## 2AC AT: T

#### It’s a check on presidential power

**Gaul 8**, Matthew J. Gaul is a partner in Steptoe’s New York office.  A former insurance regulator and securities enforcement attorney for the state of New York, Mr. Gaul represents insurance companies and other financial institutions in government investigations and complex regulatory matters, <http://faculty.lls.edu/manheim/ns/gaul2.htm>

The president may circumvent the specified waiting period by stating in his certification that a state of emergency exists which requires immediate approval of the exports.87 The emergency certification must also set forth "a detailed justification for his determination, including a description of the emergency circumstances which necessitate the immediate issuance of the export license and a discussion of the national security interests involved."88
The final **check on presidential regulatory power** in this area was added in 1996. The new provision requires the president to publish the above certifications in the federal register upon transmittal to the Speaker of the House and Chair of the Foreign Relations Committee.89 This public notification requirement only applies to major arms licenses for export deals totaling $50 million or more.

#### Restrict is to check free activity — they confuse it with restraint

**Oklahoma Attorney General**Opinions - 3/19/200**4**, Question Submitted by: The Honorable Mark Campbell, District Attorney, 19th District; The Honorable Jay Paul Gumm, State Senator, District 6, 2004 OK AG 7, [http://www.oscn.net/applications/oscn/DeliverDocument.asp?CiteID=43849](http://www.oscn.net/applications/oscn/DeliverDocument.asp?CiteID=438494)

Accordingly, we must look to the plain and ordinary meaning of the term.*Webster's New International Dictionary*defines restrictions as follows: "something that restricts" and "a regulation that restricts or restrains." *Id.* at 1937 (3d ed. 1993). Restrict is defined as follows: "to set bounds or limits to: hold within bounds: as a : to check free activity, motion, progress, or departure." Id. Restrain is defined as to "prevent from doing something." *Id.* at 1936. Therefore, as used in Section 1125, "restrictions" is meant to describe those conditions of parole or probation which are intended to restrain or prevent certain conduct of the person subject thereto.

#### In the area of refers to a certain scope

Elizabeth Miura 12, China Presentation, prezi.com/tccgenlw25so/chin165a-final-presentation/

"in the area of" refers to a certain scope

## 2AC AT: Authority

**We meet — the president asserts the right to use OCOs under the AUMF**

**Mills 12**, Elinor Mills is a CNET Author, Wording in Cyberwar Bill Begs Question Who’s In Charge, <http://news.cnet.com/8301-1009_3-57432259-83/wording-in-cyberwar-bill-begs-question-whos-in-charge/>

The House Armed Services Committee yesterday approved an amended version of the **N**ational **D**efense **A**uthorization **A**ct that removes language requiring presidential authorization for military offensive operations in cyberspace to defend the country.

Congressional sources working with House Armed Services Committee Chairman Howard "Buck" McKeon said the move did not grant the secretary of defense any additional powers and dismissed fears as unwarranted.

"We don't interpret this to mean that Congress is giving the Department of Defense new authorities," said a committee source. "It would all be within the context of the **A**uthorization to **U**se **M**ilitary **F**orce (50 U.S.C. 1541) which typically requires the request of the President."

**War powers authority is preparation or execution of war**

Fred F. **Manget** – **1987**, J.D., Vanderbilt University Law School / CIA – “Presidential War Powers,” Extracts from Studies in Intelligence: A Commemoration of the Bicentennial of the U.S. Constitution, CIA, <http://media.nara.gov/dc-metro/rg-263/6922330/Box-10-114-7/263-a1-27-box-10-114-7.pdf>

B. judicial Interpretation of War Powers Authority **There are a limited number of cases dealing with the** specific **war powers authority of the Executive Branch.** Nevertheless, **several clear principles have emerged from them. 1. Conduct of War The President has very wide discretion in conducting wars**. The strategy, objectives, and methods of waging war are squarely within his constitutional authority. The Supreme Court has stated that: As Commander in Chief, (the President) is authorized to direct the movements of the naval and military forces placed by law at his command, and to employ them in the manner he may deem most effectual to harass and conquer and subdue the enemy.24 Other federal courts have been in accord.25 The President has wide latitude in action because the nature of modern warfare requires centralized command and control for the successful prosecution of a war. 26 The total war power shared by the President and Congress grants them authority to use all means necessary to weaken the enemy and to bring the struggle to a successful conclusion, and has very few limits:27 "While the Constitution protects against invasiom. of individual rights, it is not a suicide pact. " 28 Thus, how a war is to be waged is a matter of presidential. authority subject only to regular constitutional restrictions. **2.** Self-Defense **The President has constitutional authority to order defensive military action in response to aggression without congressional approval**. This theory of self-defense has justified many military actions, from the Barbary Coast to the Mexican-American War to the Tonkin Gul£. 29 The Supreme Court has agreed. In The Prize Cases, it found that President Lincoln had the right to blockade southern states without a congressional declaration of war: "If a war be made by invasion of a foreign nation, the President is not only authorized but bound to resist force by force. He does not initiate the war, but is bound to accept the challenge without waiting for any special legislative authority. " 30 In a case arising out of the Vietnam war, the defendant claimed that draft law was unconstitutionally applied to him because Congress had not declared war. The court rejected that claim, stating that on the basis of the Commander in Chief power, "Unquestionably the President can start the gun at home or abroad to meet force with force. " 3 1 When the President acts in defense of the nation, he acts under war powers authority. **3.** Protection of Life and Property **The President also has the power to order military intervention in foreign countries to protect American citizens and property** without prior congressional approval.32 This theory has been cited to justify about 200 instances of use of force abroad in the last 200 years. 33 The theory was given legal sanction in a case arising from the bombardr:nent of a Nicaraguan oort by order of the President in 1854, in retaliation for an attack on an American consul. The court stated that it is the President to whom " .. . citizens abroad must look for protection of person and property .... The great object and duty of Government is the protection of the lives, liberty, and property of the people composing it, whether abroad or at home. Other cases have been in accord. 35 The President may use force or any other means to protect American citizens in foreign countries under his war powers authority.· This extends even to a retaliatory military strike against a country supporting terrorist acts against Americans, which occurred in :\pril1986 when US Navy and Air Force aircraft bombed the modern Barbary Coast nation of Libya. 4. Collective Security The President may also authorize military operations without prior congressional approval pursuant to collective security agreements such as NATO or OAS treaties. Unilaterial presidential action under these agreements may be justified as necessary for the protection of national security even though hostilities occur overseas and involve allies. 36 5. National Defense Power **The President's war powers authority is actually a national defense power that exists at all times, whether or not there is a war declared by Congress, an armed conflict, or any other hostilities or fighting**. In a recent case the Supreme Court upheld the revocation of the passport of a former CIA employee (Agee) and rejected his contention that certain statements of Executive Branch policy were entitled to diminished weight because they concerned the powers of the Executive in wartime. **The Court stated: "History eloquently attests that grave problems of national security and foreign policy are by no means limited to times of formally declared war. "** 3; **Another court has said that** **the war power is not confined to actual engagements on fields of battle only but embraces every aspect of national defense and comprehends everything required to wage war successfully**.3 H **A third court stated**: "It is-and must be-true that **the Executive should be accorded wide** and normally unassailable **discretion with respect to the conduct of the national defense and the prosecution of national objectives through military means. "** 39 **Thus, the Executive Branch's constitutional war powers authority does not spring into existence when Congress declares war, nor is it dependent on there being hostilities. It empowers the President to prepare for war as well as wage it,** in the broadest sense. It operates at all times. 6. Role of Military The fundamental function of the armed forces is to fight or to be ready to fight wars. 40 The Supreme Court has recognized the existence of limited, partial, and undeclared wars:41 Thus, there is a judicially recognized and legitimate activity of the armed services in times of no armed conflict that stems directly from the war powers authority of the President. That activity is the preparation for the successful waging of war, which may come in any form or level of conflict. Any actions of the Executive Branch that are part of the fundamental functions of the armed services in readying for any type of hostility are based on constitutional war powers authority of the President. 7. Foreign Intelligence Operations The President is authorized to conduct foreign intelligence operations by his constitutional war powers. This authority is derived from the Constitution itself and does not depend on any grant of legislative authority conferred on the President by Congress.42 In a case where CIA sued a former employee (Marchetti) to enjoin him from publishing a book in violation of his secrecy oath and agreement, the court stated: "Gathering intelligence information and the other activities of the Agency, including clandestine affairs against other nations, are all within the President's constitutional responsibility for the security of the nation as the Chief Executive and as Commander in Chief of our armed forces. Canst., art. II, 2. " 43 In another case, the court said: Congress and the court recognize that in this time of global tension and distrust, the United States must have an efficient means of acquiring information about other countries, information not obtain· able except by covert means. It is a legitimate function of the Executive to provide for such intelligence operations and to maintain their secrecy. 44 The conclusion to be drawn from the principles outlined above is that to the extent foreign intelligence operations are directed toward preparation for any armed conflict or the conduct of any military or paramilitary activities, they spring directh• from the pawers granted to the Executive by the war · pawers clause of the Constitution. This chain of authority exists and operates in the absence of congressional action and even despite congressional oppasition to particular foreign intelligence operations. And, in fact, almost all foreign intelligence operations are directed toward war or the potential for war because of the nature of modern armed conflict and the current state of relations between nations.
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#### **It gets rolled back — also can’t solve legal norms**

