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#### Introducing armed forces only refers to human troops, not weapons systems like nukes

Lorber 13

Eric Lorber, J.D. Candidate, University of Pennsylvania Law School, Ph.D Candidate, Duke University Department of Political Science. January 2013, "Executive Warmaking Authority and Offensive Cyber Operations: Can Existing Legislation Successfully Constrain Presidential Power?" University of Pennsylvania Journal of Contsitutional Law, 15 U. Pa. J. Const. L. 961, lexis nexis

C. The War Powers Resolution as Applied to Offensive Cyber Operations As discussed above, critical to the application of the War Powers Resolution - especially in the context of an offensive cyber operation - are the definitions of key terms, particularly "armed forces," as the relevant provisions of the Act are only triggered if the President "introduc[es armed forces] into hostilities or into situations [of] imminent ... hostilities," n172 or if such forces are introduced "into the territory, airspace, or waters of a foreign nation, while equipped for combat, except for deployments which relate solely to supply, replacement, repair, or training of such forces." n173 The requirements may also be triggered if the United States deploys armed forces "in numbers which substantially enlarge United States Armed Forces equipped for combat already located in a foreign nation." n174 As is evident, the definition of "armed forces" is crucial to deciphering whether the WPR applies in a particular circumstance to provide congressional leverage over executive actions. The definition of "hostilities," which has garnered the majority of scholarly and political attention, n175 particularly in the recent Libyan conflict, n176 will be dealt with secondarily here because it only becomes important if "armed forces" exist in the situation. ¶ As is **evident from a** textual analysis, n177 an examination of the legislative history, n178 and **the broad** policy purposes behind the creation of the Act, n179 [\*990] "armed forces" refers to U.S. soldiers and members of the armed forces, not weapon systems or capabilities such as offensive cyber weapons. Section 1547 does not specifically define "armed forces," but it states that "the term "introduction of United States Armed Forces' includes the assignment of members of such armed forces to command, coordinate, participate in the movement of, or accompany the regular or irregular military forces of any foreign country or government." n180 While this definition pertains to the broader phrase "introduction of armed forces," the clear implication is that **only members of the armed forces count for the purposes of the definition under the WPR.** Though not dispositive, **the term "member" connotes a human individual who is part of an organization.** n181 Thus, it appears that the term "armed forces" means human members of the United States armed forces. However, there exist two potential complications with this reading. First, the language of the statute states that "the term "introduction of United States Armed Forces' includes the assignment of members of such armed forces." n182 By using inclusionary - as opposed to exclusionary - language, one might argue that the term "armed forces" could include more than members. This argument is unconvincing however, given that a core principle of statutory interpretation, expressio unius, suggests that **expression of one thing (i.e., members) implies the exclusion of others (**such as non-members **constituting armed forces)**. n183 Second, the term "member" does not explicitly reference "humans," and so could arguably refer to individual units and beings that are part of a larger whole (e.g., wolves can be members of a pack). As a result, though a textual analysis suggests that "armed forces" refers to human members of the armed forces, such a conclusion is not determinative.¶ **An examination of the legislative history also suggests that Congress clearly conceptualized "armed forces" as human members of the armed forces**. For example, disputes over the term "armed forces" revolved around who could be considered members of the armed forces, not what constituted a member. Senator Thomas Eagleton, one of the Resolution's architects, proposed an amendment during the process providing that the Resolution cover military officers on loan to a civilian agency (such as the Central [\*991] Intelligence Agency). n184 This amendment was dropped after encountering pushback, n185 but the debate revolved around whether those military individuals on loan to the civilian agency were still members of the armed forces for the purposes of the WPR, suggesting that Congress considered the term to apply only to soldiers in the armed forces. Further, during the congressional hearings, the question of deployment of "armed forces" centered primarily on past U.S. deployment of troops to combat zones, n186 suggesting that **Congress conceptualized "armed forces" to mean U.S. combat troops.**¶ **The broad purpose of the Resolution aimed to prevent the large-scale but unauthorized deployments of U.S. troops into hostilities**. n187 While examining the broad purpose of a legislative act is increasingly relied upon only after examining the text and legislative history, here it provides further support for those two alternate interpretive sources. n188 As one scholar has noted, "the War Powers Resolution, for example, is concerned with sending U.S. troops into harm's way." n189 The historical context of the War Powers Resolution is also important in determining its broad purpose; as the resolutions submitted during the Vietnam War and in the lead-up to the passage of the WPR suggest, Congress was concerned about its ability to effectively regulate the President's deployments of large numbers of U.S. troops to Southeast Asia, n190 as well as prevent the President from authorizing troop incursions into countries in that region. n191 The WPR was a reaction to the President's continued deployments of these troops into combat zones, and as such suggests that Congress's broad purpose was to prevent the unconstrained deployment of U.S. personnel, not weapons, into hostilities.¶ This analysis suggests that, when defining the term "armed forces," Congress meant members of the armed forces who would be placed in [\*992] harm's way (i.e., into hostilities or imminent hostilities). **Applied to offensive cyber operations, such a definition leads to the conclusion that the** W**ar** P**owers** R**esolution likely does not cover such activities**. Worms, viruses, and kill switches are clearly not U.S. troops. Therefore, the key question regarding whether the WPR can govern cyber operations is not whether the operation is conducted independently or as part of a kinetic military operation. Rather, the key question is the delivery mechanism. For example, if military forces were deployed to launch the cyberattack, such an activity, if it were related to imminent hostilities with a foreign country, could trigger the WPR. This seems unlikely, however, for two reasons. First, it is unclear whether small-scale deployments where the soldiers are not participating or under threat of harm constitute the introduction of armed forces into hostilities under the War Powers Resolution. n192 Thus, **individual operators deployed to plant viruses in particular enemy systems may not constitute armed forces introduced into hostilities or imminent hostilities.** Second, such a tactical approach seems unlikely. If the target system is remote access, the military can attack it without placing personnel in harm's way. n193 If it is close access, there exist many other effective ways to target such systems. n194 As a result, unless U.S. troops are introduced into hostilities or imminent hostilities while deploying offensive cyber capabilities - which is highly unlikely - such operations will not trigger the War Powers Resolution.

#### Vote negative – they explode the topic, including weapons systems turns the topic into an arms control topic – nuclear weapons, space weaponization, chemical weapons and bioweapons could all be their own topics – it makes being neg impossible

## Iran Sanctions DA

#### Iran sanctions are at the top of the docket – Obama is spending capital to persuade Democrats to sustain a veto

Lobe, 12-27

Reporter for Inter Press Service(Jim, “Iran sanctions bill: Big test of Israel lobby power”

<http://www.arabamericannews.com/news/index.php?mod=article&cat=World&article=8046>)

WASHINGTON - This week’s introduction by a bipartisan group of 26 senators of a new sanctions bill against Iran could result in the biggest test of the political clout of the Israel lobby here in decades.¶ The White House, which says the bill could well derail ongoing negotiations between Iran and the U.S. and five other powers over Tehran’s nuclear program and destroy the international coalition behind the existing sanctions regime, has already warned that it will veto the bill if it passes Congress in its present form.¶ The new bill, co-sponsored by two of Congress’s biggest beneficiaries of campaign contributions by political action committees closely linked to the powerful American Israel Public Affairs Committee (AIPAC), would impose sweeping new sanctions against Tehran if it fails either to comply with the interim deal it struck last month in Geneva with the P5+1 (U.S., Britain, France, Russia, China plus Germany) or reach a comprehensive accord with the great powers within one year.¶ To be acceptable, however, such an accord, according to the bill, would require Iran to effectively dismantle virtually its entire nuclear program, including any enrichment of uranium on its own soil, as demanded by Israeli Prime Minister Benjamin Netanyahu.¶ The government of President Hassan Rouhani has warned repeatedly that such a demand is a deal-breaker, and even Secretary of State John Kerry has said that a zero-enrichment position is a non-starter.¶ The bill, the Nuclear Weapon Free Iran Act, also calls for Washington to provide military and other support to Israel if its government “is compelled to take military action in legitimate self-defense against Iran’s nuclear weapon program.”¶ The introduction of the bill last week by Republican Sen. Mark Kirk and Democratic Sen. Robert Menendez followed unsuccessful efforts by both men to get some sanctions legislation passed since the Geneva accord was signed Nov. 24.¶ Kirk at first tried to move legislation that would have imposed new sanctions immediately in direct contradiction to a pledge by the P5+1 in the Geneva accord to forgo any new sanctions for the six-month life of the agreement in exchange for, among other things, enhanced international inspections of Iran’s nuclear facilities and a freeze on most of its nuclear program.¶ Unable to make headway, Kirk then worked with Menendez to draw up the new bill which, because of its prospective application, would not, according to them, violate the agreement. They had initially planned to attach it to a defense bill before the holiday recess. But the Democratic leadership, which controls the calendar, refused to go along.¶ Their hope now is to pass it – either as a free-standing measure or as an amendment to another must-pass bill after Congress reconvenes Jan. 6.¶ To highlight its bipartisan support, the two sponsors gathered a dozen other senators from each party to co-sponsor it.¶ Republicans, many of whom reflexively oppose President Barack Obama’s positions on any issue and whose core constituencies include Christian Zionists, are almost certain to support the bill by an overwhelming margin. If the bill gets to the floor, the main battle will thus take place within the Democratic majority.¶ The latter find themselves torn between, on the one hand, their loyalty to Obama and their fear that new sanctions will indeed derail negotiations and thus make war more likely, and, on the other, their general antipathy for Iran and the influence exerted by AIPAC and associated groups as a result of the questionable perception that Israel’s security is uppermost in the minds of Jewish voters and campaign contributors (who, by some estimates, provide as much as 40 percent of political donations to Democrats in national campaigns).¶ The administration clearly hopes the Democratic leadership will prevent the bill from coming to a vote, but, if it does, persuading most of the Democrats who have already endorsed the bill to change their minds will be an uphill fight. If the bill passes, the administration will have to muster 34 senators of the 100 senators to sustain a veto – a difficult but not impossible task, according to Congressional sources.¶ That battle has already been joined. Against the 13 Democratic senators who signed onto the Kirk-Menendez bill, 10 Democratic Senate committee chairs urged Majority Leader Harry Reid, who controls the upper chamber’s calendar, to forestall any new sanctions legislation.

