### T- Authority

#### A. Authority is the legal right to take action, power is the ability to do so

Forsythe and Hendrickson 96

[David P. Forsythe, Professor and Chair of Political Science University of Nebraska-Lincoln, Ryan C. Hendrickson, Ph.D. Candidate University of Nebraska-Lincoln. “U.S. Use of Force Abroad: What Law for the President?” Presidential Studies Quarterly, Vol. 26, No. 4]

The crisis is most precisely about authority, not power. Authority, in the legal sense, concerns the right to do something. Power refers to the capability to do something. Part of the problems ¶ in the U.S. constitutional crisis over use of force abroad is that the president has the power to ¶ make war, and to obtain congressional deference most of the time, whatever the proper under ¶ standing of authority.

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

United Nations 13

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

PART I¶ INTRODUCTION¶ Article 1

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

#### No authority to attack Iran now

Buchanan 9-17-13

http://original.antiwar.com/buchanan/2013/09/16/lindseys-plan-for-war-on-iran/

This summer produced a triumph of American patriotism.¶ A grassroots coalition arose to demand Congress veto any war on Syria. Congress got the message and was ready to vote no to war, when President Obama seized upon Vladimir Putin’s offer to work together to disarm Syria of chemical weapons.¶ The war America did not want – did not come.¶ Lindsey Graham is determined that this does not happen again.¶ The next war he and his collaborators are planning, the big one, the war on Iran, will not be blocked the same way.¶ How does Graham propose to do this?¶ He plans to introduce a use-of-force resolution, a peacetime declaration of war on Iran, to ensure Obama need not come back to Congress – and can attack Iran at will. Lindsay intends a preemptive surrender of Congress’ constitutional war-making power – to Obama.¶ He wants to give Obama a blank check for war on Iran, then stampede Obama into starting the war.¶ On Fox’s “Huckabee” Sunday, Lindsey laid out his scheme:¶ “I’m going to get a bipartisan coalition together. We’re going to put together a use-of-force resolution, allowing our country to use military force … to stop the Iranian nuclear program. … I’m going to need your help, Mike, and the help of Americans and friends of Israel.”¶ In July, Graham told a cheering conference of Christians United for Israel: “If nothing changes in Iran, come September, October, I will present a resolution that will authorize the use of military force to prevent Iran from developing a nuclear bomb.”¶ That Graham is braying that he intends to give Obama a blank check for war on Iran is not all bad news. For he thus concedes Obama does not now have the authority to attack Iran.

#### Authority cannot be implied, it must be made explicit – WPR says so

Raven-Hansen 89

[Peter, Professor of Law, George Washington University National Law Center. “SPECIAL ISSUE: THE UNITED STATES CONSTITUTION IN ITS THIRD CENTURY: FOREIGN AFFAIRS: DISTRIBUTION OF CONSTITUTIONAL AUTHORITY: NUCLEAR WAR POWERS” American Journal of International Law, 83 A.J.I.L. 786, Nexis]

The statutory argument against delegation rests on the War Powers Resolution. Section 8(a)(1) of the Resolution provides that authorization for the introduction of U.S. armed forces into hostilities shall not be inferred from any provision of law (whether or not in effect before the date of the enactment of this joint resolution), including any provision contained in any appropriation Act, unless such provision specifically authorizes [such introduction] and states that it is intended to constitute specific statutory authorization within the meaning of this joint resolution. n35

### Debt Ceiling DA

#### Obama’s pressuring the GOP with a strong display of Presidential strength and staying on message – the GOP will cave

Dovere, 10/1

(Edward, Politico, “Government shutdown: President Obama holds the line” <http://www.politico.com/story/2013/10/government-shutdown-president-obama-holds-the-line-97646.html?hp=f3>)

President Barack Obama started September in an agonizing, extended display of how little sway he had in Congress. He ended the month with a display of resolve and strength that could redefine his presidency. All it took was a government shutdown. This was less a White House strategy than simply staying in the corner the House GOP had painted them into — to the White House’s surprise, Obama was forced to do what he so rarely has as president: he said no, and he didn’t stop saying no. For two weeks ahead of Monday night’s deadline, Obama and aides rebuffed the efforts to kill Obamacare with the kind of firm, narrow sales pitch they struggled with in three years of trying to convince people the law should exist in the first place. There was no litany of doomsday scenarios that didn’t quite come true, like in the run-up to the fiscal cliff and the sequester. No leaked plans or musings in front of the cameras about Democratic priorities he might sacrifice to score a deal. After five years of what’s often seen as Obama’s desperation to negotiate — to the fury of his liberal base and the frustration of party leaders who argue that he negotiates against himself. Even his signature health care law came with significant compromises in Congress. Instead, over and over and over again, Obama delivered the simple line: Republicans want to repeal a law that was passed and upheld by the Supreme Court — to give people health insurance — or they’ll do something that everyone outside the GOP caucus meetings, including Wall Street bankers, seems to agree would be a ridiculous risk. “If we lock these Americans out of affordable health care for one more year,” Obama said Monday afternoon as he listed examples of people who would enjoy better treatment under Obamacare, “if we sacrifice the health care of millions of Americans — then they’ll fund the government for a couple more months. Does anybody truly believe that we won’t have this fight again in a couple more months? Even at Christmas?” The president and his advisers weren’t expecting this level of Republican melee, a White House official said. Only during Sen. Ted Cruz’s (R-Texas) 21-hour floor speech last week did the realization roll through the West Wing that they wouldn’t be negotiating because they couldn’t figure out anymore whom to negotiate with. And even then, they didn’t believe the shutdown was really going to happen until Saturday night, when the House voted again to strip Obamacare funding. This wasn’t a credible position, Obama said again Monday afternoon, but rather, bowing to “extraneous and controversial demands” which are “all to save face after making some impossible promises to the extreme right wing of their political party.” Obama and aides have said repeatedly that they’re not thinking about the shutdown in terms of political gain, but the situation’s is taking shape for them. Congress’s approval on dealing with the shutdown was at 10 percent even before the shutters started coming down on Monday according to a new CNN/ORC poll, with 69 percent of people saying the House Republicans are acting like “spoiled children.” “The Republicans are making themselves so radioactive that the president and Democrats can win this debate in the court of public opinion” by waiting them out, said Jim Manley, a Democratic strategist and former aide to Senate Majority Leader Harry Reid who has previously been critical of Obama’s tactics. Democratic pollster Stan Greenberg said the Obama White House learned from the 2011 debt ceiling standoff, when it demoralized fellow Democrats, deflated Obama’s approval ratings and got nothing substantive from the negotiations. “They didn’t gain anything from that approach,” Greenberg said. “I think that there’s a lot they learned from what happened the last time they ran up against the debt ceiling.” While the Republicans have been at war with each other, the White House has proceeded calmly — a breakthrough phone call with Iranian President Hassan Rouhani Friday that showed him getting things done (with the conveniently implied juxtaposition that Tehran is easier to negotiate with than the GOP conference), his regular golf game Saturday and a cordial meeting Monday with his old sparring partner Israeli Prime Minister Benjamin Netanyahu. White House press secretary Jay Carney said Monday that the shutdown wasn’t really affecting much of anything. “It’s busy, but it’s always busy here,” Carney said. “It’s busy for most of you covering this White House, any White House. We’re very much focused on making sure that the implementation of the Affordable Care Act continues.” Obama called all four congressional leaders Monday evening — including Boehner, whose staff spent Friday needling reporters to point out that the president hadn’t called for a week. According to both the White House and Boehner’s office, the call was an exchange of well-worn talking points, and changed nothing. Manley advised Obama to make sure people continue to see Boehner and the House Republicans as the problem and not rush into any more negotiations until public outrage forces them to bend. “He may want to do a little outreach, but not until the House drives the country over the cliff,” Manley said Monday, before the shutdown. “Once the House has driven the country over the cliff and failed to fund the government, then it might be time to make a move.” The White House believes Obama will take less than half the blame for a shutdown – with the rest heaped on congressional Republicans. The divide is clear in a Gallup poll also out Monday: over 70 percent of self-identifying Republicans and Democrats each say their guys are the ones acting responsibly, while just 9 percent for both say the other side is. If Obama is able to turn public opinion against Republicans, the GOP won’t be able to turn the blame back on Obama, Greenberg said. “Things only get worse once things begin to move in a particular direction,” he said. “They don’t suddenly start going the other way as people rethink this.”

