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## Terrorism DA

#### Judicial review makes it impossible to target terrorists

Vladeck 13

Steve Vladeck is a professor of law and the associate dean for scholarship at American University Washington College of Law, 2/10/13, “Why a “Drone Court” Won’t Work–But (Nominal) Damages Might…”, http://www.lawfareblog.com/2013/02/why-a-drone-court-wont-work/ //jchen

This ties together with the related point of just how difficult it would be to actually have meaningful ex ante review in a context in which time is so often of the essence. If, as I have to think is true, many of the opportunities for these kinds of operations are fleeting–and often open and close within a short window–then a requirement of judicial review in all cases might actually prevent the government from otherwise carrying out authority that most would agree it has (at least in the appropriate circumstances). This possibility is exactly why FISA itself was enacted with a pair of emergency provisions (one for specific emergencies; one for the beginning of a declared war), and comparable emergency exceptions in this context would almost necessarily swallow the rule. Indeed, the narrower a definition of imminence that we accept, the more this becomes a problem, since the time frame in which the government could simultaneously demonstrate that a target (1) poses such a threat to the United States; and (2) cannot be captured through less lethal measures will necessarily be a vanishing one. Even if judicial review were possible in that context, it’s hard to imagine that it would produce wise, just, or remotely reliable decisions.

That’s why, even though I disagree with the DOJ white paper that ex ante review would present a nonjusticiable political question, I actually agree that courts are ill-suited to hear such cases–not because, as the white paper suggests, they lack the power to do so, but because, in most such cases, they would lack the competence to do so.

#### Disruption and denial key to solve nuclear terror

**Montgomery 09** – (2009, Evan Braden, Research Fellow, has published on a range of issues, including alliance politics, nuclear terrorism, military doctrine, and political revolutions, Center for Strategic and Budgetary Assessments, MA in Foreign Affairs, PhD Candidate at UVA, “Nuclear Terrorism: Assessing the Threat, Developing a Response,” http://www.dtic.mil/cgi-bin/GetTRDoc?AD=ADA506768)

The second major implication addresses the demand side of the threat. Speciﬁcally, a critical component of a broader strategy to prevent a nuclear terrorist attack will involve measures **directed at weakening al Qaeda’s leaders and eliminating** — or at the very least restricting — **their sanctuary in the FATA**. Because obtaining or building a nuclear device and delivering it to a target would be a difﬁcult and expensive operation,89 it is highly likely that any credible plot will originate with al Qaeda’s central leadership, whether its operatives attempt to carry out such an attack on their own or instead ﬁnance, organize, and coordinate the efforts of one or more afﬁliates. By themselves, al Qaeda’s various franchises and especially local extremists would likely ﬁnd an attack of this scale beyond their abilities. In fact, the group’s franchises might not even be tasked to help with such a large and important operation, beyond providing limited logistical support. According to Bruce Hoffman, “high value, ‘spectacular’ attacks are entrusted only to al Qaeda’s professional cadre: the most dedicated, committed, and absolutely reliable elements of the movement.”90 Therefore, to the extent that its sanctuary in the FATA has allowed al Qaeda’s leadership to regain its strength and plan future operations, the probability that the group might be able to conduct a catastrophic attack at some point in the future has correspondingly increased.

#### Nuclear terror causes accidental US-Russia nuclear war.

**Barrett et al. 2013** – (6/28, Anthony, PhD, Engineering and Public Policy from Carnegie Mellon University, Director of Research, Global Catastrophic Risk Institute, Fellow in the RAND Stanton Nuclear Security Fellows Program, Seth Baum, PhD, Geography, Pennsylvania State University, Executive Director, GCRI, Research Scientist at the Blue Marble Space Institute of Science, former Visiting Scholar position at the Center for Research on Environmental Decisions at Columbia University, and Kelly Hostetler, Research Assistant, GCRI, “Analyzing and Reducing the Risks of Inadvertent Nuclear War Between the United States and Russia,” Science and Global Security 21(2): 106-133, pre-print, available online)

War involving significant fractions of the U.S. and Russian nuclear arsenals, which are by far the largest of any nations, could have globally catastrophic effects such as severely reducing food production for years,1 potentially leading to collapse of modern civilization worldwide and even the **extinction of humanity**.2 Nuclear war between the United States and Russia could occur by various routes, including accidental or unauthorized launch; deliberate first attack by one nation; and inadvertent attack. In an accidental or unauthorized launch or detonation, system safeguards or procedures to maintain control over nuclear weapons fail in such a way that a nuclear weapon or missile launches or explodes without direction from leaders. In a deliberate first attack, the attacking nation decides to attack based on accurate information about the state of affairs. In an inadvertent attack, the attacking nation mistakenly concludes that it is under attack and launches nuclear weapons in what it believes is a counterattack.3 (Brinkmanship strategies incorporate elements of all of the above, in that they involve intentional manipulation of risks from otherwise accidental or inadvertent launches.4 )

Over the years, nuclear strategy was aimed primarily at minimizing risks of intentional attack through development of deterrence capabilities, though numerous measures were also taken to reduce probabilities of accidents, unauthorized attack, and inadvertent war. For purposes of deterrence, both U.S. and Soviet/Russian forces have maintained significant capabilities to have some forces survive a first attack by the other side and to launch a subsequent counterattack. However, concerns about the extreme disruptions that a first attack would cause in the other side’s forces and command-and-control capabilities led to both sides’ development of capabilities to detect a first attack and launch a counter-attack before suffering damage from the first attack.5

Many people believe that with the end of the Cold War and with improved relations between the United States and Russia, the risk of East-West nuclear war was significantly reduced.6 However, it has also been argued that inadvertent nuclear war between the United States and Russia has continued to present a substantial risk.7 While the United States and Russia are not actively threatening each other with war, they have remained ready to launch nuclear missiles in response to indications of attack.8

False indicators of nuclear attack could be caused in several ways. First, a wide range of events have already been mistakenly interpreted as indicators of attack, including weather phenomena, a faulty computer chip, wild animal activity, and control-room training tapes loaded at the wrong time.9 Second, terrorist groups or other actors might cause attacks on either the United States or Russia that resemble some kind of nuclear attack by the other nation by actions such as exploding a stolen or improvised nuclear bomb,10 especially if such an event occurs during a crisis between the United States and Russia.11 A variety of nuclear terrorism scenarios are possible.12 Al Qaeda has sought to obtain or construct nuclear weapons and to use them against the United States.13 Other methods could involve attempts to circumvent nuclear weapon launch control safeguards or exploit holes in their security.14

