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### 1NC CP

#### The executive branch of the United States federal government should issue an executive order that restricts targeted killing by remotely piloted vehicles. The order should also

#### publish clear guidelines for targeting to be carried out by nonpoliticians and make assassination truly a last resort,

#### stipulate that an outside court review the evidence before placing Americans on a kill list

#### release the legal briefs upon which the targeted killing was based

#### The Executive branch of the United States federal government should give a speech explaining the rationale for the proposal.

#### The executive branch of the United States federal government should provide all necessary resources and financial support for the CIA to conduct non-targeted killing operations.

#### The executive branch of the United States should inform Pakistani officers in real time of drone strikes with a target in Pakistan.

#### The executive branch of the United should made that the Central Intelligence Agency of the United States publish all information related to its targeted killing operations and that the CIA make intelligence gathering its primary mission. The executive branch of the United States should direct authority over targeted killing operations to the Department of Defense.

#### Dual key authority solves

Markey 2013 - Senior Fellow for India, Pakistan, and South Asia at Foreign Affairs (July 16, Daniel, “A New Drone Deal For Pakistan” <http://www.cfr.org/pakistan/new-drone-deal-pakistan/p31113>)

Then there is the option of crafting a "dual-key" authority at the operational level, perhaps by informing Pakistani officers in real time as drone strikes are launched and by implementing a mutually acceptable mechanism through which Islamabad could veto a specific strike, or at least raise it up the chain of command in a timely manner. Versions of a dual-key approach have been tried in the past, with some success. But given the fraught terms of cooperation between Washington and Islamabad in recent years, it is hard to imagine U.S. officials accepting this sort of arrangement, at least not yet. The real-time nature of the decision process would limit the potential for unwanted leaks or tip-offs to targets, but U.S. officials would still be wary that Pakistani officials could acquire too much knowledge of the drone program and its capabilities. If political trust improves over time, however, this might be a useful model for cooperation.

#### Obama himself decides drone targeting --- publishing guidelines creates transparency

[--- Court should only review if Americans are placed on a kill list]

NYT, 12 (Editorial, 5/30/2012, “Too Much Power for a President,” <http://www.nytimes.com/2012/05/31/opinion/too-much-power-for-a-president.html?_r=0)>)

It has been clear for years that the Obama administration believes the shadow war on terrorism gives it the power to choose targets for assassination, including Americans, without any oversight. On Tuesday, The New York Times revealed who was actually making the final decision on the biggest killings and drone strikes: President Obama himself. And that is very troubling. Mr. Obama has demonstrated that he can be thoughtful and farsighted, but, like all occupants of the Oval Office, he is a politician, subject to the pressures of re-election. No one in that position should be able to unilaterally order the killing of American citizens or foreigners located far from a battlefield — depriving Americans of their due-process rights — without the consent of someone outside his political inner circle. How can the world know whether the targets chosen by this president or his successors are truly dangerous terrorists and not just people with the wrong associations? (It is clear, for instance, that many of those rounded up after the Sept. 11, 2001, attacks weren’t terrorists.) How can the world know whether this president or a successor truly pursued all methods short of assassination, or instead — to avoid a political charge of weakness — built up a tough-sounding list of kills? It is too easy to say that this is a natural power of a commander in chief. The United States cannot be in a perpetual war on terror that allows lethal force against anyone, anywhere, for any perceived threat. That power is too great, and too easily abused, as those who lived through the George W. Bush administration will remember. Mr. Obama, who campaigned against some of those abuses in 2008, should remember. But the Times article, written by Jo Becker and Scott Shane, depicts him as personally choosing every target, approving every major drone strike in Yemen and Somalia and the riskiest ones in Pakistan, assisted only by his own aides and a group of national security operatives. Mr. Obama relies primarily on his counterterrorism adviser, John Brennan. To his credit, Mr. Obama believes he should take moral responsibility for these decisions, and he has read the just-war theories of Augustine and Thomas Aquinas. The Times article points out, however, that the Defense Department is currently killing suspects in Yemen without knowing their names, using criteria that have never been made public. The administration is counting all military-age males killed by drone fire as combatants without knowing that for certain, assuming they are up to no good if they are in the area. That has allowed Mr. Brennan to claim an extraordinarily low civilian death rate that smells more of expediency than morality. In a recent speech, Mr. Brennan said the administration chooses only those who pose a real threat, not simply because they are members of Al Qaeda, and prefers to capture suspects alive. Those assurances are hardly binding, and even under Mr. Obama, scores of suspects have been killed but only one taken into American custody. The precedents now being set will be carried on by successors who may have far lower standards. Without written guidelines, they can be freely reinterpreted. A unilateral campaign of death is untenable. To provide real assurance, President Obama should publish clear guidelines for targeting to be carried out by nonpoliticians, making assassination truly a last resort, and allow an outside court to review the evidence before placing Americans on a kill list. And it should release the legal briefs upon which the targeted killing was based.

#### This empirically solves transparency

Pearlstein, 13 --- Professor of Public and International Affairs at Princeton

(3/26/2013, Congress Shouldn’t Give the President New Power to Fight Terrorists, www.slate.com/articles/news\_and\_politics/jurisprudence/2013/03/congress\_shouldn\_t\_give\_president\_obama\_new\_power\_to\_fight\_terrorists.html)

This is hardly to say the president’s decision to use force operates under no constraint at all. Using force is expensive, it is alienating, it is provocative, and it may create greater threats to the American people than it prevents. Presidents have to convince the American public that war is worth fighting. This has even been true when they respond to acts of terror in self-defense. When President Reagan ordered strikes against Libya following the bombing of the civilian airliner over Lockerbie, Scotland, he made a speech from the Oval Office. Ditto for President Clinton when he bombed Sudan in response to al-Qaida’s attacks on the U.S. Embassies in Kenya and Tanzania. Mission details were rightly few, but both presidents explained who we had targeted and why. And the public, if they were displeased, could hold accountable the president or his party. Today, it is this lack of transparency—not Congress’ relative apathy—that has boosted executive power and threatened the legitimacy of current drone operations. If Congress wants to do something about this, it should start by beefing up its own oversight efforts. Current federal laws require the president to notify the intelligence committees of all covert actions carried out by CIA (after the fact if need be). Congress should also require the same degree of notification of the Senate and House Armed Services Committees for operations carried out by the military’s Joint Special Operations Command, an active participant in U.S. targeting operations. The much maligned War Powers Resolution has been modestly effective in requiring the White House to report the introduction of military forces into hostilities. In the age of drones, Congress should explore strengthening that reporting requirement further.

### 1NC DA

#### Obama is aggressively pushing completion of a farm bill --- it’s his top priority and passage is possible

Dreiling, 11/15 (Larry, 11/15/2013, “Branches jockey for farm bill positions,” http://www.hpj.com/archives/2013/nov13/nov18/1112FarmBillLDsr.cfm))

While the House-Senate farm bill discussions continue, the White House staked out its position in an address in New Orleans. Senate Agriculture Committee Chairwoman Debbie Stabenow signaled Nov. 5 that face-to-face talks among the top four farm bill negotiators will resume this week, and she is upbeat enough to hope for a deal by Thanksgiving. “I hope so. It’s doable,” the Michigan Democrat said to the Capitol Hill publication Politico. “I feel confident the four of us can come together,” Stabenow said, speaking of herself, Sen. Thad Cochran, R-MS; Rep. Collin Peterson, D-MN; and House Agriculture Committee Chairman Frank Lucas, R-OK. While the House remained on recess through Veterans Day, Peterson’s office confirmed that he was flying back to Washington early in the week, and Stabenow told Politico that all four would meet. “The savings of the farm bill will certainly be part of the solution to the budget,” said Stabenow, who is also part of those House-Senate negotiations. But she and Lucas have both said repeatedly that the text of any farm bill will be theirs to write. “The issue is who writes the farm bill,” Stabenow said. “We’ll write the farm bill.” For all her optimism, the chairwoman gave little ground herself on the contentious issue of savings on nutrition programs. The Senate farm bill proposes about $4 billion in 10-year savings, compared with the $39 billion in reductions assumed in the revised nutrition title approved by the House in September. It’s a huge gap, but Stabenow insisted that negotiators can’t ignore previously enacted food stamp cuts that went into effect Nov. 1. Those reductions will reduce spending by as much as $11 billion over the period used by the Congressional Budget Office to score the farm bill. Typically, these are not counted since the savings result from prior actions by Congress. But Stabenow said they cannot be ignored. “I am counting them,” she told Politco. “That’s real and if (the House’s) objective is to cut help for people, that started last Friday. I do count that. In fairness, that needs to be counted.” In the same vein, she showed no interest in a compromise narrowing the range of income and asset tests now used by states in judging eligibility for food stamps. “At this point, what I’m interested in doing is focusing on fraud and abuse—ways to tighten up the system to make it more accountable,” she said. “I’m not interested in taking food away from folks who have had an economic disaster, just as I’m not interested in cutting crop insurance for farmers who have had economic disasters.” Meanwhile, President Barack Obama delivered a speech at the Port of New Orleans Nov. 8, saying that passing a farm bill is the No. 1 way that Democrats and Republicans can increase jobs in the economy. Helping American businesses grow, creating more jobs—these are not Democratic or Republican priorities, Obama said. “They are priorities that everybody, regardless of party, should be able to get behind. And that’s why, in addition to working with Congress to grow our exports, I’ve put forward additional ideas where I believe Democrats and Republicans can join together to make progress right now,” Obama said. That’s when Obama launched into his pitch on the farm bill. “Congress needs to pass a farm bill that helps rural communities grow and protects vulnerable Americans,” Obama said. “For decades, Congress found a way to compromise and pass farm bills without fuss. For some reason, now Congress can’t even get that done. “Now, this is not something that just benefits farmers. Ports like this one depend on all the products coming down the Mississippi. So let’s do the right thing, pass a farm bill. We can start selling more products. That’s more business for this port. And that means more jobs right here.” Obama listed immigration reform and a responsible budget as his second and third priorities.

