### T – Armed Forces

#### US Armed Forces are all the service branches collectively

DOD 13 DOD Dictionary of Military and Associated Terms 08 November 2010, as amended through 16 July 2013. <http://www.dtic.mil/doctrine/dod_dictionary/data/u/7829.html>

United States Armed Forces

(DOD) Used to denote collectively the Army, Marine Corps, Navy, Air Force, and Coast Guard. See also Armed Forces of the United States.

Source: JP 1

#### Forces includes weapons and equipment

DOD 13 DOD Dictionary of Military and Associated Terms 08 November 2010, as amended through 16 July 2013.

http://www.dtic.mil/doctrine/dod\_dictionary/data/u/11318.html

US forces

(DOD) All Armed Forces (including the Coast Guard) of the United States, any person in the Armed Forces of the United States, and all equipment of any description that either belongs to the US Armed Forces or is being used (including Type I and II Military Sealift Command vessels), escorted, or conveyed by the US Armed Forces.
Source: JP 1qq

## XO CP

#### Doesn’t solve Israel – the strongest support for Iran strikes is coming from congress.

Times of Israel, 13 (Senate backs Israel in event of strike on Iran nuclear weapon program. http://www.timesofisrael.com/senate-votes-to-back-possible-strike-on-iran-nuclear-weapon-program/)

NEW YORK — In a show of force, the United States Senate on Wednesday unanimously passed a resolution urging an uncompromising US stance against Iranian efforts to acquire nuclear weapons, calling for Washington’s support should Israel strike the program.¶ “If the Government of Israel is compelled to take military action in legitimate self-defense against Iran’s nuclear weapons program, the United States Government should stand with Israel and provide, in accordance with United States law and the constitutional responsibility of Congress to authorize the use of military force, diplomatic, military, and economic support to the Government of Israel in its defense of its territory, people, and existence,” the resolution reads.¶ It also calls for the US to take “such action as may be necessary” to keep Iran from obtaining a nuclear weapons capability.¶ While senators are careful in their calls for US military intervention, the resolution, which passed 99-0, is seen as the most direct expression yet heard from Washington reflecting support for a potential Israeli strike.¶ “I cannot emphasize enough my strong concerns about Iran’s nuclear program and the extraordinary threat it poses to the United States, to Israel and to the entire international community,” Senator Bob Menendez (D-NJ), the powerful chair of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, said in a speech on the Senate floor before Wednesday’s vote.¶ Diploma tic efforts “have failed to achieve their central objective — getting Iran to make concessions on the nuclear program,” Menendez said. “It is clear to me that we cannot allow the Iranians to continue to drag their feet by talking while all the while they grow their nuclear program.”¶ Menendez cited an International Atomic Energy Agency report released earlier Wednesday which said Iran was speeding up its enrichment work at Natanz.¶ “We cannot allow Iran to buy more time talking — even as the centrifuges keep spinning. There is no doubt, there has never been a doubt – not in my mind – that a nuclear-armed Iran is not an option,” he said.¶ The resolution, he said, “makes clear that a nuclear Iran is not an option, and that the Unites States has Israel’s back… Iran’s leaders must understand, that unless they change course their situation will only get worse and economic struggles and international isolation will only grow. They must understand that at the end of the day their pursuit of a nuclear weapons capability will make them less, not more secure.”¶ It also contained a message for Israel, Menendez continued.¶ “The bottom line: Israel should always understand that the United States has its back, that we will not allow Iran to obtain nuclear weapons capability, and, if we are forced to, we will take whatever means necessary to prevent this outcome,” he said.¶ The resolution itself “declares that the United States has a vital national interest in, and unbreakable commitment to, ensuring the existence, survival, and security of the State of Israel, and reaffirms United States support for Israel’s right to self-defense.”¶ The resolution was introduced by Menendez and Senator Lindsey Graham (R-SC), and had 92 cosponsors (out of 100 senators) by the time it reached the Senate floor for a vote. It passed unanimously.¶ Reactions to the resolution included enthusiastic support by pro-Israel groups and criticism by groups opposed to further sanctions or military measures against Iran’s nuclear program.¶ The “Senate action…comes at a critical moment as Iran stands on the verge of attaining nuclear weapons capability following repeated defiance of the international community,” the American Israel Public Affairs Committee said on Wednesday.¶ “The passage of this resolution is an extremely significant and timely statement of solidarity with Israel and a restatement of America’s determination to thwart Iran’s nuclear quest – which endangers American, Israeli, and international security,” AIPAC said.¶ Meanwhile, the National Iranian American Council said the resolution amounted to “saber rattling.”¶ “Apparently the Senate thinks the standoff between the US and Iran suffers from a lack of brinksmanship,” the group’s policy director Jamal Abdi said. “Washington and Tehran are stuck in a vicious cycle of mutual escalation that can only be broken through the give and take of serious negotiations, not through further saber rattling.”¶ He called on Congress to “abstain from any more reckless threats or sanctions that push us closer to the brink of war with Iran. Instead, Congress should ensure diplomacy can succeed by making it absolutely clear and credible that, in exchange for verifiable concessions that prevent Iran from obtaining a nuclear weapon, sanctions will be lifted.”