Swanson 9, Chair of accountability and prosecution working group of United for Peace and Justice

(David, 1/25, Dangerous Executive Orders, www.opednews.com/articles/Dangerous-Executive-Orders-by-David-Swanson-090125-670.html)

The Center for Constitutional Rights has expressed concern that President Obama's executive order banning torture may contain a loophole. But no president has any right to declare torture legal or illegal, with or without loopholes. And if we accept that presidents have such powers, even if our new president does good with them, then loopholes will be the least of our worries. Torture is, and has long been, illegal in every case, without exception. It is banned by our Bill of Rights, the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, the Geneva Convention relative to the Treatment of Prisoners of War, the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, the Convention Against Torture and Other Cruel Inhuman or Degrading Treatment or Punishment, and Title 18, U.S. Code, Section 2340A. Nothing any president can do can change this or unchange it, weaken it or strengthen it in any way. Preventing torture does not require new legislation from Congress or new orders from a new president. It requires enforcing existing laws. In fact, adherence to the Convention Against Torture, which under Article VI of our Constitution is the supreme law of the land, requires the criminal prosecution of torturers and anyone complicit in torture. Most of the seemingly noble steps taken by Congress in recent years and by President Obama in his first week have served to disguise the fact that torture always was, still is, and shall continue to be illegal. In 2005, John McCain championed the McCain Detainee Amendment to the Defense Appropriations bill for 2005, which passed the Congress and was signed into law by President Bush. This was yet another law banning torture. It was not needed, but no harm done, right? Wrong. Passing laws like this serves to create the illusion that torture was previously legal. And that allows the new laws to create exceptions. In fact, McCain allowed a major loophole for the CIA. And that would have been bad enough. But President Bush tacked on a "signing statement" throwing out the entire ban on torture. So, with Congress trying to ban torture, and the president eliminating the ban, people could hardly be blamed for believing torture was legal. President Bush also signed executive orders and ordered the creation of legal opinions claiming that torture was legal. President Obama's new order revokes one of Bush's. But Obama has no more right to undo the legalization of torture than Bush had to legalize it in the first place. Only Congress has or should have the power to legislate. Obama's new order requires adherence to laws, rather than claiming the right to violate them, and yet there is a wide gap between publishing an order requiring adherence to the laws and actually enforcing the laws by indicting violators. The same order that President Obama uses to ban torture also orders the closure of all CIA detention facilities. Congress never authorized the creation of such things in the first place. Ordering their closure is the right thing to do. But if a president can give the order to close them, what is to prevent another president giving the order to reopen them? The answer should be all of the laws and treaties violated. Obama's executive order largely orders the government to cease violating various laws. But in so doing, rather than strengthening the laws, the new president weakens them almost to the point of nonexistence. For, what power does a law have to control behavior if it is never enforced? What deterrent value can be found in a law the violation of which results merely in a formal order to begin obeying it? And what status are we supposed to give all the other violated laws for which no such formal orders have been given?

#### Perm — do both — Congressional involvement makes the plan popular — the CP links to politics

Corcoran 11 --- Professor of Law and Director at University of New Hampshire School of Law (March 2011, Erin M., University of New Hampshire Law Review, “Obama's Failed Attempt to Close Gitmo: Why Executive Orders Can't Bring About Systemic Change,” 9 U.N.H. L. Rev. 207))

Finally, this example highlights that issuing unilateral executive orders, and then asking Congress to fund those decisions, is much less effective than having Congress help create the framework for significant policy changes. Congress is an independent branch of government regardless of whether the members' party affiliation is the same as the President's. Since members of the House are elected every two years, they are particularly sensitive to the idiosyncratic whims of the constituents in their district. For the President, it is often easier to support sweeping change on a policy level. Although Senators are elected every six years, they are still bound to protect parochial concerns of their constituents. Congress members go home every weekend to their respective districts and must explain their votes, decisions, and legislative priorities to the voters often at supermarkets, churches, and bingo halls.

Often times, when members of Congress can control the message or create the narrative addressing the problem, they can show their [\*235] constituents how their votes are in line with constituent priorities and concerns. In contrast, when Congress is told to do what the President wants and fund a controversial proposal, the members are in less control of the message and less invested in the outcome.