#### Obama’s strategy is working but failure scuttles the nuclear deal

Merry 1-1

Robert W. Merry, political editor of the National Interest, is the author of books on American history and foreign policy (Robert, “Obama may buck the Israel lobby on Iran” Washington Times, factiva)

Presidential press secretary Jay Carney uttered 10 words the other day that represent a major presidential challenge to the American Israel lobby and its friends on Capitol Hill. Referring to Senate legislation designed to force President Obama to expand economic sanctions on Iran under conditions the president opposes, Mr. Carney said: “If it were to pass, the president would veto it.”¶ For years, there has been an assumption in Washington that you can’t buck the powerful Israel lobby, particularly the American Israel Public Affairs Committee, or AIPAC, whose positions are nearly identical with the stated aims of Israeli Prime Minister Benjamin Netanyahu. Mr. Netanyahu doesn’t like Mr. Obama’s recent overture to Iran, and neither does AIPAC. The result is the Senate legislation, which is similar to a measure already passed by the House.¶ With the veto threat, Mr. Obama has announced that he is prepared to buck the Israel lobby — and may even welcome the opportunity. It isn’t fair to suggest that everyone who thinks Mr. Obama’s overtures to Iran are ill-conceived or counterproductive is simply following the Israeli lobby’s talking points, but Israel’s supporters in this country are a major reason for the viability of the sanctions legislation the president is threatening to veto.¶ It is nearly impossible to avoid the conclusion that the Senate legislation is designed to sabotage Mr. Obama’s delicate negotiations with Iran (with the involvement also of the five permanent members of the U.N. Security Council and Germany) over Iran’s nuclear program. The aim is to get Iran to forswear any acquisition of nuclear weapons in exchange for the reduction or elimination of current sanctions. Iran insists it has a right to enrich uranium at very small amounts, for peaceful purposes, and Mr. Obama seems willing to accept that Iranian position in the interest of a comprehensive agreement.¶ However, the Senate measure, sponsored by Sens. Robert Menendez, New Jersey Democrat; Charles E. Schumer, New York Democrat; and Mark Kirk, Illinois Republican, would impose potent new sanctions if the final agreement accords Iran the right of peaceful enrichment. That probably would destroy Mr. Obama’s ability to reach an agreement. Iranian President Hasan Rouhani already is under pressure from his country’s hard-liners to abandon his own willingness to seek a deal. The Menendez-Schumer-Kirk measure would undercut him and put the hard-liners back in control.¶ Further, the legislation contains language that would commit the United States to military action on behalf of Israel if Israel initiates action against Iran. This language is cleverly worded, suggesting U.S. action should be triggered only if Israel acted in its “legitimate self-defense” and acknowledging “the law of the United States and the constitutional responsibility of Congress to authorize the use of military force,” but the language is stunning in its brazenness and represents, in the view of Andrew Sullivan, the prominent blogger, “an appalling new low in the Israeli government’s grip on the U.S. Congress.”¶ While noting the language would seem to be nonbinding, Mr. Sullivan adds that “it’s basically endorsing the principle of handing over American foreign policy on a matter as grave as war and peace to a foreign government, acting against international law, thousands of miles away.”¶ That brings us back to Mr. Obama’s veto threat. The American people have made clear through polls and abundant expression (especially during Mr. Obama’s flirtation earlier this year with military action against Bashar Assad’s Syrian regime) that they are sick and weary of American military adventures in the Middle East. They don’t think the Iraq and Afghanistan wars have been worth the price, and they don’t want their country to engage in any other such wars.¶ That’s what the brewing confrontation between Mr. Obama and the Israel lobby comes down to — war and peace. Mr. Obama’s delicate negotiations with Iran, whatever their outcome, are designed to avert another U.S. war in the Middle East. The Menendez-Schumer-Kirk initiative is designed to kill that effort and cedes to Israel America’s war-making decision in matters involving Iran, which further increases the prospects for war. It’s not even an argument about whether the United States should come to Israel’s aid if our ally is under attack, but whether the decision to do so and when that might be necessary should be made in Jerusalem or Washington.¶ 2014 will mark the 100th anniversary of beginning of World War I, a conflict triggered by entangling alliances that essentially gave the rulers of the Hapsburg Empire power that forced nation after nation into a war they didn’t want and cost the world as many as 20 million lives. Historians have warned since of the danger of nations delegating the power to take their people into war to other nations with very different interests.¶ AIPAC’s political power is substantial, but this is Washington power, the product of substantial campaign contributions and threats posed to re-election prospects. According to the Center for Responsive Politics’ Open Secrets website, Sens. Kirk, Menendez and Schumer each receives hundreds of thousands of dollars a year in pro-Israel PAC money and each of their states includes concentrations of pro-Israel voters who help elect and re-elect them.¶ Elsewhere in the country, AIPAC’s Washington power will collide with the country’s clear and powerful political sentiment against further U.S. adventurism in the Middle East, particularly one as fraught with as much danger and unintended consequence as a war with Iran. If the issue gets joined, as it appears that it will, Mr. Obama will see that it gets joined as a matter of war and peace. If the Menendez-Schumer-Kirk legislation clears Congress and faces a presidential veto, the war-and-peace issue could galvanize the American people as seldom before.¶ If that happens, the strongly held opinions of a democratic public are liable to overwhelm the mechanisms of Washington power, and the vaunted influence of the Israel lobby may be seen as being not quite what it has been cracked up to be.

#### The plan causes an inter-branch fight – saps PC and derails his 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 causes a US-Iran war and Iranian prolif

WORLD TRIBUNE 11-13

[Obama said to suspend Iran sanctions without informing Congress, http://www.worldtribune.com/2013/11/13/obama-said-to-suspend-iran-sanctions-without-informing-congress/]

The administration has also pressured Congress to suspend plans for new sanctions legislation against Iran. The sources said the White House effort has encountered resistance from both Democrats and Republicans, particularly those in the defense and foreign affairs committees.¶ “I urge the White House and the Senate to learn from the lessons of the past and not offer sanctions relief in return for the false hopes and empty promises of the Iranian regime,” Rep. Ileana Ros-Lehtinen, chairwoman of the House Middle East and North Africa Subcommittee, said. “Instead, new rounds of sanctions must be implemented to gain further leverage because any misstep in calculations at this juncture will have devastating and irreversible consequences that will be difficult to correct retroactively.”¶ On Nov. 12, the White House warned that additional sanctions on Iran would mean war with the United States. White House press secretary Jay Carney, in remarks meant to intensify pressure on Congress, said sanctions would end the prospect of any diplomatic solution to Iran’s crisis. ¶ “The American people do not want a march to war,” Carney said. “It is important to understand that if pursuing a resolution diplomatically is disallowed or ruled out, what options then do we and our allies have to prevent Iran from acquiring a nuclear weapon?”¶ Still, the Senate Banking Committee has agreed to delay any vote on sanctions legislation until a briefing by Secretary of State John Kerry on Nov. 13. The sources said Kerry was expected to brief the committee on the P5+1 talks in Geneva that almost led to an agreement with Teheran.¶ “The secretary will be clear that putting new sanctions in place would be a mistake,” State Department spokeswoman Jen Psaki said on Nov. 12. “We are still determining if there’s a diplomatic path forward. What we are asking for right now is a pause, a temporary pause, in sanctions.”

#### Iran war escalates

White 11

July/August 2011 (Jeffrey—defense fellow at the Washington Institute for Near East Policy, What Would War With Iran Look Like, National Interest, p. http://www.the-american-interest.com/article-bd.cfm?piece=982)

A U.S.-Iranian war would probably not be fought by the United States and Iran alone. Each would have partners or allies, both willing and not-so-willing. Pre-conflict commitments, longstanding relationships, the course of operations and other factors would place the United States and Iran at the center of more or less structured coalitions of the marginally willing. A Western coalition could consist of the United States and most of its traditional allies (but very likely not Turkey, based on the evolution of Turkish politics) in addition to some Persian Gulf states, Jordan and perhaps Egypt, depending on where its revolution takes it. Much would depend on whether U.S. leaders could persuade others to go along, which would mean convincing them that U.S. forces could shield them from Iranian and Iranian-proxy retaliation, or at least substantially weaken its effects. Coalition warfare would present a number of challenges to the U.S. government. Overall, it would lend legitimacy to the action, but it would also constrict U.S. freedom of action, perhaps by limiting the scope and intensity of military operations. There would thus be tension between the desire for a small coalition of the capable for operational and security purposes and a broader coalition that would include marginally useful allies to maximize legitimacy. The U.S. administration would probably not welcome Israeli participation. But if Israel were directly attacked by Iran or its allies, Washington would find it difficult to keep Israel out—as it did during the 1991 Gulf War. That would complicate the U.S. ability to manage its coalition, although it would not necessarily break it apart. Iranian diplomacy and information operations would seek to exploit Israeli participation to the fullest. Iran would have its own coalition. Hizballah in particular could act at Iran’s behest both by attacking Israel directly and by using its asymmetric and irregular warfare capabilities to expand the conflict and complicate the maintenance of the U.S. coalition. The escalation of the Hizballah-Israel conflict could draw in Syria and Hamas; Hamas in particular could feel compelled to respond to an Iranian request for assistance. Some or all of these satellite actors might choose to leave Iran to its fate, especially if initial U.S. strikes seemed devastating to the point of decisive. But their involvement would spread the conflict to the entire eastern Mediterranean and perhaps beyond, complicating both U.S. military operations and coalition diplomacy.