#### The next president could repeal an xo and it would be ignored while Obama is in office.

Pope 11 [Robert S. Pope, Lieutenant Colonel, USAF, Former Research Fellow, Belfer International Security Program, 2009–2010 Interagency Task Forces The Right Tools for the Job Strategic Studies Quarterly ♦ Summer 2011]

Large changes to the national security system above the single agency or department level would most certainly require action by the president and Congress. Some have argued that a presidential executive order would be sufficient to enact the proposed reforms.93 While an executive order might change the interagency system during the current administration, **history indicates it would be unlikely to remain under the next president.94** For example, President Clinton’s new process for interagency reconstruction and stabilization operations, described in Presidential Decision Directive-56 (PDD-56), did not outlast his presidency, nor was it generally followed while he was in office.95 Nor does an executive order presuppose any support from Congress, which funds the executive branch agencies. Because political power in Congress is often strongly tied to the large sums of money associated with the defense budget, Congress will certainly want to be involved in any reforms that change the national security structure. The CSIS “Beyond Goldwater-Nichols” study team noted: “The role of Congress in the process is the most crucial determinant of the prospects for a reform effort. The recommendations that flow from congressionally mandated groups, commissions, or blue ribbon panels are more likely to lead to lasting changes than efforts launched exclusively at the executive branch level.”96 **Enduring change comes from legislation.** Examples include the 1947 National Security Act which created, among other things, the National Security Council and the Department of Defense; the 1986 GoldwaterNichols Act which created the joint military team; the 2002 act which created the Department of Homeland Security; and the 2004 act which created the office of the Director of National Intelligence.

#### Statute makes congress a stakeholder -- key to permanence and stability.

Lederman 9 [Gordon, National Security Reform for the Twenty-first Century: A New National Security Act and Reflections on Legislation’s Role in Organizational Change, headed the Project on National Security Reform’s Legal Working Group from 2007 to 2009. Currently a Congressional staffer, he served on the staff of the National Commission on Terrorist Attacks upon the United States (the “9/11 Commission”) from May 2003 to July 2004. This article is based on an address delivered to the National Security Law Section at the Association of American Law Schools’ annual meeting in 2009. JOURNAL OF NATIONAL SECURITY LAW &POLICY [Vol. 3:363 2009] LEGISLATION’S ROLE IN ORGANIZATIONAL CHANGE 367]

However, a statute brings benefits as well, despite the lengthy period of time necessary to enact it. A statute creates **permanence**, which **provides stability** for the system and also can overcome resistance from entrenched bureaucrats who might otherwise think that they can wait out an administration until the next President issues a new executive order. In addition, a statute makes Congress a stakeholder and makes it more likely that Congress will conduct **vigorous oversight** – including by getting commitments from nominees that they will implement the statute aggressively. Finally, a statute can tap into Congress’s premier constitutional power for compelling executive branch action: the power of the purse. The President may create structures and processes and fund them temporarily by transferring resources, but ultimately it is Congress that provides resources on a sustained basis. Without Congress’s input and resources, a presidentially imposed solution to interagency integration may wither for lack of funding.

#### Israel doesn’t trust the president acting alone.

Kalb, 13 (Marvin, James Clark Welling Fellow at The George Washington University and a member of Atlantic Community Advisory Board, and a Guest Scholar in Foreign Policy at The Brookings Institution. The Road to War

Presidential Commitments Honored and Betrayed. http://www.brookings.edu/research/books/2013/the-road-to-war)