#### The plan causes an inter-branch fight that derails Obama’s agenda

Kriner 10

Douglas Kriner, Assistant Profess of Political Science at Boston University, 2010, After the Rubicon: Congress, Presidents, and the Politics of Waging War, p. 67-69

Raising or Lowering Political Costs by Affecting Presidential Political Capital Shaping both real and anticipated public opinion are two important ways in which Congress can raise or lower the political costs of a military action for the president. However, focusing exclusively on opinion dynamics threatens to obscure the much broader political consequences of domestic reaction—particularly congressional opposition—to presidential foreign policies. At least since Richard Neustadt's seminal work Presidential Power, presidency scholars have warned that costly political battles in one policy arena frequently have significant ramifications for presidential power in other realms. Indeed, two of Neustadt's three "cases of command"—Truman's seizure of the steel mills and firing of General Douglas MacArthur—explicitly discussed the broader political consequences of stiff domestic resistance to presidential assertions of commander-in-chief powers. In both cases, Truman emerged victorious in the case at hand—yet, Neustadt argues, each victory cost Truman dearly in terms of his future power prospects and leeway in other policy areas, many of which were more important to the president than achieving unconditional victory over North Korea." 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." 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.6° 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 both 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 priorities, such as Social Security and immigration reform, failedperhaps 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. 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

#### That consumes his capital and causes a default

Lillis, 9/7

(Mike, The Hill, “Fears of wounding Obama weigh heavily on Democrats ahead of vote”

The prospect of wounding President Obama is weighing heavily on Democratic lawmakers as they decide their votes on Syria. Obama needs all the political capital he can muster heading into bruising battles with the GOP over fiscal spending and the debt ceiling. Democrats want Obama to use his popularity to reverse automatic spending cuts already in effect and pay for new economic stimulus measures through higher taxes on the wealthy and on multinational companies. But if the request for authorization for Syria military strikes is rebuffed, some fear it could limit Obama's power in those high-stakes fights. That has left Democrats with an agonizing decision: vote "no" on Syria and possibly encourage more chemical attacks while weakening their president, or vote "yes" and risk another war in the Middle East. “I’m sure a lot of people are focused on the political ramifications,” a House Democratic aide said. Rep. Jim Moran (D-Va.), a veteran appropriator, said the failure of the Syria resolution would diminish Obama's leverage in the fiscal battles. "It doesn't help him," Moran said Friday by phone. "We need a maximally strong president to get us through this fiscal thicket. These are going to be very difficult votes."

#### Collapses the global economy

Davidson 9-10

Adam Davidson 9/10/13, economy columnist for The New York Times, co-founder of Planet Money, NPR’s team of economics reporters, “Our Debt to Society,” NYT, <http://www.nytimes.com/2013/09/15/magazine/our-debt-to-society.html?pagewanted=all&_r=0>

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

#### Collapse causes nuclear conflicts

Harris and Burrows 9

Mathew J. Burrows counselor in the National Intelligence Council and Jennifer Harris a member of the NIC’s Long Range Analysis Unit “Revisiting the Future: Geopolitical Effects of the Financial Crisis” The Washington Quarterly 32:2 https://csis.org/files/publication/twq09aprilburrowsharris.pdf

Increased Potential for Global Conflict¶ Of course, the report encompasses more than economics and indeed believes the¶ future is likely to be the result of a number of intersecting and interlocking¶ forces. With so many possible permutations of outcomes, each with ample opportunity for unintended consequences, there is a growing sense of insecurity.¶ Even so, history may be more instructive than ever. While we continue to¶ believe that the Great Depression is not likely to be repeated, the lessons to be¶ drawn from that period include the harmful effects on fledgling democracies and¶ multiethnic societies (think Central Europe in 1920s and 1930s) and on¶ the sustainability of multilateral institutions (think League of Nations in the¶ same period). There is no reason to think that this would not be true in the¶ twenty-first as much as in the twentieth century. For that reason, the ways in¶ which the potential for greater conflict could grow would seem to be even more¶ apt in a constantly volatile economic environment as they would be if change¶ would be steadier.¶ In surveying those risks, the report stressed the likelihood that terrorism and¶ nonproliferation will remain priorities even as resource issues move up on the¶ international agenda. Terrorism’s appeal will decline if economic growth¶ continues in the Middle East and youth unemployment is reduced. For those¶ terrorist groups that remain active in 2025, however, the diffusion of¶ technologies and scientific knowledge will place some of the world’s most¶ dangerous capabilities within their reach. Terrorist groups in 2025 will likely be a¶ combination of descendants of long established groupsinheriting¶ organizational structures, command and control processes, and training¶ procedures necessary to conduct sophisticated attacksand newly emergent¶ collections of the angry and disenfranchised that become self-radicalized,¶ particularly in the absence of economic outlets that would become narrower¶ in an economic downturn.¶ The most dangerous casualty of any economically-induced drawdown of U.S.¶ military presence would almost certainly be the Middle East. Although Iran’s¶ acquisition of nuclear weapons is not inevitable, worries about a nuclear-armed¶ Iran could lead states in the region to develop new security arrangements with¶ external powers, acquire additional weapons, and consider pursuing their own¶ nuclear ambitions. It is not clear that the type of stable deterrent relationship¶ that existed between the great powers for most of the Cold War would emerge¶ naturally in the Middle East with a nuclear Iran. Episodes of low intensity¶ conflict and terrorism taking place under a nuclear umbrella could lead to an¶ unintended escalation and broader conflict if clear red lines between those states¶ involved are not well established. The close proximity of potential nuclear rivals¶ combined with underdeveloped surveillance capabilities and mobile¶ dual-capable Iranian missile systems also will produce inherent difficulties in¶ achieving reliable indications and warning of an impending nuclear attack. The¶ lack of strategic depth in neighboring states like Israel, short warning and missile¶ flight times, and uncertainty of Iranian intentions may place more focus on¶ preemption rather than defense, potentially leading to escalating crises.Types of conflict that the world continues¶ to experience, such as over resources, could¶ reemerge, particularly if protectionism grows and¶ there is a resort to neo-mercantilist practices.¶ Perceptions of renewed energy scarcity will drive¶ countries to take actions to assure their future¶ access to energy supplies. In the worst case, this¶ could result in interstate conflicts if government¶ leaders deem assured access to energy resources,¶ for example, to be essential for maintaining domestic stability and the survival of¶ their regime. Even actions short of war, however, will have important geopolitical¶ implications. Maritime security concerns are providing a rationale for naval¶ buildups and modernization efforts, such as China’s and India’s development of¶ blue water naval capabilities. If the fiscal stimulus focus for these countries indeed¶ turns inward, one of the most obvious funding targets may be military. Buildup of¶ regional naval capabilities could lead to increased tensions, rivalries, and¶ counterbalancing moves, but it also will create opportunities for multinational¶ cooperation in protecting critical sea lanes. With water also becoming scarcer in¶ Asia and the Middle East, cooperation to manage changing water resources is¶ likely to be increasingly difficult both within and between states in a more¶ dog-eat-dog world.

### Apocalyptic Rhetoric K

#### Fiat double bind – Either the harms to the 1AC are true and they cannot solve for extinction before they control the levers of power OR their harms are constructed for the purpose of alarmism which makes them symbolic terrorists - that makes serial policy failure inevitable

Kurasawa 4 – Professor of Sociology, York University of Toronto, Fuyuki, “Cautionary Tales: The Global Culture of Prevention and the Work of Foresight”, Constellations Volume 11, No 4, <http://www.yorku.ca/kurasawa/Kurasawa%20Articles/Constellations%20Article.pdf>

Up to this point, I have tried to demonstrate that **transnational socio-political relations are nurturing a thriving culture and infrastructure of prevention from below, which challenges presumptions about the inscrutability of the future** (II) and a stance of indifference toward it (III). Nonetheless, unless and **until it is substantively ‘filled in,’ the argument is vulnerable to misappropriation since farsightedness does not in and of itself ensure emancipatory outcomes.** Therefore, this section proposes to specify normative criteria and participatory procedures through which citizens can determine the ‘reasonableness,’ legitimacy, and effectiveness of competing dystopian visions in order to arrive at a socially self-instituting future. **Foremost among thepossible distortions of farsightedness is alarmism, the manufacturing ofunwarranted and unfounded doomsday scenarios. State and market institutionsmay seek to produce a culture of fear by deliberately stretching interpretations of realitybeyond the limits of the plausible so as to exaggerate the prospects of impending catastrophes, or yet again, by intentionally promoting certain prognoses over others for instrumental purposes. Accordingly, regressive dystopiascan operate as Trojan horses advancing political agendasor commercial interests that would otherwise be susceptible to public scrutiny and opposition. Instances of this kind of manipulation of the dystopian imaginary are plentiful: the invasion of Iraq in the name of fighting terrorism and an imminent threat of use of ‘weapons of mass destruction’**; the severe curtailing of American civil liberties amidst fears of a collapse of ‘homeland security’; **the neoliberal dismantling of the welfare state as the only remedy for an ideologically constructed fiscal crisis**; the conservative expansion of policing and incarceration due to supposedly spiraling crime waves; and so forth. **Alarmism constructs and codes the future in particular ways, producing or reinforcing certain crisis narratives, belief structures, and rhetorical conventions**. As much as alarmist ideas beget a culture of fear, the reverse is no less true. If fear-mongering is a misappropriation of preventive foresight, resignation about the future represents a problematic outgrowth of the popular acknowledgment of global perils. Some believe that the world to come is so uncertain and dangerous that we should not attempt to modify the course of history; the future will look after itself for better or worse, regardless of what we do or wish. One version of this argument consists in a complacent optimism perceiving the future as fated to be better than either the past or the present. Frequently accompanying it is a self-deluding denial of what is plausible (‘the world will not be so bad after all’), or a naively Panglossian pragmatism (‘things will work themselves out in spite of everything, because humankind always finds ways to survive’).37 **Much more common, however, isthe opposite reaction, a fatalistic pessimism reconciled to the idea that the future will be necessarily worse than what preceded it. This is sustained by a tragic chronological framework according to which humanity is doomed to decay, or a cyclical one of the endless repetition of the mistakes of the past. On top of their dubious assessments of what is to come, alarmismand resignation would, if widely accepted, undermine a viable practice of farsightedness. Indeed, both of them encourage public disengagement from deliberation about scenarios for the future, a process that appears to be dangerous, pointless, or unnecessary. The resulting ‘depublicization’ of debate leaves dominant groups and institutions(the state, the market, techno-science) in charge of sorting out the future for the rest of us, thus effectively producing a heteronomous social order.** How, then, can we support a democratic process of prevention from below? The answer, I think, lies in cultivating the public capacity for critical judgment and deliberation, so that participants in global civil society subject all claims about potential catastrophes to examination, evaluation, and contestation. Two normative concepts are particularly well suited to grounding these tasks: the precautionary principle and global justice.

