the US push, no one would have done this. That’s just a fantasy reading of where the technology in general aviation was already going; Zenko’s ‘original sin’ attribution of this to the US opening Pandora’s box is not a credible understanding of the development and applications of the technology. Had the US not moved on this, the result would have been a US playing catch-up to someone else. For that matter, the off-the-shelf technology for small, hobbyist UAVs is simple enough and available enough that terrorists will eventually try to do their own amateur version, putting some kind of bomb on it.¶ Moving on from the avionics, weaponizing the craft is also not difficult. The US stuck an anti-tank missile on a Predator; this is also not rocket science. Many states can build drones, many states can operate them, and crudely weaponizing them is also not rocket science. The US didn’t spark an arms race; this would occur to any state with a drone. To the extent that there is real development here, it lies in the development of specialized weapons that enable vastly more discriminating targeting. The details are sketchy, but there are indications from DangerRoom and other observers (including some comments from military officials off the record) that US military budgets include amounts for much smaller missiles designed not as anti-tank weapons, but to penetrate and kill persons inside a car without blowing it to bits, for example. This is genuinely harder to do – but still not all that difficult for a major state, whether leading NATO states, China, Russia, or India. The question is whether it would be a bad thing to have states competing to come up with weapons technologies that are … more discriminating.¶

#### South China Sea stable now

Chaibi 3/4 -- 3rd year visiting student from Princeton University in the Department of Engineering Science (Abraham, 2013, "The outlook for continuing stability in the South China Sea," http://politicsinspires.org/the-outlook-for-continuing-stability-in-the-south-china-sea/)

East Asia’s rapid economic and military development has captured global attention, but pundits are quick to point to the South China Sea, North Korea, and Taiwan as potential obstacles to the region’s continued growth. Analysis of news coverage demonstrates that regional economies and tensions have been growing in tandem. The South China Sea has historically been of particular interest because of the number of conflicting claims on the islands and sea-lanes it encompasses. China, Malaysia, Brunei, the Philippines, Vietnam, and Taiwan, among others, have often engaged in bilateral disagreements with resulting spikes in diplomatic tension and even military confrontation. Of note, these conflicts have never escalated to a full-scale regional war. Direct extrapolation suggests that previous restraint in military interactions implies the nations involved do not consider the potential benefits sufficient to justify an upset to the balance of power. However, contemporary changes in economic and security conditions complicate the issue. While current tensions appear unlikely to lead to a full-scale military conflict, the diversion of national resources needed to maintain the status quo is substantial. Institutional changes to increase transparency; clarify US treaties with ASEAN nations; and increase states’ internal enforcement of international agreements, although initially costly, would allow the neighbouring states to redirect these resources to long-term growth. Historically, China has been involved in a majority of the military conflicts in the South China Sea. A 1947 Chinese map delineates China’s controversial claim to approximately 80% of the sea. China aggressively used its navy to conclude a dispute with Vietnam in the Battle of the Paracel Islands in 1974 and then in 1988 during the Johnson South Reef Skirmish for the Spratly Islands. Conflict was narrowly averted in 1995 when the Philippines chose not to shell fort-like Chinese military structures on Mischief Reef (China maintained they were only intended as shelter for fisherman); however, the Philippines continues to assert that this is an example of “creeping occupation”. This form of venting tensions, while far short of total war, is extremely costly over the long run; the combination of of resources, energy, and lives expended to establish a claim to the islands creates a significant and avoidable opportunity cost. These skirmishes are not merely an imprint of the 20th century but continue today as witnessed by the Chinese establishment of the Sansha garrison-city in 2012 and the Sino-Philippines stand-off in the Scarborough Shoal. What then is the evidence suggesting a continued reluctance to engage in full-scale military confrontation? Although in the past conflict has often arisen between economically interdependent nations (viz. the previous peak of global trade in 1914), the China-ASEAN relationship is one of fundamental interdependence of production, visible in the prevalence of international supply chaining in manufacturing processes, rather than solely trade and labour movement[i]. The burgeoning economic interdependence and growth of neighbouring states contributes a major incentive to prevent a conflagration. $5.3 trillion of trade, of which approximately 20% is US, transits the South China Sea annually and any interruption would not only severely restrict regional trade revenues, but would also very likely guarantee US military intervention[ii]. The Association of South East Asian Nations (ASEAN) is becoming increasingly interconnected and 2015 will mark a key turning point with the opening of internal ASEAN borders for free movement of labor. The ASEAN bloc has also concluded a number of reconciliation agreements with China. Regarding security, both the 2002 Code of Conduct and the 2011 Guidelines to the Code of Conduct are intended to help coordinate diplomacy and maintain peace in South China Sea disputes. Economically China has been ASEAN’s largest trading partner since 2009, and at its opening in 2010 the ASEAN-China free trade area (ACFTA) became the largest in the world by population. These arrangements come at a time when growing estimates of the value of the natural resources contained in the South China Sea are generating pressures associated with ensuring energy security. Economic interdependence between China and ASEAN, however, is not the sole factor at play. In areas with considerable interstate tension sub-state actors have often contributed to the deterioration of international relations, most prominently with the assassination of Archduke Franz Ferdinand tipping Europe into World War I. Recent developments in state-level Chinese political and military discourse reflect a strong interest in cooperation. Chinese President Hu Jintao’s 2011 discussions with Filipino President Corazon Aquino firmly expressed the hope that “the countries concerned may put aside disputes and actively explore forms of common development in the relevant sea areas”[iii]. Additionally in 2011 the Chinese State Council Information Office released a white paper with a similar emphasis on joint development. Yet China is also reported to have developed internal fractures in its South China Sea policy, with a number of different ministries controlling paramilitary units that are not under express government oversight[iv]. For example, the Bureau of Fisheries Administration (BFA) now directs a relatively well-equipped law enforcement fleet that is tasked with patrolling Chinese-owned fishing areas. Such interest groups repeatedly instigate minor disputes with their ASEAN counterparts and the US navy that exacerbate state-level discussions and risk eventually drawing unintended consequences (characteristically, in 2004 two BFA vessels obstructed a US Navy surveillance ship in the Yellow Sea). The region has also seen a rise in high-tech militarization, with rapid development in areas ranging from aircraft carriers and submarines to cyber-espionage; this is likely to further increase due to the 2011 US “pivot to Asia” and military surge. The pivot is considered to be a sign that the US intends to continue playing a leadership role in East Asia, a strategy at odds with China’s vision[v]. An associated complication is the imprecise definition of US commitments to its ally nations in the event of disputes in contested territories, especially vis-à-vis the Philippines and Vietnam, and the possibility that alliances will be used to escalate a small battle into a regional affair. The US is making efforts to address these complications; for the first time since RIMPACS’s creation in 1971, China has been invited to participate in a US-led naval exercise. Positive near-term repercussions of growing US involvement have also been postulated; analysts suggest that one of the root causes behind Chinese interest in cooperation is the fear that aggression in the South China Sea will drive other parties to strengthen their ties with the US[vi]. The relative wealth of economic and diplomatic compromises on all sides presents a compelling argument that under current conditions, disputes in the South China Sea will continue to be restrained to small-scale skirmishes that do not threaten overall stability. This is not to say that the increase in regional tension is insignificant, but rather that the involved parties all have a strong interest in maintaining mutual growth and have demonstrated their willingness to make strategic sacrifices to maintain the status quo. Furthermore as China is the common link in the majority of the disputes, it is probable that it will be at the heart of any conflict — and China has frequently shown restraint in this regard (though not so, for example, in Tibet). In terms of China’s priorities, policy analysts tend to agree that if China were to begin a large-scale military campaign, Taiwan would most likely be the focus of its aggression[vii].