Furthermore, in the Senate, particularly in the Appropriations Committee, members work across the aisle. Until recently, appropriators tended to vote as a block regardless of party affiliation, protecting their funding prerogatives and funding for their home districts. For example, the Senate Supplemental Appropriations mark included funding to close Guantanamo Bay. Yet, during the Senate floor debate about closing Guantanamo Bay, ultimately it was the Chair of the Appropriations Committee who filed the amendment on the floor to strip funding out of the supplemental bill. n150 The Chair's action provided cover to other appropriators to vote in support of stripping the funding. Since the Chair authored the amendment, there was no longer any obligation to support the appropriations bill as it was marked up out of committee. Generally, appropriators vote together to protect funding when other senators attempt to strip funding out of appropriations bills or move funds from one account to fund a priority not accommodated by the appropriators. Since these members value collegiality, compromise, and consultation, it is no surprise that Obama's efforts to fund Guantanamo Bay closure was thwarted. If the Senate had been charged with crafting legislation, the members would have been committed to making sure they had the votes to pass it.

Overall, if the Obama Administration wants to close Guantanamo Bay, it must get Congress to lead the charge. This is going to be extremely difficult now with a Republican House of Representatives and Democrat Senate that holds the majority by the narrowest of margins. At this point, it seems as if the Administration has abandoned its campaign to close Guantanamo Bay. The only silver lining is that the Administration hopefully has learned important lessons on what works and what is a non-starter and can use this knowledge when advancing the President's future controversial policy changes.

####  ( ) This solves every warrant in their link ev

Corcoran 11 --- Professor of Law and Director at University of New Hampshire School of Law (March 2011, Erin M., University of New Hampshire Law Review, “Obama's Failed Attempt to Close Gitmo: Why Executive Orders Can't Bring About Systemic Change,” 9 U.N.H. L. Rev. 207))

Overall, there are several advantages of using legislation to mobilize systemic change. First, by having Congress draft legislation, the members are invested in its outcome. Second, by allowing Congress to author the details, often times the parochial concerns of members can be accommodated with little contention. Finally, if Congress debates the merits of a plan and votes to support it, the members are more likely to fund its implementation. [\*231]

**Links to politics**

**Hallowell 13** writer for The Blaze, Here’s How Obama is Using Executive Power to Bypass Legislative Process, <http://www.theblaze.com/stories/2013/02/11/heres-how-obamas-using-executive-power-to-bylass-legislative-process-plus-a-brief-history-of-executive-orders/>

“In an era of polarized parties and a fragmented Congress, the opportunities to legislate are few and far between,” Howell said. “So presidents have powerful incentive to go it alone. And they do.”¶ **And the political opposition howls.**¶ Sen. Marco Rubio, R-Fla., a possible contender for the Republican presidential nomination in 2016, said that on the gun-control front in particular, Obama is “abusing his power by imposing his policies via executive fiat instead of allowing them to be debated in Congress.”¶ The Republican reaction is to be expected, said John Woolley, co-director of the American Presidency Project at the University of California in Santa Barbara.¶ “For years there has been a growing concern about unchecked executive power,” Woolley said. “It tends to have a partisan content, with contemporary complaints coming from the incumbent president’s opponents.”

#### The defensive cyber plank links to politics

Sasso 12 (Brandon Sasso, December 21, 2012, “House Republicans urge Obama not to issue cybersecurity order,” The Hill, http://thehill.com/blogs/hillicon-valley/technology/274391-house-republicans-urge-obama-not-to-issue-cybersecurity-order)

A group of 46 House Republicans, led by Reps. Marsha Blackburn (Tenn.) and Steve Scalise (La.), sent President Obama a letter on Friday urging him not to issue an executive order on cybersecurity.¶ "Instead of preempting Congress' will and pushing a top-down regulatory framework, your administration should engage Congress in an open and constructive manner to help address the serious cybersecurity challenges facing our country," the lawmakers wrote. ¶ The White House is currently drafting an executive order that would encourage operators of critical infrastructure, such as banks and electric grids, to meet cybersecurity standards. ¶ The administration says the order, which could come as early as January, is necessary to protect vital systems from hackers.¶ The White House began working on the order after Senate Republicans blocked the Democrats' preferred cybersecurity bill.¶ But in their letter, the House Republicans urged the administration to continue working with Congress.

#### The counterplans covert action ensures unilateralism – prevents coalitions and fuels suspicion and cyberwar

**Rishikof 11**, Chair of the ABA Standing Committee on Law and National Security. Former professor of law and chair

(PROJECTING FORCE IN THE 21ST CENTURY - LEGITIMACY AND THE RULE OF LAWDepartment of National Security Strategy, National War Collegwww.rutgerslawreview.com/wp-content/uploads/archive/vol63/Issue4/Mustin-Rishikof\_Article\_PDF.pdf)

**Covert action** also **enables unilateral action. The stealthy nature of covert action means that the Executive would be discouraged from seeking international cooperation**. Any international support would likely be limited to notifying host nations of the presence of troops, and those notifications, as a tactical matter, would likely be last minute and very directive in nature. **This type of unilateral action** contrasts the cooperative intent for international law, and, in the words of one legal scholar, ―[u]nilateral action- covert or overt - **generates particularly high emotions, because many view it as a litmus test for one‘s commitment to international law. Excessive use of covert action might be deemed** by some nations **as a rebuke of international law or evidence of a hubristic foreign policy**. **The** continued and constant **use of this instrument** when lethality is the goal **raises issues of international legitimacy.**

**Covert designation fuels suspicion and can’t solve cyber war — also removes international pressure from Chinese hacking**

**Wright 11**, Executive director of studies at The Chicago Council on Global Affairs

(Thomas, 6/26, America has double standards in fighting cyberwar, [www.ft.com/cms/s/0/c8002f6a-a01b-11e0-a115-00144feabdc0.html#axzz1QYnW3i1w](http://www.ft.com/cms/s/0/c8002f6a-a01b-11e0-a115-00144feabdc0.html#axzz1QYnW3i1w))

While it has several advantages, **treating American cyber-destruction as a covert operation will severely undermine the new cyber-strategy. Suspicion that the US uses cyber­weapons whenever convenient will hamper its attempts to press other states to be transparent about their intentions**. **In particular, it takes the pressure off China, widely believed to be the leading state source of cyberattacks. It may also dissuade the US from developing the technology to trace the source of an attack.**

#### Nuclear war

**Sirota, Best-Selling Author, 11**, David Sirota is a best-selling author of the new book "Back to Our Future: How the 1980s Explain the World We Live In Now.", The Terrorist Threat We’re Ignoring, http://www.salon.com/news/david\_sirota/2011/07/11/trade\_terrorism