#### Plan is a perceived loss for Obama that saps his capital

Loomis, 7 --- Department of Government at Georgetown

(3/2/2007, Dr. Andrew J. Loomis is a Visiting Fellow at the Center for a New American Security, “Leveraging legitimacy in the crafting of U.S. foreign policy,” pg 35-36, [http://citation.allacademic.com//meta/p\_mla\_apa\_research\_citation/1/7/9/4/8/pages179487/p179487-36.php](http://citation.allacademic.com/meta/p_mla_apa_research_citation/1/7/9/4/8/pages179487/p179487-36.php))

**In a system where a President has limited formal power, perception matters. The reputation for success**—the belief by other political actors that even when he looks down, a president will find a way to pull out a victory—**is the most valuable resource a chief executive can have**. **Conversely, the widespread belief that the Oval Office occupant is on the defensive, on the wane or without the ability to win under adversity can lead to disaster, as individual lawmakers calculate who will be on the winning side and negotiate accordingly.** In simple terms, winners win and **losers lose more often than not. Failure begets failure. In short, a president experiencing declining amounts of political capital has diminished capacity to advance his goals.** As a result, political allies perceive a decreasing benefit in publicly tying themselves to the president, and an increasing benefit in allying with rising centers of authority. A president’s incapacity and his record of success are interlocked and reinforce each other. **Incapacity leads to political failure, which reinforces perceptions of incapacity. This feedback loop accelerates decay both in leadership capacity and defection by key allies.** The central point of this review of the presidential literature is that **the sources of presidential influence—and thus their prospects for enjoying success in pursuing preferred foreign policies—go beyond the structural factors imbued by the Constitution**. Presidential authority is affected by ideational resources in the form of public perceptions of legitimacy. The public offers and rescinds its support in accordance with normative trends and historical patterns, non-material sources of power that affects the character of U.S. policy, foreign and domestic. This brief review of the literature suggests how **legitimacy norms enhance presidential influence in ways that structural powers cannot explain**. Correspondingly, **increased executive power improves the prospects for policy success**. As a variety of cases indicate—from Woodrow Wilson’s failure to generate domestic support for the League of Nations to public pressure that is changing the current course of U.S. involvement in Iraq—the effective execution of foreign policy depends on public support. Public support turns on perceptions of policy legitimacy. As a result, policymakers—starting with the president—pay close attention to the receptivity that U.S. policy has with the domestic public. In this way, normative influences infiltrate policy-making processes and affect the character of policy decisions.

#### Obama’s involvement key to broker a deal on SNAP --- it will be the last crucial item in negotiations

Hagstrom, 11/3 --- founder and executive editor of The Hagstrom Report (11/3/2013, Jerry, “Compromise Is the Key to a New Farm Bill; It is time for House and Senate conferees to stop listening to the lobbyists and finish the bill,” <http://www.nationaljournal.com/outside-influences/compromise-is-the-key-to-a-new-farm-bill-20131103>))

It was a good question because the bill's overlong development period has given all the interests so many opportunities to state their positions that they seem more dug in than in past bill-writing efforts. But at the conference last week there were signals that the conferees think the time to act has come. The 41 conferees did use the last and possibly only public opportunity to make the case for their views. But almost all the members abided by the directive from the conference leader, House Agriculture Committee Chairman Frank Lucas, R-Okla., to keep their remarks to three minutes. And even the most ideological of them on the right and left were polite and stressed that they were there to compromise and finish a bill. It's unclear how quickly the conferees will proceed to the big issues because the House has left town until Nov. 12, the day after Veterans Day. There has been talk of a meeting on the bill between President Obama and the four conference committee principals—Lucas, House Agriculture ranking member Collin Peterson, D-Minn., Senate Agriculture Chairwoman Debbie Stabenow, D-Mich., and Senate Agriculture ranking member Thad Cochran, R-Miss. Peterson said he has mixed feelings about such a meeting because support from Obama might cause some House members to oppose the bill. But Peterson noted that the "one place" on which Obama could be "helpful" would be resolving the size of the cut to food stamps, formally known as the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program. Lucas has said that it is likely to be the last item settled and that Obama, House Speaker John Boehner, R-Ohio, and Senate Majority Leader Harry Reid, D-Nev., will have to make the call on that. The official White House position on food stamps is to make no cuts, while the Senate-passed farm bill would cut the program by $4 billion over 10 years and the House-passed bill would cut it by $39 billion over the same period.

#### Key to rural economies, secure food supply and healthy forest --- disagreement over food assistance will make or break the bill

Denver Post, 11/10 (The Post Editorials, 11/10/2013, “Here's why the farm bill matters,” Factiva))

The farm bill has the rap of being a public policy snooze, a broad measure that gets boiled down to a debate over subsidies to wealthy farmers and food stamp handouts to the poor.

Agriculture Secretary Tom Vilsack reminded the Denver Post editorial board last week that it's important to see beyond those flashpoints. In Colorado, for example, the bill has vital implications for agricultural production, conservation and struggling rural economies. Vilsack is right, of course, but it's also true that trench warfare over food assistance is the major point of disagreement between GOP and Democratic lawmakers, who will meet this week in committee to seek compromise. They need to find consensus, and it shouldn't be that hard.Although the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program (SNAP) is a crucial safety net, there are ways to trim it back somewhat more than the $4 billion over 10 years that Democrats have proposed. Slicing SNAP by $39 billion, however, which some Republicans seek, is both unfair and unrealistic. One area ripe for reform involves tightening standards for states that waive work requirement rules for able-bodied adults. There are circumstances in which a waiver is justified, in an economy where there are few jobs to be found. As Vilsack told us, when a plant closes in a small town and 1,000 people lose work, it may be unrealistic to expect those people to find jobs. But waivers shouldn't go on forever if the economy improves, and tightening the rules could result in savings. Republicans have been alarmed by the growth of food assistance spending in recent years. But that trend isn't likely to be permanent even with the present law. While the Congressional Budget Office projects small increases in SNAP recipients through 2014, that number will then decline as the economy improves. A steady course that includes continued support for the needy and moderate cuts to slow government spending should be the goal. Reaching consensus on the food assistance piece will allow the other initiatives in the farm bill to go forward, including partnerships to create marketable products from beetle-killed trees and job development in rural areas.The farm bill may not be the sexiest piece of legislation, but it works in important ways to secure the nation's food supply, protect the health of federal forests and strengthen rural economies. Federal lawmakers need to move off their entrenched positions and pass the legislation.

#### Rural economy key to the overall economy—studies prove

Rocha 13—Electric Coop Today. (Victoria, Strong Rural Economy, Strong America, February, <http://www.ect.coop/industry/trends-reports-analyses/usda-rural-america-growth-report/52264>, chm)

Investments in rural communities are vital to the nation’s overall economic health and, if overlooked, could represent a missed opportunity for significant growth, according to a new report. In fact, given the right mix of economic policies, predominantly rural regions have, on average, enjoyed faster growth than “intermediate” or urban areas, according to the report by the Organization for Economic Cooperation Development on behalf of the U.S. Department of Agriculture. Promoting Growth in All Regions uses 23 case studies of specific rural regions and fresh analyses to show that “less developed regions are often important drivers of growth.” Researchers at OECD, an international economic think tank, found that during 1995-2007, rural regions accounted for 43 percent of aggregate growth in the areas they studied. “The barriers to growth regions must overcome vary widely,” researchers found, noting that policymakers should consider a “place-based approach” rather than “‘one-size-fits-all’ economy-wide policies” to foster rural economies. In the United States, “many regions are leading the way in developing such place-based strategies,” by harnessing local assets and infrastructure, wrote Doug O’Brien, deputy undersecretary for USDA Rural Development, on a department blog. In Iowa, Maine, Vermont, Tennessee and Oregon, for example, policymakers identified renewable energy generation as moneymakers and with USDA help linked that potential to already existing industries. O’Brien cited “manufacturing to wind turbine production in Iowa and the forest products industry to woody biomass in Maine,” as examples. “Missed growth opportunities are also missed revenue opportunities for governments facing budgetary shortfalls and rising deficits,” O’Brien added.

#### Global nuclear war

Harris & Burrows 9 Mathew, PhD European History @ Cambridge, counselor of the U.S. 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

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 federal government should enact legislation restricting authority for targeted killing using remotely piloted aircraft systems to Title 10 military authority except for those active in Yemen.

#### Even if the DOD solves in Pakistan the CIA is key to fight AQAP in Yemen

Miller 2013 (May 25, “Obama’s new drone policy leaves room for CIA role” <http://articles.washingtonpost.com/2013-05-25/world/39519388_1_drone-strikes-drone-operations-cia-s>)

The drone campaign in Pakistan began under President George W. Bush and escalated after Obama took office. But from the outset, Obama administration officials expressed discomfort with the fact that an intelligence service had absorbed a lethal mission that had traditionally been the responsibility of the military. In an interview in late 2010, a senior Obama administration official stressed that the CIA was running the drone campaign in Pakistan mainly because the agency was first to develop the technology after the Sept. 11, 2001, terrorist attacks and because Pakistan’s government insisted on secrecy so that it could deny any U.S. operations on its soil. “It has been in Yemen a different story, a different history, a different evolution,” the official said, making clear that the administration regarded the CIA campaign as an anomaly and saw lethal operations as the province of the military.

#### AQAP will attack India

Roychowdhury ‘11 (Gen. Shankar Roychowdhury is a former Chief of Army Staff and a former member of Parliament, “India needs a 360° terror appraisal”, Deccan Chronicle, http://www.deccanchronicle.com/editorial/dc-comment/india-needs-360%C2%B0-terror-appraisal-659, September 6, 2011)

In this context, Al Qaeda and its emerging connections in Yemen have become very relevant for India. Yemen’s predominantly tribal culture and harsh inaccessible terrain create an inherent insularity which, in many ways, makes the country an ideal sanctuary for terrorists. Yemen has, in fact, reportedly become the principal new destination for Pashtun and Punjabi Taliban fleeing intensifying attacks by American drones. Al Qaeda in the Arabian Peninsula (AQAP) has gradually established itself here through a web of alliances with the local tribes, including some by intermarriages, particularly in the inaccessible mountains of the Shabwa province, and has now become a strong presence within the country. There is every likelihood that Pakistan’s ISI has established contacts with the AQAP, though the organisation has been targeted by Saudi and Yemeni intelligence and military who consider Al Qaeda a threat to the ruling establishments. Yemen was in the news because of reports that the AQAP was attempting to procure large quantities of castor beans for manufacturing ricin powder, an extremely lethal poison; it’s swiftly fatal if inhaled in even the most minute doses. These were then to be packed into small explosive dispenser packages and smuggled into the US and Europe, and exploded in crowded places like shopping malls, aircraft or subway stations. It would be a dirty chemical bomb from ingredients freely available in the open market, comparatively cheaper and much more accessible than even the smallest nuclear equivalent. Of course, there is much scepticism about the very feasibility of developing such a project in the primitive environments of Yemen, which is where the significance of a possible Pakistani connection with the AQAP comes in. Consider this. Pakistan has already given a Dr A.Q. Khan to the illegal nuclear market. Given the jihadi influence within the Pakistani scientific community, it is not at all impossible that another similar figure may emerge in that country in the illegal bio-chemical field as well. The AQAP has demonstrated the capability to devise imaginative and ingenuous plans to carry out attacks in the heartlands of the US and western Europe, and some were even put into operation, but detected almost at the last minute. In the past, numerous jihadi attacks have originated from Yemen, including suicide bombing of the US Navy warship USS Cole in Aden harbour in 2010, the attack on the French tanker Limburg, the failed attack on another US Navy warship The Sullivans in 2002, besides the attempted assassination of the Saudi anti-terrorist chief Prince Mohammad bin Nayef. There was also the more bizarre case of an African passenger of Yemeni origin with plastic explosives sewn into his underwear who boarded an American commercial flight flying from Amsterdam and Detroit but failed to set off the explosive when over American airspace. But fanciful or not, the US for one is certainly taking seriously the capabilities of the AQAP as a potential threat. American military aid and intelligence activities in Yemen, including strikes by American aircraft and drones, have been ramped up, and there are reports that a new American airbase for this purpose is under construction in a yet unspecified country in West Asia. Threats to India’s national security can build up in any quarter, from any region of the world. India should have no doubts that it is very much on the AQAP’s target list, through local proxies like the LeT in Pakistan, including possible “ricin bomb” operations. So even as Mr Hazare wrestles with the threat of corruption to ensure good governance, India must take due note of other threats as well and exercise the requisite caution.

