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#### asking how the executive should be allowed to conduct war masks the fundamental question of whether war should be allowed at all – ensures a military mentality

Cady 10 (Duane L., prof of phil @ hamline university, From Warism to Pacifism: A Moral Continuum, pp. 22-23)

The widespread, unquestioning acceptance of warism and the corresponding reluctance to consider pacifism as a legitimate option make it difficult to propose a genuine consideration of pacifist alternatives. Warism may be held implicitly or explicitly. Held in its implicit form, it does not occur to the warist to challenge the view that war is morally justified; war is taken to be natural and normal. No other way of understanding large-scale human conflict even comes to mind. In this sense warism is like racism, sexism, and homophobia: a prejudicial bias built into conceptions and judgments without the awareness of those assuming it. In its explicit form, warism is openly accepted, articulated, and deliberately chosen as a value judgment on nations in conflict. War may be defended as essential for justice, needed for national security, as “the only thing the enemy understands,” and so on. In both forms warism misguides judgments and institutions by reinforcing the necessity and inevitability of war and precluding alternatives. Whether held implicitly or explicitly, warism obstructs questioning the conceptual framework of the culture. If we assume (without realizing it) that war itself is morally justifiable, our moral considerations of war will be focused on whether a particular war is justified or whether particular acts within a given war are morally acceptable. These are important concerns, but addressing them does not get at the fundamental issue raised by the pacifist: the morality of war as such. In Just and Unjust Wars Michael Walzer explains that “war is always judged twice, first with reference to the reasons states have for fighting, secondly with reference to the means they adopt.”8 The pacifist suggestion is that there is a third judgment of war that must be made prior to the other two: might war, by its very nature, be morally wrong? This issue is considered by Walzer only as an afterthought in an appendix, where it is dismissed as naïve. Perhaps Walzer should not be faulted for this omission, since he defines his task as describing the conventional morality of war and, as has been argued above, conventional morality does take warism for granted. To this extent Walzer is correct. And this is just the point: our warist conceptual frameworks— our warist normative lenses— blind us to the root question. The concern of pacifists is to expose the hidden warist bias and not merely describe cultural values. Pacifists seek to examine cultural values and recommend what they ought to be. This is why the pacifist insists on judging war in itself, a judgment more fundamental than the more limited assessments of the morality of a given war or the morality of specific acts within a particular war.

#### this mindset is important – our consciousness of war guarantees endless violence that ensures planetary destruction and structural violence

* Another impact: freeing ourselves from war = more resources for peace

Lawrence 9 (Grant, “Military Industrial "War" Consciousness Responsible for Economic and Social Collapse,” OEN—OpEdNews, March 27)

As a presidential candidate, [Barack Obama](http://obama.senate.gov/) called [Afghanistan](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/War_in_Afghanistan_%282001%E2%80%93present%29) ''the war we must win.'' He was absolutely right. Now it is time to win it... Senators [John McCain](http://www.imdb.com/name/nm0564587/) and Joseph Lieberman [calling](http://www.miamiherald.com/opinion/inbox/story/960269.html) for an expanded war in Afghanistan "How true it is that war can destroy everything of value." Pope Benedict XVI [decrying](http://www.google.com/hostednews/afp/article/ALeqM5iuue8kE-e0lYZVFpt4RlbX4M_IEw) the suffering of Africa Where troops have been quartered, brambles and thorns spring up. In the track of great armies there must follow lean years. Lao Tzu on [War](http://www.sacred-texts.com/tao/salt/salt09.htm) As Americans we are raised on the utility of war to conquer every problem. We have a drug problem so we wage war on it. We have a cancer problem so we wage war on it. We have a crime problem so we wage war on it. Poverty cannot be dealt with but it has to be warred against. Terror is another problem that must be warred against. In the [United States](http://maps.google.com/maps?ll=38.8833333333,-77.0166666667&spn=10.0,10.0&q=38.8833333333,-77.0166666667%20%28United%20States%29&t=h), solutions can only be found in terms of wars. In a society that functions to support a massive military industrial war machine and empire, it is important that the terms promoted support the conditioning of its citizens. We are conditioned to see war as the solution to major social ills and major political disagreements. That way when we see so much of our resources devoted to war then we don't question the utility of it. The term "war" excites mind and body and creates a fear mentality that looks at life in terms of attack. In war, there has to be an attack and a must win attitude to carry us to victory. But is this war mentality working for us? In an age when nearly half of our tax money goes to support the war machine and a good deal of the rest is going to support the elite that control the war machine, we can see that our present war mentality is not working. Our values have been so perverted by our war mentality that we see sex as sinful but killing as entertainment. Our society is dripping violence. The violence is fed by poverty, social injustice, the break down of family and community that also arises from economic injustice, and by the managed media. The cycle of violence that exists in our society exists because it is useful to those that control society. It is easier to sell the war machine when your population is conditioned to violence. Our military industrial consciousness may not be working for nearly all of the life of the planet but it does work for the very few that are the master manipulators of our values and our consciousness. Rupert Murdoch, the media monopoly man that runs the "Fair and Balanced" [Fox Network](http://www.fox.com/), Sky Television, and [News Corp](http://www.newscorp.com/) just to name a few, [had](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Rupert_Murdoch) all of his 175 newspapers editorialize in favor of the [Iraq war](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Iraq_War). Murdoch snickers when [he says](http://www.newscorpse.com/ncWP/?p=341) "we tried" to manipulate public opinion." The Iraq war was a good war to Murdoch [because,](http://www.americanprogress.org/issues/2004/07/b122948.html) "The death toll, certainly of Americans there, by the terms of any previous war are quite minute." But, to the media manipulators, the phony politicos, the military industrial elite, a million dead Iraqis are not to be considered. War is big business and it is supported by a war consciousness that allows it to prosper. That is why more war in Afghanistan, the war on Palestinians, and the other wars around the planet in which the [military industrial complex](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Military-industrial_complex) builds massive wealth and power will continue. The military industrial war mentality is not only killing, maiming, and destroying but it is also contributing to the present social and economic collapse. As mentioned previously, the massive wealth transfer that occurs when the American people give half of their money to support death and destruction is money that could have gone to support a just society. It is no accident that after years of war and preparing for war, our society is crumbling. Science and technological resources along with economic and natural resources have been squandered in the never-ending pursuit of enemies. All of that energy could have been utilized for the good of humanity, ¶ instead of maintaining the power positions of the very few super wealthy. So the suffering that we give is ultimately the suffering we get. Humans want to believe that they can escape the consciousness that they live in. But that consciousness determines what we experience and how we live. As long as we choose to live in "War" in our minds then we will continue to get "War" in our lives. When humanity chooses to wage peace on the world then there will be a flowering of life. But until then we will be forced to live the life our present war consciousness is creating.

#### The alternative must begin in our minds – we need to free ourselves of the presumption towards war and advocate for peace and social justice to stop the flow of militarism that threatens existence

* Democracy itself is the product of searching for peaceful solutions

Demenchonok 9 – Worked as a senior researcher at the Institute of Philosophy of the Russian Academy of Sciences, Moscow, and is currently a Professor of Foreign Languages and Philosophy at Fort Valley State University in Georgia, listed in 2000 Outstanding Scholars of the 21st Century and is a recipient of the Twenty-First Century Award for Achievement in Philosophy from the International Biographical Centre --Edward, Philosophy After Hiroshima: From Power Politics to the Ethics of Nonviolence and Co-Responsibility, February, American Journal of Economics and Sociology, Volume 68, Issue 1, Pages 9-49

Where, then, does the future lie? Unilateralism, hegemonic political anarchy, mass immiseration, ecocide, and global violence—a Hobbesian bellum omnium contra omnes? Or international cooperation, social justice, and genuine collective—political and human—security? Down which path lies cowering, fragile hope?¶ Humanistic thinkers approach these problems from the perspective of their concern about the situation of individuals and the long-range interests of humanity. They examine in depth the root causes of these problems, warning about the consequences of escalation and, at the same time, indicating the prospect of their possible solutions through nonviolent means and a growing global consciousness. Today's world is in desperate need of realistic alternatives to violent conflict. Nonviolent action—properly planned and executed—is a powerful and effective force for political and social change. The ideas of peace and nonviolence, as expressed by Immanuel Kant, Leo Tolstoy, Mahatma Gandhi, Martin Luther King, and many contemporary philosophers—supported by peace and civil rights movements—counter the paralyzing fear with hope and offer a realistic alternative: a rational approach to the solutions to the problems, encouraging people to be the masters of their own destiny.¶ Fortunately, the memory of the tragedies of war and the growing realization of this new existential situation of humanity has awakened the global conscience and generated protest movements demanding necessary changes. During the four decades of the Cold War, which polarized the world, power politics was challenged by the common perspective of humanity, of the supreme value of human life, and the ethics of peace. Thus, in Europe, which suffered from both world wars and totalitarianism, spiritual-intellectual efforts to find solutions to these problems generated ideas of "new thinking," aiming for peace, freedom, and democracy. Today, philosophers, intellectuals, progressive political leaders, and peace-movement activists continue to promote a peaceful alternative. In the asymmetry of power, despite being frustrated by war-prone politics, peaceful projects emerge each time, like a phoenix arising from the ashes, as the only viable alternative for the survival of humanity. The new thinking in philosophy affirms the supreme value of human and nonhuman life, freedom, justice, and the future of human civilization. It asserts that the transcendental task of the survival of humankind and the rest of the biotic community must have an unquestionable primacy in comparison to particular interests of nations, social classes, and so forth. In applying these principles to the nuclear age, it considers a just and lasting peace as a categorical imperative for the survival of humankind, and thus proposes a world free from nuclear weapons and from war and organized violence.44 In tune with the Charter of the United Nations, it calls for the democratization of international relations and for dialogue and cooperation in order to secure peace, human rights, and solutions to global problems. It further calls for the transition toward a cosmopolitan order.¶ The escalating global problems are symptoms of what might be termed a contemporary civilizational disease, developed over the course of centuries, in which techno-economic progress is achieved at the cost of depersonalization and dehumanization. Therefore, the possibility of an effective "treatment" today depends on whether or not humankind will be able to regain its humanity, thus establishing new relations of the individual with himself or herself, with others, and with nature. Hence the need for a new philosophy of humanity and an ethics of nonviolence and planetary co-responsibility to help us make sense not only of our past historical events, but also of the extent, quality, and urgency of our present choices.

#### Framing issue – the way we discuss and represent war should come first – the language surrounding violence has direct, concrete effects

* Political acts of violence are uniquely tied to language – every government has to convince their people that it’s legitimate. The plan helps make that VERY convincing – makes it look like there’s some restraint

**Collins & Glover 2** (John, Assistant Prof. of Global Studies at St. Lawrence University, Ross, Visiting Professor of Sociology at St. Lawrence University, Collateral Language, p. 6-7)

As any university student knows, theories about the “social con­struction” and social effects of language have become a common feature of academic scholarship. Conservative critics often argue that those who use these theories of language (e.g., deconstruc­tion) are “just” talking about language, as opposed to talking about the “real world.” The essays in this book, by contrast, begin from the premise that language matters in the most concrete, im­mediate way possible: its use, by political and military leaders, leads directly to violence in the form of war, mass murder (in­cluding genocide), the physical destruction of human commu­nities, and the devastation of the natural environment. Indeed, if the world ever witnesses a nuclear holocaust, it will probably be because leaders in more than one country have succeeded in convincing their people, through the use of political language, that the use of nuclear weapons and, if necessary, the destruction of the earth itself, is justifiable. From our perspective, then, every act of political violence—from the horrors perpetrated against Native Americans to the murder of political dissidents in the So­viet Union to the destruction of the World Trade Center, and now the bombing of Afghanistan—is intimately linked with the use of language. Partly what we are talking about here, of course, are the processes of “manufacturing consent” and shaping people’s per­ception of the world around them; people are more likely to sup­port acts of violence committed in their name if the recipients of the violence have been defined as “terrorists,” or if the violence is presented as a defense of “freedom.” Media analysts such as Noam Chomsky have written eloquently about the corrosive ef­fects that this kind of process has on the political culture of sup­posedly democratic societies. At the risk of stating the obvious, however, the most fundamental effects of violence are those that are visited upon the objects of violence; the language that shapes public opinion is the same language that burns villages, besieges entire populations, kills and maims human bodies, and leaves the ground scarred with bomb craters and littered with land mines. As George Orwell so famously illustrated in his work, acts of vio­lence can easily be made more palatable through the use of eu­phemisms such as “pacification” or, to use an example discussed in this book, “targets.” It is important to point out, however, that the need for such language derives from the simple fact that the violence itself is abhorrent. Were it not for the abstract language of “vital interests” and “surgical strikes” and the flattering lan­guage of “civilization” and ‘just” wars, we would be less likely to avert our mental gaze from the physical effects of violence.