It has long been argued that the probability of inadvertent nuclear war is significantly higher during U.S.-Russian crisis conditions,15 with the Cuban Missile Crisis being a prime historical example. It is possible that U.S.-Russian relations will significantly deteriorate in the future, increasing nuclear tensions. There are a variety of ways for a third party to raise tensions between the United States and Russia, making one or both nations more likely to misinterpret events as attacks.16

## Resolve

#### Congressional restrictions cause adversaries to doubt the resolve of U.S. deterrence – causes crisis escalation.

Waxman 8/25 [Matthew Waxman 8/25/13, Professor of Law – Columbia and Adjunct Senior Fellow for Law and Foreign Policy – CFR, “The Constitutional Power to Threaten War,” Forthcoming in Yale Law Journal, vol. 123, August 25, 2013, SSRN]

A claim previously advanced from a presidentialist perspective is that stronger legislative checks on war powers is harmful to coercive and deterrent strategies, because it **establishes easily-visible impediments to the President’s authority** to follow through on threats. This was a common policy argument during the War Powers Resolution debates in the early 1970s. Eugene Rostow, an advocate inside and outside the government for executive primacy, remarked during consideration of legislative drafts that **any serious restrictions** on presidential use of force would mean in practice that “no President could make a credible threat to use force as an instrument of deterrent diplomacy, even to head off **explosive confrontations.”**178 He continued:¶ In the tense and cautious diplomacy of our present relations with the Soviet Union, as they have developed over the last twenty-five years, the authority of the President to set clear and silent limits in advance is perhaps the most important of all the powers in our constitutional armory to prevent confrontations that could carry nuclear implications. … [I]t is the diplomatic power the President needs most under the circumstance of modern life—the power to make a credible threat to use force in order to prevent a confrontation **which might escalate.**179

#### Credible conventional deterrence checks nuclear aggression

Gerson 09

MICHAEL S. GERSON, research analyst at the Center for Naval Analyses, Policy Fellow with the ONE Campaign, a visiting fellow with the Center for Public Justice, and a former senior fellow at the Council on Foreign Relations,“Conventional Deterrence in the Second Nuclear Age”, Strategic Studies Institute, Autumn 2009 //jchen

Although implicit or explicit nuclear threats may lack credibili- ty against non-WMD regimes, many potential adversaries believe that the United States will use conventional firepower, especially because America has conventional superiority and a demonstrated willingness to use it. Consequently, when dealing with non-WMD-related threats, conventional deterrence will be the most likely mechanism for deterring hostile actions.

According to Admiral Michael Mullen, the current Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, “A big part of credibility, of course, lies in our convention- al capability. The capability to project power globally and conduct effective theater-level operations . . . remains essential to deterrence effectiveness.”14

Conventional deterrence also plays an important role in preventing nonnuclear aggression by nuclear-armed regimes. Regional nuclear pro- liferation may not only increase the chances for the use of nuclear weap- ons, but, equally important, the possibility of conventional aggression. The potential for conventional conflict under the shadow of mutual nucle- ar deterrence was a perennial concern throughout the Cold War, and that scenario is still relevant. A nuclear-armed adversary may be emboldened to use conventional force against US friends and allies, or to sponsor ter- rorism, in the belief that its nuclear capabilities give it an effective deter- rent against US retaliation or intervention.15 For example, a regime might calculate that it could undertake conventional aggression against a neigh- bor and, after achieving a relatively quick victory, issue implicit or explicit nuclear threats in the expectation that the United States (and perhaps coali- tion partners) would choose not to get involved.

In this context, conventional deterrence can be an important mech- anism to limit options for regional aggression below the nuclear threshold. By deploying robust conventional forces in and around the theater of potential conflict, the United States can credibly signal that it can respond to conventional aggression at the outset, and therefore the opponent can- not hope to simultaneously achieve a quick conventional victory and use nuclear threats to deter US involvement. Moreover, if the United States can convince an opponent that US forces will be engaged at the beginning of hostilities—and will therefore incur the human and financial costs of war from the start—it can help persuade opponents that the United States would be highly resolved to fight even in the face of nuclear threats be- cause American blood and treasure would have already been expended.16 Similar to the Cold War, the deployment of conventional power in the re- gion, combined with significant nuclear capabilities and escalation dom- inance, can help prevent regimes from believing that nuclear possession provides opportunities for conventional aggression and coercion.

#### Foreign policy resolve’s key to prevent a host of impacts

Chapin and Hanson 9 – Bernard Chapin- interviewer, and Victor Davis Hanson, the Martin and Illie Anderson senior fellow at the Hoover Institution, December 7, 2009, “Change, weakness, disaster,” online: http://pajamasmedia.com/blog/change-weakness-disaster-obama-answers-from-victor-davis-hanson/

BC: Are we currently sending a message of weakness to our foes and allies? Can anything good result from President Obama’s marked submissiveness before the world? Dr. Hanson: Obama is one bow and one apology away from a circus. The world can understand a kowtow gaffe to some Saudi royals, but not as part of a deliberate pattern. Ditto the mea culpas. Much of diplomacy rests on public perceptions, however trivial. We are now in a great waiting game, as regional hegemons, wishing to redraw the existing landscape — whether China, Venezuela, Iran, North Korea, Pakistan, Syria, etc. — are just waiting to see who’s going to be the first to try Obama — and whether Obama really will be as tenuous as they expect. If he slips once, it will be 1979 redux, when we saw the rise of radical Islam, the Iranian hostage mess, the communist inroads in Central America, the Soviet invasion of Afghanistan, etc. BC: With what country then — Venezuela, Russia, Iran, etc. — do you believe his global repositioning will cause the most damage? Dr. Hanson: I think all three. I would expect, in the next three years, Iran to get the bomb and begin to threaten ever so insidiously its Gulf neighborhood; Venezuela will probably cook up some scheme to do a punitive border raid into Colombia to apprise South America that U.S. friendship and values are liabilities; and Russia will continue its energy bullying of Eastern Europe, while insidiously pressuring autonomous former republics to get back in line with some sort of new Russian autocratic commonwealth. There’s an outside shot that North Korea might do something really stupid near the 38th parallel and China will ratchet up the pressure on Taiwan. India’s borders with both Pakistan and China will heat up. I think we got off the back of the tiger and now no one quite knows whom it will bite or when.