#### The PARADOX OF RISK makes this issue NOT resolvable by weighing the plan.  If impact is calculated by multiplying probability and magnitude, any probability of an infinite impact irrationally registers as infinite

Kessler 2008 (Oliver Kessler, Sociology at University of Bielefeld, “From Insecurity to Uncertainty: Risk and the Paradox of Security Politics” *Alternatives*  33 (2008), 211-232)

The problem of the second method is that it is very difficult to  "calculate" politically unacceptable losses. **If** the **risk** of terrorism **is  defined** in traditional terms **by** probability and **potential loss,** then  the focus on dramatic terror attacks leads to the marginalization of  probabilities. The reason is that **even the highest degree of improbability becomes irrelevant as** the measure of **loss goes to infinity**.^o  The mathematical calculation of the risk of terrorism thus tends to  overestimate and to dramatize the danger. This has consequences  beyond the actual risk assessment for the formulation and execution  of "risk policies": If one factor of the risk calculation approaches  infinity (e.g., if a case of nuclear terrorism is envisaged), then there  is no balanced measure for antiterrorist efforts, and **risk management as a rational endeavor breaks down**. Under the historical con-  dition of bipolarity, the "ultimate" threat with nuclear weapons could  be balanced by a similar counterthreat, and new equilibria could be  achieved, albeit on higher levels of nuclear overkill. Under the new  condition of uncertainty, no such rational balancing is possible since  knowledge about actors, their motives and capabilities, is largely  absent.  The second form of security policy that emerges when the deter-  rence model collapses mirrors the "social probability" approach. It  represents a logic of catastrophe. In contrast to risk management  framed in line with logical probability theory, the logic of catastro- phe does not attempt to provide means of absorbing uncertainty.  Rather, it takes uncertainty as constitutive for the logic itself; **uncertainty is a** crucial **precondition for catastrophies.** In particular, cata-  strophes happen at once, **without a warning**, but with major impli-  cations for the world polity. In this category, **we find** the impact of  **meteorites.** Mars attacks, the **tsunami in South East Asia, and 9/11.**  To conceive of terrorism as catastrophe has consequences for the  formulation of an adequate security policy. Since catastrophes hap-  pen irrespectively of human activity or inactivity, no political action  could possibly prevent them. Of course, there are precautions that  can be taken, but the framing of terrorist attack as a catastrophe  points to spatial and temporal characteristics that are beyond "ratio-  nality." Thus, political decision makers are exempted from the  responsibility to provide security—as long as they at least try to pre-  empt an attack. Interestingly enough, 9/11 was framed as catastro-  phe in various commissions dealing with the question of who was  responsible and whether it could have been prevented.  This makes clear that under the condition of uncertainty, there  are no objective criteria that could serve as an anchor for measur-  ing dangers and assessing the quality of political responses. For ex-  ample, as much as one might object to certain measures by the US  administration, it is almost impossible to "measure" the success of  countermeasures. Of course, there might be a subjective assessment  of specific shortcomings or failures, but there is no "common" cur-  rency to evaluate them. As a consequence, the framework of the  security dilemma fails to capture the basic uncertainties.  Pushing the door open for the security paradox, the main prob-  lem of security analysis then becomes the question how to integrate  dangers in risk assessments and security policies about which simply  nothing is known. In the mid 1990s, a Rand study entitled "New  Challenges for Defense Planning" addressed this issue arguing that  "most striking is the fact that **we do not** even **know** who or what will  constitute **the most serious future threat,** "^i In order to cope with  this challenge it would be essential, another Rand researcher wrote,  to break free from the "tyranny" of plausible scenario planning. The  decisive step would be to create "discontinuous scenarios ... in  which there is no plausible audit trail or storyline from current  events"52 These nonstandard scenarios were later called "wild cards"  and became important in the current US strategic discourse. They  justified the transformation from a threat-based toward a capability-  based defense planning strategy.53  The problem with this kind of risk assessment is, however, that  **even** the most **absurd scenarios** can **gain plausibility. By** construct-  ing **a chain** of potentialities**, improbable events are linked** and brought into the realm of the possible, if not even the probable.  **"Although** the **likelihood of the scenario dwindles with each step,  the** residual **impression is** one of **plausibility**. "54 This so-called Oth-  ello effect has been effective in the dawn ofthe recent war in Iraq**.**   **The connection between Saddam** Hussein **and Al Qaeda** that the  US government tried to prove was disputed from the very begin-  ning. False evidence **was** again and again **presented and refuted,  but this did not prevent** the administration from presenting as the  main rationale for war **the improbable yet possible connection**between Iraq and the terrorist network and the improbable yet  possible proliferation of an improbable yet possible nuclear  weapon into the hands of Bin Laden. As Donald **Rumsfeld**  famously **said: "Absence of evidence is not evidence of absence."**  This sentence indicates that under the condition of genuine uncer-  tainty, different evidence criteria prevail than in situations where  security problems can be assessed with relative certainty.

#### The alternative is to reject the apocalyptic frames of the 1AC

Goodnight 2010 (G. Thomas Goodnight is Professor and Director of Doctoral Studies at the Annenberg School for Communication, the University of Southern California in Los Angeles; "The Metapolitics of the 2002 Iraq Debate: Public Policy and the Network Imaginary", Rhetoric & Public Affairs Volume 13, Number 1, Spring 2010)

**Opponents of the Democratic Party argued the risks of war, but their pragmatic policy challenges did not grab sufficient traction to slow the unreeling web of justification**. Of course, **there was little denial that the war would create more terrorists**, generate a lower threshold for intervention, receive weak international support, **and in the end leave the dangerous business of Afghanistan unfinished**. But the Democrats became entangled in reflexive posturing about the effects of the debate itself—the importance of "message sending" to the United Nations and "consensus" backing for the president as negotiator-in-chief. **With 9/11 not far behind, "tough" messages appeared to provide a much desired supplement to boost confidence, while pragmatism, caution, and planning took a back seat.** **Presidential hopefuls cut loose from this morass and took advantage of Republican-offered political cover. Republicans did appear to benefit from tough war rhetoric in the immediate election aftermath, enabling Bush to run successfully in 2004 as a wartime president.** As WMD continued not to turn up, the intervention dragged on, costs mounted, political fortunes reversed—although the entanglements remained and remain. [End Page 87] The debate of 2002 found that a systematic presidential campaign—when bolstered by cherry-picked evidence—can be particularly powerful, especially when administration supporters in Congress veer shamelessly from long-held positions on policy and the leadership of the opposing party takes shelter in offered political cover. Further, **the debate illustrates how the events that should prompt policy debate become colonized, in this case making common sense difficult to muster because the network imaginary laces a web of associative fears with compensatory toughness.** On the whole, the debates were not the nation's finest hour. The debate of 2002 strove to convert a traumatic national event into a conservative-articulated, Republican-captured, presidentially initiated rise in power, and ended by setting the stage for congressional investigation, the rise of the Democrats, reassertion of congressional power, and a new presidency committed to public diplomacy. WMD were at the heart of the six-year-long controversy. **It was hardly remembered that [WMD] weapons of mass destruction were not deployed by terrorists on September 11th. Rather, fast, anonymous, networked, modern systems of circulation were turned, through ingenuity, into first-strike weapons.** Seen with fresh militancy, 9/11 suggests that the modern world remains vulnerable to mutating events that change, shock, and command attention, actions that attain expanding scope and influence by virtue of a network imaginary, where such moments self-organize and multiply in varied directions. **The development of policy studies as rhetoric, then, calls attention to the disruptive events as these become situated in the restricted focus of national debate and recovered, through critique, as an unfinished metapolitics, which demands rethinking of the taken-for-granted grounds and alliances upon which post-event consensus became fabricated.** In its time, the "War on Terror" was framed as a "clash of civilizations" and a new Munich. In retrospect, 9/11 should be understood as signaling a much closer, changing, entangled, future world where the complications of security spread and interlock to haunt twenty-first-century network imaginaries.