### 1NC T

#### Interpretation – “war powers authority of the President” is the power to conduct war.

#### War powers authority of the Congress is the power to declare war

Gerald G. Howard - Spring, 2001, Senior Notes and Comments Editor for the Houston Law Review, COMMENT: COMBAT IN KOSOVO: IGNORING THE WAR POWERS RESOLUTION, 38 Hous. L. Rev. 261, LexisNexis

 [\*270] The issue, then, becomes one of defining and monitoring the authority of the political leader in a democratic nation. Black's Law Dictionary defines "war power" as "the constitutional authority of Congress to declare war and maintain armed forces, and of the President to conduct war as commander-in-chief." n45 The power and authority of United States political leaders to conduct war stems from two documents: the United States Constitution and the War Powers Resolution. n46 One must understand each of these sources of authority to properly assess the legality of the combat operations in Kosovo.

#### Violation – the aff restricts Congress’s war power by limiting its ability to declare war to jus ad bellum principles

Michael Stokes Paulsen – June 2009, Distinguished University Chair and Professor of Law, The University of St. Thomas School of Law, Feature: The Constitutional Power To Interpret International Law, THE YALE LAW JOURNAL, 118 Yale L.J. 1762

A. The Power To Initiate War - Jus ad Bellum

Congress's constitutional power to initiate ("declare") war by legislative act, and the President's constitutional executive power to defend the nation against attacks, n160 embrace a subject matter that is of course also treated by international law, including the U.N. Charter. It is not my purpose here to discuss the international law of war as it concerns a nation's decision to use military force. Rather, my point is simply that nothing in international law constitutionally constrains the decision of the United States to go to war against an enemy. While international law may prescribe that some exercises of the decision of the United States to engage in war are unlawful within the regime of international law, such restrictions may not interfere with Congress's (and the President's) constitutional powers. They are, in U.S. domestic constitutional law terms, unconstitutional purported restrictions on U.S. actors. This applies whether international law purports to forbid military action or purports to require military action by the United States. And significantly, it applies irrespective of the fact that international law commands and obligations may have been made part of U.S. law by treaty. For as noted above, a treaty may not foreclose Congress's constitutional power to declare war or the President's executive power with respect to war. Thus, whether Congress's justification for the authorizations of war in the September 18, 2001, AUMF, and with respect to the Iraq War n161 satisfied international law requirements is of no consequence as a matter of U.S. law. Constitutionally, these wars were legal, beyond question. The question of international law compliance is one of international politics and international relations, not one of binding U.S. law.

#### Vote Neg

#### Predictable limits – There are 100s of caveats the aff could have Congress declare about its willingness to authorize or fund wars in the future

#### Ground – restrictions on Congress are a relative increase in presidential power – flips all our DAs and justifies bidirectional affs – also allows affs to get perception-based advantages on changes in the power to declare war without linking to DA about the conduct of war

#### Extra T is a voter – still explodes limits and constrains negative ground – severing the aff isn’t a remedy because it forces us to go for T for 6 minutes to get back to zero

### 1NC DA

#### Immigration reform will pass --- top priority and political capital is key

Matthews, 10/16 (Laura, 10/16/2013, “2013 Immigration Reform Bill: 'I'm Going To Push To Call A Vote,' Says Obama,” [http://www.ibtimes.com/2013-immigration-reform-bill-im-going-push-call-vote-says-obama-1429220)](http://www.ibtimes.com/2013-immigration-reform-bill-im-going-push-call-vote-says-obama-1429220%29))

When Congress finally passes a bipartisan bill that kicks the fiscal battles over to early next year, the spotlight could return to comprehensive immigration reform before 2013 ends. At least that’s the hope of President Barack Obama and his fellow Chicagoan Rep. Luis Gutierrez, D-Ill., chairman of the Immigration Task Force of the Congressional Hispanic Caucus and one of the most vocal advocates for immigration reform in the House of Representatives. “When we emerge from this crazy partisan eruption from the Republicans, there will be a huge incentive for sensible Republicans who want to repair some of the damage they have done to themselves,” Gutierrez said in a statement. “Immigration reform remains the one issue popular with both Democratic and Republican voters on which the two parties can work together to deliver real, substantive solutions in the Congress this year.” Reforming the status quo has consistently been favored by a majority of Americans. Earlier this year, at least two-thirds of Americans supported several major steps to make the system work better, according to a Gallup poll. Those steps include implementing an E-verify system for employers to check electronically the immigration status of would-be employees (85 percent), a path to citizenship for undocumented immigrants, (72 percent), an entry-exit check system to make sure people who enter the country then leave it (71 percent), more high-skilled visas (71 percent) and increased border security (68 percent). The Senate passed its version of a 2013 immigration reform bill in June that includes, but is not limited to, a pathway to citizenship for immigrants without documentation and doubling security on the southern border. But that measure has stalled in the House, where Republicans are adamant they will take a piecemeal approach. The momentum that lawmakers showed for reform has been sapped by the stalemate that that has shut down the government for 16 days and brought the U.S. to the brink of default. The Senate has agreed on Wednesday to a bipartisan solution to break the gridlock. When the shutdown and default threat is resolved (for a time), that’s when Obama will renew his push to get Congress to move on immigration reform. On Tuesday the president said reform will become his top priority.“Once that’s done, you know, the day after, I’m going to be pushing to say, call a vote on immigration reform,” Obama told Univision affiliate KMEX-TV in Los Angeles. “And if I have to join with other advocates and continue to speak out on that, and keep pushing, I’m going to do so because I think it’s really important for the country. And now is the time to do it.” The president pointed the finger at House Speaker John Boehner, R-Ohio, for not allowing the bill to be brought to the floor for a vote. Boehner had promised that the Senate’s bill would not be voted on unless a majority of the majority in the House supports it -- the same principle he was holding out for on the government shutdown before he gave in. “We had a very strong Democratic and Republican vote in the Senate,” Obama said. “The only thing right now that’s holding it back is, again, Speaker Boehner not willing to call the bill on the floor of the House of Representatives. So we’re going to have to get through this crisis that was unnecessary, that was created because of the obsession of a small faction of the Republican Party on the Affordable Care Act.” Republicans are opposing the Democratic view of immigration reform because of its inclusion of a 13-year path to citizenship for undocumented immigrants. They said this amounted to “amnesty.” Some Republicans prefer to give them legal resident status instead. Immigration advocates have also been urging Obama to use his executive authority to halt the more than 1,000 deportations taking place daily. Like the activists, Gutierrez said the government shutdown didn’t do anything to slow the number of daily deportations. Some Republicans who welcomed Sen. Ted Cruz’s filibuster over Obamacare because it shifted the focus from immigration. “If Ted [didn’t] spin the filibuster, if we don’t make this the focus, we had already heard what was coming,” Rep. Louie Gohmert, R-Texas, told Fox News on Tuesday. “As soon as we got beyond this summer, we were going to have an amnesty bill come to the floor. That’s what we would have been talking about. And that’s where the pivot would have been if we had not focused America on Obamacare.” Still, pro-immigration advocates are hopeful they can attain their goal soon. “With more prodding from the president and the American people,” Gutierrez said, “we can get immigration reform legislation passed in the House and signed into law.”

#### Releasing Gitmo detainees into the US will provoke massive backlash

NYT 09

(Chinese Inmates at Guantánamo Pose a Dilemma, www.nytimes.com/2009/04/01/us/politics/01gitmo.html?pagewanted=all&\_r=0)

The Uighurs have become something of a Guantánamo Rorschach test: hapless refugees to some, dangerous plotters to others. For the Obama administration, the task of determining which of those portraits is correct and whether the men can be released inside the United States has raised the stakes for the president’s plan to close the Guantánamo prison. Either choice is likely to provoke intense reaction. The dilemma has taken on new urgency because the plan to close the prison depends on other countries’ accepting some of the remaining 241 detainees Diplomats say that with President Obama embarking on Tuesday on a European trip, the effort could falter unless this country signals it is willing to take some of the Guantánamo prisoners. At home, though, Mr. Obama faces the prospect of a storm of protest from some quarters if he admits detainees the Bush administration labeled terrorists and barred from this country. Already, word of the men’s possible release has brought denunciations and anxiety from military groups, families of Sept. 11 victims and political figures. “I don’t think people want people that could potentially be terrorists in the United States,” said Representative J. Randy Forbes, Republican of Virginia.

#### Reform key to the economy – immigrants are key to several critical sectors

West, ‘09 – Director of Governance Studies at the Brookings Institution (7/22/09, Darrell M., “The Path to a New Immigration Reform,” http://www.brookings.edu/opinions/2009/0721\_immigration\_reform\_west.aspx)

Skeptics need to understand how important a new immigration policy is to American competitiveness and long-term economic development. High-skill businesses require a sufficient number of scientists and engineers. Many industries such as construction, landscaping, health care and hospitality services are reliant on immigrant labor. Farmers need seasonal workers for agricultural productivity. Critics who worry about resource drains must understand that immigrants spend money on goods and services, pay taxes and perform jobs and start businesses vital to our economy. Beyond the economy, immigration reform prospects improve considerably across a fresh political landscape that features a popular Democratic president armed with substantial Democratic majorities in the House and Senate, many who appear receptive to comprehensive reform. Obama has called repeatedly for big ideas and bold policy actions. The country needs new policies that emphasize the importance of immigrant workers \_ across the skills spectrum \_ to our country's long-term financial future. Our universities invest millions in training foreign students but then send them home without any U.S. job opportunities that would take advantage of their new skills. And investing in the children of middle- and lower-skilled immigrants is wise as we recognize their majority role in our workforce as the next generation rises.

#### Extinction

Harris and Burrows, ‘09 [Mathew, PhD European History at Cambridge, counselor in the National Intelligence Council (NIC) and Jennifer, member of the NIC’s Long Range Analysis Unit “Revisiting the Future: Geopolitical Effects of the Financial Crisis” <http://www.ciaonet.org/journals/twq/v32i2/f_0016178_13952.pdf>]