## Politics

#### Obama’s pressuring the GOP by staying on the debt message – the GOP will blink.

Dovere 10/1 [Edward, Politico, “Government shutdown: President Obama holds the line”

http://www.politico.com/story/2013/10/government-shutdown-president-obama-holds-the-line-97646.html?hp=f3]

President Barack Obama started September in an agonizing, extended display of how little sway he had in Congress. He ended the month with a display of resolve and strength that could redefine his presidency. All it took was a government shutdown. This was less a White House strategy than simply staying in the corner the House GOP had painted them into — to the White House’s surprise, Obama was forced to do what he so rarely has as president: he said no, and he didn’t stop saying no. For two weeks ahead of Monday night’s deadline, Obama and aides rebuffed the efforts to kill Obamacare with the kind of firm, narrow sales pitch they struggled with in three years of trying to convince people the law should exist in the first place. There was no litany of doomsday scenarios that didn’t quite come true, like in the run-up to the fiscal cliff and the sequester. No leaked plans or musings in front of the cameras about Democratic priorities he might sacrifice to score a deal. After five years of what’s often seen as Obama’s desperation to negotiate — to the fury of his liberal base and the frustration of party leaders who argue that he negotiates against himself. Even his signature health care law came with significant compromises in Congress. Instead, over and over and over again, Obama delivered the simple line: Republicans want to repeal a law that was passed and upheld by the Supreme Court — to give people health insurance — or they’ll do something that everyone outside the GOP caucus meetings, including Wall Street bankers, seems to agree would be a ridiculous risk. “If we lock these Americans out of affordable health care for one more year,” Obama said Monday afternoon as he listed examples of people who would enjoy better treatment under Obamacare, “if we sacrifice the health care of millions of Americans — then they’ll fund the government for a couple more months. Does anybody truly believe that we won’t have this fight again in a couple more months? Even at Christmas?” The president and his advisers weren’t expecting this level of Republican melee, a White House official said. Only during Sen. Ted Cruz’s (R-Texas) 21-hour floor speech last week did the realization roll through the West Wing that they wouldn’t be negotiating because they couldn’t figure out anymore whom to negotiate with. And even then, they didn’t believe the shutdown was really going to happen until Saturday night, when the House voted again to strip Obamacare funding. This wasn’t a credible position, Obama said again Monday afternoon, but rather, bowing to “extraneous and controversial demands” which are “all to save face after making some impossible promises to the extreme right wing of their political party.” Obama and aides have said repeatedly that they’re not thinking about the shutdown in terms of political gain, but the situation’s is taking shape for them. Congress’s approval on dealing with the shutdown was at 10 percent even before the shutters started coming down on Monday according to a new CNN/ORC poll, with 69 percent of people saying the House Republicans are acting like “spoiled children.” “The Republicans are making themselves so radioactive that the president and Democrats can win this debate in the court of public opinion” by waiting them out, said Jim Manley, a Democratic strategist and former aide to Senate Majority Leader Harry Reid who has previously been critical of Obama’s tactics. Democratic pollster Stan Greenberg said the Obama White House learned from the 2011 debt ceiling standoff, when it demoralized fellow Democrats, deflated Obama’s approval ratings and got nothing substantive from the negotiations. “They didn’t gain anything from that approach,” Greenberg said. “I think that there’s a lot they learned from what happened the last time they ran up against the debt ceiling.” While the Republicans have been at war with each other, the White House has proceeded calmly — a breakthrough phone call with Iranian President Hassan Rouhani Friday that showed him getting things done (with the conveniently implied juxtaposition that Tehran is easier to negotiate with than the GOP conference), his regular golf game Saturday and a cordial meeting Monday with his old sparring partner Israeli Prime Minister Benjamin Netanyahu. White House press secretary Jay Carney said Monday that the shutdown wasn’t really affecting much of anything. “It’s busy, but it’s always busy here,” Carney said. “It’s busy for most of you covering this White House, any White House. We’re very much focused on making sure that the implementation of the Affordable Care Act continues.” Obama called all four congressional leaders Monday evening — including Boehner, whose staff spent Friday needling reporters to point out that the president hadn’t called for a week. According to both the White House and Boehner’s office, the call was an exchange of well-worn talking points, and changed nothing. Manley advised Obama to make sure people continue to see Boehner and the House Republicans as the problem and not rush into any more negotiations until public outrage forces them to bend. “He may want to do a little outreach, but not until the House drives the country over the cliff,” Manley said Monday, before the shutdown. “Once the House has driven the country over the cliff and failed to fund the government, then it might be time to make a move.” The White House believes Obama will take less than half the blame for a shutdown – with the rest heaped on congressional Republicans. The divide is clear in a Gallup poll also out Monday: over 70 percent of self-identifying Republicans and Democrats each say their guys are the ones acting responsibly, while just 9 percent for both say the other side is. If Obama is able to turn public opinion against Republicans, the GOP won’t be able to turn the blame back on Obama, Greenberg said. “Things only get worse once things begin to move in a particular direction,” he said. “They don’t suddenly start going the other way as people rethink this.”

#### Going off message undermines Obama’s constant pressure on the GOP.

Milbank 9/27 [Dana, Washington Post, “Obama should pivot to Dubya’s playbook” Washington Post, http://www.washingtonpost.com/opinions/dana-milbank-obama-should-try-pivoting-to-george-bushs-playbook/2013/09/27/c72469f0-278a-11e3-ad0d-b7c8d2a594b9\_story.html]