## Security K

#### The affirmative’s call to SECURITY only FEEDS THE APORIAS by which security apparatuses CONTINUOUSLY ORDER AND PROBLEMATIZE LIFE

Dillon and Reid 2K0

Professor of Politics at the University of Lancaster and lecturer in international relations at Kings College in London, 2000 [Michael and Julian, Alternatives vol. 25, issue 1, spring, EbscoHost]

As a precursor to global governance, governmentality, according to Foucault's initial account, poses the question of order not in terms of the origin of the law and the location of sovereignty, as do traditional accounts of power, but in terms instead of the management of population. The management of population is further refined in terms of specific problematics to which population management may be reduced. These typically include but are not necessarily exhausted by the following topoi of governmental power: economy, health, welfare, poverty, security, sexuality, demographics, resources, skills, culture, and so on. Now, where there is an operation of power there is knowledge, and where there is knowledge there is an operation of power. Here discursive formations emerge and, as Foucault noted, ¶ in every society the production of discourse is at once controlled, selected, organised and redistributed by a certain number of procedures whose role is to ward off its powers and dangers, to gain mastery over its chance events, to evade its ponderous, formidable materiality.[ 34] ¶ More specifically, where there is a policy problematic there is expertise, and where there is expertise there, too, a policy problematic will emerge. Such problematics are detailed and elaborated in terms of discrete forms of knowledge as well as interlocking policy domains. Policy domains reify the problematization of life in certain ways by turning these epistemically and politically contestable orderings of life into "problems" that require the continuous attention of policy science and the continuous resolutions of policymakers. Policy "actors" develop and compete on the basis of the expertise that grows up around such problems or clusters of problems and their client populations.¶ Here, too, we may also discover what might be called "epistemic entrepreneurs." Albeit the market for discourse is prescribed and policed in ways that Foucault indicated, bidding to formulate novel problematizations they seek to "sell" these, or otherwise have them officially adopted. In principle, there is no limit to the ways in which the management of population may be problematized. All aspects of human conduct, any encounter with life, is problematizable. Any problematization is capable of becoming a policy problem. Governmentality thereby creates a market for policy, for science and for policy science, in which problematizations go looking for policy sponsors while policy sponsors fiercely compete on behalf of their favored problematizations. ¶ Reproblematization of problems is constrained by the institutional and ideological investments surrounding accepted "problems," and by the sheer difficulty of challenging the inescapable ontological and epistemological assumptions that go into their very formation. There is nothing so fiercely contested as an epistemological or ontological assumption. And there is nothing so fiercely ridiculed as the suggestion that the real problem with problematizations exists precisely at the level of such assumptions. Such "paralysis of analysis" is precisely what policymakers seek to avoid since they are compelled constantly to respond to circumstances over which they ordinarily have in fact both more and less control than they proclaim. What they do not have is precisely the control that they want. Yet serial policy failure—the fate and the fuel of all policy--compels them into a continuous search for the new analysis that will extract them from the aporias in which they constantly find themselves enmeshed.[ 35] ¶ Serial policy failure is no simple shortcoming that science and policy--and policy science--will ultimately overcome. Serial policy failure is rooted in the ontological and epistemological assumptions that fashion the ways in which global governance encounters and problematizes life as a process of emergence through fitness landscapes that constantly adaptive and changing ensembles have continuously to negotiate. As a particular kind of intervention into life, global governance promotes the very changes and unintended outcomes that it then serially reproblematizes in terms of policy failure. Thus, global liberal governance is not a linear problem-solving process committed to the resolution of objective policy problems simply by bringing better information and knowledge to bear upon them. A nonlinear economy of power/knowledge, it deliberately installs socially specific and radically inequitable distributions of wealth, opportunity, and mortal danger both locally and globally through the very detailed ways in which life is variously (policy) problematized by it.

#### The discourse of the 1AC contributes to the emergence of destructive security-state that becomes indistinguishable from the forms of violence it seeks to prevent.

Agamben 2K2,

[ Professor of Philosophy at the Collège International de Philosophie in Paris, [Giorgio, Theory & Event 5:4, ProjectMuse]

Security as the basic principle of state politics dates back to the birth of the modern state. Hobbes already mentions it as the opposite of the fear which compels human beings to unite and form a society together. But not until the 18th century does the paradigm of security reach its fullest development. In an unpublished lecture at the Collège de France in 1978, Michel Foucault showed how in the political and economic practice of the Physiocrats security opposes discipline and the law as instruments of governance.¶ Neither Turgot and Quesnay nor the Physiocratic officials were primarily concerned with the prevention of famine or the regulation of production, but rather wanted to allow for their development in order to guide and "secure" their consequences. While disciplinary power isolates and closes off territories, measures of security lead to an opening and globalisation; while the law wants to prevent and prescribe, security wants to intervene in ongoing processes to direct them. In a word, discipline wants to produce order, while security wants to guide disorder. Since measures of security can only function within a context of freedom of traffic, trade, and individual initiative, Foucault can show that the development of security coincides with the development of liberal ideology.¶ Today we are facing extreme and most dangerous developments of this paradigm of security. In the course of a gradual neutralisation of politics and the progressive surrender of traditional tasks of the state, security imposes itself as the basic principle of state activity. What used to be one among several decisive measures of public administration until the first half of the twentieth century, now becomes the sole criterion of political legitimation. Security reasoning entails an essential risk. A state which has security as its only task and source of legitimacy is a fragile organism; it can always be provoked by terrorism to turn itself terroristic.¶ We should not forget that the first major organisation of terror after the war, the Organisation de l'Armée Secrète (OAS) was established by a French General who thought of himself as patriotic and who was convinced that terrorism was the only answer to the guerilla phenomenon in Algeria and Indochina. When politics, the way it was understood by theorists of the "Polizeiwissenschaft" in the eighteenth century, reduces itself to police, the difference between state and terrorism threatens to disappear. In the end it may lead to security and terrorism forming a single deadly system in which they mutually justify and legitimate each others' actions.¶ The risk is not merely the development of a clandestine complicity of opponents but that the hunt for security leads to a worldwide civil war which destroys all civil coexistence. In the new situation -- created by the end of the classical form of war between sovereign states -- security finds its end in globalisation: it implies the idea of a new planetary order which is, in fact, the worst of all disorders. But there is yet another danger. Because they require constant reference to a state of exception, measures of security work towards a growing depoliticization of society. In the long run, they are irreconcilable with democracy.¶ Nothing is therefore more important than a revision of the concept of security as the basic principle of state politics. European and American politicians finally have to consider the catastrophic consequences of uncritical use of this figure of thought. It is not that democracies should cease to defend themselves, but the defense of democracy demands today a change of political paradigms and not a world civil war which is just the institutionalization of terror. Maybe the time has come to work towards the prevention of disorder and catastrophe, and not merely towards their control. Today, there are plans for all kinds of emergencies (ecological, medical, military), but there is no politics to prevent them. On the contrary, we can say that politics secretly works towards the production of emergencies. It is the task of democratic politics to prevent the development of conditions which lead to hatred, terror, and destruction -- and not to reduce itself to attempts to control them once they occur.

#### ALTERNATIVE: VOTE NEGATIVE. ONLY TOTALLY ESCHEWING THE LOGIC OF SECURITY SOLVES.

NEOCLEOUS 2K8.

[Mark, Professor of Critique of Political Economy at Brunel University (UK), “Critique of Security.” Pg. 185-186]

The only way out of such a dilemma, to escape the fetish, is perhaps to eschew the logic of security altogether – to reject it as so ideologically loaded in favor of the state that any real political thought other than the authoritarian and reactionary should be pressed to give it up. That is clearly something that cannot be achieved within the limits of bourgeois thought and thus could never even begin to be imagined by the security intellectual. It is also something that the constant iteration of the refrain ‘this is an insecure world’ and reiteration of one fear, anxiety and insecurity after another will also make it hard to do. But it is something that the critique of security suggests we may have to consider if we want a political way out of the impasse of security. This impasse exists because security has now become so all-encompassing that it marginalizes all else, most notably the constructive conflicts, debates and discussions that animate political life. The constant prioritizing of a mythical security as a political end – as the political end – constitutes a rejection of politics in any meaningful sense of the term. That is, as a mode of action in which differences can be articulated, in which the conflicts and struggles that arise from such differences can be fought for and negotiated, in which people might come to believe that another world is possible – that they might transform the world and in turn be transformed. Security politics is, in this sense, an anti-politics, dominating political discourse in much the same manner as the security state tries to dominate human beings, reinforcing security fetishism and the monopolistic character of security on the political imagination. We therefore need to get beyond security politics, not add yet more ‘sectors’ to it in a way that simply expands the scope of the state and legitimizes state intervention in yet more and more areas of our lives. Simon Dalby reports a personal communication with Michael Williams, co-editor of the important text *Critical Security Studies*, in which the latter asks: if you take away security, what do you put in the hole that’s left behind? But I’m inclined to agree with Dalby: there is no hole. The mistake has been to think that there is a hole and that this hole needs to be filled with a new vision or revision of security in which it is re-mapped or civilized or gendered or humanized or expanded or whatever. All of these ultimately remain within the statist political imaginary, and consequently end up re-affirming the state as the terrain of modern politics, the grounds of security. The real task is not to fill the supposed hole with yet another vision of security, but to fight for an alternative political language which takes us beyond the narrow horizon of bourgeois security and which therefore does not constantly throw us into the arms of the state. That’s the point of critical politics: to develop a new political language more adequate to the kind of society we want. Thus while much of what I have said here has been of a negative order, part of the tradition of critical theory is that the negative may be as significant as the positive in setting thought on new paths. For if security really is the supreme concept of bourgeois society and the fundamental thematic of liberalism, then to keep harping on about insecurity and to keep demanding ‘more security’ (while meekly hoping that this increased security doesn’t damage our liberty) is to blind ourselves to the possibility of building real alternatives to the authoritarian tendencies in contemporary politics. To situate ourselves against security politics would allow us to circumvent the debilitating effect achieved through the constant securitizing of social and political issues, debilitating in the sense that ‘security’ helps consolidate the power of the existing forms of social domination and justifies the short-circuiting of even the most democratic forms. It would also allow us to forge another kind of politics centered on a different conception of the good. We need a new way of thinking and talking about social being and politics that moves us beyond security. This would perhaps be emancipator in the true sense of the word. What this might mean, precisely, must be open to debate. But it certainly requires recognizing that security is an illusion that has forgotten it is an illusion; it requires recognizing that security is not the same as solidarity; it requires accepting that insecurity is part of the human condition, and thus giving up the search for the certainty of security and instead learning to tolerate the uncertainties, ambiguities and ‘insecurities’ that come with being human; it requires accepting that ‘securitizing’ an issue does not mean dealing with it politically, but bracketing it out and handing it to the state; it requires us to be brave enough to return the gift.