Increased Potential for Global Conflict Of course, the report encompasses more than economics and indeed believes the future is likely to be the result of a number of intersecting and interlocking forces. With so many possible permutations of outcomes, each with ample Revisiting the Future opportunity for unintended consequences, there is a growing sense of insecurity. Even so, history may be more instructive than ever. While we continue to believe that the Great Depression is not likely to be repeated, the lessons to be drawn from that period include the harmful effects on fledgling democracies and multiethnic societies (think Central Europe in 1920s and 1930s) and on the sustainability of multilateral institutions (think League of Nations in the same period). There is no reason to think that this would not be true in the twenty-first as much as in the twentieth century. For that reason, the ways in which the potential for greater conflict could grow would seem to be even more apt in a constantly volatile economic environment as they would be if change would be steadier. In surveying those risks, the report stressed the likelihood that terrorism and nonproliferation will remain priorities even as resource issues move up on the international agenda. Terrorism’s appeal will decline if economic growth continues in the Middle East and youth unemployment is reduced. For those terrorist groups that remain active in 2025, however, the diffusion of technologies and scientific knowledge will place some of the world’s most dangerous capabilities within their reach. Terrorist groups in 2025 will likely be a combination of descendants of long established groups\_inheriting organizational structures, command and control processes, and training procedures necessary to conduct sophisticated attacks\_and newly emergent collections of the angry and disenfranchised that become self-radicalized, particularly in the absence of economic outlets that would become narrower in an economic downturn. The most dangerous casualty of any economically-induced drawdown of U.S. military presence would almost certainly be the Middle East. Although Iran’s acquisition of nuclear weapons is not inevitable, worries about a nuclear-armed Iran could lead states in the region to develop new security arrangements with external powers, acquire additional weapons, and consider pursuing their own nuclear ambitions. It is not clear that the type of stable deterrent relationship that existed between the great powers for most of the Cold War would emerge naturally in the Middle East with a nuclear Iran. Episodes of low intensity conflict and terrorism taking place under a nuclear umbrella could lead to an unintended escalation and broader conflict if clear red lines between those states involved are not well established. The close proximity of potential nuclear rivals combined with underdeveloped surveillance capabilities and mobile dual-capable Iranian missile systems also will produce inherent difficulties in achieving reliable indications and warning of an impending nuclear attack. The lack of strategic depth in neighboring states like Israel, short warning and missile flight times, and uncertainty of Iranian intentions may place more focus on preemption rather than defense, potentially leading to escalating crises. 36 Types of conflict that the world continues to experience, such as over resources, could reemerge, particularly if protectionism grows and there is a resort to neo-mercantilist practices. Perceptions of renewed energy scarcity will drive countries to take actions to assure their future access to energy supplies. In the worst case, this could result in interstate conflicts if government leaders deem assured access to energy resources, for example, to be essential for maintaining domestic stability and the survival of their regime. Even actions short of war, however, will have important geopolitical implications. Maritime security concerns are providing a rationale for naval buildups and modernization efforts, such as China’s and India’s development of blue water naval capabilities. If the fiscal stimulus focus for these countries indeed turns inward, one of the most obvious funding targets may be military. Buildup of regional naval capabilities could lead to increased tensions, rivalries, and counterbalancing moves, but it also will create opportunities for multinational cooperation in protecting critical sea lanes. With water also becoming scarcer in Asia and the Middle East, cooperation to manage changing water resources is likely to be increasingly difficult both within and between states in a more dog-eat-dog world.

### 1NC CP

#### Text: The United States Congress should require a declaration of war that is consistent with jus ad bellum principles of self-defense under international law for any decision to use or deploy armed forces against a nation-state in circumstances likely to lead to an armed attack.

#### Congress should define “armed attack” as: The use of force of a magnitude that is likely to produce serious consequences, epitomized by territorial intrusions, human casualties, or considerable destruction of property.

#### Congress should allow an exception in the event of an armed attack against the United States, or members of U.S. alliances or alignments making prior approval impractical. Congress should require immediate notice of such a determination, and shall require approval within 14 days.

#### The text of the plan signals an abandonment of Israel- they are not a U.S. ally

Morrow 2K, Hoover Institute

(James D.-, June, Annual Review of Political Science, “Alliances: Why Write Them Down?”, Vol. 3, <http://arjournals>. annualreviews.org/doi/full/10.1146/annurev.polisci.3.1.63?amp;searchHistoryKey=%24{searchHistoryKey}&cookieSet=1)

Alliances should be differentiated from alignments (Dingman 1979). Alignments are not written down by states because the common interest is obvious to all. Some alignments, such as the United States and Israel, support close relations over a long period of time, whereas others, such as the United States and Syria during the Gulf War, pass with the immediate issue. The key difference is that an alignment does not carry the expectation of a continuing relationship; the shared interest carries the entire relationship, and therefore that relationship need not be negotiated formally. An alliance entails a formal commitment between the parties wherein certain specific obligations are written out. Alliances require specification because the allies need to clarify their degree of shared interests, both to each other and to others outside the alliance (Niou & Ordeshook 1994). From alignment to alliance is a significant step up in formalization of commitment, and further steps are possible that entail greater degrees of commitment. Alliances can be thought of as part of a continuum of security relationship from alignment through federation (Lake 1996, 1999, Weber 1997). Alliances allow their members to retain final freedom of action in foreign policy; tighter forms of relations cede some control over foreign policy to another state. Historically, few sovereign states have voluntarily formed tighter relationships than alliances.

#### Consistent statements in support of U.S. security assurances that the US will come to the defense of Israel if they are under attack are key to prevent Israeli lashout

Murdock 09, Sr Advisor CSIS

(Clark A.-, Jessica M. Yeats, Linton F. Brooks, M. Elaine Bunn, Franklin C. Miller, James L. Schoff, CSIS Workshop Proceeding and Key Takeaways, “Exploring the Nuclear Posture Implications of Extended Deterrence and Assurance”, <http://csis.org/files/publication/091218_nuclear_posture.pdf>)

U.S. security assurances to Israel probably have their greatest impact on Israel’s calculus on whether it should act preventively (as it did in the past against Iraq and Syria) against Iran. Former Israeli Deputy National Security Adviser Chuck Freilich argues that “Israel’s understanding of American strategy…would affect Israel’s determination to act unilaterally…[and] Israel’s willingness to discuss options for living with a nuclear Iran would be affected by a better appreciation of American strategy and of the deterrent options the United States would be willing to consider.” In whatever form they may take, U.S. statements and actions that strengthen Israel’s confidence in U.S. assurances, both in preventing Iran from acquiring nuclear weapons and coping with a nuclear Iran, will make it less likely that Israel will feel compelled to preemptively attack Iran’s nuclear facilities. Recent developments – particularly in missile defense cooperation – appear to be helping in this regard. In a stark change of tone, Israeli Defense Minister Eduh Barak was recently quoted saying, "Israel is strong and I do not see anyone capable of representing a threat to our existence…right now is the moment for diplomacy.”146 The Washington Post reported that this strength is derived from three parts: “its nuclear capabilities…the assumption that the United States would stand behind Israel if it came under attack…[and] the calculation that enough of the country’s air bases and military facilities would survive a first strike to retaliate effectively.”147

#### An Israeli strike collapses the global economy, heg, and sparks war with China and Russia

Reuveny 10, Public Affairs Professor at Indiana

(Rafael, Guest Opinion: Unilateral strike on Iran could trigger world depression, www.indiana.edu/~spea/news/speaking\_out/reuveny\_on\_unilateral\_strike\_Iran.shtml)

A unilateral Israeli strike on Iran’s nuclear facilities would likely have dire consequences, including a regional war, global economic collapse and a major power clash. For an Israeli campaign to succeed, it must be quick and decisive. This requires an attack that would be so overwhelming that Iran would not dare to respond in full force. Such an outcome is extremely unlikely since the locations of some of Iran’s nuclear facilities are not fully known and known facilities are buried deep underground. All of these widely spread facilities are shielded by elaborate air defense systems constructed not only by the Iranians, but also the Chinese and, likely, the Russians as well. By now, Iran has also built redundant command and control systems and nuclear facilities, developed early-warning systems, acquired ballistic and cruise missiles and upgraded and enlarged its armed forces. Because Iran is well-prepared, a single, conventional Israeli strike — or even numerous strikes — could not destroy all of its capabilities, giving Iran time to respond. A regional war Unlike Iraq, whose nuclear program Israel destroyed in 1981, Iran has a second-strike capability comprised of a coalition of Iranian, Syrian, Lebanese, Hezbollah, Hamas, and, perhaps, Turkish forces. Internal pressure might compel Jordan, Egypt, and the Palestinian Authority to join the assault, turning a bad situation into a regional war. During the 1973 Arab-Israeli War, at the apex of its power, Israel was saved from defeat by President Nixon’s shipment of weapons and planes. Today, Israel’s numerical inferiority is greater, and it faces more determined and better-equipped opponents. Despite Israel’s touted defense systems, Iranian coalition missiles, armed forces, and terrorist attacks would likely wreak havoc on its enemy, leading to a prolonged tit-for-tat. In the absence of massive U.S. assistance, Israel’s military resources may quickly dwindle, forcing it to use its alleged nuclear weapons, as it had reportedly almost done in 1973. An Israeli nuclear attack would likely destroy most of Iran’s capabilities, but a crippled Iran and its coalition could still attack neighboring oil facilities, unleash global terrorism, plant mines in the Persian Gulf and impair maritime trade in the Mediterranean, Red Sea and Indian Ocean. Middle Eastern oil shipments would likely slow to a trickle as production declines due to the war and insurance companies decide to drop their risky Middle Eastern clients. Iran and Venezuela would likely stop selling oil to the United States and Europe. The world economy would head into a tailspin; international acrimony would rise; and Iraqi and Afghani citizens might fully turn on the United States, immediately requiring the deployment of more American troops. Russia, China, Venezuela, and maybe Brazil and Turkey — all of which essentially support Iran — could be tempted to form an alliance and openly challenge the U.S. hegemony. Replaying Nixon’s nightmare Russia and China might rearm their injured Iranian protege overnight, just as Nixon rearmed Israel, and threaten to intervene, just as the U.S.S.R. threatened to join Egypt and Syria in 1973. President Obama’s response would likely put U.S. forces on nuclear alert, replaying Nixon’s nightmarish scenario. Iran may well feel duty-bound to respond to a unilateral attack by its Israeli archenemy, but it knows that it could not take on the United States head-to-head. In contrast, if the United States leads the attack, Iran’s response would likely be muted. If Iran chooses to absorb an American-led strike, its allies would likely protest and send weapons, but would probably not risk using force. While no one has a crystal ball, leaders should be risk-averse when choosing war as a foreign policy tool. If attacking Iran is deemed necessary, Israel must wait for an American green light. A unilateral Israeli strike could ultimately spark World War III.

### 1NC Solvency

#### Neither the courts nor Congress want to play a role in authorizing war – they won’t enforce the aff

Gene Healy 2009 (vice president at the Cato Institute) “Reclaiming the War Power” http://object.cato.org/sites/cato.org/files/serials/files/cato-handbook-policymakers/2009/9/hb111-10.pdf

Each of these proposals has the merit of demanding that Congress carry the burden the Constitution places upon it: responsibility for the decision to go to war. The Gelb-Slaughter plan shows particular promise. Although Congress hasn’t declared war since 1942, reviving the formal declaration would make it harder for legislators to punt that decision to the president, as they did in Vietnam and Iraq. Hawks should see merit in making declarations mandatory, since a declaration commits those who voted for it to support the president and provide the resources he needs to prosecute the war successfully. Doves too should find much to applaud in the idea: forcing Congress to take a stand might concentrate the mind wonderfully and reduce the chances that we will find ourselves spending blood and treasure in conflicts that were not carefully examined at the outset. But we should be clear about the difficulties that comprehensive war powers reform entails. Each of these reforms presupposes a Congress eager to be held accountable for its decisions, a judiciary with a stomach for interbranch struggles, and a voting public that rewards political actors who fight to put the presidency in its place. Representative Jones’s Constitutional War Powers Resolution, which seeks to draw the judiciary into the struggle to constrain executive war making, ignores the Court’s resistance to congressional standing, as well as the 30-year history of litigation under the War Powers Resolution, a history that shows how adept the federal judiciary is at constructing rationales that allow it to avoid picking sides in battles between Congress and the president. Even if Jones’s Constitutional War Powers Resolution or Ely’s Combat Authorization Act could be passed today, and even if the courts, defying most past practice, grew bold enough to rule on whether hostilities were imminent, there would be still another difficulty; as Ely put it: ‘‘When we got down to cases and a court remanded the issue to Congress, would Congress actually be able to follow through and face the issue whether the war in question should be permitted to proceed? Admittedly, the matter is not entirely free from doubt.’’ It’s worth thinking about how best to tie Ulysses to the mast. But the problem with legislative schemes designed to force Congress to ‘‘do the right thing’’ is that Congress seems always to have one hand free. Statutory schemes designed to precommit legislators to particular procedures do not have a terribly promising track record. Historically, many such schemes have proved little more effective than a dieter’s note on the refrigerator. No mere statute can truly bind a future Congress, and in areas ranging from agricultural policy to balanced budgets, Congress has rarely hesitated to undo past agreements in the pursuit of short-term political advantage. A : 14431$CH10 11-11-08 14:18:58 Page 113 Layout: 14431 : Odd 113 C ATO H ANDBOOK FOR P OLICYMAKERS If checks on executive power are to be restored, we will need far less Red Team–Blue Team politicking—and many more legislators than we currently have who are willing to put the Constitution ahead of party loyalty. That in turn will depend on a public willing to hold legislators accountable for ducking war powers fights and ceding vast authority to the president. Congressional courage of the kind needed to reclaim the war power will not be forthcoming unless and until American citizens demand it.