### Pakistan

#### Strikes are down because precision is up---solves the case but avoids the DA

WT 10-9 – Washington Times, 10/9/13, “Drone strikes plummet as U.S. seeks more human intelligence,” http://www.washingtontimes.com/news/2013/oct/9/drone-strikes-drop-as-us-craves-more-human-intelli/print/

The number of drone strikes approved by the Obama administration on suspected terrorists has fallen dramatically this year, as the war with al Qaeda increasingly shifts to Africa and U.S. intelligence craves more captures and interrogations of high-value targets. U.S. officials told The Washington Times on Wednesday that the reasons for a shift in tactics are many — including that al Qaeda's senior ranks were thinned out so much in 2011 and 2012 by an intense flurry of drone strikes, and that the terrorist network has adapted to try to evade some of Washington's use of the strikes or to make them less politically palatable. But the sources acknowledged that a growing desire to close a recent gap in actionable human intelligence on al Qaeda's evolving operations also has renewed the administration's interest in more clandestine commando raids like the one that netted a high-value terrorist suspect in Libya last weekend. Capturing and interrogating suspects can provide valuable intelligence about a terrorist network that has been morphing from its roots with a central command in Pakistan and Afghanistan (known as intelligence circles as the FATA) to more diverse affiliates spread most notably across North Africa, officials and analysts said. "Al Qaeda's senior leadership in Pakistan has been steadily degraded. What remains of the group's core is still dangerous but spends much of its time thinking about personal security," one senior counterterrorism official told The Times, speaking on the condition of anonymity because of the secret nature of the drone program. "As the nature of the threat emanating from the FATA changes, it follows that the U.S. government's counterterrorism approach is going to shift accordingly." The decreased reliance on drones was in full view last weekend when one team of commandos from the Army's Delta Force captured long-sought al Qaeda operative Abu Anas al-Libi in Tripoli and a Navy SEAL team failed to take down an al Qaeda affiliate leader in Somalia. The U.S. has carried out nearly 400 drone strikes over the past decade in Pakistan, Yemen and Somalia, a tactic that killed numerous senior operatives. But al Qaeda leaders have been increasing their own counterintelligence activities and moving to more populated areas in order to increase the risks of civilian casualties, two developments that have made the strikes less politically palatable and effective, analysts and intelligence sources say. As a result, the number of drone strikes carried out against al Qaeda suspects in the Middle East and South Asia has dropped by half over the past year. There were 22 drone strikes on targets in Pakistan during the first 10 months of this year, compared with 47 carried out during 2012 and 74 in 2011, according to data compiled by the London-based Bureau of Investigative Journalism, the leading independent body examining the U.S. government's secretive drone program. But intelligence officials and some national security analysts cautioned against reading too deeply into such data, saying the U.S. remains committed to using drones when it makes sense. "Given the clandestine nature of the program, it's impossible to assess the reasons why the number of strikes has decreased over time," said Seth Jones, a political scientist who specializes in counterterrorism studies at the Rand Corp., a research institution with headquarters in California. "We just don't have access to the information," he said. Thirst for new intelligence With U.S. counterterrorism officials eager to pin down fresh and actionable intelligence on what several sources described as a gradually metastasizing and complex network of al Qaeda affiliate groups concentrated in North Africa, most analysts say it would make sense for the Obama administration to begin favoring capture-and-interrogate missions. "Raids allow you to both potentially capture a high-value target and exploit his knowledge through interrogations," said Daniel R. Green, an al Qaeda and Yemen analyst at the Washington Institute for Near East Policy. When U.S. soldiers are on the ground for a raid, Mr. Green said, it means they can "collect additional materials of intelligence value from the dwelling, further assisting in the planning of follow-on operations." Others said heavy reliance on drones has only added to America's potentially dangerous deficit of human intelligence on al Qaeda. "If you're not capturing guys to get that intel, then, yeah, you're going to be missing a part of the picture — if not a large part of the picture," said Thomas Joscelyn, a senior fellow focusing on al Qaeda and North Africa at the Foundation for Defense of Democracies. "You can rely extensively on electronic intelligence, but you still need that [human intelligence]to put the full picture together," said Mr. Joscelyn, who added that recent years have fostered a "fetish within some parts of the intelligence community for drone attacks because they've succeeded in taking out some very high-level targets. "There are other parts of the American military and intelligence community that understand that drones are not going to win this war," he said. "Drones are a necessary tactic, but they are not a strategy." Last weekend's raids in Libya and Somalia are "evidence that there's more emphasis now on capture than on kill," said Linda Robinson a senior international policy analyst at the Rand Corp. "It is an indication of the shift that was alluded to by the president in May," said Mrs. Robinson, referring to a speech President Obama gave at the National Defense University in which he stressed that "as a matter of policy, the preference of the United States is to capture terrorist suspects." Mrs. Robinson said there is "recognition that, frankly, you get something from raids, which you don't get from drones." Raids allow for capturing a suspect and can lead to an "incredible intelligence dump" from that individual, she said. Drones still on the table During the May speech on terrorism, Mr. Obama acknowledged the use of drones as a central tactic within his administration's war strategy and suggested it will continue. At the time, Mr. Obama said it "not possible for America to simply deploy a team of Special Forces to capture every terrorist." Citing instances in which doing so "would pose profound risks to our troops and local civilians" and where "putting U.S. boots on the ground may trigger a major international crisis," Mr. Obama said the secret May 2011 Navy SEAL operation that resulted in the killing of al Qaeda leader Osama bin Laden "cannot be the norm." In the shadow of such remarks from the president, some analysts say, such raids likely would pose challenges in Yemen, where the Obama administration has relied heavily on the use of drones. A raid such as the one that netted al-Libi in Tripoli would be "much more difficult" in Yemen "in part because potential targets are far more inland, thus complicating an attack from the sea," said Mr. Green, at the Washington Institute for Near East Policy. "Also, the Yemeni government is much more capable and would likely detect such a raid, as compared to Libya's anarchic conditions, and al Qaeda is a much more developed force in Yemen, which will have already adapted to this new tactic by U.S. forces," he said. Mrs. Robinson said that "with a raid, of course, you incur more risk for those U.S. forces usually, special operations forces that you're putting on the ground." "I don't think there's a big appetite to go around launching raids unless there is a clear U.S. national security interest to do so," she said. "The political and diplomatic and atmospheric risks or counterproductive effects have to be very much weighed in the equation."