#### Terrorist attack on India causes Indo-Pak war- escalates

Zarate ’11 (Juan C. Zarate, “An alarming South Asia powder keg”, Washington Post, http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/content/article/2011/02/18/AR2011021805662.html, February 20, 2011)

In 1914, a terrorist assassinated Archduke Franz Ferdinand in Sarajevo - unleashing geopolitical forces and World War I. Today, while the United States rightly worries about al-Qaeda targeting the homeland, the most dangerous threat may be another terrorist flash point on the horizon. Lashkar-i-Taiba holds the match that could spark a conflagration between nuclear-armed historic rivals India and Pakistan. Lashkar-i-Taiba is a Frankenstein's monster of the Pakistani government's creation 20 years ago. It has diverse financial networks and well-trained and well-armed cadres that have struck Indian targets from Mumbai to Kabul. It collaborates with the witches' brew of terrorist groups in Pakistan, including al-Qaeda, and has demonstrated global jihadist ambitions. It is merely a matter of time before Lashkar-i-Taiba attacks again. Significant terrorist attacks in India, against Parliament in 2001 and in Mumbai in 2008, brought India and Pakistan to the brink of war. The countries remain deeply distrustful of each other. Another major strike against Indian targets in today's tinderbox environment could lead to a broader, more devastating conflict. The United States should be directing political and diplomatic capital to prevent such a conflagration. The meeting between Indian and Pakistani officials in Bhutan this month - their first high-level sit-down since last summer - set the stage for restarting serious talks on the thorny issue of Kashmir. Washington has only so much time. Indian officials are increasingly dissatisfied with Pakistan's attempts to constrain Lashkar-i-Taiba and remain convinced that Pakistani intelligence supports the group. An Indian intelligence report concluded last year that Pakistan's Inter-Services Intelligence Directorate was involved in the 2008 Mumbai attacks, and late last year the Indian government raised security levels in anticipation of strikes. India is unlikely to show restraint in the event of another attack. Lashkar-i-Taiba may also feel emboldened since the assassination in early January of a moderate Punjabi governor muted Pakistani moderates and underscored the weakness of the government in Islamabad. The group does not want peace talks to resume, so it might act to derail progress. Elements of the group may see conflict with India as in their interest, especially after months of unrest in Kashmir. And the Pakistani government may not be able to control the monster it created. A war in South Asia would be disastrous not just for the United States. In addition to the human devastation, it would destroy efforts to bring stability to the region and to disrupt terrorist havens in western Pakistan. Many of the 140,000 Pakistani troops fighting militants in the west would be redeployed east to battle Indian ground forces. This would effectively convert tribal areas bordering Afghanistan into a playing field for militants. Worse, the Pakistani government might be induced to make common cause with Lashkar-i-Taiba, launching a proxy fight against India. Such a war would also fuel even more destructive violent extremism within Pakistan. In the worst-case scenario, an attack could lead to a nuclear war between India and Pakistan. India's superior conventional forces threaten Pakistan, and Islamabad could resort to nuclear weapons were a serious conflict to erupt. Indeed, The Post reported that Pakistan's nuclear weapons and capabilities are set to surpass those of India. So what can the United States do to ratchet down tensions? We need to build trust, confidence and consistent lines of communications between India and Pakistan. This begins by helping both parties pave the way for a constructive dialogue on the status of Kashmir. Steps toward progress would include pushing for real accountability of figures responsible for the 2008 Mumbai attacks and the handing over of wanted Lashkar-i-Taiba facilitators such as Indian crime lord Dawood Ibrahim. The United States also needs to disrupt the terrorist group's fundraising and planning. The focus should be on unearthing names and disrupting cells outside Pakistan that are tied to Lashkar-i-Taiba, which involves pressuring Islamabad for the names of Westerners who may have trained at Lashkar-i-Taiba camps. This is among the thorniest U.S. national security and counterterrorism problems. It requires officials to focus on imagining the "aftershocks" of a terrorist attack and act before the threat manifests - even as other national security issues such as unrest in the Middle East boil over. Yet without political attention, diplomatic capital and sustained preventative actions, a critical region could descend into chaos. History shows that the actions of a small group of committed terrorists, such as the Black Hand in 1914 or al-Qaeda in 2001 - can spark broader wars. History could repeat itself with Lashkar-i-Taiba. Asymmetric threats that serve as flash points for broader geopolitical crises may be the greatest threat we face from terrorism.

### 1NC K

#### **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**

* Accepting that war is inevitable even without realizing it is problematic

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 Adv 2

#### Chem Weapons won’t be used – too unreliable

Mackenzie 4-25-07 (Debora, NewScientist Staff writer, “Chemical weapons still causing concern,” http://www.newscientist.com/article/mg19426014.700-chemical-weapons-still-causing-concern.html)

Since it came into force on 29 April 1997, nearly all the world's states have signed up to the CWC, and inspectors regularly verify that their chemical plants are clean. "The international norm against chemical weapons is firmly established," says Rogelio Pfirter, head of the Organisation for the Prohibition of Chemical Weapons (OPCW), the CWC's secretariat at The Hague in the Netherlands. It helps that governments now have little appetite for chemical weapons. They are bad for a country's image, unreliable on the battlefield and are not an effective deterrent: having a chemical arsenal did not stop Iraq being attacked in 1991. These factors have contributed to the success of the CWC, says former OPCW inspector Sergey Batsanov.

#### Countries won’t use bioweapons- they are too unrealiable

MIT 2 (Ocotber 30, pg. http://web.mit.edu/newsoffice/2002/anthrax-1030.html)

Biological weapons - which could contain germs that cause diseases such as anthrax, smallpox, brucellosis or tularemia - are not effective tactical military weapons. They do not immediately harm enemy soldiers on the battlefield, or destroy artillery, tanks or munitions supplies. And each germ has its drawbacks. Smallpox, for example, is highly contagious, so it could harm friendly soldiers. Anthrax is not contagious, but if it gets in the soil for long periods of time, it can kill cattle and other animals. In addition, the efficacy of biological weapons hinges on several factors, including how many germs survive the explosion of the small bomb in which they are contained, whether the wind is blowing in the correct direction and strongly enough to carry the germs over a target, what constitutes a lethal dose, and how many people will get infected or die. Depending on the germ, as few as 1 to 4 percent of the exposed population may get infected, and estimates of mortality rates vary. "If the wind is blowing one way you have a weapon. If not, you don't," said Guillemin.

#### There’s no correlation between hegemony and stability

Fettweis, PoliSci Prof @ Tulane, ’10

[Christopher J. Fettweis, Assistant Professor of Political Science at Tulane University, “Threat and Anxiety in US Foreign Policy,” Survival, 52:2, 59-82, March 25th 2010, <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/00396331003764603>]

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

#### Divided domestic politics make it impossible for us to exercise power

Kupchan, IR Prof @ Georgetown, 11

(Charles A. Kupchan, Professor of International Affairs in the School of Foreign Service and Government Department at Georgetown University, Whitney H. Shepardson Senior Fellow at the Council on Foreign Relations, 7/26/2011, “The false promise of unipolarity: constraints on the exercise of American power”, Cambridge Review of International Affairs Volume 24, Issue 2, p. Taylor and Francis)

A final chink in the armour of Brooks and Wohlforth concerns their disregard of domestic politics in the United States. As realists, the authors consider unproblematic potential variation in the choices that Americans may make about how to deploy their preponderant power; the United States is the unipole, and will act accordingly. But just as political choice and practice in China, Russia, or Europe can alter the characteristics of unipolarity, so too can political choice in the United States. With the collapse of America's political centre and the erosion of bipartisanship on matters of foreign policy, US statecraft may prove far more unpredictable and unsteady than during the decades since World War II (Kupchan and Trubowitz 2007a). Brooks and Wohlforth do to some extent address the issue of domestic stewardship when they examine whether the Iraq War and US unilateralism constrained US power due to reputational concerns and the loss of legitimacy. The excesses of the Bush administration's brand of unilateralism, they contend, cost the United States little in terms of its influence abroad. With its surfeit of power, the United States could afford to make mistakes. The challenge in this decade, however, may be not too much US power and resolve, but an unsteady America that grows weary of the burdens of unipolarity. Brooks and Wohlforth assume that the United States will as a matter of course continue to deploy its preponderant power on a global basis; the unipole will automatically defend unipolarity. But in the aftermath of the draining wars in Iraq and Afghanistan and the economic duress and ballooning deficits associated with the global financial crisis, the United States may lose some of its enthusiasm for serving as the global guardian of last resort. Democrats and Republicans are divided on issues ranging from the war in Afghanistan to climate change to arms control. If a political compromise is to be struck, it may well entail fashioning a more modest and less costly strategy of retrenchment (Kupchan and Trubowitz 2007b). At a minimum, US grand strategy may swing between stark alternatives depending upon which party is in power. In broad terms, the Republicans favour the use of force and shun institutionalized multilateralism. Meanwhile, the Democrats favour multilateralism and engagement rather than the exercise of force. Even if unipolarity persists, its international effects may be overridden by the unpredictable choices Americans may make about when and how to deploy their national power.

#### The US will use special ops raids instead of drones after the plan

Masters, Deputy Editor at the Council on Foreign Relations, 5/23/13

(Targeted Killings, [www.cfr.org/counterterrorism/targeted-killings/p9627](http://www.cfr.org/counterterrorism/targeted-killings/p9627))

What methods of targeted killing does the United States employ?

Drone Strikes

Targeted attacks launched from unmanned aerial vehicles, or drones, have ballooned under the Obama administration. A study undertaken by the New American Foundation reports that in his first two years of office, President Obama authorized nearly four times the number of strikes in Pakistan as President Bush did in his eight years. The report, which relies solely on media accounts of attacks, claims that some 291 strikes have been launched since 2009, killing somewhere between 1,299 and 2,264 militants, as of January 2013. Alternate reports also document the escalation in drone strikes in recent years, but the accounting of militant and civilian deaths can vary widely depending on the source. Traditionally the CIA has managed the bulk of U.S. drone operations outside recognized war zones, such as in Pakistan, while the Defense Department (DOD) has commanded operations in established theaters of conflict, such as in Iraq, Afghanistan, and Libya. But in some instances, the drone operations of both the CIA and DOD are integrated, as in the covert drone campaign in Yemen. In early 2013, the Obama administration shifted some of the CIA's authority over lethal drone operations to the Defense Department in an effort to streamline counterterrorism operations and increase transparency, analysts say.