No dosubt, presidential commitments are seen as serious, almost sacred, promises to act made by a chief executive on behalf of his administration. And other nations may view these commitments as binding nation-to-nation promises that succeeding administrations will honor, too. But there is a problem. Will they?¶ In 1982, for example, President Ronald Reagan pledged America’s “iron- clad commitment to the defense of Israel.” The commitment made sense to Reagan at the time, and it has been echoed by one president after another ever since. But does Reagan’s pledge have the same resonance now that it did then? Does it mean that if Israel feels it must bomb Iran to stop its nuclear program that America must join in the attack? Much has to do with trust between leaders and countries. Do Israeli leaders trust President Barack Obama as much as they did Bill Clinton and George W. Bush? These are questions that cut to the heart—and viability—of a presidential commitment.¶ Words have consequence. Spoken by a president, they can often become American policy, with or without congressional approval. When a president “commits” the United States to a controversial course of action, he may be setting the nation on the road to war or on a road to reconciliation. In matters of national security, his powers have become awesome—his word decisive. Who decides when we go to war? The president decides. As former national security adviser Zbigniew Brzezinski told me, it “all depends” on the president. “It’s his call.” Likewise, it is his decision when and whether, and under what conditions, to support a friendly nation.¶ A president, such as Barack Obama, for example, pledges that the United States has “an ironclad commitment” to Israel’s security—meaning, one would imagine, that if Israel were attacked, the United States would come to Israel’s defense. Is there anything more to this commitment than a presidential promise? Obviously, yes. Israel enjoys broad-based support from Congress and the American people. For the most part, both nations share common values and common aims. But the president is the key to determining the flow and texture of this delicate relationship.¶ A question often asked by political leaders in Israel is whether Obama will live up to his word. Will his commitment be honored or betrayed by him or by a successor? The answer to this question can mean war or peace. Might it not be better for both nations to negotiate a formal defense treaty—and, in this way, try to reduce or even eliminate areas of doubt in their relationship? Those who question the value or relevance of a U.S.-Israeli defense treaty point out that in recent years Obama has tried to organize Israeli-Palestinian peace talks only to fail abysmally because of Palestinian objections to Israeli settlements and Israeli insistence on building such settlements in the name of security. How would a treaty resolve these problems, they ask? Indeed, even the effort to negotiate a defense treaty would likely kick up fresh tumult and anxiety among Arab states, which are apt to see a U.S. treaty with Israel as proof that the United States can no longer be counted on as an impartial negotiator.¶ Another question: Obama has warned, more than once: “Let there be no doubt—America is determined to prevent Iran from getting nuclear weapons.” Though the world has heard this warning, there are still many, especially in the Middle East, who question whether Obama would really use American military power to stop Iran from “getting nuclear weapons,” however that phrase might be defined. It is said in Washington and Jerusalem that never before have Israel and the United States been in closer alignment on stopping Iran from developing a nuclear weapon. True, and yet not quite true. In the final analysis, for reasons both political and military, Israel may, on its own, strike Iran. Would it then expect American diplomatic and military support? Obama has strongly implied yes. But, without a mutual defense treaty, there may always be a question about the durability and reliability of a presidential commitment.

## 2AC Resolve

#### Credibility/ Resolve low now.

Barnes, 13 (Fred, Executive editor of the weekly standard. Hesitation, Delay, and Unreliability. http://www.weeklystandard.com/articles/hesitation-delay-and-unreliability\_752788.html)

In his World War II memoirs, Winston Churchill offered this lesson: “In war, resolution; in defeat, defiance; in victory, magnanimity; in peace, good will.” Being resolute—that is, steadfast and determined—comes first. It is normally regarded as a critical component of success.¶ Obama and resolve don’t seem to mix. As the death toll in the Syrian civil war mounted, he opposed American intervention. Then, in an offhand remark a year ago, he said his policy would change if the Assad regime crossed a “red line” and used chemical weapons. Still, he ignored unsubstantiated reports of gas attacks that Secretary of State John Kerry said numbered in the “teens.” He decided to act only when American intelligence confirmed an estimated 1,400 people had been killed in a gas attack by the Syrian military on August 21.¶ A bombing assault was planned for Labor Day weekend to “deter” further use of chemical weapons and “degrade” Assad’s arsenal. But Obama abruptly jettisoned that plan and announced he would seek the approval of Congress. An attack, if there is to be one, could be postponed for weeks, jeopardizing what’s known as “peak” military readiness.¶ Earlier, in June, the White House announced it would send small arms and munitions to the Syrian rebels. By early September, however, no weapons had reached the rebels.¶ So hesitation, delay, and unreliability are the hallmarks of Obama’s approach to Syria, for now. This amounts to presidential “fecklessness,” says Steven F. Hayward, author of Greatness: Reagan, Churchill, and the Making of Extraordinary Leaders. “A strong war leader needs one quality above others,” he says, “a ruthlessness to see it through, coupled with a touch of legerdemain to keep our enemies off balance and fearful of what the United States might do.”¶ Obama certainly lacks that “touch” of cunning. There’s a gulf between his mission and his military. His goal is the removal of Assad as Syrian leader —in other words, regime change. But Obama insists a bombing attack in Syria would be solely to stop further use of chemical weapons. He’s publicly ruled out a wider assault aimed at regime change or deployment of ground troops.¶ “Calling for Assad’s downfall and warning him not to use chemical weapons but being hesitant to back up his strong words with commensurate actions is not how successful commanders in chief behave in wartime,” says Max Boot, author of Invisible Armies: An Epic History of Guerrilla Warfare from Ancient Times to the Present.