#### Signature strikes are key to thin the ranks of Al-Qaeda---they make it impossible for militants to keep pace with their rates of losses.

Mudd, Former Senior Official at the CIA and FBI, ‘13

[Philip, now director of global risk at SouthernSun Asset Management, 5/24/13, “Fear Factor,” http://www.foreignpolicy.com/articles/2013/05/24/fear\_factor\_signature\_strikes]

The impact of armed drones during the decade-plus of this intense global counterterrorism campaign is hard to overestimate: Without operational commanders and visionary leaders, terror groups decay into locally focused threats, or disappear altogether. Targeted strikes against al Qaeda leaders and commanders in the years immediately after 9/11 deprived the group of the time and stability required to plot a major strike. But the London subway attacks in July 2005 illustrated the remaining potency of al Qaeda's core in the tribal areas of Pakistan. The threat was fading steadily. But not fast enough. So-called signature strikes -- in which target selection is based not on identification of an individual but instead on patterns of behavior or unique characteristics that identify a group -- accelerated this decline for simple reasons. Targeting leadership degrades a small percentage of a diffuse terror group, but developing the tactical intelligence required to locate an individual precisely enough to stage a pinpoint strike, in a no-man's land half a world away, is time-consuming and difficult. And it's not a perfect science; the leaders of groups learn over time how to operate more securely. Furthermore, these leaders represent only a fraction of the threat: Osama bin Laden might have been the public face of al Qaeda, but he was supported by a web of document-forgers, bombmakers, couriers, trainers, ideologues, and others. They made up the bulk of al Qaeda and propelled the apparatus that planned the murder of innocents. Bin Laden was the revolutionary leader, but it was the troops who executed his vision. Signature strikes have pulled out these lower-level threads of al Qaeda's apparatus -- and that of its global affiliates -- rapidly enough that the deaths of top leaders are now more than matched by the destruction of the complex support structure below them. Western conceptions of how organizations work, with hierarchal structures driven by top-level managers, do not apply to al Qaeda and its affiliates. These groups are instead conglomerations of militants, operating independently, with rough lines of communication and fuzzy networks that cross continents and groups. They are hard to map cleanly, in other words. Signature strikes take out whole swaths of these network sub-tiers rapidly -- so rapidly that the groups cannot replicate lost players and their hard-won experience. The tempo of the strikes, in other words, adds sand to the gears of terror organizations, destroying their operational capability faster than the groups can recover.

## 2NC

### K

#### This turns the case – their risk arguments are manipulated by financial interests and never actually eliminated. Only doing the alternative first allows us to make politics more democratic to prevent the takeover of corporate interests.

Beck, Professor of Sociology at the Ludwig-Maximilians-University Munich, ‘92

[Ulrich, Risk Society: Towards a New Modernity, Published in association with Theory, Culture & Society, pgs. 56-57, RSR]

Through the production of risks, needs are definitively removed from their residual mooring in natural factors, and hence from their finiteness, their satisfiability. Hunger can be assuaged, needs can be satisfied; risks are a 'bottomless barrel of demands', unsatisfiable, infinite. Unlike demands, risks can be more than just called forth (by advertising and the like), prolonged in conformity to sales needs, and in short: manipulated. Demands, and thus markets, of a completely new type can be created by varying the definition of risk, especially demand for the avoidance of risk - open to interpretation, causally designable and infinitely reproducible. Production and consumption are thus elevated to a completely new level with the triumph of the risk society. The position of pre-given and manipulable demands as the reference point of commodity production is taken over by the self-producible risk. If one is not afraid of a rather bold comparison, one can say that in risk production, developed capitalism has absorbed, generalized and normalized the destructive force of war. Similarly to war, the risks of civilization which people become aware of can 'destroy' modes of produc- tion (for instance, heavily polluting cars or agricultural surpluses), and therefore overcome sales crises and create new markets, which are expandable to boot. Risk production and its cognitive agents - critique of civilization, critique of technology, critique of the environment, risk dramatization and risk research in the mass media - are a system- immanent normal form of the revolutionizing of needs. With risks, one could say with Luhmann, the economy becomes self-referential, indepen- dent of its context of satisfying human needs. An essential factor for this, however, is a 'coping' with the symptoms and symbols of risks. As they are dealt with in this way, the risks must grow, they must not actually be eliminated as causes or sources. Everything must take place in the context of a cosmetics of risk, packag- ing, reducing the symptoms of pollutants, installing filters while retaining the source of the filth. Hence, we have not a preventive but a symbolic industry and policy of eliminating the increase in risks. The 'as if' must win and become programmatic. 'Radical protesters' are needed just as much for that as technologically oriented scientists and alternative scien- tists who study hazards. Sometimes self-financed ('self-help'!), sometimes publicly financed, these groups are generally 'advertising agencies in advance' for the creation of new sales markets for risks, one might say. Fiction? Polemic? A trend in this direction can already be seen today. If it should win out, then this too would be a Pyhrric victory, for the risks would actually emerge through all the cosmetics and with them the global threat to everyone. A society would come into being here in which the explosive force of risks would spoil and poison everyone's taste for profits. Nevertheless, even the possibility illustrates the dynamics of reflexive modernization. Industrial society systematically produces its own endangerment and a questioning of itself through the multiplication and the economic exploitation of hazards. The socio-historical situation and its dynamic is comparable to the situation during the waning of the age of feudalism at the threshold of the industrial society. The feudal nobility lived off the commercial bourgeoisie (through the fief-dependent granting of rights to trade and economic use, as well as from business taxes), and encouraged it in its own interests. In this way, the nobility involuntarily and necessarily created a successor which grew steadily in power. In the same way, developed industrial society 'nourishes' itself from the hazards it produces, and so creates the social risk positions and political potentials which call into question the foundations of modernization as it has so far been known.