Kill/Capture Missions

Since President Obama assumed office, the Pentagon has also increased the use of special operations raids (aka kill/capture missions) from 675 covert raids in 2009 to roughly 2,200 in 2011. According to the Pentagon, approximately 90 percent of these night raids end without a shot fired. As conventional U.S. forces begin to drawdown, "the role of counterterrorism operations, and in particular these kinds of special missions, will become prominent," says ISAF commander General John Allen. The covert raids are directed by an elite element within the U.S. military known as Joint Special Operations Command (JSOC). The clandestine command draws top personnel from groups like the Navy SEALs and Army Delta Force, and maintains a direct relationship with the executive branch. JSOC has tripled in size since 9/11 and currently operates in a dozen countries. Jeremy Scahill of The Nation writes, "The primacy of JSOC within the Obama administration's foreign policy--from Yemen and Somalia to Afghanistan and Pakistan--indicates that he has doubled down on the Bush-era policy of targeted assassination as a staple of U.S. foreign policy." Civilians and local governments have condemned night raids as culturally offensive, given that U.S. soldiers often enter homes in the dead of night, with women present, and utilize dogs (which are viewed as impure in Muslim culture) in their search. In April 2012, the United States reached a seminal agreement with Afghanistan to give Kabul greater oversight over special operations raids and put Afghan forces in the lead of those activities.

#### Means they can’t solve because no due process protections in special ops targeted killing and special ops raids are more likely to cause the aff advantages

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

Compared to other military tools, the advantages of using drones— particularly, that they avoid direct risks to U.S. servicemembers— vastly outweigh the limited costs and consequences. Decision-makers are now much more likely to use lethal force against a range of perceived threats than in the past. Since 9/11, over 95 percent of all nonbattlefield targeted killings have been conducted by drones—the remaining attacks were JSOC raids and AC-130 gunships and offshore sea- or air-launched cruise missiles. And the frequency of drone strikes is only increasing over time. George W. Bush authorized more nonbattlefield targeted killing strikes than any of his predecessors (50), and Barack Obama has more than septupled that number since he entered office (350). Yet without any meaningful checks—imposed by domestic or international political pressure—or sustained oversight from other branches of government, U.S. drone strikes create a moral hazard because of the negligible risks from such strikes and the unprecedented disconnect between American officials and personnel and the actual effects on the ground.14 However, targeted killings by other platforms would almost certainly inflict greater collateral damage, and the effectiveness of drones makes targeted killings the more likely policy option compared to capturing suspected militants or other nonmilitary options.

### 1NC Adv 1

#### Restrictions not coming – no significant political opposition

Stephen Holmes 13, the Walter E. Meyer Professor of Law, New York University School of Law, July 2013, “What’s in it for Obama?,” The London Review of Books, <http://www.lrb.co.uk/v35/n14/stephen-holmes/whats-in-it-for-obama>

This is the crux of the problem. We stand at the beginning of the Drone Age and the genie is not going to climb back into the bottle. The chances that this way of war will, over time, reduce the amount of random violence in the world are essentially nil. Obama’s drone policy has set an ominous precedent, and not only for future residents of the White House. It promises, over the long term, to engender more violence than it prevents because it excites no public backlash. That, for the permanent national security apparatus that has deftly moulded the worldview of a novice president, is its irresistible allure. It doesn’t provoke significant protest even on the part of people who condemn hit-jobs done with sticky bombs, radioactive isotopes or a bullet between the eyes – in the style of Mossad or Putin’s FSB. That America appears to be laidback about drones has made it possible for the CIA to resume the assassination programme it was compelled to shut down in the 1970s without, this time, awakening any politically significant outrage. It has also allowed the Pentagon to wage a war against which antiwar forces are apparently unable to rally even modest public support.

#### The government won’t take up that backlash

Benjamin Wittes, editor in chief of Lawfare and a Senior Fellow in Governance Studies at the Brookings Institution. He is the author of several books and a member of the Hoover Institution's Task Force on National Security and Law, 2/27/13, In Defense of the Administration on Targeted Killing of Americans, www.lawfareblog.com/2013/02/in-defense-of-the-administration-on-targeted-killing-of-americans/

This view has currency among European allies, among advocacy groups, and in the legal academy. Unfortunately for its proponents, it has no currency among the three branches of government of the United States. The courts and the executive branch have both taken the opposite view, and the Congress passed a broad authorization for the use of force and despite many opportunities, has never revisited that document to impose limitations by geography or to preclude force on the basis of co-belligerency—much less to clarify that the AUMF does not, any longer, authorize the use of military force at all. Congress has been repeatedly briefed on U.S. targeting decisions, including those involving U.S. persons.[5] It was therefore surely empowered to either use the power of the purse to prohibit such action or to modify the AUMF in a way that undermined the President’s legal reasoning. Not only has it taken neither of these steps, but Congress has also funded the relevant programs. Moreover, as I noted above, Congress’s recent reaffirmation of the AUMF in the 2012 NDAA with respect to detention, once again contains no geographical limitation. There is, in other words, a consensus among the branches of government on the point that the United States is engaged in an armed conflict that involves co-belligerent forces and follows the enemy to the new territorial ground it stakes out. It is a consensus that rejects the particular view of the law advanced by numerous critics. And it is a consensus on which the executive branch is entitled to rely in formulating its legal views.

#### Americans like drone strikes a lot more than the alternative

Bergen and Rowland 2013 - Director of the National Security Studies Program at the New America Foundation (Summer, Peter and Jennifer, “Drone Wars,” The Washington Quarterly • 36:3 pp. 7-26 <https://csis.org/files/publication/TWQ_13Summer_Bergen-Rowland.pdf>)

Meanwhile in the United States, the drone program has enjoyed significant support. In a February 2013 Pew poll, 56 percent of Americans said they approve of lethal drone attacks in countries such as Pakistan, Yemen, and Somalia.42This is hardly surprising as the human, financial, and political costs of the drone program are very low. There are no American boots on the ground, and a drone costs a tiny fraction of the price of fighter aircraft or bombers. On the other hand, some in the U.S. media and Congress have wondered whether the drone program is an effective tactic in the fight against al-Qaeda and its affiliates, or if it might undercut that very mission by driving vulnerable young men into the arms of jihadist militant groups. Others have questioned the legality of a sustained lethal campaign in countries with which the United States is not at war, or have decried the opaque nature of the program, or criticized the killing of civilians in drone strikes.43

#### Their evidence is an oversimplification – no threat to Pakistani drone usage

Fair 2010 - Assistant Professor, Georgetown (August 2, C. Christine, “Drones Over Pakistan -- Menace or Best Viable Option?” <http://www.huffingtonpost.com/c-christine-fair/drones-over-pakistan----m_b_666721.html>)

While American opponents of the policy cling to empirically specious claims about the drones and their purported "civilian casualties," within Pakistan itself the debate is far more sophisticated. Since April 2009, many changes have occurred across the Pakistani social landscape albeit with variation across the expanse of its territory. First, the Pakistani Taliban (Tehreek-e-Taliban-e-Pakistan, TTP) made an enormous strategic blunder. Throughout the early months of 2009, the provincial officials of Khyber Pakhtoonkhwa as well as the central government were negotiating a so-called peace deal with the militants associated with the TTP operating in the settled area of Swat. By most accounts, Pakistanis as well as Swatis themselves embraced this as a viable option to diminish the violence and restore peace to this territory that had been riven by TTP violence. As the ink on the deal was drying, the TTP breached the agreement in April 2009 and overran the town of Buner, sitting to the immediate west of the Indus River. This had two effects. First, it persuaded those in Swat and elsewhere, who had previously supported the Taliban's self-proclaimed campaign to restore good governance and provide access to justice, that the Taliban were not interested in peaceful coexistence and were in fact committed to violence and expansion of power. Second, the onslaught against Buner had a powerful impact upon Pakistani opinion about the intentions of the TTP militant. Pakistanis have long viewed the Indus as an important barrier dividing the Pakistani heartland, comprised primarily of the Punjab and which lies to the east of the Indus, and the "uncontrollable" land of the Pashtuns lying to the east of the Indus. For Pakistanis the unruliness of this area increases as you move from the so-called "settled" Pashtun areas of Khyber-Pakhtoonkhwa towards the west where the "unsettled" tribal belt abuts Afghanistan. When the TTP militants came to the border of the Indus, many Pakistanis who were confident that the TTP only wanted the "Pashtun areas," came to believed the TTP militants want of all of Pakistan. These apprehensions were confirmed and even intensified when Sufi Mohammad -- a local leader of the TTP in Swat -- convened a congregation in the Swat city of Mingora and denounced the Pakistani constitution, declaring that Islam cannot accommodate democracy and that western democracy in particular was a system of infidels that has divided Pakistani society. Robust military operations began thereafter, this time with the significant degree of support of the public and diminished opposition to the same. Some four million persons were displaced from Swat once the operation began. (The army encouraged this displacement to permit it freedom of action against the militants; although the exodus was ill-planned with only a few days notice.) During my recent two trips to Swat, the Swatis I met from the Mingora area are generally pleased with the army's operation and are -- for now -- glad the army is in place. These Swatis see the army as the one organization that gets things done in contrast to the civil administration which has yet to re-establish itself after the militants drove out civil authorities. Amidst allegations that the army was indiscriminate in its use of force, some Pakistanis began arguing that Pakistan should have its own drones to allow Pakistani forces to have the same accuracy as US forces. Increasingly Pakistani officials are requesting that the United States provide drones or at least let them have a role in pulling the trigger. Advocates of Pakistani drones or increased command and control over U.S. drones note that armed drones have neither displaced millions of Pakistanis nor resulted in the destruction of homes on a large scale. Killing Whose Enemies? Killing Our Enemies The August 2009 killing of Baitullah Mehsud catalyzed another shift in the Pakistani discourse. This was the first drone strike that killed a Pakistani militant who was exclusively an enemy of Pakistan. As Baitullah Mehsud had no operational import for the U.S. mission in Afghanistan, Pakistan understood that the United States was finally employing its use of force to contend with Pakistan's own internal foes. This shift in the drone debate is an important shift that few American interlocutors appreciate as they sustain a baseless narrative that is deaf to the realities across Pakistan. Drones went from being universally dismissed among Pakistanis as a horrific menace to an instrument of significantly and comparatively humane lethality relative to other options. American analysts would be better served by appreciating the developing nuances in the drone debate in Pakistan before seeking to undermine the best program that the United States and Pakistan have in their mutual war on terror. Both American and Pakistani governments can help foster a more constructive debate by owning the program and disclosing Pakistan's ever-increasing cooperation to shape the debate by providing empirical data about the drones' victims and their operational significance. Few Pakistanis in the FATA, Khyber Pakhtoonkhwa or elsewhere in Pakistan would disagree that the world is a better place without Baitullah Mehsud in it.