#### First strike is a bluff—undermines credibility

Riedel and O'Hanlon 10 Bruce Riedel, Senior Fellow, Foreign Policy, Saban Center for Middle East Policy, Michael E. O'Hanlon, Director of Research and Senior Fellow, Foreign Policy, 3-16-10, “The Case Against Threatening Iran,” Politico

In addition, even if the charge is unfair, Obama’s critics at home could accuse him of weakness, increasing the pressure on him to consider an attack. America’s credibility might also be weakened, since Washington would be seen as having its bluff called. Future scenarios in which the United States might wish to credibly threaten an attack against an adversary, perhaps even Iran, would then be harder to handle. So the Obama administration would do well to stop talking publicly about a military option and, instead, tell regional allies a strike is highly unlikely unless Iran’s behavior becomes far more egregious.

#### Credibility not hurt by the plan.

Balkin, 13 ( JACK M. BALKIN is Knight Professor of Constitutional Law and the First Amendment at Yale Law School, and the founder and director of Yale's Information Society Project, an interdisciplinary center that studies law and new information technologies. What Congressional Approval Won't Do: Trim Obama's Power or Make War Legal. http://www.theatlantic.com/politics/archive/2013/09/what-congressional-approval-wont-do-trim-obamas-power-or-make-war-legal/279298/)

Wouldn’t congressional refusal make the United States look weak, as critics including Senator John McCain warn loudly? Hardly. The next dictator who acts rashly will face a different situation and a different calculus. The UN Security Council or NATO may feel differently about the need to act. There may be a new threat to American interests that lets Obama or the next president offer a different justification for acting. It just won’t matter very much what Obama said about red lines in the past. World leaders say provocative things all the time and then ignore them. Their motto is: That was then, and this is now.¶ If Congress turns him down, won’t Obama be undermined at home, as other critics claim? In what sense? It is hard to see how the Republicans could be less cooperative than they already are. And it’s not in the interest of Democrats to fault a president of their own party for acceding to what Congress wants instead of acting unilaterally.

#### Unwillingness to escalate to take out the link and impact

Dianne R. Pfundstein PhD Candidate, Columbia University Paper prepared for the ISA Annual Convention 3-19-2011 Compelling Compliance with the International Order: The United States, the Threat of Force, and Resolve in the Era of Unipolarity

This paper applies this new model of state resolve to the United States to demonstrate how its twenty-first century war-fighting model, and its position as sole superpower, undermine the United States’ ability to employ threats of force to coerce weak target states. The United States enjoys unique freedom to escalate conflicts, both because of its military superiority and because of the absence of a peer competitor in most regions of the world to check its actions. Despite this freedom and its unquestioned conventional military superiority, the United States has over the last sixty-five years steadily and increasingly insulated the bulk of its population from both the human and financial costs of war. Furthermore, norms about the use of violence have evolved such that the U.S. military goes to great lengths to avoid inflicting pain on the civilian populations of target states. I will demonstrate that these trends have given rise to a unique American way of war that renders the United States incapable of compelling weak states to change their behavior without having to actually force compliance: the United States may be willing to escalate, but not to suffer or inflict the costs necessary to defeat strongly motivated but conventionally weak target states, making resistance an attractive option even in the face of a credible U.S. threat to escalate. I will begin by demonstrating how the United States’ unique strategic position since the end of the Cold War has granted it the freedom to escalate most conflicts at little risk to its own safety, rendering escalation itself an uninformative signal of its willingness to suffer and destroy in order to achieve its objectives from target states. I will then examine the United States’ unwillingness to pay the human and material costs of war. My analysis reveals that, despite high absolute levels of defense spending, the United States does not want to pay for major wars, and has embraced many elements of the Revolution in Military Affairs (RMA) to insulate its military from the dangers of combat. I will then evaluate the evolution in norms about the infliction of pain on target states’ civilian populations. These trends, in combination with the demise of bipolarity, have freed U.S. policymakers to threaten and escalate military conflicts when the United States’ vital interests are not engaged and rendered the threat of military force an ineffective tool of coercion against weak but highly motivated target states.