#### **2. Your discourse and representations matter – they are the basis for war.** What we lack is not a proper scientific or empirical challenge to violence; we lack the cultural critics willing to fight the fear mongering which results in war. The AFF’s discourse is enmeshed in a form of affective securitization that makes war inevitable. As scholars, we have an obligation to refuse and problematize the cultural grammar of risk.

Elliot, ‘12

[Emory, University Professor of the University of California and Distinguished Professor of English at the University of California, Riverside, Terror, Theory, and the Humanities ed. Di Leo, Open Humanities Press, Online, RSR]

In a 1991 interview for the New York Times Magazine, Don DeLillo expressed his views on the place of literature in our times in a statement that he has echoed many times since and developed most fully in his novel Mao II: In a repressive society, a writer can be deeply influential, but in a society that’s ﬁlled with glut and endless consumption, the act of terror may be the only meaningful act. People who are in power make their arrangements in secret, largely as a way of maintaining and furthering that power. People who are powerless make an open theater of violence. True terror is a language and a vision. There is a deep narrative structure to terrorist acts, and they infiltrate and alter consciousness in ways that writers used to aspire to. (qtd. in DePietro 84) The implications of DeLillo’s statement are that we are all engaged in national, international, transnational, and global conflicts in which acts of representation, including those of terrorism and spectacular physical violence as well as those of language, performance, and art compete for the attention of audiences and for influence in the public sphere. In the early days of the Iraq War, the United States used the power of images, such as those of the “mother of all bombs” and a wide array of weapons, as well as aesthetic techniques to influence and shape the consciousness of millions and to generate strong support for the war. The shock, fear, and nationalism aroused in those days after 9/11 have enabled the Bush administration to pursue a military agenda that it had planned before 9/11. Since then, the extraordinary death and destruc- tion, scandals and illegalities, and domestic and international demon- strations and criticisms have been unable to alter the direction of this agenda. Those of us in the humanities who are trained as critical readers of political and social texts, as well as of complex artistically constructed texts, are needed now more urgently than ever to analyze the relation- ships between political power and the wide range of rhetorical methods being employed by politicians and others to further their destructive effects in the world. If humanities scholars can create conscious awareness of how such aesthetic devices such as we see in those photos achieve their affective appeal, citizens may begin to understand how they are being manipulated and motivated by emotion rather than by reason and logic. In spite of our ability to expose some of these verbal and visual constructions as devices of propaganda that function to enflame passions and stifle reasonable dis- cussion, we humanities scholars find ourselves marginalized and on the defensive in our institutions of higher learning where our numbers have been diminished and where we are frequently being asked to justify the significance of our research and teaching. While we know the basic truth that the most serious threats to our societies today are more likely to result from cultural differences and failures of communication than from inadequate scientific information or technological inadequacies, we have been given no voice in this debate. With the strong tendency toward po- larized thinking and opinion and the evangelical and fundamentalist re- ligious positions in the US today and in other parts of the world, leaders continue to abandon diplomacy and resort to military actions. Most government leaders find the cultural and social explanations of the problems we face to be vague, and they are frustrated by complex human issues. That is not reason enough, however, for us to abandon our efforts to influence and perhaps even alter the current course of events. In spite of the discouragements that we as scholars of the humanities are experiencing in these times, it seems to me that we have no option but to continue to pursue our research and our teaching and hope to influence others to question the meaning and motives of what they see and hear.

#### 3. Framework is a negative argument. Only we get access to productive state policies because the aff’s deployment of risk rolls back democratic politics and leads to error replication.

Beck, Professor of Sociology at the Ludwig-Maximilians-University Munich, ‘92

[Ulrich, Risk Society: Towards a New Modernity, Published in association with Theory, Culture & Society, pgs. 79-80, RSR]

We know all too well from the history of Germany in this century that an actual or potential catastrophe is no teacher of democracy. How ambivalent and scandalous the accumulating explosive already is becomes perfectly clear in the report of the 'environmental experts', despite themselves (Rat der Sachverstiindigen fiir Umweltfragen 1985). The urgency of the environmental dangers to the lives of plants, animals, and people depicted there 'legitimates' these experts with a confessional ecological morality typical of the turn of the twenty-first century. It gives birth to a language that fairly crawls with expressions like 'control' 'official ~approval:' and 'official supervision'. Characteristically, far reaching intervention, planning and control possibilities and rights are demanded there, on a graduated scale depending on the severity of the results to the environment (45). There is discussion of an 'expansion of the surveillance and information system for agriculture' (45). They dramatize the challenges to 'comprehensive land planning' with 'biotopic surveys' and 'plans for protection of an area', based on 'scientifically exact surveys down to the level of individual plots' to be 'imposed against competing utilization demands' (48f.). In order to accomplish its plan of 'renaturation' (51), the Council recommends 'removing the most important areas ... completely from the cultivation interests of their owners' (49). The farmers should 'be motivated by compensation to forgo certain usage. rights or to adopt required protective measures' (49). They discuss fertilization permits subject to official approval', 'legally binding fertilization plans with concrete provisions on type, extent and time of application' (53). This 'planned fertilization' (59), like other protective measures, requires a differentiated system of 'environmental surveillance' that is to be set up nationally, regionally and on the scale of individual operations (61), and will 'require a revision and further development of the basic legal provisions' (64). In short, the panorama of a scientific and bureaucratic authoritarianism is being laid out. Farmers were viewed for centuries as the 'peasantry' wresting the fruits from the soil, on which the life and survival of everyone depended, but this image is beginning to be transformed into its opposite. In this new view, agriculture becomes a distribution point for the toxins that threaten the lives of animals, plants and people. To turn aside the threatening dangers at the currently achieved high level of agricultural productivity, people demand expropriation and/or plans and controls governing every detail of work, all under the patronage of science and bureaucracy. It is not just these demands (or even the matter-of-fact way they are raised) that is the disturbing element here. Instead it is that they are part of the logic of hazard prevention, and that, considering the Impending hazards, it will not likely prove to be at all easy to point to political alternatives that really prevent what must be prevented under the dictatorship of dangers. With the increase of hazards totally new types of challenges to democracy arise in the risk society. It harbors a tendency to a legitimate totalitarianism of hazard prevention, which takes the right to prevent the worst and, in an all too familiar manner, creates something even worse. The political 'side effects' of civilization's 'side effects' threaten the continued existence of the democratic political system. That system is caught in the unpleasant dilemma of either failing in the face of systematically produced hazards, or suspending fundamental democratic principles through the addition of authoritarian, repressive 'buttresses'. Breaking through this alternative is among the essential tasks of democratic thought and action in the already apparent future of the risk society.