### Warfighting DA

#### Obama’s Syria maneuver has maximized presidential war powers because it’s on his terms

Posner 9/3

(Eric, Law Prof at University of Chicago, Obama Is Only Making His War Powers Mightier, www.slate.com/articles/news\_and\_politics/view\_from\_chicago/2013/09/obama\_going\_to\_congress\_on\_syria\_he\_s\_actually\_strengthening\_the\_war\_powers.html)

President **Obama’s** surprise **announcement that he will ask Congress for approval of a military attack on Syria is being hailed as a vindication of the rule of law and a revival of the central role of Congress in war-making**, even by critics. **But all of this is wrong. Far from breaking new legal ground, President Obama has reaffirmed the primacy of the executive in matters of war and peace. The war powers of the presidency remain as mighty as ever**. It would have been different if the president had announced that only Congress can authorize the use of military force, as dictated by the Constitution, which gives Congress alone the power to declare war. That would have been worthy of notice, a reversal of the ascendance of executive power over Congress. But the president said no such thing. He said: “I believe I have the authority to carry out this military action without specific congressional authorization.” Secretary of State John Kerry confirmed that the president “has the right to do that”—launch a military strike—“no matter what Congress does.” Thus, **the president believes that the law gives him the option to seek a congressional yes or to act on his own. He does not believe that he is bound to do the first. He has merely stated the law as countless other presidents and their lawyers have described it before him**. The president’s announcement should be understood as a political move, not a legal one. His motive is both self-serving and easy to understand, and it has been all but acknowledged by the administration. If Congress now approves the war, it must share blame with the president if what happens next in Syria goes badly. If Congress rejects the war, it must share blame with the president if Bashar al-Assad gases more Syrian children. The big problem for Obama arises if Congress says no and he decides he must go ahead anyway, and then the war goes badly. He won’t have broken the law as he understands it, but he will look bad. He would be the first president ever to ask Congress for the power to make war and then to go to war after Congress said no. (In the past, presidents who expected dissent did not ask Congress for permission.) **People who celebrate the president for humbly begging Congress for approval** also apparently **don’t realize that his understanding of the law—that it gives him the option to go to Congress**—**maximizes executive power vis-à-vis Congress**. If the president were required to act alone, without Congress, then he would have to take the blame for failing to use force when he should and using force when he shouldn’t. **If he were required to obtain congressional authorization, then Congress would be able to block him. But if he can have it either way, he can force Congress to share responsibility when he wants to and avoid it when he knows that it will stand in his way.**

#### The plan destroys causes countries to doubt the credibility of our threats – collapses security guarantees and deterrence – causes nuclear war

Zeisberg 4

(MARIAH ZEISBERG, Research Fellow, The Political Theory Project, Department of Political Science, "INTERBRANCH CONFLICT AND CONSTITUTIONAL MAINTENANCE: THE CASE OF WAR POWERS" SEPTEMBER 22, 2004, KB)

The first significant argument of pro-Presidency insularists is that flexibility is a prime value in the conduct of foreign affairs, and especially war. Implicit in this argument is the recognition that the executive is functionally superior to Congress in achieving flexibility and swiftness in war operations, a recognition I share. The Constitution cannot be meant to curtail the very flexibility that may be necessary to preserve the nation; and yet, according to the insularists, any general norm which would include Congress in decision-making about going to war could only undermine that flexibility. Writing on the War Powers Act, Eugene Rostow predicts that it would, “put the Presidency in a straightjacket of a rigid code, and prevent new categories of action from emerging, in response to the necessities of a tense and unstable world.” In fact, Rostow believes, “[t]he centralization of authority in the president is particularly crucial in matters of national defense, war, and foreign policy, where a unitary executive can evaluate threats, consider policy choices, and mobilize national resources with a speed and energy that is far superior to any other branch.” Pro-presidency insularists are fond of quoting Hamilton, who argued that “[o]f all the cares or concerns of government, the direction of war most peculiarly demands those qualities which distinguish the exercise of power by a single hand.” ¶ This need for flexibility, some insularists argue, is especially acute given modern conditions, where devastating wars can develop quickly. Today, “many foreign states have the power to attack U.S. forces - and some even the U.S. mainland - almost instantly,” and in such a world it is impracticable to require the President to seek advance authorization for hostilities. Such a requirement would simply be too risky to U.S. security. We furthermore face a nuclear age, and the system of deterrence that operates to contain that threat requires that a single person be capable of responding to nuclear attack with nuclear weapons immediately. Rostow writes, “the requirement for advance authorization would collapse the system of deterrence, making preemptive strikes by our enemies more likely.” Hence, “modern conditions” require the President to “act quickly, and often alone.” ¶ While this does not mean that Congress has no role to play in moments of crisis, it does mean that Congress should understand its role largely in terms of cooperating with the President to support his negotiations and decisions regarding relationships with foreign powers. Rostow writes,¶ “Congress should be able to act effectively both before and after moments of crisis or potential crisis. It may join the President in seeking to deter crisis by publicly defining national policy in advance, through the sanctioning of treaties or other legislative declarations. Equally, Congress may participate formally in policymaking after the event through legislative authorization of sustained combat, either by means of a declaration of war, or through legislative action having more limited legal and political consequences. Either of these devices, or both in combination, should be available in situations where cooperation between the two branches is indicated at many points along an arc ranging from pure diplomacy at one end to a declaration of war at the other.” ¶ In other words, for Congress to understand itself as having any justifiable role in challenging executive security determinations, especially at moments of crisis, would be to undermine the strength that the executive requires in order to protect the nation. Conflict in this domain represents political degradation.¶ Flexibility is also a key value to support the stability of the global security order, some pro-Presidency insularists argue. International security systems require guarantees that an attack on an ally will be retaliated as quickly as possible. Given such a system, the requirement of congressional consultation “vitiates the security guarantee.” It is important to note that the US does not simply play a role in international collective security systems: it is a central player in those systems, and hence “it is necessary for the system that U.S. participation be assured and credible. But this means that in order to support collective security, the fundamental function for Congress is to support the executive in ways that send a clear message of national resolve, so unequivocal and unmistakable that international pillagers and those who advise them can have no doubts.” ¶ This value of flexibility is sometimes applied to the mechanisms for foreign policy themselves. John Yoo, for example, argues that there must be a diversity of mechanisms for going to war, including unilateral action by the President. On Yoo’s account, Congress is granted authority in foreign affairs in times of peace, the President for times of danger. Yoo interprets the understructured nature of war powers to indicate that “the Framers did not intend the Constitution to establish a single, correct method for going to war. . . [d]uring times of relative peace, Congress can use its authority over funding and the raising of the military to play a leading role in foreign policy. In times of emergency or national danger, however, the President can seize the initiative in warmaking.” ¶ A second insularist argument is that the “nature of foreign affairs” is such that this domain cannot be guided by law. Jefferson’s oft-cited quote, that “[t]he transaction of business with foreign nations is Executive altogether,” is sometimes used in support of this argument, although I do not believe Jefferson understood himself to be making this point. Robert Bork is instead the most prominent insularist arguing this position. Far from believing that the President’s use of force can be bound by law, Bork denies that law governing foreign affairs—whether domestic or international—even exists. In Bork’s own words,¶ “[T]here are areas of life, and the international use of armed force seems to be one of them, in which the entire notion of law—law conceived as a body of legal principles declared in advance to control decisions to be made in the future—where that conception of law is out of place. The pretense that there is such a law and that it has been constantly violated, has debilitating effects upon our foreign policy . . . [t]wo examples come to mind: one is international law about the use of force, and the other is domestic law, that is, the War Powers Act. These two bodies of ‘law’ arise from different sources, but they are alike in that they are not law in any recognizable sense. They are not enforceable.” ¶ Since law in this domain simply cannot exist, the idea of a legislative body playing any role in guiding decisions here is simply senseless. Bork points us to the simple fact of the matter—that “Presidential use or support of force abroad will succeed when the public approves and fail when it disapproves. Law has little to do with the outcome.” ¶ The third important argument on behalf of insularity is that Congress already possesses all the power it needs to contain a wayward executive. This power is wielded mainly through Congress’ “power of the purse,” but also through Congress’ power to raise the military and commission (or de-commission) troops. It is in the course of approving Presidential requests for funding measures that Congress discusses the merits of his actions, and Congress retains the simple power to block the president’s actions simply by refusing him funds or military resources. Yoo argues,¶ “One might respond that it is unreasonable to expect Congress to use its appropriations powers to cut off troops in the field. Surely members of Congress will not take actions that might be interpreted as undermining the safety and effectiveness of the military, once committed and in the midst of hostilities. We should not mistake a failure of political will, however, for a violation of the Constitution. Congress undoubtedly possessed the power to end the Kosovo war, it simply chose not to. Affirmatively providing funding for a war, or at the very least refusing to cut off previous appropriations, represents a political determination by Congress that it will provide minimal support for a war, but that ultimately it will leave it to the President to receive the credit either for success or failure.” ¶ Furthermore, it is simply a fact that the President relies upon Congress to wage the wars he wishes to pursue. As Bobbit points out, unless Congress “by statute, provides an army, transport, weapons, and materials . . . there is nothing for the President to command.” Bobbit insists, though, that this does not mean that Congress can appropriately “interfere in the operation of that power” once handed over. Just as Congress, once it has established and vested the judiciary, has no authority to interfere in the operation of the judicial power, so too Congress, once it vests the President with command of a military, has no authority to interfere in how that command is used. Hence Bobbit believes that the only constitutionally legitimate way for Congress to engage in decisionmaking on the use of the sovereign war power is to remove forces from the command of the President. Bobbit continues, “[a]s a structural matter, Congress has the first and last word. It must provide forces before the President can commence hostilities, and it can remove those forces, by decommissioning them or by forbidding their use in pursuit of a particular policy at any time.” Bobbit is quite explicit about the implications of his position:¶ “Does this mean that presidents can simply ransack the current Defense Appropriations Act for available forces and that Congress then has no way to stop a president from unilaterally making war so long as one-third plus one of the members of one House sustains his veto - for the balance of the biennium? It may well mean that.” ¶ The fourth argument is that the kind of challenging characteristic of interbranch deliberation would endanger the well-being of troops in the field, as foreign nations interpret Congressional challenging to mean that we lack the will to support our soldiers. This argument is not about the comparative advantages of the presidency as an institution, or about the meaning of law: rather, it directly challenges the value of conflict itself. In fact, as we saw in chapter two, settlement theorists and realists seem to believe that the conditions of war and insecurity are the most congenial territory for their claims about the importance of deference and settlement, precisely because peace, stability, and the very possibility of rights-protection are all at stake in this issue. Rostow cites Dean Acheson’s comments on the Korean War:¶ “An incredulous country and world held its breath and read the mounting casualties suffered by these gallant troops, most of them without combat experience. In the confusion of the retreat even their divisional commander, Major General William F. Dean, was captured. Congressional hearings on a resolution of approval at such a time, opening the possibility of endless criticism, would hardly be calculated to support the shaken morale of the troops or the unity that, for the moment, prevailed at home. The harm it could do seemed to me to outweigh the little good that might ultimately accrue.”