## Weaponization

#### 1.) Military, technical and political factors prove weapons not inevitable

Tannenwald 2003 (Nina is an PhD @ Cornell, Associate Research Professor at Brown University's Watson Institute for International Studies, April, http://www.cissm.umd.edu/papers/files/tannenwald.pdf, “ Law Versus Power on the High Frontier: The Case for a Rule-Based Regime for Outer Space”; AB)

What accounts for the lack of an arms race in space so far? Explanations emphasize a set of military, technical, political, organizational, and ideational factors. According to Paul Stares, the explanation lies in the "convergence of national interests, military disincentives and technical constraints, which were buttressed at important times by formal agreements." U.S. policymakers recognized that space weapons offered few military advantages. They faced serious technical constraints, and also wanted to project a "peaceful" image of the U.S. space program. Organizational factors reinforced these considerations, as the Air Force interest in space declined for a lengthy period in the 1960s and 1970s. Other explanations emphasize the common interest of the superpowers in avoiding an ASAT race. Both the United States and the Soviet Union recognized the mutual benefits of reconnaissance satellites and reached a "tacit" agreement to refrain from developing weapons to counter them. Satellites provided mutual reassurance and thus strengthened the system of stable nuclear deterrence. As Stares emphasizes, the practice of keeping space free of weapons has been reinforced over the years by formal agreements (e.g. the 1963 UN resolution banning weapons of mass destruction from space, later codified in the Outer Space Treaty; and the ABM treaty). The international community has repeatedly reaffirmed support for the nonweaponization norm in numerous UN resolutions and diplomatic statements.

#### 2.) Deterrence checks space weapons

Krepon 08 (Michael, is the co-founder of the Henry L. Stimson Center, a Diplomat Scholar at the University of Virginia, February–March, http://www.carnegieendowment.org/files/SurvivalTellis.pdf, “China’s Military Space Strategy: An Exchange”; AB

 US military guidance calling for space superiority does not foreclose hit-to-kill ASATs, but the Pentagon prefers to use temporary and reversible effects in space warfare. But once this Pandora’s Box is opened, and the first satellite in military history is attacked in combat, not everyone may choose to fight by Marquis of Queensbury rules. Asymmetric warfare applies in space, no less than on the ground. Because every spacefaring nation can lose badly in the event that vulnerable and essential satellites are damaged or destroyed, a rudimentary form of deterrence against satellite warfare existed during the Cold War. It continues to exist today. Deterrence of satellite warfare was far simpler and less expensive than nuclear deterrence because so much latent capability existed to harm satellites. Dedicated ASAT tests weren’t needed; they were kept to a minimum because they were provocative and dangerous.

#### 3.) No space arms race — sets a high standard against transgressors

Dolman 06 (Everett C. Dolman, Professor of Comparative Military Studies at the US Air Force’s School of Advanced Air and Space Studies, Peter Hays, senior policy analyst with the Science Applications International Corporation, Karl Mueller, political scientist with the RAND Corporation, specializing in air and space strategy and other defense policy issues, 3/10/06, “Toward a Grand U.S. Strategy in Space,” George C. Marshall Institute, pg 24-25)

Nonetheless, we have a different system today and, as Karl has pointed out, it may be that if the United States were to unilaterally militarize space – and I am not advocating that necessarily, but it is an option – that it could in fact prevent an arms race. The trillions of dollars that would have to be spent to dislodge the United States from space, if it were to quickly seize control of the low-earth orbit, might be seen as not worthwhile to another state. However, if we wait fifteen or twenty years until a state is able to challenge the United States in space, then we will have a space race. By putting weapons in space to enhance its military capabilities the United States today is saying to the world that in this period of American hegemony, it is not going to wait for problems to develop overseas until they bubble over into its area of interest, and then massively and forcefully fix that problem.

#### 4.) No risk of conflict in space

Dolman 06 (Everett C. is Associate Professor of Comparative Military Studies at the U.S. Air Force's School of Advanced Air and Space Studies, http://muse.jhu.edu/journals/sais\_review/v026/26.1dolman.html, SAIS Review 26.1 163-175

In such circumstances, America certainly would respond eventually. Conversely, if America were to weaponize space today, it is unlikely that any other state or group of states would find it rational to counter in kind. The entry cost to provide the necessary infrastructure is too high—hundreds of billions of dollars, at minimum. The years of investment needed to achieve a minimal counter-force capability—essentially from scratch—would provide more than ample time for the United States to entrench itself in space and readily counter preliminary efforts to displace it. The tremendous effort in time and resources would be worse than wasted. Most states, if not all, would opt not to counter U.S. deployments in kind. They might oppose U.S. interests with asymmetric balancing, depending on how aggressively America uses its new power, but the likelihood of a hemorrhaging arms race in space should the United States deploy weapons there—at least for the next few years—is extremely remote.

#### 5. Increase in CO2 helps water management increasing crop yields

Malcolm et al. ‘12

(Scott Malcolm Ph.D., University of Pennsylvania, 1996¶ M.S., UC Santa Barbara, 1988¶ B.S., UC Santa Barbara, 1985 Associate Professor of Operations Research ¶ Applied Economics & Statistics ¶ University of Delaware , Elizabeth Marshall Economic Research Service¶ Department of Agriculture¶ Government of the United States Marcel, Aillery Agricultural Economist, ¶ Paul Heisey is an Economist in the Resource, Environmental, and Science Policy Branch of the Resource and Rural Economics Division. His work focuses on agricultural science policy, in particular public and private sector agricultural research and development, intellectual property, and genetic resources. Ph.D. and M.A. in Agricultural Economics, University of Wisconsin-Madison; B.Sc. in Mathematics, Messiah College, Grantham, Pennsylvania., Mike is a Senior Economist in the Production Economics and Technology Branch of the Resource and Rural Economics Division. His current research program seeks to inform public policy discussions on corn-based ethanol production, climate change, and nutrient, pest, and invasive species management. PhD Economics, North Carolina State University, 1999.¶ BS Mathematics, North Carolina State University, 1992.¶ and Kelly Day Rubenstein is an economist with the Resource and Rural Economics Division. Her research focuses on agricultural science policy (particularly economic aspects of agricultural research and development) and the role of genetic resources in the agricultural production process. Kelly received an M.S. in agricultural and applied economics in 1990 from the University of Minnesota and a B.A. in economics from the University of St Thomas in St. Paul. “Agricultural Adaptation ¶ to a Changing Climate¶ Economic and Environmental Implications ¶ Vary by U.S. Region” USDA ERS July 2012 accessed online August 5, 2012 at http://www.ers.usda.gov/media/848748/err136.pdf)

Increasing Atmospheric Carbon Dioxide (CO2¶ )¶ Crop yields have been observed to increase with increasing ¶ levels of atmospheric CO2¶ , though yield response differs by ¶ crop. Yield increases associated with increasing CO2¶ arise ¶ through two pathways: increased rates of photosynthesis ¶ and reduced water loss through transpiration. Research ¶ suggests that rising CO2¶ concentrations that limit plant ¶ transpiration through the stomata could help mitigate the ¶ increase in crop water stress experienced as a result of higher ¶ temperatures (Izaurralde et al., 2003). The transpiration effect ¶ (the magnitude of which depends largely on soil moisture ¶ levels) operates in all crops. Impacts on crop yields via the ¶ photosynthetic pathway, however, operate only in a subset ¶ of plants. Plants have two different metabolic pathways for ¶ photosynthesis—C3¶ and C4—but only the C3¶ photosynthetic ¶ pathway responds to increased atmospheric CO2¶ . C3¶ crops are ¶ therefore projected to have a higher yield response to increased ¶ atmospheric CO2¶ than are C4¶ crops. ¶ Among the REAP model’s major ﬁeld crops, only corn and ¶ sorghum are C4¶ plants; other major crops, such as wheat, ¶ soybeans, and cotton, are classiﬁed as C3¶ crops and therefore ¶ are more likely to respond positively to increased atmospheric ¶ CO2¶ .¶ 2¶ The U.S. Climate Change Science Program (USCCSP, ¶ 2008) reported that a doubling of CO2¶ increased estimated ¶ yields by approximately 4 percent for corn, 0-8 percent ¶ for sorghum, 44 percent for cotton, and 34-38 percent for ¶ soybeans. Actual responses to increasing atmospheric CO2¶ will depend upon whether crop growth is constrained by ¶ other stressors, such as nitrogen or water limitations.

#### 6. Food shortages cause extinction

Winnail ‘96

(Douglas S. Winnail, Ph.D., MPH, 1996, “On the Horizon”: Famine, From the World Ahead, Sep/Oct, <http://www.survivalplus.com/foods/page0004.html>)

Perhaps you have been too busy to notice, but the concern about our global food supply is real! Major news magazines are reporting that after a quiet few decades, talk of a world food crisis is again in the air. Government leaders, economists and scientists are seriously pondering such sobering questions as: Does the world face a global shortage? and Will the world starve? There is a growing sense of urgency. In November 1996 the United Nations Food and Agricultural Organization will convene a World Food Security Summit in Rome. The conference was called due to growing concerns that shrinking world food reserves, rising prices and the declining production of food grains could be the precursors of an imminent food security crisis. Dr. Jacques Diouf, the FAO Director-General, has stated, "The very survival of humanity depends on world food security ". Just what does the future hold for humanity? Will there be enough food to go around? What does a look at all the evidence indicate? And how will this issue affect your life in the months and years ahead? HOW LONG BEFORE THE CUPBOARD IS BARE? Numerous sources document that global supplies of rice, wheat, corn and other key commodities have dwindled to their lowest levels in years . The U.N. recently warned that food stocks stand far below the minimum needed to provide for world food security. The world's grain harvest has not increased in any of the last five years, and since 1992 world grain consumption has exceeded production... this year--for the first time since World War II--there are basically no surplus stocks in government-owned reserves. The tight supplies have led to steep price increases for wheat, rice, and corn. Grain stockpiles have fallen particularly fast in the U.S. and the European Union as a result of agricultural reforms that have focused on reducing overproduction and selling off surpluses--primarily to China--to gain revenue from exports. Bad weather and a string of poor harvests in grain producing areas of the world have also contributed to the dwindling reserves. A CRISIS AHEAD? Opinions are sharply divided over what the future may hold. The world's food economy may be shifting from a long-accustomed period of overall abundance to one of scarcity and that food scarcity will be the defining issue in the future. The lack of growth of the world grain harvest since 1990 coupled with the continuing growth in world population and the increased likelihood of crop-damaging heat waves in the years ahead at least carries the potential of severe food shortages.