All of these threats are, indeed, scary -- and the last one, which sounds like something out of "Saw" movie, is especially creepy. But the fear of individual terrorist acts has diverted attention from a more systemic threat that is taking the implant idea to a much bigger platform. I'm talking about the threat of terrorists or foreign governments exploiting our economy's penchant for job outsourcing/offshoring. How? By using our corresponding reliance on imports to secretly stitch security-compromising technology into our society's central IT nervous system. Sounds far-fetched, right? Sounds like some fringe theory bizarrely melding liberal political complaints about bad trade policies with tinfoil-hat paranoia, right? Yeah, that's what I thought, until last week when -- in an announcement largely ignored by the Washington press corps -- the Department of Homeland Security made a stunning disclosure at a congressional hearing. As the business trade publication Fast Company [reports](http://www.fastcompany.com/1765855/dhs-someones-spiking-our-imported-tech-with-attack-tools) (emphasis added): A top Department of Homeland Security (DHS) official has admitted on the record that electronics sold in the U.S. are being preloaded with spyware, malware, and security-compromising components by unknown foreign parties. In testimony before the House Oversight and Government Reform Committee, acting deputy undersecretary of the DHS National Protection and Programs Directorate Greg Schaffer told Rep. Jason Chaffetz (R-UT) that both Homeland Security and the White House have been aware of the threat for quite some time. When asked by Rep. Chaffetz whether Schaffer was aware of any foreign-manufactured software or hardware components that had been purposely embedded with security risks, the DHS representative stated that "I am aware of instances where that has happened," after some hesitation. This supply chain security issue essentially means that, somewhere along the line, technology being marketed in the United States was either compromised or purposely designed to enable cyberattacks. The process by which this happens is fairly straightforward -- and its connection to our tariff-free trade policies that encourage outsourcing is obvious. First, an American company or governmental agency orders a piece of computer hardware or software from a tech company. Then, because the "free" trade era has economically incentivized those companies to move their production to low-wage countries, much of that order is actually fulfilled at foreign facilities where security and quality standards may be, ahem, lacking. If this still sounds far-fetched, remember that in the offshoring/outsourcing epoch, one of the major exporters of computer hardware -- and increasingly, software -- is China. That is, the country whose government has been at the forefront of aggressively researching, developing and implementing covert technologies that turn computers into stealth weapons of the police state. There is, for example, China's Great Firewall, which prevents computers from accessing content the government deems unacceptable. There's also the [Green Dam initiative](http://online.wsj.com/article/SB124638689078074805.html), which aimed to preload spying and censorship software on PCs. These, of course, are just the cyber-sabotage projects we know about, suggesting that there are far more being engineered by the Chinese regime. And this says nothing of the additional possibility of stateless terrorist groups infiltrating the high-tech supply chain to invisibly weave vulnerabilities into our IT infrastructure. If you think the biggest ramifications of this threat are merely Angry Birds malfunctions, suddenly shitty pictures from Hipstamatic and yet longer wait times when you fire up Microsoft Word -- think again. In an information age that sees [missiles remotely fired via keystrokes](http://news.cnet.com/8301-11386_3-10064231-76.html) and data mined for intelligence gathering, supply chain vulnerabilities in high-tech products are a genuine national security problem. Indeed, they are at least as big a threat to national security as the old concerns about how, say, offshoring steel production could compromises our strength by limiting our ability to unilaterally build tanks and warships. By creating a trade policy that helps offshore high-tech production, we may be inadvertently importing spying or terrorist instruments and then embedding those instruments into our computer-dependent society at large. What might this mean in practice? As the U.S.-China Economic and Security Review Commission [reported](http://www.nextgov.com/nextgov/ng_20110707_5612.php?oref=topstory) a few months ago, it could be "kill switches" implanted in Pentagon systems that **control our arsenal**. It could be new "War Games"-esque back doors that allow Chinese military hackers to punch in their own preprogrammed "Joshua" password and [again](http://www.ft.com/cms/s/0/9dba9ba2-5a3b-11dc-9bcd-0000779fd2ac.html) breach computer networks deep within our national security apparatus.

## 2AC AT: Politics (DC) --- UMKC

#### A deal is inevitable

Sahadi, 9/12 (Jeanne, “The never-ending charade of debt ceiling fights,” <http://money.cnn.com/2013/09/12/news/economy/debt-ceiling/?source=cnn_bin)>)

Lawmakers are tied up in knots over increasing the debt ceiling this fall. But they eventually will. The only question is how messy the process will be.

Why assume they'll raise it? Because they have no real choice if they want to avoid a U.S. default. A default would hurt the economy and markets, and most lawmakers know this. That's why they regularly raise the debt ceiling before it comes to that.

In fact, since 1940, Congress has effectively approved 79 increases to the debt ceiling. That's an average of more than one a year.

How do they raise it? Sometimes lawmakers have raised it by small amounts, other times by large amounts. And sometimes they've raised it "temporarily" with provisions for a "snap-back" to a lower level.

Since it's a politically tough vote, they occasionally devise clever ways to tacitly approve increases without ever having to publicly record a "yes" vote.

For example, as part of the deal to resolve the 2011 debt ceiling war, Congress approved a plan that let President Obama raise the debt limit three times unless both the House and Senate passed a "joint resolution of disapproval." Such a measure never materialized. And even if it had, the president could have vetoed it.

Then this past February, lawmakers decided to temporarily "suspend" the debt ceiling.

Under this scheme, Treasury was able to continue borrowing to pay the country's bills until May 19. At that point, the debt limit automatically reset to the old cap plus whatever Treasury borrowed during the suspension period.

Related: Debt ceiling 'X' date could hit Oct. 18

What does raising the debt ceiling accomplish? Despite some politicians' incorrect assertions, raising the debt ceiling does not give the government a "license to spend more."

It simply lets Treasury borrow the money it needs to pay all U.S. bills in full and on time. Those bills are for services already performed and entitlement benefits already approved by Congress. In other words, it's a license to pay the bills the country incurs as a result of past decisions made by lawmakers from both parties over the years.

Refusing to raise the debt ceiling is "not like cutting up your credit cards. It's like cutting up your credit card bills," said historian Joseph Thorndike, who has written about past debt crises.

How high is it today? The debt ceiling was reset at $16.699 trillion on May 19, up from the $16.394 trillion where it was before the suspension.

Since then, Treasury has been forced to use "extraordinary measures" to keep the country from breaching the limit.

Treasury Secretary Jack Lew said those measures will be exhausted by mid-October, after which he will only have $50 billion on hand, plus incoming revenue to pay what's owed. Sounds like a lot, but it won't last long.

How long will it last? An analysis by the Bipartisan Policy Center estimates that the Treasury will no longer be able to pay all bills in full and on time at some point between Oct. 18 and Nov. 5.

So, you're saying they only have a few weeks to work this out? Yup.

House Republicans say they will demand spending cuts and fiscal reforms in exchange for their support of a debt ceiling increase. The White House, meanwhile, has said it won't negotiate quid pro quos.

The question is when will Republicans or the White House -- or both - bend in the standoff? If recent history is any guide it likely will be just in the nick of time.

And there's no telling how creative the deal they cut will be.

But any bad blood created along the way almost certainly would poison other budget negotiations. To top of page

#### No link — we’re bipart

**Perera 6/26**, SACS calls for new oversight of Cyber Command, David Perera is executive editor of the FierceMarkets Government Group, which includes FierceGovernment, FierceGovernmentIT, FierceHomelandSecurity, and FierceMobileGovernment. He has reported on all things federal since January 2004 and is co-author of [Inside Guide to the Federal IT Market](http://store.brightkey.net/mconcepts_ebiz/OnlineStore/ProductDetail.aspx?ProductId=201530), a book published in October 2012., <http://www.fiercegovernmentit.com/story/sasc-calls-new-oversight-cyber-command/2013-06-26>

The Senate Armed Services Committee says it has concerns that oversight of Cyber Command and the cyber mission within the Defense Departments "is fragmented and weak," calling for creation of a Senate-confirmed position within the undersecretary of defense for policy to supervise and manage the funds of offensive cyber forces.