If President Obama can stick to his guns, **he will win** his October standoff with Republicans. That’s an awfully big “if.” This president has been consistently inconsistent, predictably unpredictable and reliably erratic. Consider the events of Thursday morning: Obama gave a rousing speech in suburban Washington, in defense of Obamacare, on the eve of its implementation. “We’re now only five days away from finishing the job,” he told the crowd. But before he had even left the room, his administration let slip that it was delaying by a month the sign-up for the health-care exchanges for small businesses. It wasn’t a huge deal, but it was enough to trample on the message the president had just delivered. Throughout his presidency, Obama has had great difficulty delivering a consistent message. Supporters plead for him to take a position — any position — and stick with it. His shifting policy on confronting Syria was the most prominent of his vacillations, but his allies have seen a similar approach to the Guantanamo Bay prison, counterterrorism and climate change. Even on issues such as gun control and immigration where his views have been consistent, Obama has been inconsistent in promoting his message. Allies are reluctant to take risky stands, because they fear that Obama will change his mind and leave them standing alone. Now come the budget showdowns, which could define the rest of his presidency. Republican leaders are trying to shift the party’s emphasis from the fight over a government shutdown to the fight over the debt-limit increase, where they have more support. A new Bloomberg poll found that Americans, by a 2-to-1 margin, disagree with Obama’s view that Congress should raise the debt limit without any conditions. But Obama has a path to victory. That poll also found that Americans think lawmakers should stop trying to repeal Obamacare. And that was before House Republicans dramatically overplayed their hand by suggesting that they’ll allow the nation to default if Obama doesn’t agree to their laundry list of demands, including suspending Obamacare, repealing banking reforms, building a new oil pipeline, easing environmental regulations, limiting malpractice lawsuits and restricting access to Medicare. To beat the Republicans, Obama might follow the example of a Republican, George W. Bush. Whatever you think of what he did, he knew how to get it done: by **simplifying his message and repeating it**, ad nauseam, until he got the result he was after. Obama instead tends to give a speech and move along to the next topic. This is why he is forever making “pivots” back to the economy, or to health care. But the way to pressure Congress is to be **President One Note**. In the debt-limit fight, Obama already has his note: He will not negotiate over the full faith and credit of the United States. That’s as good a theme as any; it matters less what the message is than that he delivers it **consistently.** The idea, White House officials explained to me, is to avoid getting into a back-and-forth over taxes, spending and entitlement programs. “We’re right on the merits, but I don’t think we want to argue on the merits,” one said. “Our argument is not that our argument is better than theirs; it’s that theirs is stupid.” This is a clean message: Republicans are threatening to tank the economy — through a shutdown or, more likely, through a default on the debt — and Obama isn’t going to negotiate with these hostage-takers. Happily for Obama, Republicans are helping him to make the case by being publicly belligerent. After this week’s 21-hour speech on the Senate floor by Sen. Ted Cruz (R-Tex.), the publicity-seeking Texan and Sen. Mike Lee (R-Utah) objected to a bipartisan request to move a vote from Friday to Thursday to give House Republicans more time to craft legislation avoiding a shutdown. On the Senate floor, Sen. Bob Corker (R-Tenn.) accused them of objecting because they had sent out e-mails encouraging their supporters to tune in to the vote on Friday. The Post’s Ed O’Keefe caught Cruz “appearing to snicker” as his colleague spoke — more smug teenager than legislator. Even if his opponents are making things easier for him, Obama still needs to stick to his message. As in Syria, the president has drawn a “red line” by saying he won’t negotiate with those who would put the United States into default. **If he retreats, he will embolden his opponents and demoralize his supporters.**

#### Failure to lift the ceiling collapses the global economy.

Davidson 9/10 [Adam, co-founder of NPR’s "Planet Money," Our Debt to Society, New York Times, 9/10/13, http://www.nytimes.com/2013/09/15/magazine/our-debt-to-society.html?pagewanted=all]

If the debt ceiling isn’t lifted again this fall, some serious financial decisions will have to be made. Perhaps the government can skimp on its foreign aid or furlough all of NASA, but eventually the big-ticket items, like Social Security and Medicare, will have to be cut. At some point, the government won’t be able to pay interest on its bonds and will enter what’s known as sovereign default, the ultimate national financial disaster achieved by countries like Zimbabwe, Ecuador and Argentina (and now Greece). In the case of the United States, though, it won’t be an isolated national crisis. If the American government can’t stand behind the dollar, the world’s benchmark currency, then the global financial system will very likely enter a new era in which there is much less trade and much less economic growth. It would be, by most accounts, the largest self-imposed financial disaster in history. Nearly everyone involved predicts that someone will blink before this disaster occurs. Yet a small number of House Republicans (one political analyst told me it’s no more than 20) appear willing to see what happens if the debt ceiling isn’t raised — at least for a bit. This could be used as leverage to force Democrats to drastically cut government spending and eliminate President Obama’s signature health-care-reform plan. In fact, Representative Tom Price, a Georgia Republican, told me that the whole problem could be avoided if the president agreed to drastically cut spending and lower taxes. Still, it is hard to put this act of game theory into historic context. Plenty of countries — and some cities, like Detroit — have defaulted on their financial obligations, but only because their governments ran out of money to pay their bills. No wealthy country has ever voluntarily decided — in the middle of an economic recovery, no less — to default. And there’s certainly no record of that happening to the country that controls the global reserve currency. Like many, I assumed a self-imposed U.S. debt crisis might unfold like most involuntary ones. If the debt ceiling isn’t raised by X-Day, I figured, the world’s investors would begin to see America as an unstable investment and rush to sell their Treasury bonds. The U.S. government, desperate to hold on to investment, would then raise interest rates far higher, hurtling up rates on credit cards, student loans, mortgages and corporate borrowing — which would effectively put a clamp on all trade and spending. The U.S. economy **would collapse far worse than anything we’ve seen in the past several years.** Instead, Robert Auwaerter, head of bond investing for Vanguard, the world’s largest mutual-fund company, told me that the collapse might be more insidious. “You know what happens when the market gets upset?” he said. “There’s a flight to quality. Investors buy Treasury bonds. It’s a bit perverse.” In other words, if the U.S. comes within shouting distance of a default (which Auwaerter is confident won’t happen), the world’s investors — absent a safer alternative, given the recent fates of the euro and the yen — might actually buy even more Treasury bonds. Indeed, interest rates would fall and the bond markets would soar. While this possibility might not sound so bad, it’s really far more damaging than the apocalyptic one I imagined. Rather than resulting in a sudden crisis, failure to raise the debt ceiling would lead to a slow bleed. Scott Mather, head of the global portfolio at Pimco, the world’s largest private bond fund, explained that while governments and institutions might go on a U.S.-bond buying frenzy in the wake of a debt-ceiling panic, they would eventually recognize that the U.S. government was not going through an odd, temporary bit of insanity. They would eventually conclude that it had become permanently less reliable. Mather imagines institutional investors and governments turning to a basket of currencies, putting their savings in a mix of U.S., European, Canadian, Australian and Japanese bonds. Over the course of decades, the U.S. would lose its unique role in the global economy. The U.S. benefits enormously from its status as global reserve currency and safe haven. Our interest and mortgage rates are lower; companies are able to borrow money to finance their new products more cheaply. As a result, there is much more economic activity and more wealth in America than there would be otherwise. If that status erodes, the U.S. economy’s peaks will be lower and recessions deeper; future generations will have fewer job opportunities and suffer more when the economy falters. And, Mather points out, no other country would benefit from America’s diminished status. When you make the base risk-free asset more risky, the entire global economy becomes riskier and costlier.