#### Heg doesn’t solve conflict.

Fettweis 11 [Christopher, Prof. of Political Science – Tulane, Dangerous Times?: The International Politics of Great Power Peace Page 73-6]

The primary attack on restraint, or justification for internationalism, posits that if the United Stets were to withdraw from the world, a variety of ills would sweep over key regions and eventually pose threats to U.S. security and/or prosperity, nese problems might take three forms (besides the obvious, if remarkably unlikely, direct threats to the homeland): generalized chaos, hostile imbalances in Eurasia, and/or failed states. Historian Arthur Schlesinger was typical when he worried that restraint would mean "a chaotic, violent, and ever more dangerous planet."69 All of these concerns either implicitly or explicitly assume that the presence of the United States is the primary reason for international stability, and if that presence were withdrawn chaos would ensue. In other words, they depend upon hegemonic-stability logic. Simply stated, the hegemonic stability theory proposes that international peace is only possible when there is one country strong enough to make and enforce a set of rules. At the height of Pax Romana between 27 BC and 180 AD, for ex¬ample, Rome was able to bring unprecedented peace and security to the Mediterranean. The Pax Britannica of the nineteenth century brought a level of stabil¬ity to the high seas. Perhaps the current era is peaceful because the United States has established a de facto Pax Americana where no power is strong enough to challenge its dominance, and because it has established a set of rules that are gen¬erally in the interests of all countries to follow. Without a benevolent hegemon, some strategists fear, instability may break out around the globe.70 Unchecked conflicts could cause humanitarian disaster and, in today's interconnected world, economic turmoil that would ripple throughout global financial markets. If the United States were to abandon its commitments abroad, argued Art, the world would "become a more dangerous place" and, sooner or later, that would "re¬dound to America's detriment."71 If the massive spending that the United States engages in actually provides stability in the international political and economic systems, then perhaps internationalism is worthwhile. There are good theoretical and empirical reasons, however, to believe that US **hegemony is not the** primary **cause of** the current era of s**tability**. First of all, the hegemonic-stability argument overstates the role that the United States plays in the system. No country is strong enough to police the world on its own. The only way there can be stability in the community of great powers is if self-policing occurs, if states have decided that their interests are served by peace. If no pacific normative shift had occurred among the great powers that was filtering down through the system, then no amount of international constabulary work by the United States could maintain stability. Likewise, if it true that such a shift has occurred, then most of what the hegemon spends to bring stability would be wasted. The 5 percent of the world's population that 2\* m the United States simply could not force peace upon an unwilling 95. At the nsk of beating the metaphor to death, the United States may be patrolling a neighborhood that has **already rid itself of crime.** Stability and unipolarity may besimply coincidental., order for U.S. hegemony to be the reason for global stability, the rest ome World would have to expect reward for good behavior and fear punishment to/ bad. Since the end of the Cold War, the United States has not always proven to be especially eager to engage in humanitarian interventions abroad. Even rather incontrovertible evidence of genocide has not been sufficient to inspire action. Hegemonic stability can only take credit for influencing those decisions that would have ended in War without the presence, whether physical or psychologi-cal, of the United States. Ethiopia and Eritrea are hardly the only states that could go to War without the slightest threat of U.S. intervention. Since most of the world today is free to fight without U.S. involvement, something else must be at work. Stability exists in many places where no hegemony is present. Second, the limited **empirical evidence** we have suggests that there is **little connection** between the relative level of U.S. activism and international stability. During the 1990s the United States cut back on its defense spending fairly substantially. By 1998 the United States was spending $100 billion less on de¬fense in real terms than it had in 1990.72 To internationalists, defense 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 Kristol and Kagan, "doubts that the defense budget has been cut much too far to meet America's responsibilities to itself and to world peace."73 If the pacific trends were due not to U.S. hegemony but a strengthening norm against interstate War, however, one would not have expected an increase in global instability and violence. The verdict from the past two decades is fairly plain: The world grew more peaceful while the United States cut its forces. No state seemed to believe that its security was endangered by a less-capable Pentagon, 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 mistrust and arms races; no re-gional balancing occurred** once the stabilizing presence of the U.S. military was diminished. The rest of the world acted as if the threat of international War was not a pressing