**The Senate committee voted 23-3** on June 14 to report its version of the fiscal 2014 national defense authorization act ([S. 1197](http://hdl.loc.gov/loc.uscongress/legislation.113s1197)), detailing its intentions in a newly released legislative [report](http://www.gpo.gov/fdsys/pkg/CRPT-113srpt44/pdf/CRPT-113srpt44.pdf)(.pdf).

#### More ev

**Bradbury 11**, Steven G. Bradbury is an attorney at the Washington, D.C office of [Dechert LLP](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Dechert_LLP).

Bradbury was head of the [Office of Legal Counsel](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Office_of_Legal_Counsel) (OLC) in the [United States Department of Justice](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/United_States_Department_of_Justice) during the [George W. Bush administration](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/George_W._Bush_administration), 2005-January 2009. Appointed the Principal Deputy Assistant Attorney General for OLC in April 2004, he became the Acting Assistant Attorney General in 2005. He was nominated by President [George W. Bush](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/George_W._Bush) to be the Assistant Attorney General for OLC in June 2005. His nomination was approved by the [Senate Judiciary Committee](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Senate_Judiciary_Committee) in November 2005 but was never voted on by the full Senate, The Developing Legal Framework for Defensive and Offensive Cyber Operations, This speech was the Keynote address at the Harvard National Security Journal Symposium, <http://harvardnsj.org/wp-content/uploads/2011/02/Vol.-2_Bradbury_Final1.pdf>

Congressional reporting. The National Security Act also ¶ requires the President and DNI to ensure that the Intelligence Committees ¶ of the House and Senate are fully and currently informed of all intelligence ¶ and counterintelligence activities, to the extent consistent with the ¶ protection of sensitive sources and methods or other exceptionally sensitive ¶ matters.10¶ With respect to covert actions, the Act requires the President to ¶ report presidential findings supporting covert actions to the Intelligence ¶ Committees, but where the President determines that it’s essential because ¶ of “extraordinary circumstances affecting vital interests of the United ¶ States,” the President may limit access to the so-called “Gang of Eight” —¶ the chairs and ranking members of the two Intelligence Committees, the ¶ Speaker and minority leader of the House, and the majority and minority ¶ leaders of the Senate, along with whatever other congressional leaders the ¶ President chooses to include.11¶ The **committee chairs hate when briefings are limited to the Gang of Eight, because they catch hell from the members** of their committees who ¶ are outside the circle. So when former-Senator Obama first became President, there was hope among some in Congress that he would eliminate the Gang of Eight briefings. But when Congress proposed an Intelligence ¶ Authorization bill that would do just that, President **Obama threatened to veto** it. Once he became head of the Executive Branch, he clearly ¶ understood the importance of being able to limit the scope of briefings for ¶ the most sensitive matters. So the statute still allows for Gang of Eight ¶ briefings In contrast to these title 50 intelligence activities, military operations conducted under title 10 authorities are subject to oversight by the Armed Services Committees of Congress. (Title 10 of the U.S. Code governs DoD’s ¶ military authorities and the military command structure; title 50 governs the ¶ Intelligence Community and intelligence activities.)¶ And make no mistake, in the world of Washington, it really does ¶ matter whether an activity is characterized as covert action or a traditional ¶ military action because different Executive Branch departments or agencies ¶ will have ownership of the operation and different committees of Congress ¶ will have oversight jurisdiction, and they all jealously guard their respective ¶ domains.

#### Syria thumps

Hughes 9/11 --- White House Correspondent at Washington Examiner (Brian, 9/11/2013, “Syria push imperils Obama's fall agenda,” [http://washingtonexaminer.com/syria-push-imperils-obamas-fall-agenda/article/2535611)](http://washingtonexaminer.com/syria-push-imperils-obamas-fall-agenda/article/2535611%29))

President Obama may have avoided an embarrassing legislative defeat over Syria, but the debate left him weakened at a critical point in his second term, according to GOP and Democratic insiders on Capitol Hill.

In a whirlwind period for both the White House and Congress, Obama pressed for an immediate military attack against Syria before eventually asking lawmakers to delay a vote authorizing the use of force to pursue a Russian-backed diplomatic solution.

Obama’s push to punish Syrian leader Bashar Assad for using chemical weapons faced stiff opposition from both lawmakers and the public and cost him in the polls.

Many on Capitol Hill say Obama squandered momentum that could have been better served on key challenges ahead.

Obama faces crucial fights over funding the federal government, raising the nation’s debt limit, turning off the next round of sequester cuts, rolling out his healthcare reforms and overhauling the nation’s immigration laws.

“It’s certainly true that [Obama] used up a lot of political capital, apparently for nothing, on the authorization push,” a senior House GOP leadership aide told the Washington Examiner.

The aide added that the Syrian standoff could still cost the president further leverage.

Secretary of State John Kerry is to begin talks with his Russian counterpart Wednesday on a plan to have Damascus turn over its chemical weapons to international inspectors, but the prospects for a deal are uncertain.

White House press secretary Jay Carney on Wednesday declined to lay out a timeline for talks, saying only that it would “take some time.”

"I think the bigger effect is still not known,” said the GOP aide. “If somehow the Russians do help get rid of the [Syrian] regime’s chemical weapons, the president will come out fine. But if Putin and Assad just toy with him for the next month, there’s no doubt he will have an exceedingly weakened presidency and ability to make demands of anyone.”

National security analysts say it would be virtually impossible to ensure Assad turns over his chemical weapons amid the country’s brutal civil war. And even some White House officials have privately questioned whether they are being played by Russian President Vladimir Putin’s offer to help facilitate the destruction of Syria’s chemical arsenal.

An adviser to a high-ranking Democratic senator with close ties to Obama conceded that Syria could remain a distraction as the president turns his attention to his domestic agenda.

“It doesn’t make the president’s job this fall any easier,” the aide said. “There’s not a whole lot for us to rally around at this point. Obviously, it’s not the boost the White House had hoped for.”

“Do I fear a carryover effect?” the source added. “I do.”

#### And Obama’s being blasted on war powers

Nelson, 9/5 (Colleen, 9/5/2013, “Obama's Curbs on Executive Power Draw Fire,” <http://online.wsj.com/article/SB10001424127887323893004579057463262293446.html>))

President Barack Obama, who pledged to push his second-term domestic agenda through executive actions when Congress wouldn't cooperate, has moved in the opposite direction on international affairs in recent months as he created new checks on executive authority.

By asking Congress to authorize military action against Syria, proposing some constraints on National Security Agency surveillance programs and placing limits on drone strikes, the president voluntarily has ceded some authority in foreign policy and national security, legal experts say.