### CMR DA

#### U.S. civil-military relations are on the brink; new restrictions that go against military opinion will collapse CMR

Zenko **9/29**/13

[Micah, Sr. Fellow @ Council on Foreign Relations, <http://www.journalgazette.net/article/20130929/EDIT05/309299977/1147/EDIT07>, mg]

**Washington has found itself in a** crisis **over the proper relationship between** senior **civilian and military** officials. It’s a tension that shows little sign of abating, regardless of how the Syria issue plays out: Underlying forces seem guaranteed to make it worse. Every administration has its share of disputes with the Pentagon, but when it comes to where and how U.S. armed forces will be used, civil-military relations **have not been this** tense and precarious **since the** end of the Cold War. **Military officers are increasingly willing to express their personal opinions about interventions, while** civilian policymakers **are increasingly willing to** disregard **professional** military advice. Worse, a growing number of individuals from both “sides” seem unaware of the appropriate civilian and military roles and relationships, and their conflicts play out in public more prominently and immediately than ever before.

#### Congressional cause military backlash

Durden 11

[Tyler, sw, Zero Hedge, <http://www.zerohedge.com/article/pentagon-warns-mad-should-war-powers-act-be-enacted-and-us-withdraw-its-troops-libya>, June 6, mg]

Who says Mutual Assured Destruction is to be used only by bankers: our military leaders appear to have mastered the strategy of getting what they want to warning about all hell breaking loose, just as effectively. Reuters reports that should Congress pursue a resolution to withdraw from the humanitarian Libyian oil liberation force, currently headed by Sarkozy, it would send¶ an "unhelpful message of disunity" to allies and foes alike. "Pentagon Press Secretary Geoff Morrell said that "once military forces are committed, such actions by Congress can have significant consequences," particularly on relations with members of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization. "It sends an unhelpful message of disunity and uncertainty to our troops, our allies and, most importantly, the Gaddafi regime," Morrell said in a statement in Singapore, where Defense Secretary Robert Gates arrived on Thursday to attend a security dialogue with Asian allies...Kucinich's measure would invoke the 1973 War Powers¶ Resolution to direct Obama to stop the U.S. participation in the¶ war. Kucinich says Obama violated the part of the law that¶ prohibits U.S. armed forces from being involved in military¶ actions for more than 60 days without congressional¶ authorization." Kucinich seems to forget that reminding a constitutional lawyer about constitutional abuses is actually racist. And more importantly, what excuse will those hundreds of billions in "defense spending" by the US government have if America's military is relegated to "bankster" status in terms of utility. ¶ More:¶ The Pentagon reaction came after the Republican-led House on Wednesday delayed a vote on the resolution, sponsored by Democrat Dennis Kucinich, so lawmakers would have more time to weigh their options on the Libya conflict.¶ NATO is leading the intervention in Libya with a U.S. contribution but there are no U.S. troops on the ground there. ¶ The operation aims to enforce a U.N. Security Council resolution authorizing the protection of Libyan civilians from attacks by Gaddafi's forces, which are fighting rebels trying to oust the long-time leader.¶ The U.S. role has been controversial in Congress since Obama notified lawmakers on March 21 that he had ordered the intervention as part of a multinational coalition conducting air strikes to shield civilians.¶ Kucinich's measure would invoke the 1973 War Powers Resolution to direct Obama to stop the U.S. participation in the war. Kucinich says Obama violated the part of the law that prohibits U.S. armed forces from being involved in military actions for more than 60 days without congressional authorization.

#### Nuclear war

Cohen ’00 (Eliot A.-, Prof. @ Paul H. Nitze School of Advanced International Studies & director of the Strategic Studies department @ Johns Hopkins, worked for Dod, taught at the U.S. Naval War College, Fall, National Interest, “Why the Gap Matters - gap between military and civilian world”, http://www.24hourscholar.com/p/articles/mi\_m2751/is\_2000\_Fall/ai\_65576871/pg\_4?pi=scl //AGupta)

At the same time, the military exercises control, to a remarkable degree, of force structure and weapons acquisition. To be sure, Congress adds or trims requests at the margin, and periodically the administration will cancel a large program, such as the navy's projected replacement of the A-6 bomber. But by and large, the services have successfully protected programs that reflect ways of doing business going back for decades. One cannot explain otherwise current plans for large purchases of short-range fighter aircraft for the air force, supercarriers and traditional surface warships for the navy, and heavy artillery pieces for the army. Civilian control has meant, in practice, a general oversight of acquisition and some degree of control by veto of purchases, but nothing on the scale of earlier decisions to, for example, terminate the draft, re-deploy fleets, or develop counterinsurgency forces. The result is a force that looks very much like a shrunken version of the Cold War military of fifteen years ago- -which, indeed, was the initial post-Cold War design known as the "base force." The strength of the military voice and the weakness of civilian control, together with sheer inertia, has meant that the United States has failed to reevaluate its strategy and force structure after the Cold War. Despite a plethora of "bottom-up reviews" by official and semiofficial commissions, the force structure remains that of the Cold War, upgraded a bit and reduced in size by 40 percent. So What? WHAT WILL be the long-term consequences of these trends? To some extent, they have become visible already: the growing politicization of the officer corps; a submerged but real recruitment and retention crisis; a collapse of junior officers' confidence in their own leaders; [7] the odd antipathy between military and civilian cultures even as the two, in some respects, increasingly overlap; deadlock in the conduct of active military operations; and stagnation in the development of military forces for a geopolitical era radically different from the past one. To be sure, such phenomena have their precedents in American history. But such dysfunction occurred in a different context--one in which the American military did not have the task of maintaining global peace or a predominance of power across continents, and in which the armed forces consumed barely noticeable fractions of economic resources and decisionmakers' time. Today, the stakes are infinitely larger. For the moment, the United States dominates the globe militarily, as it does economically and culturally. It is doubtful that such predominance will long go unchallenged; were that to be the case it would reflect a change in the human condition that goes beyond all human experience of international politics over the millennia. Already, some of the signs of those challenges have begun to appear: increased tension with the rising power of China, including threats of force from that country against the United States and its allies; the development of modes of warfare--from terrorism through the spread of weapons of mass destruction--designed to play on American weaknesses; the appearance of problems (peacemaking, broadly defined) that will resist conventional solutions. None of these poses a mortal threat to the Republic, or is likely to do so anytime soon. Yet cumulatively, the consequences have been unfortunate enough; the inept conclusion to the Gulf War, the Somalia fiasco, and dithering over American policy in Yugoslavia may all partially be attributed to the poor state of American civil-military relations. So too may the subtle erosion of morale in the American military and the defense reform deadlock, which has preserved, to far too great a degree, outdated structures and mentalities. For now, to be sure, the United States is wealthy and powerful enough to afford such pratfalls and inefficiencies. But the full consequences will not be felt for some years, and not until a major military crisis--a challenge as severe in its way as the Korean or Vietnam War--arises. Such an eventuality; difficult as it may be to imagine today, could occur in any of a number of venues: in a conflict with China over Taiwan, in a desperate attempt to shore up collapsing states in Central or South America, or in a renewed outbreak of violence--this time with weapons of mass destruction thrown into the mix-in Southwest Asia. THE PARADOX of increased social and institutional vulnerability on the one hand and increased military influence on narrow sectors of policymaking on the other is the essence of the contemporary civil-military problem. Its roots lie not in the machinations of power hungry generals; they have had influence thrust upon them. Nor do they lie in the fecklessness of civilian leaders determined to remake the military in the image of civil society; all militaries must, in greater or lesser degree, share some of the mores and attitudes of the broader civilization from which they have emerged. The problem reflects, rather, deeper and more enduring changes in politics, society and technology.