#### Economic collapse causes global nuclear war.

Merlini, Senior Fellow – Brookings, 11

[Cesare Merlini, nonresident senior fellow at the Center on the United States and Europe and chairman of the Board of Trustees of the Italian Institute for International Affairs (IAI) in Rome. He served as IAI president from 1979 to 2001. Until 2009, he also occupied the position of executive vice chairman of the Council for the United States and Italy, which he co-founded in 1983. His areas of expertise include transatlantic relations, European integration and nuclear non-proliferation, with particular focus on nuclear science and technology. A Post-Secular World? DOI: 10.1080/00396338.2011.571015 Article Requests: Order Reprints : Request Permissions Published in: journal Survival, Volume 53, Issue 2 April 2011 , pages 117 - 130 Publication Frequency: 6 issues per year Download PDF Download PDF (~357 KB) View Related Articles To cite this Article: Merlini, Cesare 'A Post-Secular World?', Survival, 53:2, 117 – 130]

Two neatly opposed scenarios for the future of the world order illustrate the range of possibilities, albeit at the risk of oversimplification. The first scenario entails the premature crumbling of the post-Westphalian system. One or more of the acute tensions apparent today evolves into an open and traditional conflict between states, perhaps even involving the use of nuclear weapons. The crisis might be triggered by a collapse of the global economic and financial system, the vulnerability of which we have just experienced, and the prospect of a second Great Depression, with consequences for peace and democracy similar to those of the first. Whatever the trigger, the unlimited exercise of national sovereignty, exclusive self-interest and rejection of outside interference would likely be amplified, emptying, perhaps entirely, the half-full glass of multilateralism, including the UN and the European Union. Many of the more likely conflicts, such as between Israel and Iran or India and Pakistan, have potential religious dimensions. Short of war, tensions such as those related to immigration might become unbearable. Familiar issues of creed and identity could be exacerbated. One way or another, the secular rational approach would be sidestepped by a return to theocratic absolutes, competing or converging with secular absolutes such as unbridled nationalism.

## XO

#### Text

## Case

### Solvency

#### Drone courts fail – no transparency or accountability, still secret

CSM 13

Christian Science Monitor, Anna Mulrine, Staff writer, 5/24/13, “Would a US 'drone court' to authorize drone strikes be a good idea? (+video)”, http://www.csmonitor.com/USA/DC-Decoder/2013/0524/Would-a-US-drone-court-to-authorize-drone-strikes-be-a-good-idea-video //jchen

Critics of the drone program, however, are generally not reassured by the notion of oversight from a special drone court. They note that the FISA courts, on which the drone courts would be modeled, operate largely in secret, doing little to improve accountability to the public.

What’s more, they say, national and international laws are already in place governing when drone strikes are legal. Those laws, they add, offer greater transparency than would a secret court.

“I’m not big on this,” Sarah Holewinski, executive director of the Center for Civilians in Conflict, says of the drone courts. “The fact is, we have international laws. We have domestic laws. I would focus on those and say, ‘Look, here’s the due diligence you need to do in targeting a combatant. Here’s what you need to do in order to avoid civilians. Here’s what proportionality looks like.’ ”

Zeke Johnson, director of Amnesty International’s Security and Human Rights Campaign, argues that drone courts would do little to change critics' fundamental concerns about drone strikes.

“What’s needed on drones is not a ‘kill court,’ but a rejection of the radical redefinition of ‘imminence’ used to expand who can be killed – as well as independent investigations of alleged extrajudicial executions and remedy for victims,” he says.

#### Public will still be skeptical because of secrecy

WSJ 13

WSJ 3/18/13, JULIAN E. BARNES, “'Drone Court' Idea Called Into Question”, http://online.wsj.com/article/SB10001424127887324323904578368340635025254.html //jchen

Under the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act, Congress has set up court oversight of national-security surveillance inside the U.S.

Voicing doubts about establishment of a similar court to oversee drone strikes, Mr. Johnson said its proceedings would be secret and judges likely would reject few of the government's requests. That would lead the media and the public to take a skeptical view of it, he said.

Mr. Johnson added that such a court may be unconstitutional, by infringing on the president's role as commander in chief.

#### Perceived as a rubber stamp – doesn’t solve groupthink

Greenwald 13

Glenn Greenwald, broke the Edward Snowden story, award-winning journalist, former constitutional litigator and author of three New York Times bestsellers, JD from New York University Law School, 5/3/13, “The bad joke called 'the FISA court' shows how a 'drone court' would work”, The Guardian, http://www.theguardian.com/commentisfree/2013/may/03/fisa-court-rubber-stamp-drones //jchen

But does anyone believe that a "drone court" would be any less of a mindless rubber-stamp than the Fisa court already is? Except for a handful of brave judges who take seriously their constitutionally assigned role of independence, the vast majority of federal judges are far too craven to tell the president that he has not submitted sufficient proof that would allow him to kill someone he claims is a Terrorist. The fact that it would all take place in secret, with only the DOJ present, further ensures that the results would mirror the embarrassing subservience of the Fisa court. As former Pentagon chief counsel Jeh Johnson put it in a speech last month discussing this proposal:

"Its proceedings would necessarily be ex parte and in secret, and, like a FISA court, I suspect almost all of the government's applications would be granted, because, like a FISA application, the government would be sure to present a compelling case. So, at the same time the New York Times editorial page promotes a FISA-like court for targeted lethal force, it derides the FISA court as a 'rubber stamp' because it almost never rejects an application. How long before a 'drone court' operating in secret is criticized in the same way?"

#### Executive circumvention – they’ll evade drone court jurisdiction

Taylor 13

Paul Taylor, Senior Research Fellow @ Center for Policy & Research, “Former DOD Lawyer Frowns on Drone Court”, 3/23/13, http://transparentpolicy.org/2013/03/former-dod-lawyer-frowns-on-drone-court/ //jchen

Lastly, there is the concern of creating perverse incentives: whether a person’s name or identity is known has never been a factor in determining the legality of targeting an otherwise-lawful military target. But by creating a separate legal regime for known targets, we could create a disincentive to collect information about a target. We do not want a military or intelligence agency that keeps itself intentionally uninformed. Nor do we want to halt a military operation in progress simply because one of the targets is recognized late. Conducting the review ex post would not eliminate these issues, but it would substantially mitigate them. The military (or CIA, if it keeps its program), would not fear an interruption of its operations, and could even have an incentive to collect more information in order to later please a court that has plenty of time to look back at the past operations and question whether an individual was in fact targeted.

Not mentioned in Mr. Johnson’s comments, but related to his concern regarding perverse incentives, is another concern. The Executive, or some agency within it, may attempt to evade the jurisdiction of the court by claiming that it did not “specifically target” the individual, but was targeting under general constitutional authorities “someone” that appeared to be an imminent threat to the US–and now the case is moot. No court could enforce its jurisdiction before it knows that the individual is targeted, but it can enforce its jurisdiction after the targeting is brought to completion. In an ex post review, if the claim is made that the killing was not “targeted,” and thus that no review is necessary, the court will be able to employ its power to determine its own jurisdiction to enquire into the process leading to the killing, which in this type of review would be half the job.