#### No impact to Pakistani public opinion

Khory 2013 – professor at Mount Holyoke (March 27, Kavita, “The Worrying Future of Drone Strikes” <https://www.mtholyoke.edu/media/worrying-future-drone-strikes>)

QA: What has been the Pakistani government’s response to these drone strikes, and does it publicly or privately support the drone strikes? KK: The precise role of Pakistan’s government and military in the drone strikes remains unclear. For the most part, the government denies any operational knowledge of the attacks. Government officials have challenged the legality of drone strikes in Pakistan, which have risen significantly under the Obama administration, and complain that these strikes are carried out without their consent. Yet, as we learned from documents released by WikiLeaks in 2010, senior Pakistani officials tacitly approved drone strikes while publicly condemning them. Pakistanis have shared intelligence with American counterparts, and until 2011 the CIA carried out drone missions from an airbase in Pakistan. QA: Is the Pakistani government under pressure from within Pakistan to end drone strikes on its soil? KK: Despite growing anger and protests against drone strikes, public opinion is not likely to influence policy in any meaningful way. Drone strikes are a sticking point in current United States-Pakistan relations, but policy toward them is shaped by a variety of factors. For example, the Pakistani government’s support for drone strikes declined significantly after the killing of Osama bin Laden and the deaths of 24 Pakistani soldiers in a botched NATO airstrike. The government’s ambiguous posture and contradictory policy on drones is frustrating for many Pakistanis, but few are calling for a radical restructuring of Pakistan-U.S. relations.

How to Reduce the Need for Drones

#### No public blowback – the public thinks the army is worse

Anderson 2013 - senior fellow in Governance Studies at Brookings and a professor of law at American University (May 24, Kenneth, “The Case for Drones” <http://www.realclearpolitics.com/articles/2013/05/24/the_case_for_drones_118548.html>)

It is sharply contested, to say the least, whether and to what extent drone strikes are creating blowback among villagers, or whether and to what extent, as a former British soldier recently returned from Afghanistan remarked to me, villagers are sad to see the Taliban commander who just insisted on marrying someone’s young daughter blown up in an airstrike. There is also debate about the degree to which villagers are aware that the American drones are undertaking strikes that the Pakistani government might otherwise undertake. Critics often neglect to focus on the Pakistani government’s regular and brutal assaults in the tribal zones. Despite a general perception that all of Pakistan is united against drone strikes, voices in the Pakistani newspapers have often made note that the tribal areas fear the Pakistani army far more than they fear U.S. drones, because, despite mistakes and inevitable civilian casualties, they see them as smaller and more precise. But the blunt reality is that as the counterinsurgency era ends for U.S. forces, narrow blowback concerns about whether villages might be sufficiently provoked against American infantry are subsiding.

# 2NC

## Other cp

### Solves

#### Executive orders facilitate the legislative process

Mayer and Price, 02 (Kenneth, Kevin, Professor @ U of Wisconsin-Madison, Graduate Student @ U of Wisconsin-Madison, Presidential Studies Quarterly, “Unilateral presidential powers: significant executive orders”, 6/1/2002, lexis)

If presidents may use the rhetorical, personal, and persuasive resources of the office, they may also take advantage of the formal prerogatives vested in the chief executive by the Constitution, statutory grants of authority, and the evolution of relevant legal doctrine. (Cash 1963; Cross 1988; Fleishman and Aufses 1976; Jack 1986; Neighbors 1964; Rosenberg 1981; Sunstein 1981; Tauber 1982). To the extent that executive orders alter institutional structures or processes, they provide potent resources for presidential leadership based on formal authority. In short, presidents enjoy significant but not unfettered latitude in governing the government through the issuance of executive orders. The administrative authority vested in the modern presidency is significant in its own right, but we claim that the exercise of intragovernment powers can yield consequences for the larger political system as well. In a highly permeable system in which executive policy decisions can spill over into other institutions and the broad political culture, executive orders can effect changes that presidents may or may not have intended--or even considered--in the first place (Weir 1989). In other words, politically significant executive orders are not merely executive phenomena. As illustrated by the long history of executive orders concerning integration and civil rights--Truman ordering the integration of the armed forces, Kennedy and Johnson requiring affirmative action in federal contracting, Reagan attempting to limit the role of ethnic preferences in federal affirmative action programs--these instruments of presidential authority can animate contending forces, facilitate innovations in the legislative process, codify ideological, commitments, and drive social change.

### AT: Exec Not Credible / Accountable

#### President’s visibility ensures public awareness and accountability

Rao, 9 --- Assistant Professor of Law, George Mason University School of Law (Spring 2009, Neomi, Willamette Law Review, “PRESIDENTIAL POWER IN THE 21ST CENTURY SYMPOSIUM: ARTICLE: THE PRESIDENT'S SPHERE OF ACTION,” 45 Willamette L. Rev. 527))

B. Ex Ante Constraints

As with the other branches, the primary ex ante constraints on the President are inherent in the nature of the executive power. As the Chief Executive, the President stands in a unique position - he represents the nation, oversees implementation of its laws, and preserves the nation's safety. n93 These responsibilities impose certain constraints on the President.

[\*548] The Framers deliberately chose a unitary executive because, as Hamilton explained, "unity is conducive to energy... Decision, activity, secrecy, and despatch, will generally characterize the proceedings of one man, in a much more eminent degree than the proceeding of any greater number." n94 In addition to energy in the executive, unity promotes both visibility and responsibility. Because the President alone commands the executive branch, the public can identify the source and author of bad policies. As Hamilton explained, the "two greatest securities" the people have in the faithful exercise of the executive power are the restraint of public opinion and the "opportunity of discovering with facility and clearness the misconduct of the persons they trust" n95 so that censure or punishment may follow. n96

Similarly, Madison noted that the executive power has a narrower scope than the legislative power and is "more simple in its nature." n97 Accordingly, he argued, "projects of usurpation ... would immediately betray and defeat themselves." n98 By their nature, the President's actions are usually visible, and this visibility provides accountability. n99

The President's visibility substitutes for more concrete ex ante constraints on the exercise of his powers. Execution of the laws usually generates public awareness of the President's actions and triggers the possibility of political and judicial review. This [\*549] arrangement maximizes energy in the executive by leaving accountability largely to follow after the fact of executive action.

## Case

### Siggie

#### The plan specifically and narrowly creates restrictions on targeted killings---those killings are legally and operationally distinct from “signature strikes”

David Hastings Dunn 13, Reader in International Politics and Head of Department in the Department of Political Science and International Studies at the University of Birmingham, UK, and Stefan Wolff, Professor of International Security at the University of Birmingham in the UK, March 2013, “Drone Use in Counter-Insurgency and Counter-Terrorism: Policy or Policy Component?,” in Hitting the Target?: How New Capabilities are Shaping International Intervention, ed. Aaronson & Johnson, http://www.rusi.org/downloads/assets/Hitting\_the\_Target.pdf

Yet an important distinction needs to be drawn here between acting on operational intelligence that corroborates existing intelligence and confirms the presence of a specific pre-determined target and its elimination – so-called ‘targeted strikes’ (or less euphemistically, ‘targeted killings’) – and acting on an algorithmic analysis of operational intelligence alone, determining on the spot whether a development on the ground suggests terrorist activity or association and thus fulfils certain (albeit, to date, publicly not disclosed) criteria for triggering an armed response by the remote pilot of a drone – so-called ‘signature strikes’.6

Targeted strikes rely on corroborating pre-existing intelligence: they serve the particular purpose of eliminating specific individuals that are deemed crucial to enemy capabilities and are meant to diminish opponents’ operational, tactical and strategic capabilities, primarily by killing mid- and top-level leadership cadres. To the extent that evidence is available, it suggests that targeted strikes are highly effective in achieving these objectives, while simultaneously generating relatively little blowback, precisely because they target individual (terrorist) leaders and cause few, if any, civilian casualties. This explains, to a significant degree, why the blowback effect in Yemen – where the overwhelming majority of drone strikes have been targeted strikes – has been less pronounced than in Pakistan and Afghanistan.7

Signature strikes, in contrast, can still be effective in diminishing operational, tactical and strategic enemy capabilities, but they do so to a certain degree by chance and also have a much higher probability of causing civilian casualties. Using drones for signature strikes decreases the dependence on pre-existing intelligence about particular leaders and their movements and more fully utilises their potential to carry out effective surveillance and respond to the conclusions drawn from it immediately. Signature strikes have been the predominant approach to drone usage in Pakistan and Afghanistan.8 Such strikes have had the effect of decimating the rank and file of the Taliban and their associates – but they have also caused large numbers of civilian casualties and, at a minimum, weakened the respective host governments’ legitimacy and forced them to condemn publicly, and in no uncertain terms, the infringement of their states’ sovereignty by the US. In turn, this has strained already difficult relations between countries which have more common than divergent interests when it comes to regional stability and the fight against international terrorist networks. That signature strikes have a high probability of going wrong and that such failures prove extremely counterproductive is also illustrated by a widely reported case from Yemen, in which twelve civilians were killed in the proximity of a car identified as belonging to an Al-Qa’ida member.9

The kind of persistent and intimidating presence of a drone policy geared towards signature strikes, and the obvious risks and consequences involved in repeatedly making wrong decisions, are both counterproductive in themselves and corrosive of efforts that seek to undercut the local support enjoyed by insurgent and terrorist networks, as well as the mutual assistance that they can offer each other. Put differently, signature strikes, in contrast to targeted killings, do anything but help to disentangle the links between insurgents and terrorists.