### Appellate CP

#### An appropriate appellate court should submit a writ of certification to the Supreme Court of the United States asking to clarify Presidential authority to introduce armed forces into hostilities. The Supreme Court should rule that the President of the United States is precluded from participating in military conflict with the Islamic Republic of Iran that is initiated by the United States or others.

#### CP solves

O’Brien ‘11

(David M. Orsquo;Brien is Leone Reaves and George W. Spicer Professor of Government and Foreign Affairs at the University of Virginia. He is the author of several books, including Constitutional Law and Politics and Storm Center: The Supreme Court in American Politics , winner of the American Bar Associationrsquo;s Silver Gavel Award and now in its widely adopted Seventh Edition.¶ *Storm Center: The Supreme Court in American Politics* W W Norton & Company Incorporated, 2011, TSW)

Although most cases now come as certiorari petitions, Congress provides that appellate courts may also submit a writ of certification to the Court, requesting the justices to clarify or "make¶ more certain" a point of federal law. The Court receives only¶ a handful of such cases each term. Congress also gave the Court¶ the power to issue certain extraordinary writs, or orders. In a¶ few cases, the Court may issue writs of mandamus and prohibition, ordering lower courts or public officials either to do some-¶ thing or to refrain from some action. In addition, the Court has¶ die power to grant writs of habeas corpus (“produce the body"),¶ enabling it to review cases by prisoners who claim that their constitutional rights have been violated and that they are unlawfully¶ imprisoned.

#### Court can effectively reign in the president – Bush era proves

Johnsen ‘12

(Dawn Elizabeth Johnsen is an American lawyer and professor of Constitutional law, who is currently on the faculty at Maurer School of Law at Indiana University in Bloomington, Indiana. “SYMPOSIUM: "THE ESSENCE OF A FREE SOCIETY": THE EXECUTIVE POWERS LEGACY OF JUSTICE STEVENS AND THE FUTURE OF FOREIGN AFFAIRS DEFERENCE” Northwestern University Law Review¶ Spring, 2012¶ Northwestern University Law Review¶ 106 Nw. U.L. Rev. 467 Lexis, TSW)

Conclusion¶ ¶ Viewed together and in context, the Supreme Court's 9/11 detainee rulings, with Justice Stevens playing the leading role, effected substantial changes in national counterterrorism policies. Although not the direct subject of any of its cases, ending the unlawful practices of waterboarding and other methods of torture was surely among the most significant direct changes wrought by the Court. More fundamentally, the Court helped restore the rule of law and the constitutional balance of powers. The rulings are best understood in the context of an Administration that, following [\*525] brutal attacks on America, sought unprecedented expansions of executive power, discretion, secrecy, and deference. The Court forced the Bush Administration to abandon its go-it-alone stance and instead to respect traditional checks on executive power: from the Court, from Congress, from within the Executive Branch, and - with greater transparency - from the American people. It is important to recall that the course of litigation and public response depended in part upon leaked documents, a contingency upon which the rule of law and constitutional balance should not depend. In time, the cases may well be remembered not primarily as post-9/11 cases concerning the Executive's authority over suspected terrorists, but as part of a select line of landmark cases that secures the deep and lasting structure of our constitutional commitment to democracy, separation of powers, and the rule of law, even in the face of daunting challenges. Justice Stevens, more than any other Justice, ensured the Court's continued commitment to these principles and earned posterity's recognition for a job well done.

### Strikes Advantage

#### No strikes now - most recent evidence

Mousavian 9-18

(Hossein, The Guardian, 9-18-13, “US-Iran talks are an opportunity for reconciliation that must not be wasted,” Lexis, accessed 10-4-13, BS)

The recent exchange of letters between Iranian and American presidents, coupled with positive statements from two capitals have created hopes for a possible breakthrough in Iran-US relations. Iran is ready to "build trust" with the United States, Iran's foreign minister, Javad Zarif, stated and White House spokeswoman Bernadette Meehan said: "We remain ready to engage with the Rouhani government on the basis of mutual respect to achieve a peaceful resolution to the nuclear issue." While these signals are encouraging, there are reasons to be both optimistic and pessimistic. Before Hasan Rouhani's election as president this summer, the Iranian supreme leader, Ayatollah Ali Khamenei, had already given his blessing for the possibility of direct talks with US. That remains valid for the new administration. Zarif has recently recognised the Holocaust as a historical fact and condemned the killing of Jews by Nazis, while Rouhani appears to have sent out a message of congratulations to the Jewish people for Rosh Hashanah. Those familiar with Iran-US relations understand that with President Obama, the secretary of state, John Kerry, and secretary of defence, Chuck Hagel, in office in Washington, and Rouhani, Zarif and Ali Shamkhani, secretary of the supreme national security council of Iran, in Tehran, there is no better opportunity to bring an end to decades of hostilities between Washington and Tehran. At the same time there is room for doubt. While Iran played a constructive role in convincing the Syrian president, Bashar al-Assad, to join the chemical weapons convention, Obama has nevertheless threatened it with military strikes. "They shouldn't draw a lesson that we haven't struck, to think we won't strike Iran," he said. While Iran and the US both consider the use of chemical weapons a crime, Iran has been a victim of these weapons, while the US has deployed them and turned a blind eye to their use. Given this, it would be prudent for Obama, instead of threatening Iran, to apologise for the backing it gave to Saddam Hussein's use of chemical weapons against Iran during the war (1980-88) when 100,000 Iranians were killed or injured by them. That said, Iran believes broader negotiations can achieve a deal - if the parties come to the table with good intentions. "Rouhani's election and his appointments to the nuclear diplomatic team have created a like-minded group that would facilitate the resolution of the dispute if the other side was willing to do so," Ali Akbar Salehi, a MIT PhD graduate and the Iranian atomic energy chief, said.

#### Strikes don’t escalate

1. Government chaos

2. Military = weak and disorganized

3. Economy is destroyed

4. Irans proxy not eager to attack Israel

5. US less vulnerable with Iraq withdrawal

6. Iran’s only ally, Assad is busy with a civil war

Michael Hirsh is chief correspondent for National Journal and former editor/ diplomatic correspondent for Newsweek, 2/12/12, http://www.theatlantic.com/international/archive/2012/02/why-israel-might-believe-attacking-iran-is-worthwhile/252921/, “Why Israel Might Believe Attacking Iran Is Worthwhile”; we reject the use of ableist language in this evidence - hhs-ab

**Western powers had thought that a preemptive strike on** oil-rich **Iran could have** devastating **implications** for the region and the world. It could undermine the global economy (especially at a time of high oil prices) and peace in the Middle East. It could rain rocket fire on Israeli towns and possibly shift global power balances. **But now, some American and Israeli experts--both inside and outside their governments--argue that Iran is less likely to retaliate in a serious way. An attack**, in other words, may **have fewer drawbacks than the skeptics first thought.**  Partly, **this has to do with Iran's internal problems**. **Its government is mired in chaos and infighting, its military is weak and disorganized, and its economy is [devestated] crippled**. **Iran's** main **proxies**, Hezbollah and Hamas, **are not eager to attack Israel, and the United States is less vulnerable in Iraq now that its military has withdrawn.** **Tehran's** lone **ally** in the region, Syria's Bashar al-**Assad, is fighting a civil war**. Iran "basically only has three asymmetric options for retaliation," says Matthew Kroenig, who recently published a controversial essay in Foreign Affairs urging **a U.S. attack on Iran as "the least bad option."**