concern, despite the reduction in U.S. capabilities. The incidence and magnitude of global conflict **declined** while the United States cut its military spending under President Clinton, and it kept declining as the Bush Administra-tion ramped spending back up. No complex statistical analysis should be neces-sary to reach the conclusion that the two are unrelated. It is also worth noting for our purposes that the United States was no less safe. Military spending figures by themselves are insufficient to disprove a con- nection between overall U.S. actions and international stability. One could pre- sumably argue that spending is not the only, or even the best, indication of he- LTm? T 15 inSt6ad US" foreign Political and security commitments Zcre7Tn I ^ ndther was -gnificantly altered during this period, mcreased conflict should not have been expected. Alternately, advocates of heg¬emonic stability could believe that relative rather than absolute spending is de¬cisive in bringing peace. Although the United States cut back on its spending during the 1990s, its relative advantage never wavered. However, even if it were true that either U.S. commitments or relative spend-ing accounts for international pacific trends, the 1990s make it obvious that stability can be sustained at drastically lower levels. In other words, even if one believes that there is a level of engagement below which the United States cannot drop without imperiling global stability, a rational grand strategist would still cut back on engagement (and spending) until that level is determined. As of now, we have no idea how cheap hegemonic stability could be, or if a low point exists at all. Since the United States ought to spend the minimum amount of its blood and treasure while seeking the maximum return on its investment, engagement should be scaled back until that level is determined. Grand strategic decisions are never final; continual adjustments can and must be made as time goes on. And if the constructivist interpretation of events is correct and the global peace is inher-ently stable, no increase in conflict would ever occur, irrespective of U.S. spend-ing, which would save untold trillions for an increasingly debt-ridden nation. It is also perhaps worth noting that if opposite trends had unfolded, if other states had reacted to news of cuts in U.S. defense spending with more aggressive or insecure behavior, then internationalists would surely argue that their expec-tations had been fulfilled. If increases in conflict would have been interpreted as evidence for the wisdom of internationalist strategies, then logical consistency demands that the lack thereof should at least pose a problem. As it stands, the ordy data we have regarding the likely systemic reaction to a more restrained United States suggests that current peaceful trends are unrelated to U.S. military pending. Evidently the rest of the world can operate quite effectively without ^e presence of a global policeman. Those who think otherwise base their view on faith alone. tf the only thing standing between the world and chaos is the U.S. military Presence, then an adjustment in grand strategy would be exceptionally counter-productive. But it is worth recalling that none of the other explanations for the decline of War—**nuclear weapons, complex economic interdependence, international and domestic political institutions, evolution in ideas and norms** necessitate an activist America to maintain their validity. Were America to be-co\*e more restrained, nuclear weapons would still affect the calculations of the would-be aggressor; the process of globalization would continue, deepening the complexity of economic interdependence; the United Nations could still deploy Peacekeepers where necessary; and democracy would not shrivel where it cur-\*7 exis\*s. Most importantly, the idea that war is a worthwhile way to resolve conflict would have no reason to return. As was argued in chapter 2, normative evolution is typically unidirectional. Strategic restraint in such a world would be virtually risk-free. Finally, some analysts have worried that a de facto surrender of U.S. hege¬mony would lead to a rise of Chinese influence. Indeed, China is the only other major power that has increased its military spending since the end of the Cold War, even if it is still a rather low 2 percent of its GDP. Such levels of effort do not suggest a desire to compete with, much less supplant, the United States. The much-ballyhooed decade-long military buildup has brought Chinese spending up to approximately one-tenth the level of that of the United States. It is hardly clear that restraint on the part of the United States would invite Chinese global dominance. Bradley Thayer worries that Chinese would become "the language of diplomacy, trade and commerce, transportation and navigation, the internet, world sport, and global culture," and that Beijing would come to "dominate sci¬ence and technology, in all its forms" to the extent that soon the world would witness a Chinese astronaut who not only travels to the Moon, but "plants the communist flag on Mars, and perhaps other planets in the future."74 Fortunately one need not ponder for too long the horrible specter of a red flag on Venus, since on the planet Earth, where War is no longer the dominant form of conflict resolution, the threats posed by even a rising China would not be terribly dire. The dangers contained in the terrestrial security environment are less frightening than ever before, no matter which country is strongest.