#### Signature strikes are far worse for all of their impacts---this turns the case on a grand scale

David Hastings Dunn 13, Reader in International Politics and Head of Department in the Department of Political Science and International Studies at the University of Birmingham, UK, and Stefan Wolff, Professor of International Security at the University of Birmingham in the UK, March 2013, “Drone Use in Counter-Insurgency and Counter-Terrorism: Policy or Policy Component?,” in Hitting the Target?: How New Capabilities are Shaping International Intervention, ed. Aaronson & Johnson, http://www.rusi.org/downloads/assets/Hitting\_the\_Target.pdf

Yet an important distinction needs to be drawn here between acting on operational intelligence that corroborates existing intelligence and confirms the presence of a specific pre-determined target and its elimination – so-called ‘targeted strikes’ (or less euphemistically, ‘targeted killings’) – and acting on an algorithmic analysis of operational intelligence alone, determining on the spot whether a development on the ground suggests terrorist activity or association and thus fulfils certain (albeit, to date, publicly not disclosed) criteria for triggering an armed response by the remote pilot of a drone – so-called ‘signature strikes’.6¶ Targeted strikes rely on corroborating pre-existing intelligence: they serve the particular purpose of eliminating specific individuals that are deemed crucial to enemy capabilities and are meant to diminish opponents’ operational, tactical and strategic capabilities, primarily by killing mid- and top-level leadership cadres. To the extent that evidence is available, it suggests that targeted strikes are highly effective in achieving these objectives, while simultaneously generating relatively little blowback, precisely because they target individual (terrorist) leaders and cause few, if any, civilian casualties. This explains, to a significant degree, why the blowback effect in Yemen – where the overwhelming majority of drone strikes have been targeted strikes – has been less pronounced than in Pakistan and Afghanistan.7¶ Signature strikes, in contrast, can still be effective in diminishing operational, tactical and strategic enemy capabilities, but they do so to a certain degree by chance and also have a much higher probability of causing civilian casualties. Using drones for signature strikes decreases the dependence on pre-existing intelligence about particular leaders and their movements and more fully utilises their potential to carry out effective surveillance and respond to the conclusions drawn from it immediately. Signature strikes have been the predominant approach to drone usage in Pakistan and Afghanistan.8 Such strikes have had the effect of decimating the rank and file of the Taliban and their associates – but they have also caused large numbers of civilian casualties and, at a minimum, weakened the respective host governments’ legitimacy and forced them to condemn publicly, and in no uncertain terms, the infringement of their states’ sovereignty by the US. In turn, this has strained already difficult relations between countries which have more common than divergent interests when it comes to regional stability and the fight against international terrorist networks. That signature strikes have a high probability of going wrong and that such failures prove extremely counterproductive is also illustrated by a widely reported case from Yemen, in which twelve civilians were killed in the proximity of a car identified as belonging to an Al-Qa’ida member.9¶ The kind of persistent and intimidating presence of a drone policy geared towards signature strikes, and the obvious risks and consequences involved in repeatedly making wrong decisions, are both counterproductive in themselves and corrosive of efforts that seek to undercut the local support enjoyed by insurgent and terrorist networks, as well as the mutual assistance that they can offer each other. Put differently, signature strikes, in contrast to targeted killings, do anything but help to disentangle the links between insurgents and terrorists.¶ Counter-insurgency as a strategy works best by providing security on the ground (deploying soldiers amongst the community that they are intended to protect) and establishing and sustaining a sufficiently effective local footprint of the state and its institutions providing public goods and services beyond just security (water, food, sanitation, healthcare, education and so forth). This strategy is often encapsulated in the formula ‘clear, hold, build’,10 and it needs to go hand-in-hand with pursuing a viable political settlement that addresses what are the, in many cases, legitimate concerns of those fighting, and supporting, an insurgency. By living among the communities they seek to secure, soldiers can win their trust, stem support for the insurgents, and understand who their enemies are, what their demands and objectives are, and how best to single out those who represent an irreconcilable threat to the community. In other words, in a context in which the objective is to protect innocent civilians, win over reconcilable insurgents and their supporters, and eliminate those who are irreconcilable, drones can deliver specific contributions to an overall counter-insurgency policy. Yet this can only happen if drones target individuals for a reason, rather than being used, and perceived, as a blanket approach against an entire community.

# 1NR

### 2NC O/V

Turns hegemony

Khalilzad, counselor at CSIS, 11 [2/8/11, Zalmay Khalilzad was the United States ambassador to Afghanistan, Iraq, and the United Nations during the presidency of George W. Bush and the director of policy planning at the Defense Department from 1990 to 1992. "The Econom and National Security" Feb 8 www.nationalreview.com/blogs/print/259024]

The current recession is the result of a deep financial crisis, not a mere fluctuation in the business cycle. Recovery is likely to be protracted. The crisis was preceded by the buildup over two decades of enormous amounts of debt throughout the U.S. economy — ultimately totaling almost 350 percent of GDP — and the development of credit-fueled asset bubbles, particularly in the housing sector. When the bubbles burst, huge amounts of wealth were destroyed, and unemployment rose to over 10 percent. The decline of tax revenues and massive countercyclical spending put the U.S. government on an unsustainable fiscal path. Publicly held national debt rose from 38 to over 60 percent of GDP in three years.

Without faster economic growth and actions to reduce deficits, publicly held national debt is projected to reach dangerous proportions. If interest rates were to rise significantly, annual interest payments — which already are larger than the defense budget — would crowd out other spending or require substantial tax increases that would undercut economic growth. Even worse, if unanticipated events trigger what economists call a “sudden stop” in credit markets for U.S. debt, the United States would be unable to roll over its outstanding obligations, precipitating a sovereign-debt crisis that would almost certainly compel a radical retrenchment of the United States internationally.

Growth solves terrorism – free trade

Griswold 3 (Daniel Griswold is director of the Center for Trade Policy Studies at the Cato Institute, “Can Free Trade Promote Peace in the Middle East?”, June 20 2003, http://www.freetrade.org/pubs/speeches/dg-062003.htm)

Free trade is not a panacea, but it is a necessary building block for a more peaceful and prosperous Middle East. Free trade has helped to reduce poverty in those countries and regions of the world that have progressively opened themselves to the global economy. Free trade can till the soil for democracy and respect for human rights by creating an economically independent and growing middle class. Countries that are open to trade and global commerce are more likely to be working democracies that respect human rights. The Bush administration's white paper on National Security Strategy last year emphasized the importance of trade in building a more secure world. In his May 9 address in South Carolina, President Bush said, "The Arab world has a great cultural tradition, but is largely missing out on the economic progress of our time. Across the globe, free markets and trade have helped defeat poverty, and taught men and women the habits of liberty." We have seen this dynamic in action in South Korea, Taiwan, Chile, Mexico, and other countries where economic reforms and openness have laid a foundation for political competition and democracy. Within the Arab world, those nations that have traveled the furthest on the road of economic reform, and Jordan certainly belongs on that list, are among the leaders of political reform as well. Sadly, the Arab world is a land that globalization has largely passed by-and their isolation is largely self-imposed. Average tariff barriers in the Arab Middle East are among the highest in the world, and as a consequence the region suffers from chronically declining shares of global trade and investment. Average annual inflows of foreign direct investment to Arab countries are only slightly larger than the inflows to Sweden; non-oil exports from Arab countries to the rest of the world are smaller than those of Denmark. There are more McDonalds franchises serving the 15 million people in the Netherlands serve the 280 million people in the whole Arab world. The government of Jordan took the positive step of joining the World Trade Organization in 2000, but WTO membership is still the exception in the Middle East. Here's a pop quiz: What do Libya, Sudan, Syria, Iraq, Iran, and Afghanistan have in common? Besides all of them being ongoing or recent sponsors of terrorism, not one of them belongs to the WTO. Internal market freedom is also lacking in many Arab nations that are still suffering from a bout of so-called Arab socialism. Most Arab countries engage in widespread price controls and state-ownership of enterprises. They lack the legal and political infrastructure to enforce property and contract rights. Those policies have wrought dismal economic performance. The total gross domestic product of the 280 million people who live in Arab lands is smaller than that of Spain. According to a recent report by the UN Development Program, between 1985 and 1998, real per capita GDP declined in a broad swath of the Arab world. In contrast, real GDP during that same period rose by 30 percent in Israel, 90 percent in Chile, and more than doubled in Thailand, China, and South Korea. The record on civil and political freedom in the Arab world is no better. Freedom House, the human rights group in New York, reported in its latest study that only 25 percent of Muslim-majority countries in the world are democracies compared to 75 percent of non-Muslim countries. Freedom House noted in most recent report that, "the democracy gap between the Islamic world and rest of the world is dramatic," and there is no sign that the gap is closing. That depressing reality feeds terrorism, not because of poverty but because of a lack of opportunity and hope for a better future, especially among the young. It's a myth that poverty breeds terrorism. In fact, poverty is more widespread in sub-Saharan Africa and South Asia than in the Arab world, in part because of the network of private Islamic charities that help the poorest in society. And many terrorists are well educated and come from relatively privileged families. As Paul Blustein of the Washington Post wrote in a story from Cairo last year: "It is not poverty that drives their discontent so much as an economy that provides few chances for interesting work and upward mobility." Young people who cannot find meaningful work and who cannot participate in the political process are ripe pickings for religious fanatics and terrorist recruiters. All of this gives urgency to the summit in Jordan this weekend, and to what the Bush administration is trying to accomplish with its proposal for a free trade area in the Middle East. The initiative concentrates on negotiating free trade agreements with willing and ready partners in the Middle East, with the goal of establishing a network of agreements within a decade.

### 2NC AT Impact

Broad studies prove our argument

Royal, ‘10 [2010, Jedediah Royal is the Director of Cooperative Threat Reduction at the U.S. Department of Defense, “Economic Integration, Economic Signaling and the Problem of Economic Crises, Economics of War and Peace: Economic, Legal and Political Perspectives”, ed. By Goldsmith and Brauer, p. 213-215]

Less intuitive is how periods of economic decline may increase the likelihood of external conflict. Political science literature has contributed a moderate degree of attention to the impact of economic decline and the security and defence behaviour of interdependent states. Research in this vein has been considered at systemic, dyadic and national levels. Several notable contributions follow. First, on the systemic level, Pollins (2008) advances Modelski and Thompson's (1996) work on leadership cycle theory, finding that rhythms in the global economy are associated with the rise and fall of a pre-eminent power and the often bloody transition from one pre-eminent leader to the next. As such, exogenous shocks such as economic crises could usher in a redistribution of relative power (see also Gilpin. 1981) that leads to uncertainty about power balances, increasing the risk of miscalculation (Feaver, 1995). Alternatively, even a relatively certain redistribution of power could lead to a permissive environment for conflict as a rising power may seek to challenge a declining power (Werner. 1999). Separately, Pollins (1996) also shows that global economic cycles combined with parallel leadership cycles impact the likelihood of conflict among major, medium and small powers, although he suggests that the causes and connections between global economic conditions and security conditions remain unknown. Second, on a dyadic level, Copeland's (1996, 2000) theory of trade expectations suggests that 'future expectation of trade' is a significant variable in understanding economic conditions and security behaviour of states. He argues that interdependent states are likely to gain pacific benefits from trade so long as they have an optimistic view of future trade relations. However, if the expectations of future trade decline, particularly for difficult to replace items such as energy resources, the likelihood for conflict increases, as states will be inclined to use force to gain access to those resources. Crises could potentially be the trigger for decreased trade expectations either on its own or because it triggers protectionist moves by interdependent states.4 Third, others have considered the link between economic decline and external armed conflict at a national level. Blomberg and Hess (2002) find a strong correlation between internal conflict and external conflict, particularly during periods of economic downturn. They write: The linkages between internal and external conflict and prosperity are strong and mutually reinforcing. Economic conflict tends to spawn internal conflict, which in turn returns the favour. Moreover, the presence of a recession tends to amplify the extent to which international and external conflicts self-reinforce each other. (Blomberg & Hess, 2002. p. 89) Economic decline has also been linked with an increase in the likelihood of terrorism (Blomberg, Hess, & Weerapana, 2004), which has the capacity to spill across borders and lead to external tensions. Furthermore, crises generally reduce the popularity of a sitting government. “Diversionary theory" suggests that, when facing unpopularity arising from economic decline, sitting governments have increased incentives to fabricate external military conflicts to create a 'rally around the flag' effect. Wang (1996), DeRouen (1995). and Blomberg, Hess, and Thacker (2006) find supporting evidence showing that economic decline and use of force are at least indirectly correlated. Gelpi (1997), Miller (1999), and Kisangani and Pickering (2009) suggest that the tendency towards diversionary tactics are greater for democratic states than autocratic states, due to the fact that democratic leaders are generally more susceptible to being removed from office due to lack of domestic support. DeRouen (2000) has provided evidence showing that periods of weak economic performance in the United States, and thus weak Presidential popularity, are statistically linked to an increase in the use of force. In summary, recent economic scholarship positively correlates economic integration with an increase in the frequency of economic crises, whereas political science scholarship links economic decline with external conflict at systemic, dyadic and national levels.5 This implied connection between integration, crises and armed conflict has not featured prominently in the economic-security debate and deserves more attention. This observation is not contradictory to other perspectives that link economic interdependence with a decrease in the likelihood of external conflict, such as those mentioned in the first paragraph of this chapter. Those studies tend to focus on dyadic interdependence instead of global interdependence and do not specifically consider the occurrence of and conditions created by economic crises. As such, the view presented here should be considered ancillary to those views.