#### Err Neg – their authors exaggerate

Luttwak 7

Edward, Senior Associate – Center for Strategic and International Studies, “The Middle of Nowhere”, Prospect Magazine, May, <http://www.prospect-magazine.co.uk/article_details.php?id=9302>)

Why are middle east experts so unfailingly wrong**?** The lesson of history is that men never learn from history, but middle east experts, like the rest of us, should at least learn from their past mistakes. Instead, they just keep repeating them. The first mistake is "five minutes to midnight" catastrophism. The late King Hussein of Jordan was the undisputed master of this genre. Wearing his gravest aspect, he would warn us that with patience finally exhausted the Arab-Israeli conflict was about to explode, that all past conflicts would be dwarfed by what was about to happen unless, unless… And then came the remedy—usually something rather tame when compared with the immense catastrophe predicted, such as resuming this or that stalled negotiation, or getting an American envoy to the scene to make the usual promises to the Palestinians and apply the usual pressures on Israel. We read versions of the standard King Hussein speech in countless newspaper columns, hear identical invocations in the grindingly repetitive radio and television appearances of the usual middle east experts, and are now faced with Hussein's son Abdullah periodically repeating his father's speech almost verbatim. What actually happens at each of these "moments of truth"—and we may be approaching another one—is nothing much; only the same old cyclical conflict which alwaysrestarts when peace is about to break out, and always dampens down when the violence becomes intense enough. The ease of filming and reporting out of safe and comfortable Israeli hotels inflates the media coverage of every minor affray. But humanitarians should note that the dead from Jewish-Palestinian fighting since 1921 amount to fewer than 100,000—about as many as are killed in a season of conflict in Darfur.

#### No Israel/Iran war -- not in Israel’s interest

Dreyfuss 12 (Robert Dreyfuss is an independent, investigative journalist writing an article for the Diplomat, August 22, 2012, “Why Israel Won’t Attack Iran”, <http://thediplomat.com/2012/08/22/why-israel-wont-attack-iran/?all=true>, AB)

What kind of coercion is it when the guy with the gun says: “Do this or I’ll shoot myself in the head?” Not much at all, unless you believe that Israel is hell bent on inflicting great pain on itself, as Seymour Hersh implied back in 1991, in The Samson Option: Israel’s Nuclear Arsenal and American Foreign Policy. Despite the fact that Prime Minister Benjamin Netanyahu, Defense Minister Ehud Barak, and a panoply of American backers of Israel have ratcheted up their much-hyped threat to bomb Iran, doing so would explode in Israel’s face. Which is why it won’t happen. How so? For starters, by attacking Iran – even in the midst of a U.S. election campaign – Israel would run the risk of angering and alienating Washington, its main patron, in a manner likely to forever change the U.S.-Israeli relationship for the worse.

#### Newest developments prove no war -- relations increasing now

Mathews 13 (Owen Matthews, contributing editor, June 22nd 2013, “China: the Middle East’s new power broker”, http://www.spectator.co.uk/features/8940201/china-the-middle-easts-new-power-broker/, AB)

It’s exactly ten years since Iranian dissidents first blew the cover of a secret uranium-enrichment facility under a mountain at Natanz, in a bleak stretch of desert near Isfahan. Ever since, relations between Israel and Iran have headed inexorably towards war. Israeli leaders have insisted that they are ready to launch a military strike — unilaterally if necessary — against Iran if the uranium enrichment continues. Iranian leaders, liberals and hardliners alike, have been equally adamant that the centrifuges will continue to spin. For Israeli hawks like prime minister Benjamin Netanyahu, the question has been not whether to strike Iran, but when.But in the past few weeks, the diplomatic geometry has shifted — and for the first time in a decade there are signs that the spiral towards conflict could be broken. Iran’s new president, Hassan Rouhani, has announced that he wishes to re-establish diplomatic relations with the United States. But perhaps equally importantly, China has quietly emerged as the new behind-the-scenes dealmaker in the Middle East. As the US comes closer to energy self-sufficiency and reduces its military presence in the Middle East, China is beginning to realise that its own energy security — and economic security — depends on maintaining peace in the region. After years of trying to stay out of Arab-Israeli politics, in May -Beijing invited Netanyahu and Mahmoud Abbas for talks on the Palestinian peace process. Another ultra-discreet meeting took place earlier this month at Green Templeton College in Oxford. Chinese and Israeli generals met to talk about establishing a back-channel dialogue directly between Israel, the US and Iran — with China as the honest broker.China’s interest in averting war is clear: it imports 12 per cent of its oil from Iran, and over half from the Persian Gulf. ‘To sustain its prosperity China must foster stability,’ Lord Mandelson told the delegates at the Oxford meeting. ‘China can less and less afford to sit on sidelines as conflicts worsen. China has too much at stake to continue to sit out every conflict and leave it to everyone else to deal with.’ Hitherto China, like Russia, has insisted on the principle of non-intervention in internal conflicts. It has opposed western military interventions from Yugoslavia to Iraq to Syria. ‘But the nature of the issues now facing China means it no longer has the luxury of standing by,’ said Mandelson. ‘Let us not say intervene, let us say engage. This is not interference — this is the exercise of responsibility.’ The bottom line is that the Chinese are in a unique position to break the deadlock on talks with Iran. Sanctions have undoubtedly hurt Tehran, but failed to weaken its resolve to enrich uranium. The problem is, in part, that the US and Britain are fatefully tainted in Iranian eyes by a history of meddling in Persian politics — capitulation to the Great and Little Satans would be electoral suicide. China, on the other hand, could play several vital roles. First, its status as Iran’s biggest foreign investor and trading partner puts it in a position to offer significant rewards for good behaviour — and restoring Iran’s sanctions-devastated economy is one of President Rouhani’s top priorities. Secondly, China can offer security guarantees to reassure Iran that it doesn’t necessarily need a nuclear bomb. Perhaps, Professor Sir John Hanson, an old Iran hand and former warden of Green College, suggested to the meeting, China could propose ‘a regional security organisation that does not include western powers’ — maybe within the framework of the China-led Shanghai Co-operation Organisation, which currently includes Russia and Central Asia with Iran as an official observer. Thirdly, and perhaps most importantly, China’s role as a middleman could let Iran back down without losing face — a concept central to both Chinese and Iranian cultures — or being seen to surrender to western powers. In the words of one member of the Chinese delegation, ‘If you surround an enemy from all sides, he has no choice but to fight — he has nowhere to escape to.’ Crucially, the Green Templeton meeting ended with an agreement to reconvene at a more private location with both Iranian and US representatives present.

### Proxy Wars Advantage

#### SANCTIONS are driving uncertainty of the Rouhani regime and proxy wars – their 1AC evidence

Pesaran, 9/17 (Hashem Pesaran is the John Elliot Distinguished Chair in Economics at the University of Southern California. Iran sanctions: now is the time to negotiate. <http://www.theguardian.com/world/2013/sep/17/world-powers-negotiate-nuclear-iran>)

It is well documented that economic sanctions on their own have not generally been effective in achieving their political aims, particularly when they are imposed against non-democratic regimes. Sanctions have their greatest impact in the short term, as their effects tend to be mitigated in the longer term by structural economic and political adjustments. Overall, effective sanctions have been short-lived, whilst ineffective ones have lasted a long time. In the case of Iran, sanctions started by the US over 30 years ago, initially targeting the oil industry, have now become much more sweeping, with other Western countries joining in. As sanctions have increased in scope and duration, inevitably they have also become more indiscriminate in their incidence and effects, with low-income households and vulnerable social groups in Iran suffering the most. Sanctions have been effective in weakening the Iranian economy, without as yet delivering any of their intended foreign policy goals. This can be largely explained in terms of the internal dynamics of how the different groups in Iran and the west react to the sanctions. Within Iran, sanctions radicalise the extreme groups further and, by distorting the functioning of the markets, encourage economic manipulations that largely benefit those radical groups that are close to the regime. Such groups oppose any compromise that might lead to an easing of sanctions. In the sanctioning countries, sanctions are justified, even if they end up producing widespread hardship and misery, on the grounds that they are better than wars. But as sanctions become more prolonged they tend to become even less effective in achieving their political objectives; the sanctioning countries consequently tend to impose additional, more extensive sanctions, which only promotes further radicalisation in both the sanctioned and sanctioning countries. The only way to stop this vicious cycle is for both sides to negotiate in good faith and with open minds. Many western observers believe that recently elected Iranian president Hassan Rouhani is sincerely seeking a diplomatic solution. However, there are politicians and officials in the capitals of the P5+1 group – the five permanent UN Security Council members, plus Germany – who will push to implement even harsher measures if a diplomatic solution is not reached relatively soon. Witness the recent 400-20 vote in the US House of Representatives in favour of further punishing sanctions against Iran.