### Drone Prolif

### 1NC Frontline

#### 1. International norm against drones fail – states won’t give up tech advantage

Megret 13

Frédéric Mégret, Associate-Professor, Faculty of Law, McGill University, Research Chair in the Law of Human Rights and Legal Pluralism, Centre for Human Rights and Legal Pluralism, “The Humanitarian Problem with Drones”, March 5, 2013, http://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract\_id=2228659 //jchen

A good classic example of this is the invention of the crossbow which conferred a very considerable military advantage to those troops that mastered its art; another example is the onset of modern aviation and the possibility, only just barely contemplated towards the end of the First World War, of aerial bombardment. In both cases, an attempt was made to reinstate the laws of war’s broad symmetry by trying to outlaw the weapon. In the case of the crossbow, Pope Innocent II famously pronounced it to be hateful to God and unfit for Christians; in the case of aerial bombardment, a Commission of Jurists was set up as part of the 1921 Washington Conference on the Limitations of armaments which adopted a fairly restrictive code for aerial warfare. It is no surprise that calls to severely regulate or perhaps even outlaw certain means and methods of combat were at their strongest in conditions of technological asymmetry, i.e.: when one side stood to benefit disproportionality from such regulation (the side that did not master the technology).

Both the attempts at regulating the crossbow and aerial bombardment were almost unmitigated catastrophes. In the case of the crossbow, the weapon was first only prohibited between Christians, allowing crusaders to use it at will against the Saracens; but quickly used between Christian nations as well, ultimately showing that a technological advance such as this was too precious to be relinquished against real foes. The Washington conference never led to a Convention and was essentially a fiasco. In both cases, it seems, the normative effort was suspected of, under humanitarian guise, unduly reining in technological progress, not adding much to what could be distilled from general principles of the laws of war, and unduly restricting states’ ability to develop a military advantage. If the precedents of the crossbow and aerial bombardment are any indication, then it is likely that efforts to regulate drone warfare would be headed the same way because it is simply beggars belief to think that powers that have such an edge would voluntarily limit, let alone relinquish it.

#### 2. Even if they model, drone prolif is slow- no investment

Micah Zenko 2013 (Douglas Dillon fellow in the Center for Preventive Action (CPA) at the Council on Foreign Relations (CFR). Previously, he worked for five years at the Harvard Kennedy School and in Washington, DC, at the Brookings Institution, Congressional Research Service, and State Department’s Office of Policy Planning, council on foreign relations, "Reforming US Drone Strike Policies" pdf)

Based on current trends, it is unlikely that most states will have, within ten years, the complete system architecture required to carry out distant drone strikes that would be harmful to U.S. national interests. However, those candidates able to obtain this technology will most likely be states with the financial resources to purchase or the industrial base to manufacture tactical short-range armed drones with limited firepower that lack the precision of U.S. laser-guided munitions; the intelligence collection and military command-and-control capabilities needed to deploy drones via line-of-sight communications; and crossborder adversaries who currently face attacks or the threat of attacks by manned aircraft, such as Israel into Lebanon, Egypt, or Syria; Russia into Georgia or Azerbaijan; Turkey into Iraq; and Saudi Arabia into Yemen. When compared to distant U.S. drone strikes, these contingencies do not require system-wide infrastructure and host-state support. Given the costs to conduct manned-aircraft strikes with minimal threat to pilots, it is questionable whether states will undertake the significant investment required for armed drones in the near term.

#### 3. Norms fail – other countries will reinterpret I-law to justify using drones

Lerner 13

Ben Lerner, Vice President for Government Relations at the Center for Security Policy in Washington, D.C, American Spectator, “Judging ‘Drones’ From Afar”, 3/25/13, http://spectator.org/archives/2013/03/25/judging-drones-from-afar/1

Whatever the potential motivations for trying to codify international rules for using UAVs, such a move would be ill advised. While in theory, every nation that signs onto a treaty governing UAVs will be bound by its requirements, it is unlikely to play out this way in practice. It strains credulity to assume that China, Russia, Iran, and other non-democratic actors will not selectively apply (at best) such rules to themselves while using them as a cudgel with which to bash their rivals and score political points. The United States and its democratic allies, meanwhile, are more likely to adhere to the commitments for which they signed up. The net result: we are boxed in as far as our own self-defense, while other nations with less regard for the rule of law go use their UAVs to take out whomever, whenever, contorting said “rules” as they see fit. One need only look at China’s manipulation of the Law of the Sea Treaty to justify its vast territorial claims at the expense of its neighbors to see how this often plays out.

And who would enforce the treaty’s rules — a third party tribunal? Would it be an apparatus of the United Nations, the same U.N. that assures us that it is not coming after the United States or its allies specifically, even as its investigation takes on as its “immediate focus” UAV operations recently conducted by those countries?

The United States already conducts warfare under the norms of centuries of practice of customary international law in areas such as military necessity and proportionality, as well as the norms to which we committed ourselves when we became party to the 1949 Geneva Conventions and the United Nations Charter. These same rules can adequately cover the use of UAVs in the international context. But if the United States were to create or agree to a separate international regime for UAVs, we would subject ourselves to new, politicized “rules” that would needlessly hold back countries that already use UAVs responsibly, while empowering those that do not.

America is in the midst of an important conversation about UAVs. President Obama should state unambiguously that we will not invite others to dictate its outcome.

#### Deterrence logic still applies – nations won’t recklessly deploy drones

Time 12

“Betting Against a Drone Arms Race”, Joseph Singh is a researcher at the Center for a New American Security, 8/13/12, http://nation.time.com/2012/08/13/betting-against-a-drone-arms-race/ //jchen

Instead, we must return to what we know about state behavior in an anarchistic international order. Nations will confront the same principles of deterrence, for example, when deciding to launch a targeted killing operation regardless of whether they conduct it through a drone or a covert amphibious assault team.

Drones may make waging war more domestically palatable, but they don’t change the very serious risks of retaliation for an attacking state. Any state **otherwise deterred** from using force abroad will not significantly increase its power projection on account of acquiring drones.

What’s more, the very states whose use of drones could threaten U.S. security – countries like China – are not democratic, which means that the possible political ramifications of the low risk of casualties resulting from drone use are irrelevant. For all their military benefits, putting drones into play requires an ability to meet the political and security risks associated with their use.

Despite these realities, there remain a host of defensible arguments one could employ to discredit the Obama drone strategy. The legal justification for targeted killings in areas not internationally recognized as war zones is uncertain at best.