The president's moves on national-security issues reflect a mix of political pragmatism as well as personal principles, and exactly how much power Mr. Obama actually has given up is the subject of debate. He has walked a fine line on Syria, for example, saying he wasn't required to seek sign-off from lawmakers for a military strike but asking for their approval anyway.

A senior administration official said that while the new drone-strike policy does rein in executive authority, the NSA and Syria proposals weren't a reduction of power but an effort to increase transparency and build public confidence.

Still, the president, who was criticized for seizing too much power through recess appointments and other steps that some said circumvented Congress, now is being criticized by veterans of past Republican administrations for weakening the presidency.

John Yoo, a Justice Department official in the George W. Bush administration, said Mr. Obama had unnecessarily limited his own authority. He noted that it is rare to see a president restrict his powers.

Mr. Obama "has been trying to reduce the discretion of the president when it comes to national security and foreign affairs," said Mr. Yoo, now a law professor at the University of California at Berkeley. "These proposals that President Obama is making really run counter to why we have a president and a constitution."

#### The plan’s not perceived

**Schmitt 13**, **co-director of the Marilyn Ware Center for Security Studies at AEI** and the director of AEI's Program on American Citizenship. Mr. Schmitt is a former staff director of the Senate Select Committee on Intelligence. He was executive director of the President's Foreign Intelligence Advisory Board during President Ronald Reagan's second term. Mr. Schmitt's security work focuses on longer-term strategic issues that will affect America's security at home and its ability to lead abroad, while his work in the area of citizenship focuses on challenges to maintaining and sustaining a strong civic culture. His books include Of Men and Materiel: The Crisis in Military Resources (AEI Press, 2007), to which he was a contributing author and editor with Tom Donnelly; Silent Warfare: Understanding the World of Intelligence (Brassey’s, 2002), coauthored with Abram Shulsky and now in its third edition; and U.S. Intelligence at the Crossroads: Agendas for Reform (Brassey’s, 1995), a coedited volume to which he is a contributing author. His two most recent books, to which he is also editor and contributing author, are The Rise of China: Essays on the Future Competition (Encounter Books, May 2009) and Safety, Liberty and Islamist Terrorism: American and European Approaches to Domestic Counterterrorism (AEI Press, 2010), <http://www.aei-ideas.org/2011/12/authorization-for-cyber-attacks/>

The press (and the White House) has been obsessed by the detention provision in the recently agreed upon FY2012 Defense Authorization bill, but one of the items that **slipped under the radar** is language authorizing the American military to engage in offensive operations in cyberspace. Under Sec. 954,

Congress affirms that the Department of Defense has the capability, and upon direction by the President may conduct offensive operations in cyberspace to defend our Nation, allies and interests.

#### Obama’s not involved on debt ceiling

**Pianin, 9/10** (Eric, 9/10/2013, “Debt-Ceiling Danger Zone Threatens U.S.,” <http://www.thefiscaltimes.com/Articles/2013/09/10/Debt-Ceiling-Danger-Zone-Threatens-US>))

Once that threshold is crossed, the government could default on payments to major creditors, begin shuttering federal agencies, furloughing workers or miss making Social Security payments to retirees. **Obama has repeatedly said there will be no political bargaining over the debt ceiling, as there was two years ago**. However, **the top four Democratic and Republican leaders will meet privately on Thursday to discuss the debt ceiling and how to avoid a government shutdown before Oct 1**, according to Politico.

The meeting, requested by Senate Majority Leader Harry Reid (D-NV), will be the first time the group has met since they departed Washington for the August recess. **It will include** House Speaker John **Boehner** (R-OH), House Minority Leader Nancy **Pelosi** (D-CA) **and** Senate Minority Leader Mitch **McConnell** (R-KY).

Boehner said recently he’s gearing up for “a whale of a fight” with Obama over raising the debt ceiling, and that he’ll demand major concessions in terms of spending cuts and entitlement reforms in return for increasing the government’s nearly $16.7 trillion of borrowing authority. It would take an additional $1.1 trillion of borrowing authority to get the government through 2014, according to BPC’s analysis.

#### Obama can’t effectively use capital

**Dowd 4/20**, **Pulitzer Prize Winner** No Bully in the Pulpit, Maureen Dowd, winner of the 1999 Pulitzer Prize for distinguished commentary, became a  New York Times Op-Ed columnist in 1995 after having served as a correspondent in the paper's Washington bureau since 1986. She has covered four presidential campaigns and served as White House correspondent. She also wrote a column, "On Washington," for The New York Times Magazine. Ms. Dowd joined The New York Times as a metropolitan reporter in 1983. She began her career in 1974 as an editorial assistant for The Washington Star, where she later became a sports columnist, metropolitan reporter and feature writer. When the Star closed in 1981, she went to Time magazine.

Born in Washington D.C., Ms. Dowd received a B.A. degree in English literature from Catholic University (Washington, D.C.) in 1973, <http://www.nytimes.com/2013/04/21/opinion/sunday/dowd-president-obama-is-no-bully-in-the-pulpit.html?hp&_r=0>

THE graying man flashing fury in the Rose Garden on behalf of the Newtown families, the grieving man wiping away tears after speaking at the Boston memorial service, is not the same man who glided into office four years ago.

President Obama has watched the blood-dimmed tide drowning the ceremony of innocence, as Yeats wrote, and he has learned how to emotionally connect with Americans in searing moments, as he did from the White House late Friday night after the second bombing suspect was apprehended in Boston.

Unfortunately, **he still has not learned how to govern.**

How is it that the president won the argument on gun safety with the public and lost the vote in the Senate? It’s because he doesn’t know how to work the system. And it’s clear now that he doesn’t want to learn, or to even hire some clever people who can tell him how to do it or do it for him.

It’s unbelievable that with 90 percent of Americans on his side, he could get only 54 votes in the Senate. It was a glaring example of his weakness in using leverage to get what he wants. No one on Capitol Hill is scared of him.

Even House Republicans who had no intention of voting for the gun bill **marveled privately that the president could not muster 60 votes** in a Senate that his party controls.

President Obama thinks he can use emotion to bring pressure on Congress. But that’s **not how adults with power respond to** **things**. He chooses not to get down in the weeds and pretend he values the stroking and other little things that matter to lawmakers.

After the Newtown massacre, he and his aides hashed it out and decided he would look cold and unsympathetic if he didn’t push for some new regulations. To thunderous applause at the State of the Union, the president said, “The families of Newtown deserve a vote.” Then, as usual, he took his foot off the gas, lost momentum and confided his pessimism to journalists.

The White House had a defeatist mantra: This is tough. We need to do it. But we’re probably going to lose.

When you go into a fight saying you’re probably going to lose, you’re probably going to lose.

The president once more delegated to the vice president. Couldn’t he have come to the Hill himself to lobby with the families and Joe Biden?

The White House should have created a war room full of charts with the names of pols they had to capture, like they had in “The American President.” Soaring speeches have their place, but this was about blocking and tackling.