### Iran Proliferation Advantage

#### Officials confirm no Iran nukes

Press TV 13 (July 6th 2013, <http://www.presstv.com/detail/2013/07/06/312468/no-proof-iran-is-after-nweapon-straw/>, “No evidence Iran is seeking to build nuclear weapon: Jack Straw”, AB)

Former British Foreign Secretary Jack Straw has rejected the baseless allegation that there may be a military dimension to Iran’s nuclear energy program by emphasizing that there is no evidence for such a claim. “There is no evidence, not from the IAEA (the International Atomic Energy Agency), not from the Americans... There is no evidence that they (Iranians) are involved in building a bomb,” Straw said at a Thursday TV panel discussion at the British state-run broadcaster, the BBC. Straw, who served as acting shadow deputy prime minister of the United Kingdom in 2010, also referred to the 2007 US National Intelligence Estimate (NIE) that verified Iran was not after nuclear arms. The NIE report, prepared by 16 US intelligence agencies, confirmed with “high confidence” the peaceful nature of Iran’s nuclear program. A similar report was also published in 2011. At one point during the discussion, Straw struck back at a fellow panelist, who was insisting on the unfounded allegation about Iran's nuclear energy program, and asked her, “Have they (the Iranians) got a nuclear bomb?” and then posed the rhetorical question to the defiant panelist, “Where is the evidence?!”

#### Iranian nukes aren’t a threat - they just accelerate the reason they are being developed

Zizek ‘5(Slavoj, Solvenian Philosopher & senior researcher at the Institute for Advanced Study in the Humanities @ Essen (Germany), “Give Iranian Nukes A Chance,” 11 August 2005,http://www.inthesetimes.com/article/2280)

**But are nuclear arms in the hands of Iran's rulers really a threat to international peace and security? To answer the question properly, one has to locate it in its political and ideological context. Every power structure has to rely on an underlying implicit threat**, i.e. whatever the oficial democratic rules and legal constraints may be, we can ultimately do whatever we want to you. In the 20th century, however, the nature of this link between power and the invisible threat that sustains it changed. Existing power structures no longer relied on their own fantasmatic projection of a potential, invisible threat in order to secure the hold over their subjects. Rather, **the threat was externalized**, displaced onto an Outside Enemy. It became **the** **invisible**(and, for that reason, all-powerful and omni-present) threat of this **enemy** that **legitimized** the existing power structure's **permanent state of emergency**. **Fascists invoked the** threat of the**Jewish conspiracy**, Stalinists the threat of the class enemy, **Americans** the threat of **Communism-**all the way **up to** today's **"war on terror**." The threats posed by such **an invisible enemy legitimizes the logic of the preemptive strike. Precisely because the threat is virtual, one cannot afford to wait for it to come. Rather, one must strike in advance, before it is too late. In other words, the omni-present invisible threat of Terror legitimizes the all too visible protective measures of defense-which, of course, are what pose the true threat to democracy and human rights** (e.g., the London police's recent execution of the innocent Brazilian electrician, Jean Charles de Menezes). Classic power functioned as a threat that operated precisely by never actualizing itself, by always remaining a threatening gesture. Such functioning reached its climax in the Cold War, when the threat of mutual nuclear destruction had to remain a threat. With the "war on terror", **the invisible threat causes** the **incessant** actualization, not of the threat itself, but, of the **measures against the threat.** The nuclear strike had to remain the threat of a strike, while the threat of the terrorist strike triggers the endless series of preemptive strikes against potential terrorists**. We are thus passing from the logic of MAD (Mutually Assured Destruction) to a logic in which ONE SOLE MADMAN runs the entireshow and is allowed to enact its paranoia. The power that presents itself as always being under threat**, living in mortal danger, and thus merely defending itself, **is** **the most dangerous** kind of power-the very model of the Nietzschean ressentiment and moralistic hypocrisy. And indeed, it was Nietzsche himself who, more than a century ago, in Daybreak, provided the best analysis of the false moral premises of today's "war on terror": No government admits any more that it keeps an army to satisfy occasionally the desire for conquest. **Rather, the army is supposed to serve for defense, and one invokes the morality that approves of self-defense.  at our neighbor, who denies the desire But this implies one's own morality and the neighbor's immorality; for the neighbor must be thought of as eager to attack and conquer if our state must think of means of self-defense. Moreover, the reasons we give for requiring an army imply thfor conquest just as much as our own state, and who, for his part, also keeps an army only for reasons of self-defense, is a hypocrite and a cunning criminal whowould like nothing better than to overpower a harmless and awkward victim without any fight. Thus all states are now ranged against each other: they presuppose their neighbor's bad disposition and their own good disposition. This presupposition, however, is inhumane, as bad as war and worse. At bottom, indeed, it is itself the challenge and the cause of wars, because as I have said, it attributes immorality to the neighbor and thus provokes a hostile disposition and act.** We must abjure the doctrine of the army as a means of self-defense just as completely as the desire for conquests. Is not the ongoing "war on terror" proof that "terror" is the antagonistic Other of democracy-the point at which democracy's plural options turn into a singular antagonism? Or, as we so often hear, "In the face of the terrorist threat, we must all come together and forget our petty differences." More pointedly, the difference between the "war on terror" with previous 20th century worldwide struggles such as the Cold War is that the enemy used to be clearly identified with the actually existing Communist empire, whereas today the terrorist threat is inherently spectral, without a visible center. It is a little bit like the description of Linda Fiorentino's character in The Last Seduction: "Most people have a dark side ... she had nothing else." Most regimes have a dark oppressive spectral side ... the terrorist threat has nothing else. The paradoxical result of this spectralization of the enemy is an unexpected reflexive reversal. **In this world without a clearly identified enemy, it is the United States, the protector against the threat, that is emerging as the main enemy**-much like in Agatha Christie's Murder on the Orient-Express, where, since the entire group of suspects is the murderer, the victim himself (an evil millionaire) turns out to be the real criminal. This background allows us to finally answer our initial question: Yes, nukes for Iran-and Noriega and Saddam to the Hague. It is crucial to see the link between these two demands. Why are Timothy Garton Ash, Michael Ignatieff and other internationalist liberals-who are otherwise full of pathetic praise for the Hague tribunal-silent about the idea to deliver Noriega and Saddam to the Hague? Why Milosevic and not Noriega? Why was there not even a public trial against Noriega? Was it because he would have disclosed his own CIA past, including how the United States condoned his participation in the murder of Omar Torrijos Herrera? In a similar way, Saddam's regime was an abominable authoritarian state, guilty of many crimes, mostly toward its own people. However, one should note the strange but key fact that, when the U.S. representatives were enumerating Saddam's evil deeds, they systematically omitted what was undoubtedly his greatest crime (in terms of human suffering and of violating international law): the aggression against Iran. Why? Because the United States and the majority of foreign states actively helped Iraq in this aggression. What's more, the United States now plans to continue Saddam's work of toppling the Iranian government.

#### Iran prolif impossible

Alon Ben-Meir, a professor of International Relations and Middle Eastern Studies at The New School and at New York University, 11/23/10 [“Difficult Road Ahead”, <http://www.iranian.com/main/2010/nov/difficult-road-ahead>]

Finally, there are those who counsel patience. They argue that Iran is experiencing many difficulties and its nuclear program is advancing far more slowly than what was previously thought. They suggest that Tehran's efforts have been impeded by a combination of elements, including foreign sabotage of their nuclear computer programs, inability to import nuclear technology, a restive public resulting from the post-election political crisis, international pressure and internal discord between the various centers of power about the overall direction of where the country is heading. For these reasons, I join those who counsel patience provided that the Obama administration continues to focus on making the sanctions increasingly more effective, indeed crippling. to reach an agreement.

#### Iranian prolif would not cause an arms race

Posen 06 (Barry Posen, Ford International Professor of Political Science at the Massachusetts Institute of Technology, 3-30-2006, “We Can Live With a Nuclear Iran” AlterNet, <http://www.alternet.org/audits/34219/>)

A Middle Eastern arms race is a frightening thought, but it is improbable. If Iran acquires nuclear weapons, among its neighbors, only Israel, Egypt, Saudi Arabia and Turkey could conceivably muster the resources to follow suit. Israel is already a nuclear power. Iranian weapons might coax the Israelis to go public with their arsenal and to draw up plans for the use of such weapons in the event of an Iranian military threat. And if Israel disclosed its nuclear status, Egypt might also find it diplomatically difficult to forswear acquiring nuclear weapons. But Cairo depends on foreign assistance, which would make Egypt vulnerable to the enormous international pressure it would most likely face to refrain from joining an arms race. Saudi Arabia, meanwhile, has the money to acquire nuclear weapons and technology on the black market, but possible suppliers are few and very closely watched. To develop the domestic scientific, engineering and industrial base necessary to build a self-sustaining nuclear program would take Saudi Arabia years. In the interim, the Saudis would need nuclear security guarantees from the United States or Europe, which would in turn apply intense pressure on Riyadh not to develop its own arms. Finally, Turkey may have the resources to build a nuclear weapon, but as a member of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, it relied on American nuclear guarantees against the mighty Soviet Union throughout the cold war. There's no obvious reason to presume that American guarantees would seem insufficient relative to Iran.