### 2NC AT Resilient

#### Farm bill critical U.S. economic stability --- sustains a vital sector

Johanns, 11/12 --- Senator from Nebraska who sits on the Agriculture, Nutrition and Forestry; the Banking, Housing and Urban Affairs committee (Sen. Mike Johanns, “Bill can be part of budget solution,” <http://thehill.com/homenews/news/190046-bill-can-be-part-of-budget-solution>))

But the farm bill is much more than a tool for budget hawks in Washington to achieve savings. Fresh agriculture policy has proven elusive for those who feed and fuel our world since the old policy expired last year. Recent droughts and freak blizzards underscore the need for replenished disaster assistance that expired in 2011.

Farmers and ranchers from my home state of Nebraska tell me they could live without costly annual direct payments to bolster their income, and they are happy to pay into a crop insurance program that provides a backstop in tough years. They are prepared to do their part to help reduce government spending so long as they have the risk management tools they need to succeed. Lawmakers must also be prepared to provide these tools while reducing government spending.

Eliminating direct payments and streamlining duplicative conservation programs are part of the agriculture titles that save about $13 billion in both chambers’ farm bills. While lawmakers might differ on how additional cost savings are achieved, the end product will reflect improved efficiency and a commitment to targeting government resources more narrowly to meet specific needs.

The food stamp program is the biggest sticking point in farm bill negotiations. The Senate bill saves $4 billion from the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program (SNAP), or about one-half of a percent. The House bill saves about 10 times more. Admittedly, there’s a lot of pasture between those two figures. And both sides should be prepared to live with something in the middle.

As these negotiations move forward, we must acknowledge that we are working with a limited pot of resources, requiring a strong commitment to efficiency and priority. Nobody wants to block assistance from folks truly in need, and we should seek ways to protect limited resources for these families. One way to do this is to crack down on states that skirt eligibility requirements for SNAP recipients by enrolling folks in the program who don’t qualify for the benefit. Doing so would save roughly $20 billion and ensure limited resources are not being diluted by state programs that lure unqualified Americans into unneeded federal benefits.

The farm bill is not out of the woods yet, but it stands as a model for fiscally responsible governance. The bipartisan, multiregional, multifaceted House and Senate plans focus on how to save rather than how to spend. A new long-term farm bill would provide certainty for the rural sector that is so important for economic stability. It guarantees real savings while protecting vulnerable families. And it might be just the example Congress needs to inspire responsible solutions to the fiscal challenges facing our nation.

### 2NC AT Healthcare

#### Health care diversion actually helping Obama put positive spin on farm bill to help get it passed

Green, 11/13 (Emma, 11/13/2013, Atlantic.com, “How to Pass the Farm Bill: Make It About Anything but Farm Subsidies,” Factiva))

Few people are paying attention to the farm bill currently making its way through Congress. Between the government shutdown, the technical flaws of Healthcare.gov, and the never-ending budget negotiations, Washington has plenty of political drama to divert its attention. As the House and Senate try to reconcile their views on the 1,000-page piece of legislation over the coming weeks, it seems that the Obama administration is taking advantage of this distraction to put some good, old-fashioned spin on the controversial topic of farm subsidies.

#### Obama will right the ship and bounce back from health care to pass agenda

Parnes, 11/16 (Amie, 11/16/2013, “Obama has his Bush moment,” <http://thehill.com/homenews/administration/190455-obama-has-his-bush-moment>))

Still, the Obama team remains confident that they can right the ship — both for ObamaCare and the remainder of the president’s second term agenda.

White House press secretary Jay Carney said Friday that the president could regain his footing “by waking up every day and focusing on addressing the concerns that the American people have.”

“This is obviously a challenge, and we're facing the challenge, and we're up to the challenge,” he said.

“He can come out of this,” the former official said. “This can be a painful chapter in his second term biography or it can completely tear it down but he's throwing everything he has into this and I think he'll be able to move past it. I'd much rather be in this situation right now than what Bush faced around the same time of his presidency.”

### 2NC AT Iran

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

#### Farm bill is Obama’s top priority --- that’s the 1nc Dreilingevidence.

#### Farm bill is the top priority and the next two weeks are key

Eubank, 11/10 (Andy, 11/10/2013, “Farm Bill at Top of President’s Idea List in New Orleans,” <http://www.hoosieragtoday.com/farm-bill-at-top-of-presidents-idea-list-in-new-orleans/>))

Speaking on the economy in New Orleans Friday – President Barack Obama again addressed three things he believes Republicans and Democrats can join together to do to make progress in the area of business growth and job creation right now. The farm bill was first on his list. President Obama said Congress needs to pass a farm bill that helps rural communities grow and protects vulnerable Americans. Stressing that the farm bill doesn’t just benefit farmers – the President called on Congress to do the right thing and pass a farm bill. The two weeks ahead of Thanksgiving could determine if Congress will get that done yet this year. The House and Senate will both be in session before taking a Thanksgiving break that is scheduled to begin November 22nd. Congressional aides have suggested that recess will last two weeks. That schedule would have members returning December 9th for another two week session before an NewOrleansNightLifeexpected December 20th departure for the Christmas and New Year’s holidays. The farm bills approved by the House and Senate will not expire at the end of the year since the congressional session continues – but the pressure is on to finish a farm bill by then.

#### Iran sanctions wont be brought up

Lesniewski, 11/14 (Niels, 11/14/2013, “McCain: Reid Might Use Vitter Dispute to Keep Iran Sanctions Off Floor,” <http://blogs.rollcall.com/wgdb/mccain-reid-might-use-vitter-dispute-to-keep-iran-sanctions-off-floor/>))

Sen. John McCain suggested Thursday that the Senate’s majority leader may have an ulterior motive in the standoff with Sen. David Vitter that’s slowed the chamber to a crawl. The Arizona Republican suggested that the dispute between Majority Leader Harry Reid, D-Nev., and Vitter, R-La., over an amendment requiring disclosure about congressional staffers entering the new health care exchanges under Obamacare could be a gambit to help forestall the arrival of a floor debate on increased Iran sanctions. “I think [Reid] is using it as a rationale because it’s clear that they don’t want a resolution concerning Iran and negotiations with Iran,” McCain said. Those advocating for new sanctions against the Iranian regime over its nuclear development have said the fiscal 2014 defense bill is the logical place for the debate, since it’s the next moving vehicle on the Senate floor, and it usually has a relatively open amendment process. President Barack Obama was clear Thursday in saying that the administration does not favor an additional sanctions push in the midst of diplomatic talks with Iran over the nuclear program. “What I’ve said to members of Congress is that if, in fact, we’re serious about trying to resolve this diplomatically … if we’re serious about pursuing diplomacy, then there’s no need for us to add new sanctions on top of the sanctions that are already very effective and that brought them to the table in the first place,” Obama told reporters at the White House. “Now, if it turns out they can’t deliver, they can’t come to the table in a serious way and get this issue resolved, the sanctions can be ramped back up. And we’ve got that option.” Senate Armed Services Chairman Carl Levin of Michigan wants to avoid seeing the defense bill become a legislative Christmas tree this year, but whether the legislation can get through the Senate before the literal Capitol Christmas tree arrives on Nov. 25 is an open question. Levin echoed the views of other Democrats who weren’t sure how long the Obamacare-related standoff would continue. “Well, I don’t know what Vitter’s going to do,” in terms of yielding back debate time, Levin said. “There will be all kinds of amendments, I’m sure which could be cleared, hopefully. That was the way we used to do things around here,” Levin said. “Then at the end a manager’s package, I would hope that that would be the case.” Vitter has made repeated unanimous consent requests to set up votes on an amendment that would set a new public reporting requirement for congressional offices about which staff members have been designated as “official” employees. The “official” staff will lose access to the Federal Employee Health Benefits Plan, instead obtaining insurance through the Obamacare exchange system. “This is a charade and, at a minimum, I think the public should know how each office and each member is handling that situation,” Vitter said Thursday when trying to set up a vote on his proposal and a Democratic alternative on a number of legislative vehicles, including the defense bill. Reid criticized Vitter on the Senate floor Thursday morning, highlighting the fact that the Louisianan was the only senator with an objection to a compounding pharmacy safety bill.

### 2nc Uniqueness

#### Farm bill is Obama’s top priority --- he’s pushing and passage is likely. That’s Dreiling.

#### Obama’s involvement will be critical to broker a deal on the biggest sticking point which is food stamps --- that’s Hagstrom.

#### Momentum now --- can be concluded this year

Rogers, 11/14 (David, 11/14/2013, “Republicans more optimistic on farm bill,” [www.politico.com/story/2013/11/republicans-farm-bill-99889.html?hp=l5)](http://www.politico.com/story/2013/11/republicans-farm-bill-99889.html?hp=l5)))

House Republicans were more upbeat Thursday on getting a farm bill done this year, with Speaker John Boehner raising the subject and Agriculture Committee Chairman Frank Lucas saying he and his Senate counterparts are “getting to a common point on the commodity title.”

“I can say that all the face-to-face meetings that have gone on with the principals — in the last couple of weeks — have made progress,” Lucas told POLITICO. “We are getting to a common point on the commodity title.”

“There are still some big principles: choice vs. all inclusive, how you calculate the acres. But we are moving and staff on a variety of fronts are ironing out the differences.”

Talks between the Oklahoma Republican and Senate Agriculture Committee Chairwoman Debbie Stabenow (D-Mich.) are expected to continue late Thursday. And at his weekly news conference Thursday morning, Boehner included the farm bill as part of his year-end agenda.

“There are issues that can be resolved before the end of the year, including reforms to our farm programs, a bill to reauthorize important water projects around the country and hopefully a budget agreement so that we can stop lurching from one crisis to another,” the speaker told reporters. “We have got a chance to find common ground, and I am hopeful that we can make progress on all of these issues.”