### 1NC Deterrence

Evidence is rhetorically powerful but not very warranted

#### Perception of a divided government turns resole

Posner and Vermeule, 10 - \*professor of law at the University of Chicago AND \*\*professor of law at Harvard (Eric and Adrian, The Executive Unbound, p. 60)

In this way, measures urged by the executive to cope with a crisis of unclear magnitude acquired a kind of self-created momentum. Rejection of those measures would themselves create a political crisis that might, in turn, reduce confidence and thus trigger or exacerbate the underlying financial crisis. A similar process occurred in the debates over the AUMF and the Patriot Act, where proponents of the bills urged that their rejection would send terrorist groups a devastating signal about American political willpower and unity, thereby encouraging more attacks. These political dynamics, in short, create a self-fulfilling crisis of authority that puts legislative institutions under tremendous pressure to accede to executive demands, at least where a crisis is even plausibly alleged. Critics of executive power contend that the executive exploits its focal role during crises in order to bully and manipulate Congress, defeating Madisonian deliberation when it is most needed. On an alternative account, the legislature rationally submits to executive leadership because a crisis can be addressed only by a leader. Enemies are emboldened by institutional conflict or a divided government; financial markets are spooked by it. A government riven by internal conflict will produce policy that varies as political coalitions rise and fall. Inconsistent policies can be exploited by enemies, and they generate uncertainty at a time that financial markets are especially sensitive to agents’ predictions of future government action. It is a peculiar feature of the 2008 financial crises that a damaged president could not fulfill the necessary leadership role, but that role quickly devolved to the Treasury secretary and Fed chair who, acting in tandem, did not once express disagreement publicly.

#### If we win that Congress falls in line with the president/that it’s all based on party politics, there’s no comparative advantage in the deterrent signal Congress sends

#### The Congress sets red-lines too – means the plan leads to 535 different red lines

Politico 2013 (September 14, “President Obama reframes 'red line' rhetoric” <http://www.politico.com/story/2013/09/obama-red-line-syria-96287.html>)

The turn started slowly over the holiday weekend, with top members of his administration and congressional allies drawing not-so-subtle comparisons between Assad’s actions and those of other brutal dictators and their atrocities, including Hitler and the Holocaust. They had been talking about “international norms” the previous week, but there was nothing as compelling as what was to come in the effort to lobby members of Congress to get behind Obama. On a conference call with lawmakers on Monday, Secretary of State John Kerry described the current situation as a “Munich moment” — a reference to the 1938 pact with British Prime Minister Neville Chamberlain that facilitated Hitler’s march across Europe. After a Tuesday meeting at the White House, Minority Leader Nancy Pelosi (D-Calif.) trotted out both lines of argument: She said the world, not Obama, had drawn the red line and that leaders had to say “never again” – a phrase used by Jews and others in the aftermath of the Holocaust as a reminder to stop evil before it gathers steam. Pressed on whether she was comparing the chemical weapons attack to the Holocaust, Pelosi backed off – but the implication was clear that it is the civilized world, not just Obama, that must act to counter Assad. Still, it was a far cry from the personal way in which he and his aides described the personal nature of his decision — and his willingness to lead on his own — on Saturday. “I have decided that the United States should take military action against the Syrian regime,” he said. “and I’m prepared to give that order.” And when senior administration officials described his decision to hold off on that order to share the burden with Congress, they described it as the confident call of a commander in chief willing to turn the direction of the ship of state on a dime — no matter what his advisers thought about the risks of going to Congress. But the effort to pass the buck to Congress and the community of nations didn’t back up the leadership narrative he was trying to construct. He needed a new rhetorical plan to match his new proposal to seek affirmation from congressman and other countries. So, the temporary discomfort of hard-to-believe rhetorical yoga was trumped by the need to elevate the discussion from a personal plane to a moral one, a last stab at building international support to back up the “red line” remark. People close to the president argued Wednesday that the red line was never just Obama’s, and that the president has long made that clear.

#### Plan reduces credibility – shows our hand to enemies

Scowcroft 93

(Brent, Arnold, National Security Adviser Under Bush I and Ford, Undersecretary of State for Political Affairs in Bush I, The Washington Post, “Foreign Policy Straightjacket”, 10/20/1993, p. lexis)

Maneuvering in the complex environment of a Somalia -- or of a Haiti, Bosnia or the other crises that loom on and just over the horizon -- requires the agility of a ballet dancer, not the Mack truck of legislation. In a world that increasingly places a premium on a rapidly adaptable foreign policy, codifying highly detailed requirements in a public law is a recipe for ineffectiveness. It undermines the president's ability to threaten, cajole and pressure our adversaries by publicizing the costs we will and won't pay and by broadcasting the conditions and constraints under which our forces will operate. At the same time, it leaves our friends and allies, whose cooperation we seek, to wonder whether Congress will permit the president to follow through on his promises and commitments. Finally, it stays on the books, continuing to tie the president's hands as circumstances change and Congress's attention shifts to other priorities. Now more than ever, trying to legislate foreign policy is simply a bad idea.

### 1NC Wars of Choice

#### Congressional influence doesn’t lead to better war decision making – empirical evidence

Nzelibe and Yoo 2005 - Assistant Professor of Law, Northwestern University Law School AND Professor of Law, University of California at Berkeley School of Law (Jide and John, “Rational War and Constitutional Design ” 115 Yale L.J. 2512 (2005), <http://scholarship.law.berkeley.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1067&context=facpubs>)

Bur before accepting this seemingly attractive vision, we should ask whether the Congress-first system lives up to its promises. In other words, has requiring congressional ex ante approval for foreign wars produced less war, better decision-making, or greater consensus? A cursory review of previous American wars does not suggest that requiring congressional authorization before the use of force invariably produces better decision-making. For example, the declarations of war initiating the Mexican-American and Spanish-American Wars did not result from extensive deliberation or necessarily result in good policy. Although both wars benefited the United States by expanding the nation's territory and enhancing its presence on the world stage,14 they remained offensive wars of conquest. Nor is it clear that congressional participation has resulted in greater consensus. Congress approved both the Vietnam and the 2003 Iraq Wars, but both have produced sharp divisions in American domestic politics.

#### Executive branch has internal checks on groupthink – including Congress freezes policymaking

Posner and Vermeule, 7– \*Kirkland and Ellis Professor of Law at the University of Chicago Law School AND \*\*professor at Harvard Law School (Eric and Adrian, Terror in the Balance: Security, Liberty, and the Courts p. 46-47)

The idea that Congress will, on net, weed out bad policies rests on an institutional comparison. The president is elected by a national constituency on a winner-take-all basis (barring the remote chance that the Electoral College will matter), whereas Congress is a summation of local constituencies and thus affords more voice to political and racial minorities. At the level of political psychology, decisionmaking within the executive is prone to group polarization and other forms of groupthink or irrational panic,51 whereas the internal diversity of legislative deliberation checks these forces. At the level of political structure, Congress contains internal veto gates and chokepoints—consider the committee system and the fi libuster rule—that provide minorities an opportunity to block harmful policies, whereas executive decisionmaking is relatively centralized and unitary. The contrast is drawn too sharply, because in practice the executive is a they, not an it. Presidential oversight is incapable of fully unifying executive branch policies, which means that disagreement flourishes within the executive as well, dampening panic and groupthink and providing minorities with political redoubts.52 Where a national majority is internally divided, the structure of presidential politics creates chokepoints that can give racial or ideological minorities disproportionate influence, just as the legislative process does. Consider the influence of Arab Americans in Michigan, often a swing state in presidential elections. It is not obvious, then, that statutory authorization makes any difference at all. One possibility is that a large national majority dominates both Congress and the presidency and enacts panicky policies, oppresses minorities, or increases security in ways that have ratchet effects that are costly to reverse. If this is the case, a requirement of statutory authorization does not help. Another possibility is that there are internal institutional checks, within both the executive branch and Congress, on the adoption of panicky or oppressive policies and that democratic minorities have real infl uence in both arenas. If this is the case, then a requirement of authorization is not necessary and does no good. Authorization only makes a difference in the unlikely case where the executive is thoroughly panicky, or oppressively majoritarian, while Congress resists the stampede toward bad policies and safeguards the interests of oppressed minorities. Even if that condition obtains, however, the argument for authorization goes wrong by failing to consider both sides of the normative ledger. As for majoritarian oppression, the multiplicity of veto gates within Congress may allow minorities to block harmful discrimination, but it also allows minorities to block policies and laws which, although targeted, are nonetheless good. As for panic and irrationality, if Congress is more deliberative, one result will be to prevent groupthink and slow down stampedes toward bad policies, but another result will be to delay necessary emergency measures and slow down stampedes toward good policies. Proponents of the authorization requirement sometimes assume that quick action, even panicky action, always produces bad policies. But there is no necessary connection between these two things; expedited action is sometimes good, and panicky crowds can stampede either in the wrong direction or in the right direction. Slowing down the adoption of new policies through congressional oversight retards the adoption not only of bad policies, but also of good policies that need to be adopted quickly if they are to be effective.

#### Power of the purse creates a functional check

Seth Weinberger – 2009, Asst. Prof. of Politics and Gov’t at University of Puget Sound, Restoring the Balance: War Powers in an Age of Terror, googlebooks

The use by Congress of appropriations to check the president’s ability to use force has been more frequent since 1970. During the Vietnam War, for example, Congress used the power of the purse four times: in 1970, when it prohibited the use of funds to finance American ground troops or military advisors in Cambodia: twice in June 1973, when Congress, in two separate appropriations bills, cut off funds “to support directly or indirectly combat operations in or over Cambodia, Laos, North Vietnam, and South Vietnam by United States forces”: and in 1974, when a personnel ceiling of 4,000 Americans in Vietnam six months after enactment and 3,000 within one year was passed.’8 In 1976, the appropriations bill for the Defense Department barred the use of any funds “for any activities in Angola,” and Congress subsequently passed a permanent ban on the use of any funds “to conduct military or paramilitary operations in Angola.” In 1984, in the midst of furious debate over President Reagan’s policies in Latin America, the appropriations bill passed stated that “no funds available to the Central Intelligence Agency, the Department of Defense, or any other agency or entity of the United States involved [in] intelligence activities may be obligated or expended for the purpose or which would have the effect of supporting, directly or indirectly, military or paramilitary operations in Nicaragua by any nation, group, organization, movement, or individual.”’9 And, during the 1990s, Congress tried several times to use its appropriations power to limit President Clinton’s ability to deploy American troops. In 1993, Congress cut off funding for U.S. troops in Somalia, while in 1994, it forbade the use of funds appropriated to the Defense Department for intervention in the Rwandan genocide.20 It is evident that Congress not only knows how to use its appropriations power as a check on the president, but also has demonstrated the willingness to use that power. Furthermore. Congress possesses broad discretionary control over the funds it appropriates. In *Spaulding v. Douglass Aircraft*, the court stated that: Congress in making appropriations has the power and authority not only to designate the purpose of the appropriation, but also the terms and conditions under which the executive department. . . may expend such appropriations. The purpose of appropriations, the terms and conditions under which said appropriations were made is a matter solely in the hands of Congress and it is the plain and explicit duty of the executive branch to comply with the same.2’ Because the power of the purse is SO clearly and explicitly given to Congress. it serves as a broad and effective means by which the legislative branch can check the executive branch by limiting or even forbidding funds to be used in specific ways for specific purposes. As Jon Pevehouse and William Howell argue in their work examining congressional checks on presidential war powers, the appropriations power is a potent tool in the hands of Congress.22

#### Presidents only take unilateral action on short engagements – squo solves adventurism

Peter M. Shane 9-2-2013; Author, 'Connecting Democracy' and 'Madison's Nightmare'; Law professor, “Rebalancing War Powers: President Obama's Momentous Decision”

<http://www.huffingtonpost.com/peter-m-shane/rebalancing-war-powers-pr_b_3853232.html>
But seeking authorization for a military strike against Syria marks the first time that a modern-day president has taken the initiative to elicit legislative approval for a military action that, by the President's own reckoning, will neither be a prolonged, nor a boots-on-the-ground operation. In announcing his decision, President Obama, like both Presidents Bush, declared that he possessed the constitutional authority to act unilaterally. He said he does not need Congress' approval in order to proceed. But historical precedents have consequences. Whatever their formal legal views, the Bushes' decisions helped cement a consistent pattern: With the exception of Korea, the United States has never engaged in a massive or prolonged military deployment without some form of explicit congressional sanction. A President acting unilaterally to start what is sometimes called "a real war" henceforth would probably be courting impeachment.