Instead of the pit-bull legislative aides in Aaron Sorkin’s movie, Obama has Miguel Rodriguez, an arm-twister so genteel that The Washington Post’s Philip Rucker wrote recently that no one in Congress even knows who he is.

**The president was oblivious to red-state Democrats facing tough elections**. Bring the Alaskan Democrat Mark Begich to the White House residence, hand him a drink, and say, “How can we make this a bill you can vote for and defend?”

Sometimes you must leave the high road and fetch your brass knuckles. Obama should have called Senator Heidi Heitkamp of North Dakota over to the Oval Office and put on the squeeze: “Heidi, you’re brand new and you’re going to have a long career. You work with us, we’ll work with you. Public opinion is moving fast on this issue. The reason you get a six-year term is so you can have the guts to make tough votes. This is a totally defensible bill back home. It’s about background checks, nothing to do with access to guns. Heidi, you’re a mother. Think of those little kids dying in schoolrooms.”

Obama had to persuade some Republican senators in states that he won in 2012. He should have gone out to Ohio, New Hampshire and Nevada and had big rallies to get the public riled up to put pressure on Rob Portman, Kelly Ayotte and Dean Heller, giving notice that they would pay a price if they spurned him on this.

Tom Coburn, the Republican senator from Oklahoma, is one of the few people on the Hill that the president actually considers a friend. Obama wrote a paean to Coburn in the new Time 100 issue, which came out just as Coburn sabotaged his own initial effort to help the bill.

Obama should have pressed his buddy: “Hey, Tom, just this once, why don’t you do more than just talk about making an agreement with the Democrats? You’re not running again. Do something big.”

Couldn’t the president have given his Rose Garden speech about the “shameful” actions in Washington before the vote rather than after?

There were ways to get to 60 votes. The White House just had to scratch it out with a real strategy and a never-let-go attitude.

Obama hates selling. He thinks people should just accept the right thing to do. But as Joe Manchin, the West Virginia Democrat, noted, senators have their own tough selling job to do back home. “In the end you can really believe in something,” he told The Times’s Jennifer Steinhauer, “but you have to go sell it.”

The president said the Newtown families deserved a vote. But he was setting his sights too low. They deserved a law.

#### The business lobby is key

Lerer, 9/12 (Lisa, “Obama Syria Reversal Sets Stage for Fights With Congress,” <http://www.bloomberg.com/news/2013-09-12/obama-syria-reversal-sets-stage-for-fights-with-congress.html>))

Business Lobbying

On fiscal issues, Democrats are counting on pressure from traditional Republican allies, such as the business sector, to persuade lawmakers to cut deals.

“It is insane not to raise the debt ceiling,” U.S. Chamber President Tom Donohue said in an Aug. 30 interview with C-SPAN.

Though Republican leaders fear being blamed for a government shutdown, they’re under pressure from anti-tax Tea Party lawmakers who want to use the needed votes on the budget and debt limit as leverage to delay implementation of Obama’s health-care law.

#### Economic decline doesn’t cause war

Zakaria Editor Newsweek ‘9

(Fareed-, Dec. 12, Newsweek, “The Secrets of Stability”, http://www.newsweek.com/id/226425/page/1; Jacob)

One year ago, the world seemed as if it might be coming apart. The global financial system, which had fueled a great expansion of capitalism and trade across the world, was crumbling. All the certainties of the age of globalization—about the virtues of free markets, trade, and technology—were being called into question. Faith in the American model had collapsed. The financial industry had crumbled. Once-roaring emerging markets like China, India, and Brazil were sinking. Worldwide trade was shrinking to a degree not seen since the 1930s.

Pundits whose bearishness had been vindicated predicted we were doomed to a long, painful bust, with cascading failures in sector after sector, country after country. In a widely cited essay that appeared in The Atlantic this May, Simon Johnson, former chief economist of the International Monetary Fund, wrote: "The conventional wisdom among the elite is still that the current slump 'cannot be as bad as the Great Depression.' This view is wrong. What we face now could, in fact, be worse than the Great Depression."

Others predicted that these economic shocks would lead to political instability and violence in the worst-hit countries. At his confirmation hearing in February, the new U.S. director of national intelligence, Adm. Dennis Blair, cautioned the Senate that "the financial crisis and global recession are likely to produce a wave of economic crises in emerging-market nations over the next year." Hillary Clinton endorsed this grim view. And she was hardly alone. Foreign Policy ran a cover story predicting serious unrest in several emerging markets.

Of one thing everyone was sure: nothing would ever be the same again. Not the financial industry, not capitalism, not globalization.

One year later, how much has the world really changed? Well, Wall Street is home to two fewer investment banks (three, if you count Merrill Lynch). Some regional banks have gone bust. There was some turmoil in Moldova and (entirely unrelated to the financial crisis) in Iran. Severe problems remain, like high unemployment in the West, and we face new problems caused by responses to the crisis—soaring debt and fears of inflation. But overall, things look nothing like they did in the 1930s. The predictions of economic and political collapse have not materialized at all.

A key measure of fear and fragility is the ability of poor and unstable countries to borrow money on the debt markets. So consider this: the sovereign bonds of tottering Pakistan have returned 168 percent so far this year. All this doesn't add up to a recovery yet, but it does reflect a return to some level of normalcy. And that rebound has been so rapid that even the shrewdest observers remain puzzled. "The question I have at the back of my head is 'Is that it?' " says Charles Kaye, the co-head of Warburg Pincus. "We had this huge crisis, and now we're back to business as usual?"

This revival did not happen because markets managed to stabilize themselves on their own. Rather, governments, having learned the lessons of the Great Depression, were determined not to repeat the same mistakes once this crisis hit. By massively expanding state support for the economy—through central banks and national treasuries—they buffered the worst of the damage. (Whether they made new mistakes in the process remains to be seen.) The extensive social safety nets that have been established across the industrialized world also cushioned the pain felt by many. Times are still tough, but things are nowhere near as bad as in the 1930s, when governments played a tiny role in national economies.

It's true that the massive state interventions of the past year may be fueling some new bubbles: the cheap cash and government guarantees provided to banks, companies, and consumers have fueled some irrational exuberance in stock and bond markets. Yet these rallies also demonstrate the return of confidence, and confidence is a very powerful economic force. When John Maynard Keynes described his own prescriptions for economic growth, he believed government action could provide only a temporary fix until the real motor of the economy started cranking again—the animal spirits of investors, consumers, and companies seeking risk and profit.

Beyond all this, though, I believe there's a fundamental reason why we have not faced global collapse in the last year. It is the same reason that we weathered the stock-market crash of 1987, the recession of 1992, the Asian crisis of 1997, the Russian default of 1998, and the tech-bubble collapse of 2000. The current global economic system is inherently more resilient than we think. The world today is characterized by three major forces for stability, each reinforcing the other and each historical in nature.