#### Expert predictions fail—specialist biases and market incentives for punditry.

Menand 2005 (Louis. “Everybody’s An Expert.” The New Yorker. December 5, <http://www.newyorker.com/archive/2005/12/05/051205crbo_books1?currentPage=1>)

It is the somewhat gratifying lesson of Philip Tetlock’s new book, “Expert Political Judgment: How Good Is It? How Can We Know?” (Princeton; $35), that people who make prediction their business—people who appear as experts on television, get quoted in newspaper articles, advise governments and businesses, and participate in punditry roundtables—are no better than the rest of us. When they’re wrong, they’re rarely held accountable, and they rarely admit it, either. They insist that they were just off on timing, or blindsided by an improbable event, or almost right, or wrong for the right reasons. They have the same repertoire of self-justifications that everyone has, and are no more inclined than anyone else to revise their beliefs about the way the world works, or ought to work, just because they made a mistake. No one is paying you for your gratuitous opinions about other people, but the experts are being paid, and Tetlock claims that the better known and more frequently quoted they are, the less reliable their guesses about the future are likely to be. The accuracy of an expert’s predictions actually has an inverse relationship to his or her self-confidence, renown, and, beyond a certain point, depth of knowledge. People who follow current events by reading the papers and newsmagazines regularly can guess what is likely to happen about as accurately as the specialists whom the papers quote. Our system of expertise is completely inside out: it rewards bad judgments over good ones. “Expert Political Judgment” is not a work of media criticism. Tetlock is a psychologist—he teaches at Berkeley—and his conclusions are based on a long-term study that he began twenty years ago. He picked two hundred and eighty-four people who made their living “commenting or offering advice on political and economic trends,” and he started asking them to assess the probability that various things would or would not come to pass, both in the areas of the world in which they specialized and in areas about which they were not expert. Would there be a nonviolent end to apartheid in South Africa? Would Gorbachev be ousted in a coup? Would the United States go to war in the Persian Gulf? Would Canada disintegrate? (Many experts believed that it would, on the ground that Quebec would succeed in seceding.) And so on. By the end of the study, in 2003, the experts had made 82,361 forecasts. Tetlock also asked questions designed to determine how they reached their judgments, how they reacted when their predictions proved to be wrong, how they evaluated new information that did not support their views, and how they assessed the probability that rival theories and predictions were accurate. Tetlock got a statistical handle on his task by putting most of the forecasting questions into a “three possible futures” form. The respondents were asked to rate the probability of three alternative outcomes: the persistence of the status quo, more of something (political freedom, economic growth), or less of something (repression, recession). And he measured his experts on two dimensions: how good they were at guessing probabilities (did all the things they said had an x per cent chance of happening happen x per cent of the time?), and how accurate they were at predicting specific outcomes. The results were unimpressive. On the first scale, the experts performed worse than they would have if they had simply assigned an equal probability to all three outcomes—if they had given each possible future a thirty-three-per-cent chance of occurring. Human beings who spend their lives studying the state of the world, in other words, are poorer forecasters than dart-throwing monkeys, who would have distributed their picks evenly over the three choices. Tetlock also found that specialists are not significantly more reliable than non-specialists in guessing what is going to happen in the region they study**.** Knowing a little might make someone a more reliable forecaster, but Tetlock found that knowing a lot can actually make a person less reliable**.** “We reach the point of diminishing marginal predictive returns for knowledge disconcertingly quickly,” he reports. “In this age of academic hyperspecialization, there is no reason for supposing that contributors to top journals—distinguished political scientists, area study specialists, economists, and so on—are any better than journalists or attentive readers of the New York Times in ‘reading’ emerging situations.” And the more famous the forecaster the more overblown the forecasts. “Experts in demand,” Tetlock says, “were more overconfident than their colleagues who eked out existences far from the limelight.”

#### 2. Sequencing DA — ideological change must proceed institutional reform — otherwise institutional focus ensures that war power authority remains insulated and centralized.

Aziz Rana 12, Assistant Professor of Law, Cornell University Law School; A.B., Harvard College; J.D., Yale Law School; PhD., Harvard University, July 2012, “NATIONAL SECURITY: LEAD ARTICLE: Who Decides on Security?,” 44 Conn. L. Rev. 1417

If the objective sociological claims at the center of the modern security concept are themselves profoundly contested, what does this meahn for reform efforts that seek to recalibrate the relationship between liberty and security? Above all, it indicates that the central problem with the procedural solutions offered by constitutional scholars-emphasizing new statutory frameworks or greater judicial assertiveness-is that they mistake a question of politics for one of law. In other words, such scholars ignore the extent to which governing practices are the product of background political judgments about threat, democratic knowledge, professional expertise, and the necessity for insulated decision-making. To the extent that Americans are convinced that they face continuous danger from hidden and potentially limitless assailants-danger too complex for the average citizen to comprehend independently-it is inevitable that institutions (regardless of legal reform initiatives) will operate to centralize power in those hands presumed to enjoy military and security expertise. Thus, any systematic effort to challenge the current framing of the relationship between security and liberty must begin by challenging the underlying assumptions about knowledge and security upon which legal and political arrangements rest. Without a sustained and public debate about the validity of security expertise, its supporting institutions, and the broader legitimacy of secret information, there can be no substantive shift in our constitutional politics. The problem at present, however, is that it remains unclear which popular base exists in society to raise these questions. Unless such a base fully emerges, we can expect our prevailing security arrangements to become ever more entrenched.