Further, the short-term gains yielded by targeted killing operations in Pakistan, Somalia and Yemen, while debilitating to Al Qaeda leadership in the short-term, may serve to destroy already tenacious bilateral relations in the region and radicalize local populations.

Yet, the past decade’s experience with drones bears no evidence of impending instability in the global strategic landscape. Conflict may not be any less likely in the era of drones, but the nature of 21st Century warfare remains fundamentally unaltered despite their arrival in large numbers.

#### Long timeframe – neither India nor Pakistan currently have drones. Their card is making up future scenarios – give it no weight

#### Accidental war unlikely

Farley, 13 (Robert, assistant professor at the Patterson School of Diplomacy and International Commerce – University of Kentucky, April 5, “North Korea and the Fallacy of Accidental Wars”, The Diplomat, http://thediplomat.com/2013/04/05/north-korea-and-the-fallacy-of-accidental-wars/?all=true)

Accidental wars rarely happen. Historians have demonstrated that most wars initially deemed “accidental,” (perhaps most notably the First World War), have in actuality resulted from deliberative state policy, even if the circumstances of the war were unplanned. While war seems discordant, it actually requires a great deal of cooperation and coordination. Fundamentally, two parties have to agree to conduct a war; otherwise, you have either a punitive raid or an armed surrender negotiation.

#### No Indo-Pak war.

Loudon 8 [Bruce, The Australian, Doomsday dread, December 04, 2008, http://www.theaustralian.news.com.au/story/0,25197,24746635-25837,00.html]

THE doomsayers' published assessments tell the grim story: upwards of 12 million people killed on the first day of a nuclear exchange, more than 150 million dead in a longer nuclear conflict. Devastation and destruction on a scale that is almost unimaginable. A catastrophe that would vastly transcend that seen at Hiroshima and Nagasaki at the end of World War II. That is why, as India and Pakistan muscle up to each other after the Mumbai massacre and leaders from across the world hurry to counsel cool heads and caution in New Delhi and Islamabad, the unspoken fear everywhere is that the two South Asian neighbours could be pushed into the unthinkable: their fourth war, and one in which they would mobilise their nuclear arsenals. It is, it must be said, **an unlikely prospect.** No one in either capital -- even among the hotheads -- is thinking in those terms. **Experienced strategic analysts rule it out**. "Don't even think about it. It ain't going to happen," one says. But as the crisis over terrorism across South Asia deepens and jihadist groups linked to al-Qa'ida launch devastating attacks such as the one in Mumbai last week -- attacks designed to exacerbate tensions between India and Pakistan -- there is, in the view of most analysts, always the potential for events to tumble out of control and lead to a doomsday nuclear conflagration, with enormous loss of life. "South Asia's a nuclear tinderbox," a leading military analyst in New Delhi tells The Australian. "Yes, of course, I'd just about rule it out in the context of the face-off following the Mumbai attack. "But it's always there, always nagging at the edges of the constant tensions in the subcontinent. And there's no doubt that Osama (bin Laden) is doing his bit to stir the pot and do what he can to increase those tensions, since conflict between India and Pakistan serves the jihadist cause." Yesterday, US military officials in Washington, DC, closely monitoring the situation described the military temperature between the two neighbours as "pretty low right now", adding that although Pakistan has moved some aircraft and air defence units closer to the Indian border since the Mumbai attack, "on the nuclear side there is nothing". Which is hardly surprising, for the political will in both sides, despite the muscle-flexing, is **overwhelmingly against** resort to their nuclear arsenals. India, since it demonstrated its nuclear capability in 1998, has maintained a firm no-first-strike policy and a few days ago Pakistan's President Asif Ali Zardari turned longstanding Pakistani policy on its head (some believe to the annoyance of the country's powerful generals) by articulating a similar stance. On both sides there is a **mood of extreme caution** on the subject of any possible use of nuclear weapons, matched only by the intense secrecy that surrounds their arsenals.

### Legitimacy

#### Alt Causes –

#### Single issues not key to soft power– perceptions change slowly.

Gray, International Politics at Reading, 11 [COLIN S. GRAY is Professor of International Poli- tics and Strategic Studies at the University of Reading, England. He worked at the International Institute for Strategic Studies (London), and at Hudson Institute (Croton-on-Hudson, NY) before founding the Na- tional Institute for Public Policy, a defense-oriented think tank in the Washington, DC, area. Dr. Gray served for 5 years in the Reagan administration on the President’s General Advisory Committee on Arms SSI Monograph HARD POWER AND SOFT POWER: THE UTILITY OF MILITARY FORCE AS AN INSTRUMENT OF POLICY IN THE 21ST CENTURY Colin S. Gray April 2011]

The error lies in the search for, and inevitable finding of, “golden keys” and “silver bullets” to resolve current versions of **en- during problems.** Soft-power salesmen have a potent product-mix to sell, but they fail to appreciate the real- ity that **American soft power is a product essentially unalterable over a short span of years.** As a country with a cultural or civilizational brand that is unique and mainly rooted in deep historical, geographical, and ideational roots, America is not at liberty to emu- late a major car manufacturer and advertise an exten- sive and varied model range of persuasive soft-power profiles. Of course, some elements of soft power can be emphasized purposefully in tailored word and deed. However, foreign perceptions of the United States are no more developed from a blank page than the American past can be retooled and fine-tuned for contemporary advantage. Frustrating though it may be, a country cannot easily escape legacies from its past.

#### Can’t substitute for hard power.

Kroenig, Government at Georgetown, et al. 10 [Matthew, Department of Government, Georgetown University Melissa McAdam, Department of Political Science, University of California, Berkeley Steven Weber, Information School, University of California, Berkeley, Taking Soft Power Seriously, Comparative Strategy, Volume 29, Issue 5 November 2010 , pages 412 – 431]

Foreign policy actors have many reasons to experiment with soft power, not merely because its use can be less costly than hard power. But, soft power comes with its own quite **striking limitations**. Our research suggests that soft power strategies will be **unlikely to succeed** except under fairly restrictive conditions. It may very well be, then, that the U.S. foreign policy elite is at risk of **exaggerating** the effectiveness of soft power (rather than underutilizing it) as a tool of foreign policy. After all, international communication is fraught with difficulties, persuading people to change firmly held political views is hard, and individual attitudes are often thought to have an **insignificant role** in determining international political outcomes. Soft power, therefore, will probably be considered a niche foreign policy option useful for addressing a small fraction of the problems on Washington's foreign policy agenda. Analysts who suggest that soft power can easily be substituted for hard power or who maintain that soft power should provide an overarching guide to the formulation of U.S. foreign policy are **badly mistaken**. It is not conducive to good policy to employ the idea of soft power as a way of arguing against the use of military force, for example.