#### Legal contraints aren’t the answer – party loyalty determines if Congress will check the president – takes out deliberation internal because it means there are no productive debates on the floor

William G. Howell and Jon C. Pevehouse – 2007, Associate Professors at the Harris School of Public Policy at the University of Chicago, When Congress Stops Wars: Partisan Politics and Presidential Power, Foreign Affairs, Vol. 86, No. 5 (Sep. - Oct., 2007), pp. 95-107, http://themonkeycage.org/wp-content/uploads/2013/09/Howell-Pevehouse-2007-1.pdf

FOR MOST of George W. Bush's tenure, political observers have lambasted Congress for failing to fulfill its basic foreign policy obligations. Typical was the recent Foreign Affairs article by Norman Ornstein and Thomas Mann, "When Congress Checks Out," which offered a sweeping indictment of Congress' failure to monitor the president's execution of foreign wars and antiterrorist initiatives. Over the past six years, they concluded, congressional oversight of the White House's foreign and national security policy "has virtually collapsed." Ornstein and Mann's characterization is hardly unique. Numerous constitutional-law scholars, political scientists, bureau crats, and even members of Congress have, over the years, lamented the lack of legislative constraints on presidential war powers. But the dearth of congressional oversight between 2000 and 2006 is nothing new. Contrary to what many critics believe, terrorist threats, an overly aggressive White House, and an impotent Democratic Party are not the sole explanations for congressional inactivity over the past six years. Good old-fashioned partisan politics has been, and continues to be, at play. It is often assumed that everyday politics stops at the water's edge and that legislators abandon their partisan identities during times of war in order to become faithful stewards of their constitutional obligations. But this received wisdom is almost always wrong. The illusion of congressional wartime unity misconstrues the nature of legislative oversight and fails to capture the particular conditions under which members of Congress are likely to emerge as meaningful critics of any particular military venture. The partisan composition of Congress has historically been the decisive factor in determining whether lawmakers will oppose or acquiesce in presidential calls for war. From Harry Truman to Bill Clinton, nearly every U.S. president has learned that members of Congress, and members of the opposition party in particular, are fully capable of interjecting their opinions about proposed and ongoing military ventures. When the opposition party holds a large number of seats or controls one or both chambers of Congress, members routinely challenge the president and step up oversight of foreign conflicts; when the legislative branch is dominated by the president's party, it generally goes along with the White House. Partisan unity, not institutional laziness, explains why the Bush administration's Iraq policy received such a favorable hearing in Congress from 2000 to 2006. The dramatic increase in congressional oversight following the 2oo6 midterm elections is a case in point. Immediately after assuming control of Congress, House Democrats passed a resolution condemning a proposed "surge" of U.S. troops in Iraq and Senate Democrats debated a series of resolutions expressing varying degrees of outrage against the war in Iraq. The spring 2007 supplemental appropriations debate resulted in a House bill calling for a phased withdrawal (the president vetoed that bill, and the Senate then passed a bill accepting more war ftinding without withdrawal provisions). Democratic heads of committees in both chambers continue to launch hearings and investigations into the various mishaps, scandals, and tactical errors that have plagued the Iraq war. By all indications, if the govern ment in Baghdad has not met certain benchmarks by September, the Democrats will push for binding legislation that further restricts the president's ability to sustain military operations in Iraq.

#### Their Fawcett evidence is terrible – says multilateralism emerged which was then “retrospectively” applied to America’s “Vietnam moment” i.e. IRAQ – not reverse causal and no way to overwhelm past failures

**No chance of decline in multilateralism**

**Ikenberry, 11** – (May/June issue of Foreign Affairs, G. John, PhD, Albert G. Milbank Professor of Politics and International Affairs at Princeton University in the Department of Politics and the Woodrow Wilson School of Public and International Affairs, “The Future of the Liberal World Order,” http://www.foreignaffairs.com/

articles/67730/g-john-ikenberry/the-future-of-the-liberal-world-order?page=show DH)

For all these reasons, many observers have concluded that world politics is experiencing not just a changing of the guard but also a transition in the ideas and principles that underlie the global order. The journalist Gideon Rachman, for example, says that a cluster of liberal internationalist ideas -- such as faith in democratization, confidence in free markets, and the acceptability of U.S. military power -- are all being called into question. According to this worldview, the future of international order will be shaped above all by China, which will use its growing power and wealth to push world politics in an illiberal direction. Pointing out that China and other non-Western states have weathered the recent financial crisis better than their Western counterparts, pessimists argue that an authoritarian capitalist alternative to Western neoliberal ideas has already emerged. According to the scholar Stefan Halper, emerging-market states "are learning to combine market economics with traditional autocratic or semiautocratic politics in a process that signals an intellectual rejection of the Western economic model." Today's international order is not really American or Western--even if it initially appeared that way. But this panicked narrative misses a deeper reality: although the United States' position in the global system is changing, the liberal international order is alive and well. The struggle over international order todayis not about fundamental principles. China and other emerging great powers do not want to contest the basic rules and principles of the liberal international order; they wish to gain more authority and leadership within it. Indeed, today's power transition represents not the defeat of the liberal order but its ultimate ascendance. Brazil, China, and India have all become more prosperous and capable by operating inside the existing international order -- benefiting from its rules, practices, and institutions, including the World Trade Organization (WTO) and the newly organized G-20. Their economicsuccess and growing influence are tied to the liberal internationalist organization of world politics, and they have deep interests in preserving that system. In the meantime, alternatives to an open and rule-based order have yet to crystallize. Even though the last decade has brought remarkable upheavals in the global system -- the emergence of new powers, bitter disputes among Western allies over the United States' unipolar ambitions, and a global financial crisis and recession -- the liberal international order has no competitors. On the contrary, the rise of non-Western powers and the growth of economic and security interdependence are creating new constituencies for it. To be sure, as wealth and power become less concentrated in the United States' hands, the country will be less able to shape world politics. But the underlying foundations of the liberal international order will survive and thrive.Indeed, now may be the best time for the United States and its democratic partners to update the liberal order for a new era, ensuring that it continues to provide the benefits of security and prosperity that it has provided since the middle of the twentieth century.

# 2NC

## Cp

### impact

#### Israeli feelings of vulnerability will cause them to adopt a launch on warning posture- risks miscalc, war, and nuclear escaltion

Schoenfeld 98– SENIOR EDITOR COMMENTARY

*THINKING ABOUT THE UNTHINKABLE*, COMMENTARY, DECEMBER

If preemption is largely ruled out as an option, what then? To reduce its vulnerability--enemy missiles can arrive within ten minutes from firing--Israel may well be compelled to adopt a "launch-on-warning" posture for both its conventional and nuclear forces. For the purpose of considering this eventuality, we may assume that Israel has indeed developed a secure retaliatory force of the kind Tucker saw as essential to stability. Even so, however, this would not offer much reassurance. Unlike its neighbors, and unlike the U.S., Israel is a tiny country, and in a nuclear environment it would not have the luxury of waiting to assess the damage from a first strike before deciding how to respond. Thus, in any future crisis, at the first hint from satellite intelligence or some other means that a missile fusillade was being prepared from, say, Iran or Iraq, Israel, to protect its populace, would have to punch first. And it would have to strike not only at missile sites, some of which it might well miss, but at a broader range of targets--communications facilities, air bases, storage bunkers, and all other critical nodes--so as to paralyze the enemy and thus rule out the possibility of attack. These are the implications of launch-on-warning. Clearly, such a posture presents grave problems. Lacking secure second-strike forces of their own, and aware that Israel would no doubt try to hit them preemptively, Iran and Iraq would be under tremendous pressure to launch their missiles first--to "use them or lose them." In other words, what this scenario leads to is the prospect of both sides' moving to a permanent position of hair-trigger alert. It is a nightmarish prospect. The possibility that nuclear war might break out at any moment--by accident, miscalculation, or design--would inevitably place an intolerable strain on Israel's freedom of military movement, and take a no less heavy toll on civilian morale**.**

### AT: Lots of Alignments

#### No solvency deficit- the plan already includes a slew of commitments indistinguishable from the CP

#### The plan allows for 2nd strikes to defend allies- that includes almost half of the world

Campbell 04, VP & Direction International Security Program CSIS

(Kurt M.-, Spring, The Washington Quarterly, “The End of Alliances? Not So Fast”, Vol. 27 #2, Ebsco;)

The more relevant question then is not whether alliances are dead but rather how they are adapting to new exigencies and conditions. Many traditional alliances were created over the last 50 years or more as vehicles to provide a formal security guarantee by the United States and to facilitate rapid U.S. intervention in the face of foreign aggression, which at various times threatened to come from the Soviet Union and/or the People’s Republic of China.

During that time, the United States assembled important, formalized security relationships with virtually half of the world’s countries and pledged to defend nearly 50 treaty allies in the event of an attack, primarily to support a strategy of containing communism, which included assistance in major conflicts such as those in Korea and Vietnam. Some such alliances have been multilateral, most notably NATO, though others were attempted, such as the ill-fated Southeast Asia Treaty Organization (SEATO), but most were bilateral arrangements between the United States and countries in all regions throughout the globe.

### AT: Permutation – CP

#### Restrict means the aff must define the conditions in which use of armed forces is allowed

Cambridge Dictionary of American English 09

([http://dictionary.cambridge.org/define.asp?key=restrict\*1+0&dict=A](http://dictionary.cambridge.org/define.asp?key=restrict*1+0&dict=A);)

restrict verb [T] to limit (an intended action) esp. by setting the conditions under which it is allowed to happen

### Israel Isn’t an Ally

#### Israel isn’t an ally of the United States because there’s no security pact - that’s our Morrow evidence

#### The fact that some refer to Israel as an ally means nothing- they’re not

Mark 2K

(Clyde R.-, Oct. 17, Adapted from a report by Congressional Research Service, “Israeli-United States Relations”,

<http://www.policyalmanac.org/world/archive/crs_israeli-us_relations.shtml>)

Strategic Cooperation Although Israel frequently is referred to as an ally of the United States, technically Israel may not fall under the definition of "ally" because there is no mutual defense agreement between the two countries. The Reagan Administration considered Israel a "strategic asset" because of Israel's opposition to the Soviet Union. Israel's Defense Minister Ariel Sharon and Secretary of Defense Caspar Weinberger signed a memorandum of understanding (MOU) on November 30, 1981, establishing a framework for continued consultation and cooperation to enhance the national security of both countries and confront the Soviet threat. (On December 18, 1981, the State Department announced the "suspension" of the MOU in reaction to Israel's annexing the Syrian Golan Heights.)

#### It is incorrect to label Israel as an ally

Cristol 2k

(Jay-, May. 27, History News Network, “When Did the U.S. and Israel Become Allies?”, [http://hnn.us/articles/ 751.html](http://hnn.us/articles/751.html))

There has never been a treaty between Israel and the United States. Both countries have shared values and a passion for democracy. While in 2002 Israel is a defacto ally of the U.S., the official U.S. government position is that there is a "special relationship" between Israel and the United States. Those who refer to Israel as an ally of the United States in 1967 are guilty of an anachronism and display a lack of knowledge of history.