#### Here’s more specific evidence in the context of war powers – concerns with reforms are another means to centralize power within technical elites.

Aziz Rana 12, Assistant Professor of Law, Cornell University Law School; A.B., Harvard College; J.D., Yale Law School; PhD., Harvard University, July 2012, “NATIONAL SECURITY: LEAD ARTICLE: Who Decides on Security?,” 44 Conn. L. Rev. 1417

Widespread concerns with the government's security infrastructure are by no means a new phenomenon. In fact, such voices are part of a sixty-year history of reform aimed at limiting state (particularly presidential) discretion and preventing likely abuses. n8 What is remarkable about these reform efforts is that in every generation critics articulate the same basic anxieties and present virtually identical procedural solutions. These procedural solutions focus on enhancing the institutional strength of both Congress and the courts to rein in the unitary executive. They either promote new statutory schemes that codify legislative responsibilities or call for greater court activism. As early as the 1940s, Clinton Rossiter argued that only a clearly established legal framework in which Congress enjoyed the power to declare and terminate states of emergency would prevent executive tyranny and rights violations in times of crisis. n9 After the Iran-Contra scandal, Harold Koh, now State Department Legal Adviser, once more raised this approach, calling for passage of a National Security Charter that explicitly enumerated the powers of both the executive and the legislature, promoting greater balance between the branches and explicit constraints on government action. n10 More recently, [\*1421] Bruce Ackerman has defended the need for an "emergency constitution" premised on congressional oversight and procedurally specified practices. n11 As for increased judicial vigilance, Arthur Schlesinger argued nearly forty years ago, in his seminal book, The Imperial Presidency, that the courts "had to reclaim their own dignity and meet their own responsibilities" by abandoning deference and by offering a meaningful check to the political branches. n12 Today, Laurence Tribe and Patrick Gudridge once more imagine that, by providing a powerful voice of dissent, the courts can play a critical role in balancing the branches. They write that adjudication can "generate[]-even if largely (or, at times, only) in eloquent and cogently reasoned dissent-an apt language for potent criticism." n13¶ The hope-returned to by constitutional scholars for decades-has been that by creating clear legal guidelines for security matters and by increasing the role of the legislative and judicial branches, government abuse can be stemmed. Yet despite this reformist belief, presidential and military prerogatives continue to expand even when the courts or Congress intervene. Indeed, the ultimate result primarily has been to entrench further the system of discretion and centralization. In the case of congressional legislation (from the 200 standby statutes on the books n14 to [\*1422] the post-September 11 and Iraq War Authorizations for the Use of Military Force, to the Detainee Treatment Act and the Military Commissions Acts n15 ), this has often entailed Congress self-consciously playing the role of junior partner- buttressing executive practices by providing its own constitutional imprimatur to them. Thus, rather than rolling back security practices, greater congressional involvement has tended to further strengthen and internalize emergency norms within the ordinary operation of politics. n16 As just one example, the USA PATRIOT Act, while no doubt controversial, has been renewed by Congress a remarkable ten consecutive times without any meaningful curtailments. n17 Such realities underscore the dominant drift of security arrangements, a drift unhindered by scholarly suggestions and reform initiatives. Indeed, if anything, today's scholarship finds itself mired in an argumentative loop, re-presenting inadequate remedies and seemingly incapable of recognizing past failures.¶ What explains both the persistent expansion of the federal government's security framework as well as the inability of civil libertarian solutions to curb this expansion? This Article argues that the current reform debate ignores the broader ideological context that shapes how the balance between liberty and security is struck. In particular, the very meaning of security has not remained static, but rather has changed dramatically since World War II and the beginning of the Cold War. This shift has principally concerned the basic question of who decides on issues of war and emergency. And as the following pages explore, at the center of this shift has been a transformation in legal and political judgments about the capacity of citizens to make informed and knowledgeable decisions in security domains. Yet, while underlying assumptions about popular knowledge-its strengths and limitations-have played a key role in shaping security practices in each era of American constitutional history, [\*1423] this role has not been explored in any sustained way in the scholarly literature.¶ As an initial effort to delineate the relationship between knowledge and security, this Article will argue that throughout most of the American experience, the dominant ideological perspective saw security as grounded in protecting citizens from threats to their property and physical well-being (especially those threats posed by external warfare and domestic insurrection). Drawing from a philosophical tradition extending back to John Locke, many politicians and thinkers-ranging from Alexander Hamilton and James Madison, at the founding, to Abraham Lincoln and Roger Taney-maintained that most citizens understood the forms of danger that imperiled their physical safety. n18 The average individual knew that securing collective life was in his or her own interest, and also knew the institutional arrangements and practices that would fulfill this paramount interest. n19 A widespread knowledge of security needs was presumed to be embedded in social experience, indicating that citizens had the skill to take part in democratic discussion regarding how best to protect property or to respond to forms of external violence. Thus the question of who decides was answered decisively in favor of the general public and those institutions-especially majoritarian legislatures and juries-most closely bound to the public's wishes. n20¶ What marks the present moment as distinct is an increasing repudiation of these assumptions about shared and general social knowledge. Today, the dominant approach to security presumes that conditions of modern complexity (marked by heightened bureaucracy, institutional specialization, global interdependence, and technological development) mean that while protection from external danger remains a paramount interest of ordinary citizens, these citizens rarely possess the capacity to pursue such objectives adequately. n21 Rather than viewing security as a matter open to popular understanding and collective assessment, in ways both small and large the prevailing concept sees threat as sociologically complex and as requiring elite modes of expertise. n22 Insulated decision-makers in the executive branch, armed with the specialized skills of the [\*1424] professional military, are assumed to be best equipped to make sense of complicated and often conflicting information about safety and self-defense. n23 The result is that the other branches-let alone the public at large-face a profound legitimacy deficit whenever they call for transparency or seek to challenge presidential discretion. Not surprisingly, the tendency of procedural reform efforts has been to place greater decision-making power in the other branches, and then to watch those branches delegate such power back to the very same executive bodies.
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#### Voter for limits – their interp includes assassination, killing of enemy combatants in war, intentional slaying of criminals and dissidents

**Silva 3** (Sebastian Jose Silva, Faculte de Droit de l'Universite de Montreal, “Death For Life: A Study of Targeted Killing by States In International Law,” August 2003)