The first is the spread of great-power peace. Since the end of the Cold War, the world's major powers have not competed with each other in geomilitary terms. There have been some political tensions, but measured by historical standards the globe today is stunningly free of friction between the mightiest nations. This lack of conflict is extremely rare in history. You would have to go back at least 175 years, if not 400, to find any prolonged period like the one we are living in. The number of people who have died as a result of wars, civil conflicts, and terrorism over the last 30 years has declined sharply (despite what you might think on the basis of overhyped fears about terrorism). And no wonder—three decades ago, the Soviet Union was still funding militias, governments, and guerrillas in dozens of countries around the world. And the United States was backing the other side in every one of those places. That clash of superpower proxies caused enormous bloodshed and instability: recall that 3 million people died in Indochina alone during the 1970s. Nothing like that is happening today.

Peace is like oxygen, Harvard's Joseph Nye has written. When you don't have it, it's all you can think about, but when you do, you don't appreciate your good fortune. Peace allows for the possibility of a stable economic life and trade. The peace that flowed from the end of the Cold War had a much larger effect because it was accompanied by the discrediting of socialism. The world was left with a sole superpower but also a single workable economic model—capitalism—albeit with many variants from Sweden to Hong Kong.

This consensus enabled the expansion of the global economy; in fact, it created for the first time a single world economy in which almost all countries across the globe were participants. That means everyone is invested in the same system. Today, while the nations of Eastern Europe might face an economic crisis, no one is suggesting that they abandon free-market capitalism and return to communism. In fact, around the world you see the opposite: even in the midst of this downturn, there have been few successful electoral appeals for a turn to socialism or a rejection of the current framework of political economy. Center-right parties have instead prospered in recent elections throughout the West.

The second force for stability is the victory—after a decades-long struggle—over the cancer of inflation. Thirty-five years ago, much of the world was plagued by high inflation, with deep social and political consequences. Severe inflation can be far more disruptive than a recession, because while recessions rob you of better jobs and wages that you might have had in the future, inflation robs you of what you have now by destroying your savings. In many countries in the 1970s, hyperinflation led to the destruction of the middle class, which was the background condition for many of the political dramas of the era—coups in Latin America, the suspension of democracy in India, the overthrow of the shah in Iran. But then in 1979, the tide began to turn when Paul Volcker took over the U.S. Federal Reserve and waged war against inflation. Over two decades, central banks managed to decisively beat down the beast. At this point, only one country in the world suffers from -hyperinflation: Zimbabwe. Low inflation allows people, businesses, and governments to plan for the future, a key precondition for stability.

Political and economic stability have each reinforced the other. And the third force that has underpinned the resilience of the global system is technological connectivity. Globalization has always existed in a sense in the modern world, but until recently its contours were mostly limited to trade: countries made goods and sold them abroad. Today the information revolution has created a much more deeply connected global system.

Managers in Arkansas can work with suppliers in Beijing on a real-time basis. The production of almost every complex manufactured product now involves input from a dozen countries in a tight global supply chain. And the consequences of connectivity go well beyond economics. Women in rural India have learned through satellite television about the independence of women in more modern countries. Citizens in Iran have used cell phones and the Internet to connect to their well-wishers beyond their borders. Globalization today is fundamentally about knowledge being dispersed across our world.

This diffusion of knowledge may actually be the most important reason for the stability of the current system. The majority of the world's nations have learned some basic lessons about political well-being and wealth creation. They have taken advantage of the opportunities provided by peace, low inflation, and technology to plug in to the global system. And they have seen the indisputable results. Despite all the turmoil of the past year, it's important to remember that more people have been lifted out of poverty over the last two decades than in the preceding 10. Clear-thinking citizens around the world are determined not to lose these gains by falling for some ideological chimera, or searching for a worker's utopia. They are even cautious about the appeals of hypernationalism and war. Most have been there, done that. And they know the price.

#### Plan solves alliances — that’s Dunlap — extinction

**Ross 99** (Winter, Douglas – professor of political science at Simon Fraser University, Canada’s functional isolationism and the future of weapons of mass destruction, International Journal, p. lexis)

Thus, an easily accessible tax base has long been available for spending much more on international security than recent governments have been willing to contemplate. Negotiating the landmines ban, discouraging trade in small arms, promoting the United Nations arms register are all worthwhile, popular activities that polish the national self-image. But they should all be supplements to, not substitutes for, a proportionately equitable commitment of resources to the management and prevention of international conflict – and thus the containment of the WMD threat. FutureAmerican governments will not ‘police the world’ alone. For almost fifty years the Soviet threat compelled disproportionate military expenditures and sacrifice by the United States. That world is gone. Only by enmeshing the capabilities of the **U**nited **S**tates and other leading powers in a co-operative security management regime where the burdens are widely shared does the world community have any plausible hope of avoiding **warfare involving nuclear or other WMD**.
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#### This is net more popular, avoids rollback, and amplifies all our international perception advantages

**Moss 2, Associate Dean for Academic Programs in the Industrial College of the Armed Forces, National Defense University**, and a professor in its department of grand strategy. Previously Professor Moss was a member of the staff of the House Subcommittee on Europe and the Middle East. The opinions within are his own and reflect no position of the National Defense University or the Department of Defense, Information Warfare and War Powers: Keeping the Constitutional Balance, Fletcher Forum of World Affairs

More importantly, as in any debate and vote on the use of traditional military force, Congress's placement of information warfare within the context of the Constitution guarantees that the President's policy towards it will have a stronger legal foundation and public support. This is critical not only for sustained acceptance of the policy at home but also for international recognition of the justification of the President's decisions abroad. Ultimately, information warfare, cyber-attacks, or cyber warfare must come under the same requirements for accountability in the Constitution as traditional military force. The President cannot be given an instrument of warfare over which Congress has no power.

#### Syria standoff will still continue to undermine rest of agenda

Brownstein, 9/12 (Ronald, “How It Can Still Go Wrong for Obama; His turn on Syria avoids a cliff, but it sets him on a rocky road that could still rattle his presidency,” <http://www.nationaljournal.com/political-connections/how-it-can-still-go-wrong-for-obama-20130912>))

The sudden swerve toward international diplomacy offers President Obama the opportunity of a better outcome in Syria—at the risk of creating an enervating standoff that weakens him in all the other struggles barreling his way this fall.

When Obama agreed this week to pursue the unexpected Russian initiative to place Syria’s chemical weapons under international control for eventual destruction, the most important thing the president accomplished was to defer the confrontation at home and abroad.

That offers him the immediate upside of avoiding a congressional vote he appeared likely to lose in the House and perhaps the Senate, too. The downside is, he’s ensured that the Syrian showdown will continue for weeks, and likely months, clouding everything else he wants to accomplish.

By the time that process ends, Obama might have done much more to remove the chemical-weapons threat from Syria than he could have achieved in a military action short of outright invasion. Yet there’s equal risk that he will soon be so tangled in inconclusive international wrangling, he will wish he had unilaterally made his point by quickly striking Syria in early September. Obama steered away from the cliff for now, but he turned onto a rocky road that promises more bumps ahead.