#### Allies require treaties – Israel isn’t an ally

Wortzel 05, Former Professor of Asian Studies and director of the Strategic Studies Institute at the U.S. Army War College

(Larry, Change Partners: Who Are America's Military and Economic Allies in the 21st Century?, www.heritage.org/research/lecture/change-partners-who-are-americas-military-and-economic-allies-in-the-21st-century

In the international system, a strict understanding of a formal ally is a nation that has entered into a treaty with the United States, and a treaty is actually a contract with a foreign nation-an agreement, sovereign state with sovereign state, which derives "from obligations of good faith." For the United States, the Constitution grants the President the power to make treaties "by and with the advice and consent of the Senate." The responsibilities related to treaties are immense. In Federalist Papers Two and Three, John Jay told our citizens that the ability to make treaties is a distinguishing characteristic of a nation-state. The exercise of that power, however, brings obliga­tions. These include security obligations as well as obligations regarding trade and enterprise. Besides treaties, there are other types of interna­tional agreements that may be made by the execu­tive branch. These executive agreements are binding in international law, and in most cases, no agreement can be made without consulting with the State Department and, often, the Department of Commerce. Congress often gives the flexibility to the Presi­dent to create international agreements in specific areas so the government can carry out its business smoothly, particularly in the scientific field, in for­eign aid, agriculture, and trade. Working Together to Advance Core Values We form partnerships to combine our strength with the strength of like-minded nations in the preservation and advancement of core values. These values that distinguish us from our adversar­ies are, in the words of U.S. Trade Representative Robert Zoellick, now Deputy Secretary of State, "openness; peaceful exchange; democracy; the rule of law; and compassion." Americans live for these values, as well as die for them. We even extend these values to the way we treat our enemies. As Thomas Paine wisely explained, "He that would make his own liberty secure, must guard even his enemy from oppres­sion; for if he violates this duty, he establishes a pre­cedent that will reach to himself." Thus, we observe international norms like the Laws of Land Warfare and the Geneva Convention. Who are our allies? And why do we form these partnerships? The formal treaty allies of the United States are the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, or NATO, now numbering 26 nations; Japan; South Korea; Australia; the Philippines; Thailand; and the Rio Pact nations. The Rio Pact is a hemi­spheric treaty of 23 nations in the Americas, signed in Rio de Janeiro, Brazil, in 1947. It actually pre-dates NATO.

### AT: Syria Caused Link

#### Israel is comfortable with Syria developments – it doesn’t cross the threshold of our link because it doesn’t involve an attack against their homeland

Washington Post 2013 (September 12, “Israel divided over best course on Syria” <http://articles.washingtonpost.com/2013-09-12/world/41992570_1_israel-s-israeli-embassy-iran>)

Israel’s diplomatic and defense establishment appears to be divided over the best course of action to take on Syria, security analysts and former military commanders here said Thursday. It has been no secret that some of Israel’s political leaders and generals were initially disappointed that President Obama sought congressional approval for missile strikes, saying it showed weakness that would embolden Syrian President Bashar al-Assad and boost Iran and its nuclear ambitions. An analysis in the Times of Israel, citing unnamed sources, said that Obama’s decision to hit the pause button had “privately horrified” Jerusalem. But that was 12 days ago. Now, many Israelis have begun to identify some advantages in a Russia-brokered diplomatic deal to secure Assad’s stores of chemical weapons, especially if it succeeds. “Israel was watching the reaction of the international community, especially the United States, as a kind of test case on how they would react to the Iran situation,” said Oded Eran, former deputy chief of mission at the Israeli Embassy in Washington. “But now there are more Israelis who are looking at the possible deal between Russia and United States on the chemical arsenal of Syria as an interesting precedent,” Eran said. “If the international community, through the U.S. and Russia, is able to put its hands on, to monitor or collect all the arsenal of Syria, this could be some sort of a precedent concerning Iran.” Israel maintains that Iran is seeking to build a nuclear weapon, a development it has described as “an existential threat.” Iran says its nuclear program is limited to research and energy production. Israel Ziv, a retired major general and former head of the Israel Defense Forces’ operations directorate, said that from a strategic standpoint, a U.S. missile strike might not have achieved much and would have posed risks. “I don’t see anything positive coming from an attack,” Ziv said. “I see more positive results, potentially, on addressing Syria’s chemical weapon stockpiles.” Ziv said it took guts not to attack Syria.

### 2NC Link Wall

#### We’ll isolate several links

#### 1) Paranoia - Israeli insecurity and dependence forces them to carefully monitor changes in the U.S.’s military posture and roles - the plan will be vetted for clues about the future direction of American policy. They’ll be left asking why the U.S. crafts a policy that specifies who it defends and leaves them out

Steinberg 98

(Gerald-, Bar Ilan, Professor of Political Studies, Dec, MERIA, Vol. 2 #4)

Given the intensity of the relationship with the United States and degree of dependence, Israeli policymakers and analysts have carefully monitored and studied the implications of perceived changes in the American role, especially in the Middle East. Signs of increasing isolation at the political level, as well as changes in military posture and preparedness, military budgets, deployments, R&D programs, etc. are scrutinized in the search for clues regarding the future direction of the United States. Since the end of the Cold War, Israelis have become concerned regarding the role and capabilities of the United States. The history of isolationism is well known among the Israeli "foreign policy elite," and the emphasis on domestic policies during the 1992 presidential election, and particularly on the part of Clinton, raised some concerns regarding American disengagement. In addition, the Republican-controlled Congress exhibited increasingly isolationist tendencies, as evidenced by the policies of Senator Jesse Helms, who headed the Senate Foreign Relations Committee. Nevertheless, in practice, the Clinton administration turned out to be relatively pro-active in the Middle East, taking a major role following the agreement between Palestinian and Israeli negotiators (the Oslo agreement). Although isolationist elements in Congress had an increasingly important effect globally, it is difficult to discern a direct impact on American policy with respect to Israel.

#### 3. Crisis – geographic proximity increases the need for a timely response by the US in the case of an attack on Israel. After the plan Israel would be unsure whether congress would declare war so the US could deploy troops in time if they are attacked. That increases preemptive pressures

Kramer 13, President of Shalem College

(Martin, 9/17, Israel Likes Its U.S. Presidents Strong, www.commentarymagazine.com/2013/09/17/israel-likes-its-u-s-presidents-strong-2/

Why was Obama’s recourse to Congress so alarming? Israel has long favored strong presidential prerogatives. That’s because the crises that have faced Israel rarely ever leave it the time to work the many halls of Congress. Israel discovered the dangers of presidential weakness in May 1967, when Israel went to President Lyndon Johnson to keep a commitment—a “red line” set by a previous administration—and Johnson balked. He insisted he would have to secure congressional support first. That show of presidential paralysis left Israel’s top diplomat shaken, and set the stage for Israel’s decision to launch a preemptive war.

Kramer 13, President of Shalem College

(Martin, 9/17, Israel Likes Its U.S. Presidents Strong, www.commentarymagazine.com/2013/09/17/israel-likes-its-u-s-presidents-strong-2/

In light of this history, it’s not hard to see why Israel would view any handoff by a president to the Congress in the midst of a direct challenge to a presidential commitment as a sign of weakness and an indication that Israel had better start planning to act on its own. It’s not that Israel lacks friends on the Hill. But in crises where time is short and intelligence is ambivalent—and such are the crises Israel takes to the White House—Israel needs presidents who are decisive.

### AT: Israel Will Never Strike

#### They underestimate Netanyahu – Israel will strike if they perceive US abandonment

Tobin 10/22, Senior Online Editor of Commentary

(Jonathan, Will Israel Strike Iran? Iraq is No Precedent, www.commentarymagazine.com/2013/10/22/will-israel-strike-iran-iraq-is-no-precedent-nuclear/

Given the fact that Israeli Prime Minister Netanyahu has been rattling his rhetorical sabers in the direction of Iran for years, it’s hard to argue with Sadot’s conclusion. As late as just a week ago during an address to the Knesset, Netanyahu once again warned the world that Israel isn’t afraid to act alone if its security is endangered. Should Jerusalem ever be convinced that the U.S. was about to sell it down the river, Netanyahu might well decide to strike Iran. But Sadot is wrong when he claims, as he did in his article, that Israel’s 1981 attack on Iraq’s nuclear reactor at Osirak or the 2007 strike on the nuclear facility that Syria was building tells us much about Israel would or could do against Iran. There are simply no comparisons in terms of size or scale to the challenge awaiting the Israel Defense Forces in Iran or the diplomatic obstacles to such a decision by Netanyahu.

# 1NR

### 2NC Defense

#### Status quo solves – power of the purse

Nzelibe and Yoo 2005 - Assistant Professor of Law, Northwestern University Law School AND Professor of Law, University of California at Berkeley School of Law (Jide and John, “Rational War and Constitutional Design ” 115 Yale L.J. 2512 (2005), <http://scholarship.law.berkeley.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1067&context=facpubs>)

The choice between the Congress-first view and the current system of war powers is not one of total versus zero congressional participation. The question really is one of ex ante versus ex post participation. Even under the strongest President-first theories, Congress still retains the ability to check presidential foreign policy and national security decisions through the funding power. Often Congress can exercise that authority ex ante. It had the opportunity, for example, to prevent Presidents from waging the Persian Gulf War, the Kosovo conflict, and the wars in Afghanistan and Iraq by refusing to appropriate money before the fighting began. Some Congress-first scholars doubt the effectiveness of Congress's appropriation power in constraining presidential military ventures,16 but Congress has frequently used the threat to cut off funding to force withdrawal of forces and terminate conflicts." With the high costs of modern conflict, any significant military undertaking will require Presidents to seek congressional cooperation. Critics of presidential power fail to explain why political accountability would be enhanced by requiring that Congress not just provide funding for military hostilities ex ante, but also go to the additional step of enacting legislation authorizing the conflict.

### O/V

#### Immigration reform is key to both hard and soft power

Nye, ’12 (12/10/2012, Harvard Prof and former US assistant secretary of defense, state and chairman of the US National Intelligence Council “Immigration and American Power,” http://www.project-syndicate.org/commentary/obama-needs-immigration-reform-to-maintain-america-s-strength-by-joseph-s--nye)

CAMBRIDGE – The United States is a nation of immigrants. Except for a small number of Native Americans, everyone is originally from somewhere else, and even recent immigrants can rise to top economic and political roles. President Franklin Roosevelt once famously addressed the Daughters of the American Revolution – a group that prided itself on the early arrival of its ancestors – as “fellow immigrants.” In recent years, however, US politics has had a strong anti-immigration slant, and the issue played an important role in the Republican Party’s presidential nomination battle in 2012. But Barack Obama’s re-election demonstrated the electoral power of Latino voters, who rejected Republican presidential candidate Mitt Romney by a 3-1 majority, as did Asian-Americans. As a result, several prominent Republican politicians are now urging their party to reconsider its anti-immigration policies, and plans for immigration reform will be on the agenda at the beginning of Obama’s second term. Successful reform will be an important step in preventing the decline of American power. Fears about the impact of immigration on national values and on a coherent sense of American identity are not new. The nineteenth-century “Know Nothing” movement was built on opposition to immigrants, particularly the Irish. Chinese were singled out for exclusion from 1882 onward, and, with the more restrictive Immigration Act of 1924, immigration in general slowed for the next four decades. During the twentieth century, the US recorded its highest percentage of foreign-born residents, 14.7%, in 1910. A century later, according to the 2010 census, 13% of the American population is foreign born. But, despite being a nation of immigrants, more Americans are skeptical about immigration than are sympathetic to it. Various opinion polls show either a plurality or a majority favoring less immigration. The recession exacerbated such views: in 2009, one-half of the US public favored allowing fewer immigrants, up from 39% in 2008. Both the number of immigrants and their origin have caused concerns about immigration’s effects on American culture. Demographers portray a country in 2050 in which non-Hispanic whites will be only a slim majority. Hispanics will comprise 25% of the population, with African- and Asian-Americans making up 14% and 8%, respectively. But mass communications and market forces produce powerful incentives to master the English language and accept a degree of assimilation. Modern media help new immigrants to learn more about their new country beforehand than immigrants did a century ago. Indeed, most of the evidence suggests that the latest immigrants are assimilating at least as quickly as their predecessors. While too rapid a rate of immigration can cause social problems, over the long term, immigration strengthens US power. It is estimated that at least 83 countries and territories currently have fertility rates that are below the level needed to keep their population constant. Whereas most developed countries will experience a shortage of people as the century progresses, America is one of the few that may avoid demographic decline and maintain its share of world population. For example, to maintain its current population size, Japan would have to accept 350,000 newcomers annually for the next 50 years, which is difficult for a culture that has historically been hostile to immigration. In contrast, the Census Bureau projects that the US population will grow by 49% over the next four decades. Today, the US is the world’s third most populous country; 50 years from now it is still likely to be third (after only China and India). This is highly relevant to economic power: whereas nearly all other developed countries will face a growing burden of providing for the older generation, immigration could help to attenuate the policy problem for the US. In addition, though studies suggest that the short-term economic benefits of immigration are relatively small, and that unskilled workers may suffer from competition, skilled immigrants can be important to particular sectors – and to long-term growth. There is a strong correlation between the number of visas for skilled applicants and patents filed in the US. At the beginning of this century, Chinese- and Indian-born engineers were running one-quarter of Silicon Valley’s technology businesses, which accounted for $17.8 billion in sales; and, in 2005, immigrants had helped to start one-quarter of all US technology start-ups during the previous decade. Immigrants or children of immigrants founded roughly 40% of the 2010 Fortune 500 companies. Equally important are immigration’s benefits for America’s soft power. The fact that people want to come to the US enhances its appeal, and immigrants’ upward mobility is attractive to people in other countries. The US is a magnet, and many people can envisage themselves as Americans, in part because so many successful Americans look like them. Moreover, connections between immigrants and their families and friends back home help to convey accurate and positive information about the US. Likewise, because the presence of many cultures creates avenues of connection with other countries, it helps to broaden Americans’ attitudes and views of the world in an era of globalization. Rather than diluting hard and soft power, immigration enhances both. Singapore’s former leader, Lee Kwan Yew, an astute observer of both the US and China, argues that China will not surpass the US as the leading power of the twenty-first century, precisely because the US attracts the best and brightest from the rest of the world and melds them into a diverse culture of creativity. China has a larger population to recruit from domestically, but, in Lee’s view, its Sino-centric culture will make it less creative than the US. That is a view that Americans should take to heart. If Obama succeeds in enacting immigration reform in his second term, he will have gone a long way toward fulfilling his promise to maintain the strength of the US.