## Balancing

#### Hegemony isn’t key to peace

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

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

#### Heg is unsustainable Layne 10(Christopher Layne, Professor and Robert M. Gates Chair in National Security at Texas A&M's George H.W. Bush School of Government & Public Service. "Graceful decline: the end of Pax Americana". The American Conservative. May 2010. http://findarticles.com/p/articles/mi\_7060/is\_5\_9/ai\_n5422359

China's economy has been growing much more rapidly than the United States' over the last two decades and continues to do so, maintaining audacious 8 percent growth projections in the midst of a global recession. Leading economic forecasters predict that it will overtake the U.S. as the world's largest economy, measured by overall GDP, sometime around 2020. Already in 2008, China passed the U.S. as the world's leading manufacturing nation--a title the United States had enjoyed for over a century--and this year China will displace Japan as the world's second-largest economy. Everything we know about the trajectories of rising great powers tells us that China will use its increasing wealth to build formidable military power and that it will seek to become the dominant power in East Asia. Optimists contend that once the U.S. recovers from what historian Niall Ferguson calls the "Great Repression"--not quite a depression but more than a recession--we'll be able to answer the Chinese challenge. The country, they remind us, faced a larger debt-GDP ratio after World War II yet embarked on an era of sustained growth. They forget that the postwar era was a golden age of U.S. industrial and financial dominance, trade surpluses, and persistent high growth rates. Those days are gone. The United States of 2010 and the world in which it lives are far different from those of 1945. Weaknesses in the fundamentals of the American economy have been accumulating for more than three decades. In the 1980s, these problems were acutely diagnosed by a number of writers--notably David Calleo, Paul Kennedy, Robert Gilpin, Samuel Huntington, and James Chace--who predicted that these structural ills would ultimately erode the economic foundations of America's global preeminence. A spirited late-1980s debate was cut short, when, in quick succession, the Soviet Union collapsed, Japan's economic bubble burst, and the U.S. experienced an apparent economic revival during the Clinton administration. Now the delayed day of reckoning is fast approaching. Even in the best case, the United States will emerge from the current crisis with fundamental handicaps. The Federal Reserve and Treasury have pumped massive amounts of dollars into circulation in hope of reviving the economy. Add to that the $1 trillion-plus budget deficits that the Congressional Budget Office (CBO) predicts the United States will incur for at least a decade. When the projected deficits are bundled with the persistent U.S. current-account deficit, the entitlements overhang (the unfunded future liabilities of Medicare and Social Security), and the cost of the ongoing wars in Iraq and Afghanistan, there is reason to worry about the United States' fiscal stability. As the CBO says, "Even if the recovery occurs as projected and the stimulus bill is allowed to expire, the country will face the highest debt/GDP ratio in 50 years and an increasingly unsustainable and urgent fiscal problem**."** The dollar's vulnerability is the United States' geopolitical Achilles' heel. Its role as the international economy's reserve currency ensures American preeminence, and if it loses that status, hegemony will be literally unaffordable. As Cornell professor Jonathan Kirshner observes, the dollar's vulnerability "presents potentially significant and underappreciated restraints upon contemporary American political and military predominance." Fears for the dollar's long-term health predated the current financial and economic crisis. The meltdown has amplified them and highlighted two new factors that bode ill for continuing reserve-currency status. First, the other big financial players in the international economy are either military rivals (China) or ambiguous allies (Europe) that have their own ambitions and no longer require U.S. protection from the Soviet threat. Second, the dollar faces an uncertain future because of concerns that its value will diminish over time. Indeed, China, which has holdings estimated at nearly $2 trillion, is worried that America will leave it with huge piles of depreciated dollars. China's vote of no confidence is reflected in its recent calls to create a new reserve currency. In coming years, the U.S. will be under increasing pressure to defend the dollar by preventing runaway inflation. This will require it to impose fiscal self-discipline through some combination of budget cuts, tax increases, and interest-rate hikes**.** Given that the last two options could choke off renewed growth, there is likely to be strong pressure to slash the federal budget. But it will be almost impossible to make meaningful cuts in federal spending without deep reductions in defense expenditures. Discretionary non-defense domestic spending accounts for only about 20 percent of annual federal outlays. So the United States will face obvious "guns or butter" choices. As Kirshner puts it, the absolute size of U.S. defense expenditures are "more likely to be decisive in the future when the U.S. is under pressure to make real choices about taxes and spending. When borrowing becomes more difficult, and adjustment more difficult to postpone, choices must be made between raising taxes, cutting non-defense spending, and cutting defense spending." Faced with these hard decisions, Americans will find themselves afflicted with hegemony fatigue.

**Heg can’t solve war - empirically proven that decrease in heg causes peace**

**Fettweis, 10** Christopher J. **Fettweis** (Professor of national security affairs @ U.S. Naval War College) **2010** “Threat and Anxiety in US Foreign Policy,” Survival, Volume 52, Issue 2 April 2010 , pages 59 – 82

**One** potential **explanation for the growth of global peace can be dismissed** fairly quickly: **US actions do not seem to have contributed much.** The limited evidence suggests that **there is little reason to believe in the stabilising power of the US hegemon, and that there is no relation between the relative level of American activism and international stability. During the 1990s, the United States cut back on its defence spending** fairly **substantially**. By 1998, the United States was spending $100 billion less on defence in real terms than it had in 1990, a 25% reduction.29 To internationalists, defence hawks and other believers in hegemonic stability, this irresponsible 'peace dividend' endangered both national and global security**. 'No serious analyst of American military capabilities', argued** neo-conservatives William **Kristol and** Robert **Kagan** in 1996, **'doubts that the defense budget has been cut much too far to meet America's responsibilities to itself and to world peace'**.30 **And yet the verdict from the 1990s is fairly plain: the world grew more peaceful while the United States cut its forces. No state seemed to believe that its security was endangered by a less-capable US military**, or at least none took any action that would suggest such a belief. **No militaries were enhanced to address power vacuums; no security dilemmas drove insecurity or arms races; no regional balancing occurred once the stabilis-ing presence of the US military was diminished. The rest of the world acted as if the threat of international war was not a pressing concern, despite the reduction in US military capabilities**. Most of all, the United States was no less safe. The incidence and magnitude of global conflict declined while the United States cut its military spending under President Bill Clinton, and kept declining as the George W. Bush administration ramped the spending back up. Complex statistical analysis is unnecessary to reach the conclusion that world peace and US military expenditure are unrelated.

## Solvency

#### Obama will ignore limitations – Libya proves

Crabtree 11

(SUSAN CRABTREE, White House correspondent at The Washington Times. She was the senior editor of The Hill, “Clinton To Congress: Obama Would Ignore Your War Resolutions” MARCH 30, 2011, <http://tpmdc.talkingpointsmemo.com/2011/03/clinton-tells-house-obama-would-ignore-war-resolutions.php>, KB)

Rep. Brad Sherman (D-CA), who asked Clinton about the War Powers Act during a classified briefing, said Clinton and the administration are sidestepping the measure’s provisions giving Congress the ability to put a 60-day time limit on any military action.¶ “They are not committed to following the important part of the War Powers Act,” he told TPM in a phone interview. “She said they are certainly willing to send reports [to us] and if they issue a press release, they’ll send that to us too.”¶ The White House would forge ahead with military action in Libya even if Congress passed a resolution constraining the mission, Secretary of State Hillary Clinton said during a classified briefing to House members Wednesday afternoon.¶ Clinton was responding to a question from Rep. Brad Sherman (D-CA) about the administration’s response to any effort by Congress to exercise its war powers, according to a senior Republican lawmaker who attended the briefing. ¶ The answer surprised many in the room because Clinton plainly admitted the administration would ignore any and all attempts by Congress to shackle President Obama’s power as commander in chief to make military and wartime decisions. In doing so, he would follow a long line of Presidents who have ignored the act since its passage, deeming it an unconstitutional encroachment on executive power.

**Restricting war powers authority causes the executive shift to self-defense justification --- guts the plan’s signal and causes global instability**

Barnes, 12

J.D. at Boston University and M.A. in Law and Diplomacy at The Fletcher School of Law and Diplomacy at Tufts University (Spring 2012, Beau D., Military Law Review, “REAUTHORIZING THE “WAR ON TERROR”: THE LEGAL AND POLICY IMPLICATIONS OF THE AUMF’S COMING OBSOLESCENCE,” 211 Mil. L. Rev. 57)

2. Effect on the International Law of Self-Defense¶ **A failure to reauthorize military force would lead to significant negative consequences on the international level as well. Denying the Executive Branch the authority to carry out military operations in the armed conflict against Al Qaeda would force the President to find authorization elsewhere**, **most likely in the international law of self-defense**--the jus ad bellum. n142 Finding sufficient legal authority for the United States's ongoing counterterrorism operations in the international law of self-defense, however, is problematic for several reasons. As a preliminary matter, **relying on this rationale usurps Congress's role in regulating the contours of U.S. foreign and national security policy. If the Executive Branch can assert "self-defense against a continuing threat" to target and detain terrorists worldwide, it will almost always be able to find such a threat.** n143 Indeed, the Obama Administration's broad understanding of the concept of "imminence" illustrates the danger of allowing the executive to rely on a **self-defense authorization** alone. n144 [\*94] This approach also **would inevitably lead to dangerous "slippery slopes."** **Once the President authorizes a targeted killing of an individual who does not pose an imminent threat in the strict law enforcement sense of "imminence,"** n145 **there are few potential targets that would be off-limits to the Executive Branch. Overly malleable concepts are not the proper bases for the consistent use of military force in a democracy.** **Although the Obama Administration has disclaimed this manner of broad authority because the AUMF "does not authorize military force against anyone the Executive labels a 'terrorist,'"** n146 **relying solely on the international law of self defense would likely lead to precisely such a result**.¶ The slippery slope problem, however, is not just limited to the United States's military actions and the issue of domestic control. **The creation of international norms is an iterative process**, **one to which the** **U**nited **S**tates **makes significant contributions**. **Because of this outsized influence, the U**nited **S**tates **should not claim international legal rights that it is not prepared to see proliferate around the globe**. Scholars have observed that **the** Obama **Administration's "expansive and open-ended interpretation of the right to self-defence threatens to destroy the prohibition on the use of armed force . . . ."** n147 **Indeed, "[i]f other states were to claim the broad-based authority that the United States does, to kill people anywhere, anytime, the result would be chaos."** n148¶ [\*95] **Encouraging the proliferation of an expansive law of international self-defense would** not only be harmful to U.S. national security and global stability, but it would also directly contravene the Obama Administration's national security policy, **sap**ping **U.S. credibility**. The Administration's National Security Strategy emphasizes U.S. "moral leadership," basing its approach to U.S. security in large part on "pursu[ing] a rules-based international system that can advance our own interests by serving mutual interests." n149 **Defense Department General Counsel** Jeh **Johnson has argued that "[a]gainst an unconventional enemy that observes no borders and does not play by the rules, we must guard against aggressive interpretations of our authorities that will discredit our efforts, provoke controversy and invite challenge."** n150 **Cognizant of the risk of establishing unwise international legal norms, Johnson argued that the** **U**nited States **"must not make [legal authority] up to suit the moment."** n151 The Obama Administration's global counterterrorism strategy is to "adher[e] to a stricter interpretation of the rule of law as an essential part of the wider strategy" of "turning the page on the past [and rooting] counterterrorism efforts within a more durable, legal foundation." n152