## 2AC Debt Ceiling

#### Neither side will back down.

NBC 10/4 [http://firstread.nbcnews.com/\_news/2013/10/04/20818520-first-thoughts-conservatives-arent-backing-down]

\*\*\* Conservatives aren’t backing down: Here we are in Day 4 of the government shutdown, and after a brief period of comity yesterday (given the violent episode on Capitol Hill), both sides in the stalemate are **back into their respective corners.** That’s especially true for conservatives. Despite polls showing that more Americans are blaming Republicans than Democrats for the shutdown, and despite establishment Republicans admitting they aren’t winning this fight, **conservatives aren’t backing down.** In fact, they feel they have survived the fallout from the first few days. Case in point is Sen. Rand Paul’s (R-KY) admission in that hot-mic moment that “We’re gonna win this, I think.” Is that the reality of this standoff? Or it is simply due to the conservative echo chamber? After all, one of the major differences between the last shutdown (in 1995-1996) and now is the rise of FOX News, Drudge, and Breitbart News. As the New York Times recently wrote, “a fervent group of conservatives — bloggers, pundits, activists and even members of Congress — is harnessing the power of the Internet, determined to tell the story of the current budget showdown on its terms.” It explains why conservatives aren’t as convinced as many others are that this will do significant damage to the party.

#### Plan doesn’t cause a tradeoff. Negotiations would occur within the republic caucus and republicans would be lockstep in support of limiting Obama’s power.

Sargent 9/12 [Greg, Washington Post, The Morning Plum: Senate conservatives stick the knife in House GOP leaders

http://www.washingtonpost.com/blogs/plum-line/wp/2013/09/12/the-morning-plum-senate-conservatives-stick-the-knife-in-house-gop-leaders/]

All of this underscores a basic fact about this fall’s fiscal fights: Far and away the **dominant factor** shaping how they play out will be the d**ivisions among Republicans. There’s** a great deal of chatter (see Senator Bob Corker for one of the most absurd examples yet) to the effect that Obama’s mishandling of Syria has diminished his standing on Capitol Hill and will weaken him in coming fights. But those battles at bottom will be about whether the Republican Party can resolve its internal differences. Obama’s “standing” with Republicans — if it even could sink any lower — is **utterly irrelevant to that question**. The bottom line is that, when it comes to how aggressively to prosecute the war against Obamacare, **internal GOP differences may be unbridgeable.** Conservatives have adopted a deliberate strategy of deceiving untold numbers of base voters into believing Obamacare will be stopped outside normal electoral channels. Central to maintaining this fantasy is the idea that any Republican leader who breaks with this sacred mission can only be doing so because he or she is too weak and cowardly to endure the slings and arrows that persevering against the law must entail. GOP leaders, having themselves spent years feeding the base all sorts of lies and distortions about the law, are now desperately trying to inject a does of reality into the debate by pointing out that the defund-Obamacare crusade is, in political and practical terms alike, insane. But it may be too late. The time for injecting reality into the debate has long since passed.

#### No trade off – no negotiations over debt ceiling.

CNN 9/15 [Obama economic adviser's refrain: No debt ceiling negotiations Posted by CNN's Dan Merica, http://politicalticker.blogs.cnn.com/2013/09/15/obama-economic-advisers-refrain-no-debt-ceiling-negotiations/]

Washington (CNN) - President Barack Obama and his closest advisers are making it clear: They will not negotiate on the looming debt ceiling. In an interview on Sunday with ABC, Obama said he "will not negotiate...on the debt ceiling" because making a debate over the credit of the United States the norm would alter "the constitutional structure of this government entirely." Gene Sperling, a senior economic adviser to Obama, echoed his boss's pledge on a Sunday call with reporters. "All (Obama) has said is that he cannot and will not and should not negotiate on the debt limit because to do so gives credence to the idea of any side threatening the default of the United States of America over a policy dispute," said Sperling, the outgoing director of the National Economic Council. "As you heard the president say, he is not going to negotiate over the debt limit, that we should not be negotiating over whether to pay our bills."

#### Economic decline doesn’t cause war.

Jervis 11 [Robert, Adlai E. Stevenson Professor of International Politics in the Department of Political Science, and a Member of the Arnold A. Saltzman Institute of War and Peace Studies at Columbia University. Force in Our Times Saltzman Working Paper No. 15 July 2011 http://www.siwps.com/news.attachment/saltzmanworkingpaper15-842/SaltzmanWorkingPaper15.PDF]