#### TURNS DETERRENCE

Taylor ‘4 [4/1/04, Mark Taylor is a professor of Political Science at the Massachusetts Institute of Technology, “The Politics of Technological Change: International Relations versus Domestic Institutions,” http://www.scribd.com/doc/46554792/Taylor]

Technological innovation is of central importance to the study of international relations (IR), affecting almost every aspect of the sub-field. 2 First and foremost, a nation’s technological capability has a significant effect on its economic growth, industrial might, and military prowess; therefore relative national technological capabilities necessarily influence the balance of power between states, and hence have a role in calculations of war and alliance formation. Second, technology and innovative capacity also determine a nation’s trade profile, affecting which products it will import and export, as well as where multinational corporations will base their production facilities. 3 Third, insofar as innovation-driven economic growth both attracts investment and produces surplus capital, a nation’s technological ability will also affect international financial flows and who has power over them. 4 Thus, in broad theoretical terms, technological change is important to the study of IR because of its overall implications for both the relative and absolute power of states. And if theory alone does not convince, then history also tells us that nations on the technological ascent generally experience a corresponding and dramatic change in their global stature and influence, such as Britain during the first industrial revolution, the United States and Germany during the second industrial revolution, and Japan during the twentieth century. 5 Conversely, great powers which fail to maintain their place at the technological frontier generally drift and fade from influence on international scene. 6 This is not to suggest that technological innovation alone determines international politics, but rather that shifts in both relative and absolute technological capability have a major impact on international relations, and therefore need to be better understood by IR scholars. Indeed, the importance of technological innovation to international relations is seldom disputed by IR theorists. Technology is rarely the sole or overriding causal variable in any given IR theory, but a broad overview of the major theoretical debates reveals the ubiquity of technological causality. For example, from Waltz to Posen, almost all Realists have a place for technology in their explanations of international politics. 7 At the very least, they describe it as an essential part of the distribution of material capabilities across nations, or an indirect source of military doctrine. And for some, like Gilpin quoted above, technology is the very cornerstone of great power domination, and its transfer the main vehicle by which war and change occur in world politics. 8 Jervis tells us that the balance of offensive and defensive military technology affects the incentives for war. 9 Walt agrees, arguing that technological change can alter a state’s aggregate power, and thereby affect both alliance formation and the international balance of threats. 10 Liberals are less directly concerned with technological change, but they must admit that by raising or lowering the costs of using force, technological progress affects the rational attractiveness of international cooperation and regimes. 11 Technology also lowers information & transactions costs and thus increases the applicability of international institutions, a cornerstone of Liberal IR theory. 12 And in fostering flows of trade, finance, and information, technological change can lead to Keohane’s interdependence 13 or Thomas Friedman et al’s globalization. 14 Meanwhile, over at the “third debate”, Constructivists cover the causal spectrum on the issue, from Katzenstein’s “cultural norms” which shape security concerns and thereby affect technological innovation; 15 to Wendt’s “stripped down technological determinism” in which technology inevitably drives nations to form a world state. 16 However most Constructivists seem to favor Wendt, arguing that new technology changes people’s identities within society, and sometimes even creates new cross-national constituencies, thereby affecting international politics. 17 Of course, Marxists tend to see technology as determining all social relations and the entire course of history, though they describe mankind’s major fault lines as running between economic classes rather than nation-states. 18 Finally, Buzan & Little remind us that without advances in the technologies of transportation, communication, production, and war, international systems would not exist in the first place

### 2NC AT Boehner Vote

#### Boehner more likely to allow vote now --- he holds the cards

Macgillis, 10/24 --- senior editor of New Republic (Alec, 10/24/2013, “Seven Reasons To Stop Being Fatalistic About Immigration Reform,” <http://www.newrepublic.com/article/115341/immigration-reform-may-actually-pass>))

But the natural optimist in me thinks that the odds for some sort of serious immigration reform happening in the months ahead are better than many realize. A few reasons why, in no particular order:

Boehner has space. To the extent that there was any logic to the Speaker’s letting the government shutdown and debt-ceiling brinkmanship drag out as long as he did, it was that he had strengthened his position with his caucus’s hard-right flank and thereby created some room to maneuver on other fronts. “Boehner’s hold is a little stronger than it was” a few months ago, his near-predecessor as speaker, the lobbyist supreme Bob Livingston, told me when I ran into him at a function Wednesday night.

Well, there is no better opportunity for Boehner to show that this is the case – to retroactively justify a gambit that cost the country billions of dollars – than to press forward with immigration reform. To do that will require more than just casual comments like the one he tossed off Wednesday – it will require making clear that the leadership is serious about this and setting aside time on the calendar for it.

But wouldn’t pushing the issue forward mean once again breaking the not-so-hallowed Hastert Rule, which requires leadership to bring up for a vote only measures supported a majority of the caucus? Well, yes and no. There is increasing talk of taking a piecemeal route in the House – with, among others, one Dream Act-style measure to legalize those who came into the country as minors, one to stiffen border enforcement, one to expand visas for skilled foreign workers, and, yes, one to provide some sort of eventual path to citizenship for illegal immigrants beyond the Dreamers. The latter would not get a majority of House GOP support, but perhaps if brought through in a stream of other measures would not set off the Hastert Rule alarms as loudly. There would remain the question of how to reconcile whatever passed with the comprehensive reform bill already passed by the Senate – House conservatives say they are wary of a conference committee. But the fact remains that there is a conceivable path forward – if Boehner wants to pursue it. “He’s in a much stronger place for himself job-security-wise all around,” says one House Democratic aide.

**And, even if not vote in 2013 strong progress now key to passage in spring**

**Palmer & Sherman, 10/25** (Anna Palmer and Jake Sherman, 10/25/2013, “House GOP plans no immigration vote in 2013,” <http://www.politico.com/story/2013/10/house-gop-plans-no-immigration-vote-in-2013-98824.html?hp=r1)>)

**\*\*\*Note --- text of evidence is correct – sentence cuts off after “And”**

The Chamber is also releasing Friday an immigration “Myths and Facts” document trying to debunk some fallacies on immigration reform.

And **even if passage of any kind of reform passage doesn’t happen by the end of December, it doesn’t mean the fight is over. Partnership for a New American Economy’s** Jeremy **Robbins said the question is when “the next moment” would be for reform**. And

“There’s a lot of political challenges, but it’s also a very real opening,” Robbins said. **“Coming out of this opening. If we get immigration reform fantastic, if not, then how are we poised to be bigger and stronger for the next opening in the spring.”**

**AT: Thumpers --- All**

**The issue of \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ has already been priced in to Obama’s political calculations but the plan hasn’t --- making it a unique link.**

**And, immigration is Obama’s top priority --- that’s the 1nc Matthews evidence.**

**More evidence Immigration is THE top priority**

**Lerer and Tiron, 10/24** (Lisa and Roxana, 10/24/2013, “Republicans After Shutdown Seen Losing Again on Immigration,” <http://www.bloomberg.com/news/2013-10-24/republicans-after-shutdown-seen-losing-again-defying-immigration.html>))

**Immigration First**

In remarks **after the** partial government **shutdown ended** last week, **Obama listed immigration first among three legislative priorities**, along with action on the budget and passage of a farm bill.

**Obama is shifting the focus back to immigration now --- plan would disrupt that**

**Shear, 10/25** (Michael D., 10/25/2013, The New York Times, “Obama Pitches Immigration Overhaul,” Factiva))

WASHINGTON -- President **Obama** on Thursday **renewed his call for an immigration overhaul**, telling an audience of activists at the White House that the fate of a bipartisan Senate bill now rests with Republicans in the House.

''Anyone still standing in the way of this bipartisan reform should at least explain why,'' Mr. Obama said to repeated applause in the East Room. **''If House Republicans have new and different additional ideas for how we should move forward, then we should hear them. I will be listening.''**

The Senate passed legislation in June by a vote of 68-32, giving a lift to Mr. Obama's plans to improve border security, require employers to verify the immigration status of their workers, and provide a path to citizenship for 11 million undocumented immigrants. White House strategists hoped that the vote would prompt action in the House, where Republicans had resisted similar calls for an overhaul of the system.

But the effort stalled this summer, with many House Republicans expressing dissatisfaction with the increases in border security and saying they do not support any plan that would allow people in the country illegally to eventually become citizens.

Mr. **Obama's remarks** on Thursday **were aimed at rebooting the discussion after months in which attention shifted to concerns about Iran and Syria and contentious disputes at home with the House Republicans that led to a government shutdown.**

**Obama pivoting away from health care to immigration now**

**Chakraborty, 10/24** (Barnini, 10/24/2013, “A pivot in priorities? Obama touts immigration reform,” [http://www.foxnews.com/politics/2013/10/24/pivot-in-priorities-obama-touts-immigration-reform/)](http://www.foxnews.com/politics/2013/10/24/pivot-in-priorities-obama-touts-immigration-reform/%29))

WASHINGTON – President **Obama shifted focus** Thursday **from** the pile-up of **problems related to** the rollout of his **health care law to** another prickly political topic: **immigration**.

**Obama made his case for comprehensive reform** at a White House event **and insisted that Congress had enough time to pass the immigration bill by the end of the year**.

**2nc Uniqueness**

**Immigration reform will pass --- it is Obama’s top priority and Obama’s push will help ensure it is in GOP’s interest to fall in line. That’s Matthews**

**Their ev is a pessimistic snap shot of the status quo and doesn’t assumes the endgame of Obama’s continued political pressure**

**Nakamura, 10/24** (David, 10/24/2013, “Pressing House GOP, Obama evokes George W. Bush in immigration speech,” [http://www.washingtonpost.com/blogs/post-politics/wp/2013/10/24/pressing-house-gop-obama-evokes-george-w-bush-in-immigration-speech/)](http://www.washingtonpost.com/blogs/post-politics/wp/2013/10/24/pressing-house-gop-obama-evokes-george-w-bush-in-immigration-speech/%29))

With public opinion polls showing widespread frustration with the GOP in the wake of the government shutdown, **the administration hopes to keep the political pressure on through immigration and other domestic priorities**.

Toward the end of his speech, Obama thanked the advocates for their persistence and urged them to keep up the fight.