#### The executive will redefine the law to get around the plan

Pollack 13

Norman Pollack 13, Prof of History @ MSU and PhD in History from Harvard, “Drones, Israel, and the Eclipse of Democracy, Counterpunch, 2/5, [www.counterpunch.org/2013/02/05/drones-israel-and-the-eclipse-of-democracy/](http://www.counterpunch.org/2013/02/05/drones-israel-and-the-eclipse-of-democracy/)

Bisharat first addresses the transmogrification of international law by Israel’s military lawyers. We might call this damage control, were it not more serious. When the Palestinians first sought to join the I.C.C., and then, to receive the UN’s conferral of nonmember status on them, Israel raised fierce opposition. Why? He writes: “Israel’s frantic opposition to the elevation of Palestine’s status at the United Nations was motivated precisely by the fear that it would soon lead to I.C.C. jurisdiction over Palestinian claims of war crimes. Israeli leaders are unnerved for good reason. The I.C.C. could prosecute major international crimes committed on Palestinian soil anytime after the court’s founding on July 1, 2002.” In response to the threat, we see the deliberate reshaping of the law: Since 2000, “the Israel Defense Forces, guided by its military lawyers, have attempted to **remake the laws** of war by consciously violating them and then **creating** new legal concepts to provide juridical cover for their misdeeds.” (Italics, mine) In other words, habituate the law to the existence of atrocities; in the US‘s case, targeted assassination, repeated often enough, seems permissible, indeed clever and wise, as pressure is steadily applied to the laws of war. Even then, “collateral damage” is seen as unintentional, regrettable, but hardly prosecutable, and in the current atmosphere of complicity and desensitization, never a war crime. (**Obama is** hardly a novice **at** this game of **stretching the law to suit the convenience of**, shall we say, the **national interest**? In order to ensure the distortion in counting civilian casualties, which would bring the number down, as Brennan with a straight face claimed, was “zero,” the Big Lie if ever there was one, placing him in distinguished European company, Obama **redefined the meaning** of “combatant” status to be any male of military age throughout the area (which we) declared a combat zone, which noticeably led to a higher incidence of sadism, because it allowed for “second strikes” on funerals—the assumption that anyone attending must be a terrorist—and first responders, those who went to the aid of the wounded and dying, themselves also certainly terrorists because of their rescue attempts.) These guys play hardball, perhaps no more than in using—by report—the proverbial baseball cards to designate who would be next on the kill list. But funerals and first responders—verified by accredited witnesses–seems overly much, and not a murmur from an adoring public.
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## T

#### Links to our limits offense – their evidence concedes that the plan is “other forces,” not forces - that includes stuff like satellites – creates a whole new topic

**US Defense Report 3**

(RESOURCES ALLOCATED TO MISSION AND SUPPORT ACTIVITIES, http://www.iwar.org.uk/military/resources/us-defense-report/2003/14\_Appendix\_Resources\_Allocated.pdf)

Section 113(l) of Title 10, United States Code, requires the Department of Defense¶ (DoD) to identify resources allocated to mission and support activities in each of the five¶ preceding fiscal years. In response to that requirement, Appendix C provides year-byyear comparisons of: ¶ • DoD funding (in constant dollars) allocated to forces and infrastructure (Table ¶ C-1).1¶

\*\*\*footnote inserted\*\*\*

FORCE CATEGORIES¶ • Expeditionary Forces. Operating forces designed primarily for nonnuclear ¶ operations outside the United States. Includes combat units (and their organic¶ support) such as divisions, tactical aircraft squadrons, and aircraft carriers. ¶ • Deterrence and Protection Forces. Operating forces designed primarily to deter ¶ or defeat direct attacks on the United States and its territories. Also includes¶ those agencies engaged in U.S. international policy activities under the direct ¶ supervision of the Office of the Secretary of Defense. ¶ • Other Forces. Includes most intelligence, space, and combat-related command, ¶ control, and communications programs, such as cryptologic activities, satellite ¶ communications, and airborne command posts.

#### Also includes cyberspace which proves a topic coherence da if their interpretation is correct, then including ‘offensive cyber operations’ in the topic would be redundant and unnecessary, since cyber command falls under the uniformed services – this means their interpretation isn’t predictable

USSTRATCOM, 13(“U.S. Cyber Command” current as of August, http://www.stratcom.mil/factsheets/Cyber\_Command/)

USCYBERCOM is a sub-unified command subordinate to U. S. Strategic Command (USSTRATCOM). Service elements include: Army Cyber Command (ARCYBER); Air Forces Cyber (AFCYBER); Fleet Cyber Command (FLTCYBERCOM); and Marine Forces Cyber Command (MARFORCYBER). The Command is also standing up dedicated Cyber Mission Teams to accomplish the three elements of our mission.

#### US Armed Forces means active duty military personnel – prefer it – congressional definition

US Congress 80 ("U.S. Policy in the Far East," US Congress - House Committee on Foreign Affairs, p. 98)

(a) "United States armed forces" means the personnel on active duty belonging to the land, sea or air armed services of the United States of America when in the territory of Japan.

#### Uniformed services means people – this is true in times of war

USERRA 94 ("Uniformed Services Employment and Reemployment Rights Act," http://www.justice.gov/crt/military/statute.htm)

(16) The term 'uniformed services' means the Armed Forces, the Army National Guard and the Air National Guard when engaged in active duty for training, inactive duty training, or full-time National Guard duty, the commissioned corps of the Public Health Service, and any other category of persons designated by the President in time of war or national emergency.

#### United States Armed Forces means uniformed military personnel

Internal Revenue Service 5 ("Part 7. Rulings and Agreements - Chapter 25. Exempt Organizations Determinations Manual - Section 19. Veterans' Organizations," http://www.irs.gov/irm/part7/irm\_07-025-019.html)

Veterans are defined as present or former members of the United States Armed Forces. IRC 7701(a)(15) defines the "military or naval forces of the United States" and the term "Armed Forces of the United States" as including all regular and reserve components of the uniformed services which are subject to the jurisdiction of the Secretary of Defense, the Secretary of the Army, the Secretary of the Navy, or the Secretary of the Air Force. Each term also includes the Coast Guard and the National Guard.

\*IRC = Internal Revenue Code

#### Uniformed services means people

Wikipedia 10 ("uniformed services," http://en.academic.ru/dic.nsf/enwiki/729988)

Uniformed services are bodies of people in the employ of a state that are not employed on standard terms of contract, but have some element of additional discipline, and wear a uniform.\

#### Hostilities implies units of US armed forces engaged in an active exchange of fire with opposing units --- weapons systems don’t count

Opderbeck 13

David W. Opderbeck 13, Professor of Law, Seton Hall University School of Law, 8/2/13, “Drone Courts,” http://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract\_id=2305315

The WPR does not indicate that Congress has any authority to oversee or control the President’s deployment of armed forces in circumstances other than those involving actual or immanent “hostilities.” Recently the Obama administration has interpreted what “hostilities” means in this context very narrowly in connection with U.S. military involvement in the revolution that overthrew Libyan leader Mohammar Quadaffi.176 As Harold Koh, Legal Advisor to the Department of State, testified before the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations in 2011, “as virtually every lawyer recognizes, the operative term, ‘hostilities,’ is an ambiguous standard, which is nowhere defined in the statute.”177 Koh further noted that “[a]pplication of these provisions often generates difficult issues of interpretation that must be addressed in light of a long history of military actions abroad, without guidance from the courts, involving a Resolution passed by a Congress that could not have envisioned many of the operations in which the United States has since become engaged.”178¶ In light of these ambiguities, Koh testified, the Executive branch, in league with Congress, has engaged in casuistic efforts to determine when a particular situation does or does not involve “hostilities.”179 Koh noted that a particularly influential effort to frame principles for application was developed in 1975 by his predecessor Monroe Leigh and Defense Department General Counsel Martin Hoffmann, in a letter that has become canonical in this context.180 The Leigh-Hoffmann letter states that “hostilities” implies “a situation in which units of the U.S. armed forces are actively engaged in exchanges of fire with opposing units of hostile forces.”181 As Koh interpreted the Leigh-Hoffman letter, if the mission, exposure of U.S. forces, and risk of elevation are each limited, the military forces are not engaged in “hostilities.”182 Koh therefore argued that the involvement of U.S. forces in airstrikes against Quaddafi’s forces did not constitute “hostilities.”¶ If the practice of previous administrations supplies guiding precedent, Koh’s argument was sound. As Koh noted, the WPR’s requirements for “hostilities” were not invoked for military operations in Grenada, Lebanon, El Salvador, Iraq (Operation Desert Storm), Kosovo, or Somalia.183 It seems that the use of combat drones for targeted strikes also would not ordinarily constitute “hostilities,” since there is usually no “exchange of fire” under such circumstances.