#### Will pass --- stars are aligning

Peterson, 11/15 (Erick, 11/15/2013, “Former ag director outlines opportunities, challenges,” <http://www.capitalpress.com/article/20131115/ARTICLE/131119920>))

**\*\*\*Note --- He is Dan Newhouse is the former Department of Agriculture director for Washington state**

He is similarly disappointed by the Congress not passing a farm bill, but hopes that one will pass this year.

“The stars are lining up,” he said of the prospects for passage.

#### Chance of passage better than 50/50 --- there is a way to resolve food stamp disagreement

Stebbins, 11/12 (Christine, 11/12/2013, “Food Stamp Gridlock Hurting Chance of Congress Passing Farm, Crop Insurance Bill,” <http://www.insurancejournal.com/news/national/2013/11/12/310867.htm>))

The chances of the U.S. Congress passing a five-year farm bill by year’s end are a little better than 50/50 given the gridlock over food stamps for the poor, a top farm policy expert said on Monday.

“There is a slightly better chance than 50/50 that we will get a bill rolled into a budget at the end of the year. But it’s no better than that,” Barry Flinchbaugh, a Kansas State University agricultural economist who advises legislators shaping the U.S. farm bill, told Reuters on the sidelines of a farm bankers meeting in Minneapolis.

The farm bill, already a year behind schedule, is the master legislation that directs government supports for farmers and food aid programs.

The bill is now with a conference committee of 41 members of Congress who are hammering out the difference between the House and Senate bills. The biggest difference: the Senate wants $4 billion cut from food stamps while the House wants to reduce the program by $40 billion.

“Food is the only division. The other issues can be settled,” said Flinchbaugh, citing variations in how they address crop insurance for farmers along with other subsidies.

Historically, the conference committee reconciles differences and brings a compromise to a final vote. That process has been hampered by the deep divisions between the Republican-controlled House and the Senate, where Democrats are in the majority.

“There is a way perhaps we can get past this food stamp gridlock. We cut food stamps $6-$8 billion and then we put in all these caveats the far right wants to put in the food stamp program, like work requirements and drug tests,” said Flinchbaugh, who has advised on farm policy for over 40 years.

### 2NC AT Extension

#### Persistent leadership by Obama key to secure a fair and just farm bill --- just extending the 2008 farm bill again fails farmers

Clayton, 11/5 --- Former Congresswoman and former Assistant Director General of the UN Food and Agriculture Organization (11/5/2013, Eva M., “Congressional and Presidential Leadership Needed for a Fair and Equitable Farm Bill,” <http://www.huffingtonpost.com/eva-m-clayton/congressional-and-presidential_b_4221884.html>))

The leadership in the U.S. House of Representatives and the Senate must instruct the Conferees to negotiate in the best interest of the American people. President Obama must be persistent in his leadership by calling on Congress to treat our most vulnerable citizens fairly, protect small and large farmers, and give rural communities an opportunity to grow economically. Another extension of the Farm Bill once again is unacceptable. Farmers and businesses, which have been devastated by the legislative uncertainty, are unable to plan for the next planting season, and cannot do so until Congress acts and the president signs a bill. This delay has hampered assistance for early generation farmers, minority farmers, and the rural small business sector who all suffer disproportionately without a signed bill. The Fair World Project reports that the majority of farm subsidies are paid to the most profitable companies in the U.S. and "ten percent of farms receive roughly 70 percent of all subsidies." This oversized government benefit reaped by large farms is a major factor in their ability to further expand, leading to increased concentration in the agriculture sector. These subsidies often drive land costs up and small farmers out. Yet, the conversation continues to be focused on cutting the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program (SNAP). This political gamesmanship puts us again at the crossroads of the "haves and have not's," while too many Americans depend on SNAP for it to be cut in the final bill. The House-passed Farm Bill cut $40 Billion over a ten-year period, mainly by cutting SNAP. The Tea Party and the extreme right wing of the Republican Party might see this as important part of its agenda to "cut spending," but such actions by the House have only resulted in ending 34 years of bipartisan cooperation on food and farm legislation. While Republicans in Congress continue to attack the Food Stamps program as an "easy place" to cut, they fail to recognize the needs of their own constituents and the contribution it provides our economy. Some fail to acknowledge, understand, or care that we had a recession and that Food Stamps were a part of the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act of 2009. This bill, known as the 'Stimulus Package,' was scheduled to end November 1, 2013 and resulted in millions of people being dropped from the program. According to the Center on Budget and Policy Priorities (CBPP), ending the Recovery Act will reduce benefits to approximately $1.40 per person per meal in 2014. Just think $1.40 per meal! Further, the vast majority of the 47 million SNAP recipients are children, seniors, and adults with disabilities. SNAP can be the bridge between living and survival, dignity and embarrassment. In fact over 900,000 veterans and 5,000 active duty service personnel currently receive food stamps. An example of this hardship was chronicled by the Food and Environment Reporting Network. Steven Johnson, a veteran of the war in Afghanistan, was medically discharged from the military and was unable to find work as a result of his disability. To further complicate matters, there was significant lag time between the end of his military pay and the beginning of his disability benefits. The typical wait time for this benefit is 394 days for active duty veterans, and longer for non-active duty personnel. That is 394 days without a pay check. 394 days without the capacity to feed yourself or your family. To bridge this gap, Johnson relied on food stamps to help feed his family. As veteran Johnson said, "Food Stamps were the last resort we had." This is what is at stake for the Confrees and this President. Unfortunately, there have been anecdotal comments of fraud where "people are trading food stamps for cash." While these instances must be addressed, but it is simply unfair to use these anecdotes to characterize how the law functions. The Department of Agriculture has reported that as few as 1.3 percent of all benefits, were traded at a discount for cash. I agree that fraud is unacceptable concerning all government programs and laws. However, it is amazing how offensive it is for Republicans to use assistance for the poor as a political piñata when fraud persists on Wall Street or among big businesses. The Fair World Project rightly notes that the "Farm Bill is the single most important piece of legislation affecting the food we eat, the kinds of crops American farmers grow, and the environment in which they are grown. The Farm Bill is at the very essence of our nation's food security." This could not be more accurate. The Conferees must put our country first to find success in their negotiations. A strong and fair Farm Bill will require Congressional and presidential leadership. The fate of our nation's food security depends on it.

### 2nc Political Capital Key

#### Obama’s involvement key to broker a deal on SNAP --- it will be the last crucial item in negotiations. That’s Hagstrom.

#### Obama’s capital key to resolve SNAP disagreement

Hopkinson, 11/14 (Jenny, 11/14/2013, “ Tom Vilsack: More than agriculture at stake in farm bill,” <http://www.politico.com/story/2013/11/pro-agriculture-launch-99874.html>))

The administration’s silence on SNAP is not sitting well with some lawmakers, however.

Speaking on a panel during the Pro launch event, Rep. Jim McGovern (D-Mass) said the nutrition program is key to passing the farm bill.

“The White house ought to take some leadership on this issue,” said McGovern, a strong proponent of the program.

#### Obama using political capital to complete farm bill negotiations

Reuters, 10/18 (“Obama says Americans 'completely fed up' with Washington,” 10/18/2013, <http://tvnz.co.nz/world-news/obama-says-americans-completely-fed-up-washington-5652654?ref=rss)>

President Barack Obama has scolded congressional Republicans, hours after a fiscal crisis was narrowly averted and called on his opponents to help repair the economic damage caused by a 16-day US government shutdown and a close brush with a debt default.

Obama stressed that he is willing to work with lawmakers wherever they can agree, but the tone he struck amounted to a rebuke of Republicans, whom Americans largely blame for pushing the United States to the brink of an economic calamity.

"The American people are completely fed up with Washington," said Obama in a White House speech attended by many of the aides who worked day and night through the various stages of the latest fiscal stalemate.

Hours after he signed into law a bill hastily cobbled together to end the crisis, Obama said events over the past two weeks had inflicted "completely unnecessary" damage on the US economy.

An increase in borrowing costs caused by the near-debt default was harmful and consumers cut back on spending with hundreds of thousands of government workers suddenly idled, he said.

"There was no economic rationale for all of this," he said.

Though bruised by the battle, Obama emerged as the clear winner. He immediately sought to use the political capital gained to advance a domestic policy agenda centered around a fresh round of budget talks and an effort to win approval of two stalled items, immigration reform and a farm bill.

### 2NC Link Wall

#### Perception of losing decks the president

Ornstein, 1 (Norman, American Enterprise Institute, September 10, Lexis)

The compromise accomplished two ends. First, it changed the agenda base of the issue. Patients' rights went from an issue where the only viable proposal was from Democrats (with GOP co-sponsors), which the President vowed to veto - to one where both Democrats and Bush are for patients' rights and merely differ on the details. Two, it gave the President a victory on the House floor when all the pundits predicted defeat - a major momentum builder. In a system where a President has limited formal power, perception matters. The reputation for success - the belief by other political actors that even when he looks down, a president will find a way to pull out a victory - is the most valuable resource a chief executive can have. Conversely, the widespread belief that the Oval Office occupant is on the defensive, on the wane or without the ability to win under adversity can lead to disaster, as individual lawmakers calculate who will be on the winning side and negotiate accordingly. In simple terms, winners win and losers lose more often than not.

**Fighting to defend his war power will sap Obama’s capital, trading off with rest of agenda**

**Kriner, 10** --- assistant professor of political science at Boston University

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

**While congressional support leaves the president’s reserve of political capital intact, congressional criticism saps energy from other initiatives on the home front by forcing the president to expend energy and effort defending his international agenda. Political capital spent shoring up support for a president’s foreign policies is capital that is unavailable for his future policy initiatives**. Moreover, any weakening in the president’s political clout may have immediate ramifications for his reelection prospects, as well as indirect consequences for congressional races.59 Indeed, Democratic efforts to tie congressional Republican incumbents to President George W. Bush and his war policies paid immediate political dividends in the 2006 midterms, particularly in states, districts, and counties that had suffered the highest casualty rates in the Iraq War. 60

**In addition to boding ill for the president’s perceived political capital and reputation, such partisan losses in Congress only further imperil his programmatic agenda, both international and domestic.** Scholars have long noted that President Lyndon **Johnson’s dream of a Great Society also perished in the rice paddies of Vietnam. Lacking** the requisite funds in a war-depleted treasury and **the political capital needed to sustain his legislative vision, Johnson gradually let his domestic goals slip away** as he hunkered down in an effort first to win and then to end the Vietnam War. In the same way, **many of** President **Bush’s highest second-term domestic proprieties, such as Social Security and immigration reform, failed perhaps in large part because the administration had to expend so much energy and effort waging a rear-guard action against congressional critics of the war in Iraq.**61

**When making their cost-benefit calculations, presidents surely consider these wider political costs of congressional opposition to their military policies.** If congressional opposition in the military arena stands to derail other elements of his agenda, all else being equal, the president will be more likely to judge the benefits of military action insufficient to its costs than if Congress stood behind him in the international arena.