Even if war is still seen as evil, the security community could be dissolved if severe conflicts of interest were to arise. Could the more peaceful world generate new interests that would bring the members of the community into sharp disputes? 45 A zero-sum sense of status would be one example, perhaps linked to a steep rise in nationalism. More likely would be a worsening of the current economic difficulties, which could itself produce greater nationalism, undermine democracy, and bring back old-fashioned beggar-thy-neighbor economic policies. While these dangers are real, it is hard to believe that the conflicts could be great enough to lead the members of the community to contemplate fighting each other. It is not so much that economic interdependence has proceeded to the point where it could not be reversed – states that were more internally interdependent than anything seen internationally have fought bloody civil wars. Rather it is that even if the more extreme versions of free trade and economic liberalism become discredited, it is hard to see how without building on a pre-existing high level of political conflict leaders and mass opinion would come to believe that their countries could prosper by impoverishing or even attacking others. Is it possible that problems will not only become severe, but that people will entertain the thought that they have to be solved by war? While a pessimist could note that this argument does not appear as outlandish as it did before the financial crisis, an optimist could reply (correctly, in my view) that the very fact that we have seen such a sharp economic down-turn without anyone suggesting that force of arms is the solution shows that even if bad times bring about greater economic conflict, **it will not make war thinkable.**

#### Empirically doesn’t collapse the economy.

Tanner 11 [Michael Tanner 11, National Review, “No Surrender on Debt Ceiling”, Jan 19, http://www.nationalreview.com/articles/257433/no-surrender-debt-ceiling-michael-tanner]

Of course the Obama administration is already warning of Armageddon if Congress doesn’t raise the debt ceiling. Certainly it would be a shock to the economic system. The bond market could crash. The impact would be felt at home and abroad. But would it necessarily be worse than the alternative? While Congress has never before refused to raise the debt ceiling, it has in fact frequently taken its time about doing so. In 1985, for example, Congress waited nearly three months after the debt limit was reached before it authorized a permanent increase. In 1995, four and a half months passed between the time that the government hit its statutory limit and the time Congress acted. And in 2002, Congress delayed raising the debt ceiling for three months. It took three months to raise the debt limit back in 1985 as well. **In none of those cases did the world end.** More important, what will be the consequences if the U.S. government fails to reduce government spending? What happens if we raise the debt ceiling then continue merrily on our way spending more and running up ever more debt? Already Moody’s and Standard & Poor’s have warned that our credit rating might be reduced unless we get a handle on our national debt. We’ve heard a lot recently about the European debt crisis, but, as one senior Chinese banking official recently noted, in some ways the U.S. financial position is more perilous than Europe’s. “We should be clear in our minds that the fiscal situation in the United States is much worse than in Europe,” he recently told reporters. “In one or two years, when the European debt situation stabilizes, [the] attention of financial markets will definitely shift to the United States. At that time, U.S. Treasury bonds and the dollar will experience considerable declines.” Moreover, unless we do something, federal spending is on course to consume 43 percent of GDP by the middle of the century. Throw in state and local spending, and government at all levels will take 60 cents out of every dollar produced in this country. Our economy will not long survive government spending at those levels.

####  Winners win – Plan lets the Obama sweep through gridlock and raise the debt ceiling more quickly.

Hirsch, 13 (Michael, Chief correspondent for the National Journal. There’s No Such Thing as Political Capital. http://www.nationaljournal.com/magazine/there-s-no-such-thing-as-political-capital-20130207)

But the abrupt emergence of the immigration and gun-control issues illustrates how suddenly shifts in mood can occur and how political interests can align in new ways just as suddenly. Indeed, the pseudo-concept of political capital masks a larger truth about Washington that is kindergarten simple: You just don’t know what you can do until you try. Or as Ornstein himself once wrote years ago, “Winning wins.” In theory, and in practice, depending on Obama’s handling of any particular issue, even in a polarized time, he could still deliver on a lot of his second-term goals, depending on his skill and the breaks. Unforeseen catalysts can appear, like Newtown. Epiphanies can dawn, such as when many Republican Party leaders suddenly woke up in panic to the huge disparity in the Hispanic vote.¶ Some political scientists who study the elusive calculus of how to pass legislation and run successful presidencies say that political capital is, at best, an empty concept, and that almost nothing in the academic literature successfully quantifies or even defines it. “It can refer to a very abstract thing, like a president’s popularity, but there’s no mechanism there. That makes it kind of useless,” says Richard Bensel, a government professor at Cornell University. Even Ornstein concedes that the calculus is far more complex than the term suggests. Winning on one issue often changes the calculation for the next issue; there is never any known amount of capital. “The idea here is, if an issue comes up where the conventional wisdom is that president is not going to get what he wants, and he gets it, then each time that happens, it changes the calculus of the other actors” Ornstein says. “If they think he’s going to win, they may change positions to get on the winning side. It’s a bandwagon effect.”