**As defined by** Steven R. **David, targeted killing is the "**intentional slaying **of a specific individual** or group of individuals undertaken **with explicit** governmental approval.,,25 Though concise, **the problem with this definition is that it** fails to specify the intended targets **and** ignores the context **in which they are carried out**. By failing to define targeted killings as measures of counter-terrorism, killings of all types may indiscriminately fall under its mantle with devastating consequences. As such, the killing of political leaders in peacetime, which amounts to assassination, can fall within its scope. The same can be said about the killing of specific enemy combatants in armed conflict, which amounts to targeted military strikes, and the intentional slaying of common criminals, dissidents, or opposition leaders. Actions carried-out by governments within their jurisdictions can also be interpreted as targeted killings. Although the killing of terrorists abroad may constitute lawful and proportionate self-defense in response to armed attacks, the use of such measures by states for an unspecified number of reasons renders shady their very suggestion. David's definition is essentially correct but over-inclusive.

#### They conflate overall drone strategy and targeted killings—gives them an incredibly broad and expanding number of affs.

Anderson, Professor of International Law at American University, ‘13

[Kenneth, June 2013, “The Case for Drones,” Commentary, Vol. 135, No. 6]

This feature of Predators and Reapers -- the two forms of drones really at issue today -- enables the second aspect of drone warfare: targeted killing, a method of using force that takes advantage of drone technology. But drones and targeted killing are not the same thing: One is a technology and weapon platform, the other a way to use it. Targeted killing can be done not only with drones, but with human teams, too, as seen most dramatically in the Bin Laden raid by the Navy SEALs.¶ Similarly, drones are useful for more than targeted killing. They have broad, indeed rapidly expanding, military functions as a weapons platform -- as evidenced in counterinsurgency strikes in Pakistan, Afghanistan, and Yemen against groups of fighters, not only individuals. This is conventional targeting of hostile forces in conventional conflict, just like one would see with a manned war plane. They have much in common. The pilot of a manned craft is often far away from the target, as would be a drone pilot -- over the horizon or many miles away. Unlike the drone pilot, however, he might have minimal situational awareness of the actual events on the ground at the target -- his knowledge may be nothing more than instrument data. A drone pilot may in fact have far greater visual and other sensor data than the pilot of a manned craft without handling the distractions caused by the work to keep a high-speed jet in the air.

#### Most precise interpretations prove that TKs are premeditated against a specific individual---their interps are normative which kills predictability.

Abresch, Director, Project on Extrajudicial Executions, Center for Human Rights and Global Justice, New York University School of Law, ‘9

[William, “Targeted Killing in International Law,” European Journal of International Law, 20 (2): 449-453]

Studies of targeted killing are often situated within the politically fraught debate over Hellfire missile attacks on suspected terrorists. The scope of Melzer's analysis is, then, refreshingly broad, covering equally sniper shots used to end hostage stand-offs, poison letters sent to insurgent commanders, and commando raids launched with orders to liquidate opponents. These diverse practices are marked off from other uses of lethal force by states, such as soldiers shooting in a firefight, with a precise and intuitively satisfying definition. Melzer defines targeted killing as a use of lethal force by a subject of international law that is directed against an individually selected person who is not in custody and that is intentional (rather than negligent or reckless), premeditated (rather than merely voluntary), and deliberate (meaning that ‘the death of the targeted person [is] the actual aim of the operation, as opposed to deprivations of life which, although intentional and premeditated, remain the incidental result of an operation pursuing other aims’) (at 3–4). It is a strength of Melzer's book that, although the concepts deployed in this definition do not correspond with those found in either international human rights law or international humanitarian law (IHL), he eschews de lege ferenda argumentation in favour of a rigorous elaboration of the implications of the lex lata for the practices covered by his definition.

[“de lege ferenda” means “what the law should be,” while “lex lata” means “what the law really is”]

#### You misunderstand the targeted killing topic – drones are a part, but not the only targeted killing aff – here’s 7 more affs you can read

Alston 10 (Philip – John Norton Pomeroy Professor of Law at New York University School of Law, and co-Chair of the law school's Center for Human Rights and Global Justice, “ Report of the Special Rappo rteur on extrajudicial, summary or arbitrary executions,”, 2010, http://www2.ohchr.org/english/bodies/hrcouncil/docs/14session/A.HRC.14.24.Add6.pdf)

II. Background A. Definition of “targeted killing” 7. Despite the frequency with which it is invoked, “targeted killing” is not a term defined under international law. Nor does it fit neatly into any particular legal framework. It came into common usage in 2000, after Israel made public a policy of “targeted killings” of alleged terrorists in the Occu pied Palestinian Territories. 1 The term has also been used in other situations, such as: • The April 2002 killing, allegedly by Russian armed forces, of “rebel warlord” Omar Ibn al Khattab in Chechnya. 2 • The November 2002 killing of alleged al Qa eda leader Ali Qaed Senyan al-Harithi and five other men in Yemen, reportedly by a CIA-operated Predator drone using a Hellfire missile. 3 • Killings in 2005 – 2008 by both Sri Lankan government forces and the opposition LTTE group of individuals identified by eac h side as collaborating with the other. 4 • The January 2010 killing, in an operation allegedly carried out by 18 Israeli Mossad intelligence agents, of Mahmoud al-Mahbouh, a Hamas leader, at a Dubai hotel. 5 According to Dubai officials, al-Mahbouh was suffocated with a pillow; officials released videotapes of those responsible, whom they alleged to be Mossad agents. 6 8. Targeted killings thus take place in a variety of contexts and may be committed by governments and their agents in times of peace as well as armed conflict, or by organized armed groups in armed conflict. 7 The means and methods of k illing vary, and include sniper fire, shooting at close range, missiles from helicopters, gunships, drones, the use of car bombs, and poison. 8 9. The common element in all these contexts is that lethal force is intentionally and deliberately used, with a degree of pre-meditation, against an individual or individuals specifically identified in advance by the perpetrator. 9 In a targeted killing, the specific goal of the operation is to use lethal force. This distinguishes targeted killings from unintentional, accidental, or reckless killings, or killings made without conscious choice. It also distinguishes them from law enforcement operations, e.g., against a suspected suicide bomber. Under such circumstances, it may be le gal for law enforcemen t personnel to shoot to kill based on the imminence of the threat, but the goal of the operation, from its inception, should not be to kill. 10. Although in most circumstances targeted killings violate the right to life, in the exceptional circumstance of armed conflict, they may be legal. 10 This is in contrast to other terms with which “targeted killing” has sometimes been interchangeably used, such as “extrajudicial execution”, “summa ry execution”, and “assassination”, all of which are, by definition, illegal.