#### Even HAARP

MIHALKO ‘13

Mark <http://theringmastersrealm.blogspot.com/2013/01/the-executive-order-haarp-natural.html>

As I was driving home today, the words of Vice President Biden about the potential use of Executive Order for gun control struck a nerve. Sure, it is unconstitutional and an outrageous idea, but there was another reason. That secondary reason stems from my research on the use of HAARP and the signing of borderline-to-illegal executive orders by this administration. This was originally posted in separate pieces, but I believe it is time to put this all together and publish it for all people to read and dissect. Yes, it is a long post, but it is full of information that I believe is very important. Some of the ideas may seem speculative, but when you pull back the curtain and look at what is beginning to transpire, these are some signs to be monitoring. ¶ For many American citizens, the information that I have provided on HAARP and Weather Manipulation sits as just conspiracy theory. To them, there is no way that the government can or will control the weather, especially in a way that can harm or injure innocent victims. In looking at the evidence that we have discovered, there is no question that this type of activity could be possible. Of course, the major question would be why. While the true reasons could be many, it seems to come down to a somewhat common thread of this administration, New World Order or a World Government. That is right, the NWO that have ideals that promote Population Control, Gun Control, Martial Law, and a Police State. Yes, the theory is out there, but before you call me crazy, look at the facts and hear me out. This may not be easy to read, and you may not want to believe it, but there are just too many twists to be anything else.¶ While we found some disturbing activities that happened during the days, we outlined in that article, it was important to determine a point where these types of occurrences started. In my view, the precision that was demonstrated by placing a HAARP signal in the perfect spot at the precise power ratio that would steer Hurricane Sandy almost to a 90-degree turn would have to be an outcome and not a chance placement. With that in mind, I did a random Google search for natural disaster and HAARP, just in a chance something would hit, and something did. In searching for answers, a disturbing trend started to appear with natural disasters and a long stretch of what many consider unconstitutional executive orders or legislation.¶ The date was January 12, 2010 and the massive 7.0 Earthquake struck Haiti, destroyed much of a country that was barely hanging on after being hit with four hurricanes, and guess what, there were major HAARP testing events taking place that day. Now that may be coincidence, but it was what was happening in the Executive Offices that added some clarity to the ordeal. Executive Order 13528 the Establishment of the Council of Governors was signed. Sure, from the name, it may sound harmless, but in reality, it is the Executive Order that for all intensive purposes outline how and when Martial Law is to be set in the United States. That is right, Martial Law here inside our borders. Ironically, all test data for the HAARP system on this date has been deleted.¶ Incredibly, the foray into the ultimate goal of New World Order seems to be growing and the cloak of misdirection is just beginning. Yesterday, I covered what seemed to be the beginning of the use of HAARP to control the weather for political gain in this current administration. At this point, I am still researching strange weather phenomena and governmental actions in previous administrations, which I am positive, will exist. Now, it is time to continue on breaking down this string of concentrated coincidences. We will spend this article documenting the eventful year of 2011, starting with the tragedies suffered in Joplin, Missouri.¶ From all accounts, there were some extreme HAARP readings in the time preceding the devastating tornados that ravaged Joplin, Missouri. While the specific numerical values of those levels are not available to the extent they are now, “HAARP Rings” were found on multiple weather RADAR systems prior to the ordeal. In a strange twist, this storm, coupled with some recent flooding not only fit the profile of the United Nations famed Agenda 21 for population control, it also coincided with the signing of another Executive Order, Executive Order 13574 of May 23, 2011, Authorizing the Implementation of Certain Sanctions Set Forth in the Iran Sanctions Act of 1996, as Amended. It authorizes the government to seize assets of a “sanctioned person” in a battle against terrorism.¶ This is the first time you see the term “sanctioned” person in use and it will be a key theme moving forward. What is a sanctioned person? By loose definition, it could be someone with multiple guns, someone with a stockpile of ammunition, someone who has a stash of gold or silver, and the best someone with seven days of stored food. Honestly, that describes many Americans. Of course, some will argue that this mentions Iran specifically, but in reading it, it only calls Iran by name once and uses the reference United States Person on more than one occasion.¶ The next date is September 9, 2011, the same day that we outlined in one of our other HAARP articles, when Hurricane Irene bore down on the East Coast, an earthquake hit Vancouver, and there was destruction in Central America. On that date, we did not see President Obama intently watching the devastation in real time in the White House Situation Room like with Hurricane Sandy. In fact, he was busy signing Executive Order 13584 - Developing an Integrated Strategic Counterterrorism Communications Initiative and Establishing a Temporary Organization to Support Certain Government-wide Communications Activities Directed Abroad. From the name, and for the most part in reading it, it is an anti-terrorism order. Yet, a closer look would reveal that it authorizes a special agency inside the State Department to create a communications link monitoring terrorist activities against American citizens in national and international areas. Really, this one is not extremely dangerous by itself, but again, this is one of many to come.¶ After this order, things quieted down, until Executive Order 13590 - Authorizing the Imposition of Certain Sanctions with Respect to the Provisions of Goods, Services, Technology, or Support for Iran's Energy and Petrochemical Sectors signed on November 20, 2011. This was an interesting order because the term “sanctioned person” was used again. Coincidently, that date also matched a day where severe weather along with heavy rain started for the parts of the United States, including heavy precipitation in the Northwest that measured at least seven inches in some areas.¶ To close out 2011, we move to December, when President Obama signs the extremely contentious National Defense Authorization Act (NDAA). This act has been in place since the early 2000s and has been controversial since its inception. If you have not heard of the act, you must be out of the loop. This act authorizes $662 billion in funding for the defense of the United Statesand its interests abroad. It includes items such as Department of Defense health care costs, counter-terrorism within the U.S. and abroad and military modernization. It also imposes economic sanctions against Iran (section 1045), commissions appraisals of the military capabilities of countries such as Iran, China, and Russia, refocuses the strategic goals of NATO, and gives governors the ability to request the help of military reservists in the event of a hurricane, earthquake, flood, terrorist attack or other disaster.¶ While those issues may not seem out of line, the most controversial provisions are contained in Title X, Subtitle D, entitled Counter-Terrorism. These include sub-sections 1021 and 1022, which deal with detention of persons the government suspects of involvement in terrorism. The controversy was to their legal meaning and potential implications for abuse of Presidential authority. Although the White House and Senate sponsors maintain that the Authorization for Use of Military Force (AUMF) already grants presidential authority for indefinite detention, or the creation of a kill list, the act states that Congress "affirms" this authority and makes specific provisions as to the exercise of that authority for indefinite detention without trial. Of course, separately these mean little, but as a whole, create a tangled web. Especially when you dig a bit deeper in natural disasters with somewhat troubling political undercurrents involved.¶ Do you see how these events are connected, and at the price of the freedoms granted in the Constitution of the United States. The combination of the unconstitutional portions of the NDAA, coupled with the powers granted in these executive orders sit at the heart of something bigger than the War on Terror. Think about what we have heard, Osama Bin Laden is Dead; the terrorists are on the run. Even if that was the case, and it is not, why do we have a need for so many covert orders that have to potential to suppress Constitutional Rights? The only reason I can see is something much darker, something mentioned by President George H.W. Bush, the New World Order. A reference he made multiple times including once on September 11, 1990 and then again in his most famous statement in March 1991.

#### And Rods from God, global strike, space lasers, and heat weapons

SpaceDaily ‘05

<http://www.spacedaily.com/reports/White_House_Says_It_Is_Not_Looking_At_Weaponizing_Space.html>

The White House said Wednesday that it is not looking at weaponizing space in the face of a newspaper report stating the US Air Force was seeking presidential authority that could lead to such a program.¶ "Let me make that clear right off the top, because you asked about the weaponization of space, and the policy that we're talking about is not looking at weaponizing space," White House spokesman Scott McClellan told reporters.¶ However, McClellan said that the administration of US President George W. Bush wants to ensure that its space assets are adequately protected.¶ "We have a draft updated national space policy that is going through the interagency review process," he said.¶ McClellan spoke in the wake of a New York Times report Wednesday which said the US Air Force was seeking a national security directive from President Bush that could lead to fielding offensive and defensive space weapons.¶ An unidentified senior administration official, cited by the Times, said a new presidential directive to replace a 1996 policy that emphasized a more pacific use of space is expected within weeks.¶ McClellan said that Bush had directed in June 2002 "that there be a review of our national space policies."¶ The White House spokesman said it had been "about seven or eight years" since US space policy had been updated.¶ "And certainly during the last eight or nine years there have been a number of domestic and international developments that have changed the threats and challenges facing our space capabilities," McClellan said.¶ "And so the space policy needed to be updated to take into account those changes. And at this point it's still going through that review process.¶ "We believe in the peaceful exploration of space," he stressed.¶ Officials told the Times that the aim of the directive was not to place weapons permanently in orbit - which is banned under the 30-year-old Antiballistic Missile Treaty the US withdrew from in 2002 - but to use space as a platform for weapons systems currently being developed.¶ The daily mentioned Air Force programs such as Global Strike, calling for a military space plane carrying precision-guided weapons that could strike from halfway around the world in 45 minutes.¶ The 'Rods From God' program aims to launch cylinders of tungsten, titanium or uranium from space to strike targets on the ground at speeds of about 11,500 kilometers per hour (7,200 miles per hour) with the force of a small nuclear weapon.¶ Other programs call for bouncing lethal laser beams off orbiting mirrors or high-altitude blimps, or turning radio waves into heat weapons. In April the Air Force launched an experimental XSS-11 microsatellite able to disrupt reconnaissance and communications satellites.

#### Nuclear weapons, land mine bans, cluster bombs, chemical weapons

**Lobel, 8** - Professor of Law, University of Pittsburgh Law School (Jules, “Conflicts Between the Commander in Chief and Congress: Concurrent Power over the Conduct of War” 392 OHIO STATE LAW JOURNAL [Vol. 69:391, <http://moritzlaw.osu.edu/students/groups/oslj/files/2012/04/69.3.lobel_.pdf>)

The third theory—based on the distinction between general rules and specific tactics—also has surface appeal, but is unworkable when applied to specific issues because the line between policy and tactic is too amorphous and hazy to be useful in real world situations. For example, how does one decide whether the use of waterboarding as a technique of interrogation is a policy or specific tactic? Even if it is arguably a specific tactic, Congress could certainly prohibit that tactic as antithetical to a policy prohibiting cruel and inhumane treatment. So too, President Bush’s surge strategy in Iraq could be viewed as a tactic to promote a more stable Iraq, or as a general policy which Congress should be able to limit through use of its funding power. Congress can limit tactical decisions to use particular weapons such as chemical weapons, nuclear weapons, or cluster bombs by forbidding the production or use of such weapons, or simply refusing to fund them.42 Congress could also, however, enact more limited and specific restrictions to prohibit the use of nuclear weapons or land mines in a particular conflict or even a particular theater of war. Indeed, most specific tactics could be permitted or prohibited by a rule. In short, the distinctions between strategies and tactics, rules and detailed instructions, or policies and tactics are simply labels which are virtually indistinguishable. Labeling an activity with one of these terms is largely a distinction without a difference. Accordingly, these labels are not helpful to the real problem of determining the respective powers of Congress and the President.43

#### Broad interpretations cause unmanageable research burdens

Taylor 5

Taylor III, now a JD from William and Mary, 2005¶ (Jarred, “Searching for a More Perfect Union,” <https://docs.google.com/document/d/1ypiOXjRVPWzNxDsFVJ0S1n-QfIGtXzp7Y59meEwd-bE/edit?hl=en_US>)

**It would take even the most seasoned scholar years of research and hundreds of pages to** adequately **analyze** the development of **any presidential power** over the course of American history; **war power is** certainly **no exception**. Every President since George Washington has interpreted the martial prerogatives of his office in different ways, and most have set some sort of precedent for succeeding officeholders. Nevertheless, some of the major changes in executive military power bear highlighting.