**"There are going to be moments where you meet resistance and the press will declare something dead, that it's not going to happen. That can be overcome,"** Obama said. As the crowd applauded, the president raised his voice to be heard: "You look fired up to make the next push. **Whether you are a Republican or a Democrat or an independent, I want you to keep working and I'll be right next to you to make sure we get immigration reform done."**

**Boehner leaning toward allowing a vote in the House that will allow passage --- pressure from Obama playing a role**

**Sullivan, 10/24** (Sean, 10/24/2013, “John Boehner’s next big test: Immigration,” [http://www.washingtonpost.com/blogs/the-fix/wp/2013/10/24/john-boehners-next-big-test-immigration-reform/)](http://www.washingtonpost.com/blogs/the-fix/wp/2013/10/24/john-boehners-next-big-test-immigration-reform/%29))

President Obama delivered remarks Thursday morning to renew his call for Congress to pass sweeping immigration reform. **The prevailing sentiment in Washington is that it’s not going to happen this year, and may not even happen next year.**

**But because of the last few weeks, it just might get done by early next year. It’s all up to** House Speaker John A. **Boehner** (R-Ohio), **who by political necessity, must now at least consider leaning in more on immigration.**

“Let’s see if we can get this done. And let’s see if we can get it done this year,” Obama said at the White House.

Fresh off a decisive defeat in the budget and debt ceiling showdown that cost the GOP big and won the party no major policy concessions from Democrats, **Boehner was asked** Wednesday about **whether he plans to bring up immigration legislation during the limited time left on the 2013 legislative calendar. He didn’t rule it out.**

“I still think immigration reform is an important subject that needs to be addressed. And **I’m hopeful,” said Boehner**.

**The big question is whether the speaker’s hopefulness spurs him to press the matter legislatively or whether the cast-iron conservative members** who oppose even limited reforms **will dissuade him and extinguish his cautiously optimistic if noncommittal outlook.**

**Months ago, as House Republicans were slow-walking immigration after the Senate passed a broad bill, the latter possibility appeared the likelier bet. But times have changed. The position House Republicans adopted in the fiscal standoff badly damaged the party’s brand. The GOP is reeling**, searching desperately for a way to turn things around. That means **Boehner**, too, **must look for ways to repair the damage**.

And **that’s where immigration comes in**. Even before the government shutdown showdown, a vocal part of the GOP (think Sen. John McCain) had been talking up the urgent need to do immigration reform or risk further alienating Hispanic voters. **Now, amid hard times for the party driven by deeper skepticism from Democrats, independents and even some Republicans following the fiscal standoff, the political imperative is arguably even stronger.**

**The policy imperative already exists for some House Republicans — perhaps enough of them that if Boehner allowed a vote, reform of some type could pass with a majority of House Democrats and a minority of House Republicans, as did last week’s deal to end the government shutdown and raise the debt ceiling.** (What specifically could pass and whether Obama could accept it is another question.)

What’s not clear is whether Boehner would be willing to chart a path with less than majority GOP support again so soon after the last time and without his back against the wall as it was in the fiscal standoff.

This much we know: **The White House and Senate Democrats will keep applying pressure on Boehner to act on immigration. Obama’s remarks are the latest example of his plan. The speaker will be feeling external and internal pressure to move ahead on immigration.**

But he will also feel pressure from conservatives to oppose it. Here’s the thing, though: **Boehner listened to the right flank of his conference in the fiscal fight, and that path was politically destructive for his party. That’s enough to believe he will at least entertain the possibility of tuning the hard-liners out a bit more this time around.**

All of which is why **it’s too soon to cross immigration off the “maybe it will still get done” list just yet**.

### 2NC AT Comprtmentalization

#### It’s not all about arms-twisting --- their authors ignore other tools Obama can employ

Kuttner 11 (Robert, Senior Fellow – Demos and Co-editor – American Prospect, “Barack Obama's Theory of Power,” The American Prospect, 5-16, http://prospect.org/cs/articles?article=barack\_obamas\_theory\_of\_power)

As the political scientist Richard Neustadt observed in his classic work, Presidential Power, a book that had great influence on President John F. Kennedy, **the essence of a president's power is "the power to persuade."** Because our divided constitutional system does not allow the president to lead by commanding, presidents amass power by making strategic choices about when to use the latent authority of the presidency to move public and elite opinion and then use that added prestige as clout to move Congress. In one of Neustadt's classic case studies, Harry Truman, a president widely considered a lame duck, nonetheless persuaded the broad public and a Republican Congress in 1947-1948 that the Marshall Plan was a worthy idea. As Neustadt and Burns both observed, though an American chief executive is weak by constitutional design, **a president possesses several points of leverage**. He can play an effective outside game, motivating and shaping public sentiment, making clear the differences between his values and those of his opposition, and **using popular support to box in his opponents and move them in his direction**. He can complement the outside bully pulpit with a nimble inside game, uniting his legislative party, bestowing or withholding benefits on opposition legislators, forcing them to take awkward votes, and using the veto. He can also enlist the support of interest groups to pressure Congress, and use media to validate his framing of choices. Done well, all of this signals leadership that often moves the public agenda.

### 2NC LT

#### Republican disunity now

**Parnes 10/18**, Amie, white house correspondent for the Hill“Obama’s hollow debt victory,” 10/18, http://thehill.com/homenews/administration/329219-obamas-hollow-debt-victory

Another former White House official saw things differently and argued Obama now has a real shot at securing a victory on the immigration bill.

“The trick here is to capitalize on the moment without spiking the football,” the former official said. “On immigration, if he could tailor what he’s doing as part of functionality and not as politics, that would be key." Cal Jillson, a professor of political science at Southern Methodist University said Obama could capitalize on the victory simply by seizing on a Republican Party “in disarray.” On immigration, “it’s a question of whether he can develop the issue in such a way that that it’ll give them little choice,” Jillson said, adding that Obama “can make the argument that it is critical in a number of ways.” It remains to be seen whether Republicans can resolve their differences and present a united front to Obama before the next budget and fiscal deadlines in early 2014. But Senate Minority Leader Mitch McConnell made it known Thursday that he would not allow another government shutdown as part of a strategy to repeal ObamaCare. "I think we have fully now acquainted our new members with what a losing strategy that is," McConnell told The Hill in an interview. Obama on Thursday, as the GOP licked their wounds, pledged to “look for willing partners” across the aisle to “get important work done.” But another former senior administration official said Obama’s second term is dependent on the outcome the “Republican Civil War,” and whether Speaker John Boehner (R-Ohio) is willing to pass an immigration bill without a majority of the GOP.

### AT: Unilateral Executive Immigration Reform

#### Only congressional action can effectively reform immigration

Leopold, 13 --- General Counsel and Past President, American Immigration Lawyers Association (1/22/2013, David, “Obama Takes Action on Guns and Immigration: Now It's Congress' Turn,” http://www.huffingtonpost.com/david-leopold/congress-guns-immigration\_b\_2501651.html)

It feels like déjà vu all over again.

I'm referring to what happened a little more than six months ago when President Obama used his executive authority to grant DREAM Act eligible youth a temporary reprieve from deportation. The reprieve, known as Deferred Action for Childhood Arrivals, was derived from the legal tradition of prosecutorial discretion, and implemented to give deserving undocumented youth a chance to temporarily step out of the shadows without fear of arrest and removal from the U.S. Since June the Administration has granted deferred action to more than 150,000 undocumented immigrants. You could be forgiven for thinking I was referencing what happened last week when President Obama issued a series of executive orders designed to keep guns out of the hands of criminals and people with mental health issues. Among other things, the orders use laws already on the books to improve information sharing among state and federal agencies so that deadly weapons, including military-style assault weapons, are not sold to people who will massacre Americans while they're in a classroom, enjoying a movie, or otherwise living their lives. Importantly, these stop-gap measures on gun control and immigration give Congress the space and opportunity to enact permanent legislative solutions, which will, hopefully, make America safer and fix its dysfunctional immigration system. Moreover, by decisively using his executive authority, the president is following through, pushing forward the "will of the people" instead of doing nothing. National polls continue to show that Americans -- including many members of the NRA -- overwhelmingly favor common sense restrictions on guns. Through rigorous enforcement of the laws already on the books President Obama is doing what the American people demand but what Congress is scared to do. He is taking bold action to save lives and show the American people that he listens and cares about their safety. And the same holds true for immigration. As even the newest polls show, the majority of Americans -- including Republicans, Democrats, and Independents -- want the immigration system fixed; they want a safe border and an immigration policy that serves the needs of American families and businesses, and includes a pathway to earned citizenship for the millions of undocumented immigrants living in the shadows. Yes, the system is broken, but the president is well within his rights to use his executive authority to make sure the law is administered as intelligently and humanely as possible until Congress acts to fix it. But, as Mr. Obama reminded the nation last Wednesday, when it comes to changing the law he cannot do it alone. Real change can come only when the American people demand it, whether it is to ban semi-automatic assault weapons and high capacity clips or enact an overhaul of the immigration "system" we currently deal with, made up of a mismatched patchwork of policies and procedures.

After all, the entire nation wins when its leaders take bold action to protect the American people.

#### Executive actions are minor and not a replacement for comprehensive efforts

Nakamura and Bahrampour, 13 (David Nakamura Tara Bahrampour, 1/4/2013, Washington Post, “Obama prioritizing immigrant issues,” Factiva)

**\*\*\*Angela Kelley, an analyst at the Center for American Progress, a liberal think tank allied with the White House**

Still, administration officials emphasize that such administrative actions are not intended as a substitute for broader legislation, which would be aimed at providing a path to citizenship for the nation's 11 million undocumented workers.

"At the end of the day, those are just crumbs," Kelley said of the executive moves.

### 2NC AT T/ Economy

Legalization reform offsets any losses in government money.

Immigration Policy Center, 09 (April, IPC fact check, "The economics of immigration reform: what legalizing undocumented immigrants would mean for the U.S. economy", http://www.immigrationpolicy.org/images/File/factcheck//EconomicsofCIRFullDoc.pdf, WEA)

Legalizing undocumented workers would improve wages and working conditions for all workers, and increase tax revenues for cash-strapped federal, state, and local governments. Moreover, comprehensive immigration reform that includes a path to legalization for undocumented workers would pay for itself through the increased tax revenue it generates, in contrast to the failed and costly enforcement-only policies that have been pursued thus far. Newly legalized workers would be able to move into higher-paying jobs, pay more in taxes, and spend more on goods and services—all of which would increase the already-substantial economic benefits of immigration for the United States.

### 2NC AT Impact Defense

#### Economic decline undercuts interdependence and triggers nuclear conflict

Kemp ’10 [Geoffrey Kemp, Director of Regional Strategic Programs at The Nixon Center, served in the White House under Ronald Reagan, special assistant to the president for national security affairs and senior director for Near East and South Asian affairs on the National Security Council Staff, Former Director, Middle East Arms Control Project at the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, 2010, The East Moves West: India, China, and Asia’s Growing Presence in the Middle East, p. 233-4]

The second scenario, called Mayhem and Chaos, is the opposite of the first scenario; everything that can go wrong does go wrong. The world economic situation weakens rather than strengthens, and India, China, and Japan suffer a major reduction in their growth rates, further weakening the global economy. As a result, energy demand falls and the price of fossil fuels plummets, leading to a financial crisis for the energy-producing states, which are forced to cut back dramatically on expansion programs and social welfare. That in turn leads to political unrest: and nurtures different radical groups, including, but not limited to, Islamic extremists. The internal stability of some countries is challenged, and there are more “failed states.” Most serious is the collapse of the democratic government in Pakistan and its takeover by Muslim extremists, who then take possession of a large number of nuclear weapons. The danger of war between India and Pakistan increases significantly. Iran, always worried about an extremist Pakistan, expands and weaponizes its nuclear program. That further enhances nuclear proliferation in the Middle East, with Saudi Arabia, Turkey, and Egypt joining Israel and Iran as nuclear states. Under these circumstances, the potential for nuclear terrorism increases, and the possibility of a nuclear terrorist attack in either the Western world or in the oil-producing states may lead to a further devastating collapse of the world economic market, with a tsunami-like impact on stability. In this scenario, major disruptions can be expected, with dire consequences for two-thirds of the planet’s population