#### Zenko concedes there is a distinction – even the government acknowledges it.

Micah Zenko 12, the Douglas Dillon Fellow at the Council on Foreign Relations, 7/16/12, “Targeted Killings and Signature Strikes,” http://blogs.cfr.org/zenko/2012/07/16/targeted-killings-and-signature-strikes/

Although signature strikes have been known as a U.S. counterterrorism tactic for over four years, no administration official has acknowledged or defended them on-the-record. Instead, officials emphasize that targeted killings with drones (the official term is “targeted strikes”) are only carried out against specific individuals, which are usually lumped with terms like “senior” and “al-Qaeda.” Harold Koh: “The United States has the authority under international law, and the responsibility to its citizens, to use force, including lethal force, to defend itself, including by targeting persons such as high-level al-Qaeda leaders who are planning attacks.” John Brennan: “This Administration’s counterterrorism efforts outside of Afghanistan and Iraq are focused on those individuals who are a threat to the United States.” Jeh Johnson: “In an armed conflict, lethal force against known, individual members of the enemy is a long-standing and long-legal practice.” Eric Holder: “Target specific senior operational leaders of al Qaeda and associated forces.” In April, Brennan was asked, “If you could address the issue of signature strikes, which I guess aren’t necessarily targeted against specific individuals?” He replied: “You make reference to signature strikes that are frequently reported in the press. I was speaking here specifically about targeted strikes against individuals who are involved.” Shortly thereafter, when the White House spokesperson was asked about drone strikes, he simply stated: “I am not going to get into the specifics of the process by which these decisions are made.

#### They’re totally different procedures and ignoring the distinction flips the topic aff – they get Pakistan, Afghanistan, and Yemen affs about building relations to destroy terror networks.

Dunn, Reader in International Politics and Head of Department in the Department of Political Science and International Studies at the University of Birmingham, ‘13

[David Hastings and Stefan Wolff, Professor of International Security at the University of Birmingham in the UK, March 2013, “Drone Use in Counter-Insurgency and Counter-Terrorism: Policy or Policy Component?,” in Hitting the Target?: How New Capabilities are Shaping International Intervention, ed. Aaronson & Johnson, http://www.rusi.org/downloads/assets/Hitting\_the\_Target.pdf]

Yet an important distinction needs to be drawn here between acting on operational intelligence that corroborates existing intelligence and confirms the presence of a specific pre-determined target and its elimination – so-called ‘targeted strikes’ (or less euphemistically, ‘targeted killings’) – and acting on an algorithmic analysis of operational intelligence alone, determining on the spot whether a development on the ground suggests terrorist activity or association and thus fulfils certain (albeit, to date, publicly not disclosed) criteria for triggering an armed response by the remote pilot of a drone – so-called ‘signature strikes’.6¶ Targeted strikes rely on corroborating pre-existing intelligence: they serve the particular purpose of eliminating specific individuals that are deemed crucial to enemy capabilities and are meant to diminish opponents’ operational, tactical and strategic capabilities, primarily by killing mid- and top-level leadership cadres. To the extent that evidence is available, it suggests that targeted strikes are highly effective in achieving these objectives, while simultaneously generating relatively little blowback, precisely because they target individual (terrorist) leaders and cause few, if any, civilian casualties. This explains, to a significant degree, why the blowback effect in Yemen – where the overwhelming majority of drone strikes have been targeted strikes – has been less pronounced than in Pakistan and Afghanistan.7¶ Signature strikes, in contrast, can still be effective in diminishing operational, tactical and strategic enemy capabilities, but they do so to a certain degree by chance and also have a much higher probability of causing civilian casualties. Using drones for signature strikes decreases the dependence on pre-existing intelligence about particular leaders and their movements and more fully utilises their potential to carry out effective surveillance and respond to the conclusions drawn from it immediately. Signature strikes have been the predominant approach to drone usage in Pakistan and Afghanistan.8 Such strikes have had the effect of decimating the rank and file of the Taliban and their associates – but they have also caused large numbers of civilian casualties and, at a minimum, weakened the respective host governments’ legitimacy and forced them to condemn publicly, and in no uncertain terms, the infringement of their states’ sovereignty by the US. In turn, this has strained already difficult relations between countries which have more common than divergent interests when it comes to regional stability and the fight against international terrorist networks. That signature strikes have a high probability of going wrong and that such failures prove extremely counterproductive is also illustrated by a widely reported case from Yemen, in which twelve civilians were killed in the proximity of a car identified as belonging to an Al-Qa’ida member.9¶ The kind of persistent and intimidating presence of a drone policy geared towards signature strikes, and the obvious risks and consequences involved in repeatedly making wrong decisions, are both counterproductive in themselves and corrosive of efforts that seek to undercut the local support enjoyed by insurgent and terrorist networks, as well as the mutual assistance that they can offer each other. Put differently, signature strikes, in contrast to targeted killings, do anything but help to disentangle the links between insurgents and terrorists.

#### The aff kills nuanced debates.

Anderson, Professor at Washington College of Law, American University, ‘11

[Kenneth, Hoover Institution visiting fellow, Non-Resident Visiting Fellow at Brookings, “Efficiency in Bello and ad Bellum: Targeted Killing Through Drone Warfare,” Sept 23 2011, http://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract\_id=1812124]

Speaking to the broad future of the technology, however, and given the direction of technology and cost, it appears inevitable that drones will take on many more operational roles over time, whether in conventional war, special operations, and what has here been called generically “intelligence-driven uses of force.” Drones will likely evolve – as aircraft, as well as in the weapons and sensor systems they bear – into many specialized types. They will get both bigger and smaller than they are now, for example, and they will surely evolve into those specialized for surveillance and those specialized to fire weapons. And they will also surely evolve into those specialized in high-value, “intelligence-driven” targeted killing of individuals and those that are suited to conventional operations. Bearing in mind these increasingly varied uses is essential to understanding, when it comes to targeted killing and/or drone warfare, that one-size-fits-all legal analysis is not sufficient.