#### Limits literally double the educational benefit of debate

Arrington 2009

(Rebecca, UVA Today, “Study Finds That Students Benefit From Depth, Rather Than Breadth, in High School Science Courses” March 4)

A recent study reports that high school students who study fewer science topics, but study them in greater depth, have an advantage in college science classes over their peers who study more topics and spend less time on each. Robert Tai, associate professor at the University of Virginia's Curry School of Education, worked with Marc S. Schwartz of the University of Texas at Arlington and Philip M. Sadler and Gerhard Sonnert of the Harvard-Smithsonian Center for Astrophysics to conduct the study and produce the report. "Depth Versus Breadth: How Content Coverage in High School Courses Relates to Later Success in College Science Coursework" relates the amount of content covered on a particular topic in high school classes with students' performance in college-level science classes. The study will appear in the July 2009 print edition of Science Education and is currently available as an online pre-print from the journal. "As a former high school teacher, I always worried about whether it was better to teach less in greater depth or more with no real depth. This study offers evidence that teaching fewer topics in greater depth is a better way to prepare students for success in college science," Tai said. "These results are based on the performance of thousands of college science students from across the United States." The 8,310 students in the study were enrolled in introductory biology, chemistry or physics in randomly selected four-year colleges and universities. Those who spent one month or more studying one major topic in-depth in high school earned higher grades in college science than their peers who studied more topics in the same period of time. The study revealed that students in courses that focused on mastering a particular topic were impacted twice as much as those in courses that touched on every major topic.

## Security K

#### Portraying china and russia as “rising” powers fills the meaning of the signifier of the “west” in a way that reproduces external antagonism into the field of ir even if the context of those relations discourses is co-operative.

WEBER 2K8

[Christian, PhD-candidate, Goethe-University Frankfurt a.M. – International Studies, “securitizing china and Russia?: Western relationships with “rising” powers in the East”, http://tinyurl.com/weber08]

Accordingly, this research field of the project covers the global dimension of transformations in the Western order in the context of great power relations. It explores if, how and to what extent the development of transatlantic cooperation and integration in the post-Cold War era is connected with exclusionary practices to the outside, namely the discursive construction of new dividing lines between "Western democracies" on the one hand and "Eastern dictatorial regimes" on the other. For this purpose, it shall be investigated how significant actors in the U.S. and Europe conceptualize China’s ongoing gain in material power and also how they assess their relations towards Russia in the face of an increasing dependence on Russian strategic oil and gas resources. A thorough investigation of how Western actors categorize and represent themselves and others in struggles about the signification of events and policies should provide answers to the main question if and how the “the West” is being reproduced in the post-Cold War era through the construction of fundamental differences towards China and Russia as “rising powers” in the East.

**C. Reject their notion of politics that is inherently exclusionary – interrogating the aff’s discourse is critical to effective policymaking**

Grondin 2K4

[David, Assistant Professor at University of Ottowa, “(Re)Writing the “National Security State”,” presented at the annual International Studies Association Convention, 17-20 March 2004,<http://www.ieim.uqam.ca/IMG/pdf/rewriting_national_security_state.pdf>]

A poststructuralist approach to international relations reassesses the nature of the political. Indeed, it calls for the repoliticization of practices of world politics that have been treated as if they were not political. For instance, limiting the ontological elements in one’s inquiry to states or great powers is a political choice. As Jenny Edkins puts it, we need to “bring the political back in” (Edkins, 1998: xii). For most analysts of International Relations, the conception of the “political” is narrowly restricted to politics as practiced by politicians. However, from a poststructuralist viewpoint, the “political” acquires a broader meaning, especially since practice is not what most theorists are describing as practice. Poststructuralism sees theoretical discourse not only as discourse, but also as political practice. Theory therefore becomes practice. The political space of poststructuralism is not that of exclusion; it is the political space of postmodernity, a dichotomous one, where one thing always signifies at least one thing and another (Finlayson and Valentine, 2002: 14). Poststructuralism thus gives primacy to the political, since it acts on us, while we act in its name, and leads us to identify and differentiate ourselves from others. This political act is never complete and celebrates undecidability, whereas decisions, when taken, express the political moment. It is a critical attitude which encourages dissidence from traditional approaches (Ashley and Walker, 1990a and 1990b). It does not represent one single philosophical approach or perspective, nor is it an alternative paradigm (Tvathail, 1996: 172). It is a nonplace, a border line falling between international and domestic politics (Ashley, 1989). The poststructuralist analyst questions the borderlines and dichotomies of modernist discourses, such as inside/outside, the constitution of the Self/Other, and so on. In the act of definition, difference – thereby the discourse of otherness – is highlighted, since one always defines an object with regard to what it is not (Knafo, 2004). As Simon Dalby asserts, “It involves the social construction of some other person, group, culture, race, nationality or political system as different from ‘our’ person, group, etc. Specifying difference is a linguistic, epistemological and, most importantly, a political act; it constructs a space for the other distanced and inferior from the vantage point of the person specifying the difference” (Dalby, cited in TUathail, 1996: 179). Indeed, poststructuralism offers no definitive answers, but leads to new questions and new unexplored grounds. This makes the commitment to the incomplete nature of the political and of political analysis so central to poststructuralism (Finlayson and Valentine, 2002: 15). As Jim George writes, “It is postmodern resistance in the sense that while it is directly (and sometimes violently) engaged with modernity, it seeks to go beyond the repressive, closed aspects of modernist global existence. It is, therefore, not a resistance of traditional grand-scale emancipation or conventional radicalism imbued with authority of one or another sovereign presence. Rather, in opposing the large-scale brutality and inequity in human society, it is a resistance active also at the everyday, community, neighbourhood, and interpersonal levels, where it confronts those processes that systematically exclude people from making decisions about who they are and what they can be” (George, 1994: 215, emphasis in original). In this light, poststructural practices are used critically to investigate how the subject of international relations is constituted in and through the discourses and texts of global politics. Treating theory as discourse opens up the possibility of historicizing it. It is a myth that theory can be abstracted from its socio-historical context, from reality, so to speak, as neorealists and neoclassical realists believe. It is a political practice which needs to be contextualized and stripped of its purportedly neutral status. It must be understood with respect to its role in preserving and reproducing the structures and power relations present in all language forms. Dominant theories are, in this view, dominant discourses that shape our view of the world (the “subject”) and our ways of understanding it.

#### 4. PERMUTATION LINKS MORE: State-centricity coopts the perm – The political focus of the aff makes sovereign identity, our link to otherization and “meaning to life”, inevitable

Campbell 98

(David, Professor of International politics at the University of Newcastle, Writing Security: US Foreign Policy and the Politics of Identity, pg 38-39)

The subfield of international relations that serves as the main body of literature on foreign is that of “comparative foreign policy,” a field indebted to the realist orthodoxy that underpins the discipline’s view of the cold war.4 A number of reviews have provided a clear insight to the entailments and assumptions of this dominant mode of understanding foreign policy. In the introduction to a collection that surveyed “new directions” in the study of foreign policy, James Rosenau noted with approval that the conspicuous absence of “ philosophical and methodological argumentation” in the collected essays was an indication of the field’s passage into a “more mature era of inquiry.” In contrast to earlier periods “the epistemological and methodological premises on which the analysis rest[s]…are largely taken for granted.”5 These assumptions give rise to a conventional and largely unquestioned substantive focus (for scholars rather than practitioners) in foreign policy analysis: the policies of states oriented toward the external world.6 Rosenau has provided an illuminating metaphor to describe this focus. Foreign policy analysis, he argued, “is a bridging discipline. It takes as its focus of study the bridges that whole systems called states to build to link themselves and their subsystems to the even more encompassing international systems of which they are a part.”7 In this understanding, global politics comprises states, their(domestic) subsystems, and international systems. These systems and subsystems exist independently of, and prior to, any relationship that results from their joining by the “bridge” of foreign policy. That bridge is consciously constructed by the state in an effort to make itself part of the larger system and to deal with the dangers and uncertainties that the larger system holds for its own security. As a phenomenon thought to be common to all states, we speak about foreign policy of state “x” or state “y,” Thereby indicating that the state is prior to the policy. Underpinned by a commitment to epistemic realism, this understanding depends on the “explicit and grounded... prior conceptualizations of variables and relationships.”8 These variables are the internal factors of the state and the external conditions of the international system. The relationships involve the structure of the internal factors ( the processes of decision making within the state, in which psychological interpretations act as an additional “bridge” between individuals and institutions)9 and the interaction of the internal factors and external conditions.10

#### Their security thinking intrinsically produces in-group thinking that necessitates violence against an out-group – This is the root cause of war

Lipschutz 98 (Ronnie D, Professor, Department of Politics @ The UC Santa Cruz, "8. Negotiating the Boundaries of Difference and Security at Millennium's End," Cioanet,http://www.ciaonet.org/book/lipschutz/lipschutz18.html]

Much of the analysis that currently purports to explain these wars revolves around the concepts of ethnicity and sectarianism : Increasingly, groups of people are defining themselves collectively, relative to others, in terms of certain shared or acquired characteristics such as appearance, religion, history, origins, language, and so on. This is not something new, of course; the very ideas of nationalism and the nation-state are based on such differences. But analyses based on the construction and application of ethnicity generally ignore the importance of the Other --whom one is not--in fostering the sense of collective identity so important to action centered on ethnicity or sectarianism. 11 Defining oneself in such terms requires defining someone else in different terms; differentiation thus draws a boundary between the self and the Other. This Other is not, at first, necessarily a threat in terms of one's own continued existence, although ethnicity can and does become securitized. 12 But the peaceful acceptance of an Other requires that boundaries be drawn somewhere else, and that security, the speech act, specify another Other (as in, for example, South Slavs against the Hapsburgs, or Yugoslavia against the Soviet Union). There are always implicit risks in the peaceful acceptance of an Other as a legitimate ontology, because doing so raises the possibility, however remote, of accepting the Other's characteristics as a legitimate alternative and, consequently, of being taken over by the Other. Given this epistemology of threats, it does not take much to be "turned." 13 How else to account for the life and death character of the distinctions among Serbs, Croats, and Muslims in Bosnia, which the untutored eye can hardly detect? 14 As James Der Derian puts it in his contribution to this volume, "The desire for security is manifested as a collective resentment of difference--that which is not us, not certain, not predictable."