#### Can’t solve warming – China and India pollute for economic and geopolitical reasons – they don’t care about US credibility

#### No modeling – states lack infrastructural capacity

Levi 11 [Michael A. Levi David M. Rubenstein Senior Fellow for Energy and the Environment Why Don’t States Cooperate More on Energy and Climate? Posted on Tuesday, January 18, 2011 http://blogs.cfr.org/levi/2011/01/18/why-dont-states-cooperate-more-on-energy-and-climate/?utm\_source=feedburner&utm\_medium=feed&utm\_campaign=Feed%3A+mlevi+%28Michael+Levi%27s+Blog%29&utm\_content=Google+Reader]

I spent Friday and Saturday at an excellent (largely academic) workshop on international institutions and global governance. In our discussions about why states do and don’t cooperate, I was struck by how absent states’ capacity to cooperate was from the discussion. In particular, when it comes to energy and climate, it’s one of the bigger blind spots in how both practitioners and scholars think about cooperation. Here’s a simple example of what I’m referring to: People argue that international oil markets would function more smoothly if states would publish basic data on their domestic markets (supply, demand, stocks, etc). They observe that China (among others) doesn’t do that. The immediate conclusion is that Beijing doesn’t want to. The only policy recourse, then, is to pressure or persuade China to change tack. But in more than one recent conversation, people have emphasized to me that Beijing doesn’t have many of the needed statistics itself (though it’s working on developing its capacity). Badgering them won’t change that; until they develop the capacity to collect the right statistics, cooperation will fail. The same thing is true much more broadly. India, for example, won’t be able to force power plants to internalize pollution costs until it develops a serious environmental regulator. Brazil won’t get deforestation properly under control without stronger capacity to enforce the laws that it puts on the books. One might even argue that China won’t improve its IPR protection until its innovation system becomes much more capable of developing technologies itself. Our view of international politics, though, tends to focus much more on pure ambition than on these sorts of features that directly influence results.

#### Worst climate impacts take decades to arrive and don’t assume adaptation

Robert O. Mendelsohn 9, the Edwin Weyerhaeuser Davis Professor, Yale School of Forestry and Environmental Studies, Yale University, June 2009, “Climate Change and Economic Growth,” online: http://www.growthcommission.org/storage/cgdev/documents/gcwp060web.pdf

The heart of the debate about climate change comes from numerous warnings from scientists and others that give the impression that human- induced climate change is an immediate threat to society (IPCC 2007a, 2007c; Stern 2006). Millions of people might be vulnerable to health effects (IPCC 2007a), crop production might fall in the low latitudes (IPCC 2007a), water supplies might dwindle (IPCC 2007a), precipitation might fall in arid regions (IPCC 2007a), extreme events will grow exponentially (Stern 2006), and between 20 and 30 percent of species will risk extinction (IPCC 2007a). Even worse, there may be catastrophic events such as the melting of Greenland or Antarctic ice sheets, causing severe sea-level rise, which would inundate hundreds of millions of people (Dasgupta and others 2009). Proponents argue that there is no time to waste. Unless greenhouse gases are cut dramatically today, economic growth and well-being may be at risk (Stern 2006). These statements are largely alarmist and misleading. Although climate change is a serious problem that deserves attention, society’s immediate behavior has an extremely low probability of leading to catastrophic conse- quences. The science and economics of climate change are quite clear that emissions over the next few decades will lead to only mild consequences. The severe impacts predicted by alarmists require a century (or two, accord- ing to Stern 2006) of no mitigation. Many of the predicted impacts assume that there will be no or little adaptation. The net economic impacts from climate change over the next 50 years will be small regardless. Most of the more severe impacts will take more than a century or even a millennium to unfold, and many of these “potential” impacts will never occur because people will adapt. It is not at all apparent that immediate and dramatic policies need to be developed to thwart long-range climate risks. What is needed are long-run balanced responses.

#### Human diversity, medicine and evolutionary limits check Disease

Gladwell 95 [Malcolm, New York bureau chief of The Washington Post, New Republic, July 17]

This is what is wrong with the Andromeda Strain argument. Every infectious agent that has ever plagued humanity has had to adopt a specific strategy, but every strategy carries a corresponding cost, and this makes human counterattack possible. Malaria is vicious and deadly, but it relies on mosquitoes to spread from one human to the next, which means that draining swamps and putting up mosquito netting can all but halt endemic malaria. Smallpox is extraordinarily durable, remaining infectious in the environment for years, but its very durability, its essential rigidity, is what makes it one of the easiest microbes to create a vaccine against. aids is almost invariably lethal because its attacks the body at its point of great vulnerability, that is, the immune system, but the fact that it targets blood cells is what makes it so relatively uninfectious. I could go on, but the point is obvious. Any microbe capable of wiping us all out would have to be everything at once: as contagious as flu, as durable as the cold, as lethal as Ebola, as stealthy as HIV and so doggedly resistant to mutation that it would stay deadly over the course of a long epidemic. But viruses are not, well, superhuman. They cannot do everything at once. It is one of the ironies of the analysis of alarmists such as Preston that they are all too willing to point out the limitations of human beings, but they neglect to point out the limitations of microscopic life forms. If there are any conclusions to be drawn about disease, they are actually the opposite of what is imagined in books such as The Hot Zone and The Coming Plague. It is true that the effect of the dramatic demographic and social changes in the world over the past few decades is to create new opportunities for disease. But they are likely to create not homogeneous patterns of disease, as humans experienced in the past, so much as heterogeneous patterns of disease. People are traveling more and living in different combinations. Gene pools that were once distinct are mixing through intermarriage. Adults who once would have died in middle age are now living into their 80s. Children with particular genetic configurations who once died at birth or in infancy are now living longer lives. If you talk to demographers, they will tell you that what they anticipate is increasing clusters of new and odd diseases moving into these new genetic and demographic niches. Rare diseases will be showing up in greater numbers. Entirely unknown diseases will emerge for the first time. But the same diversity that created them within those population subgroups will keep them there. Laurie Garrett's book is mistitled. We are not facing "the coming plague." We are facing "the coming outbreaks."

# 2NC

### 2NC Will Pass

#### Obama will get it done now – no signs of budging.

The Hill 10/1 [Obama schedules events to hammer Boehner on shutdown, http://thehill.com/homenews/administration/326009-obama-schedules-events-to-hammer-boehner-on-shutdown]

President Obama will hold a series of events in the coming days to highlight the consequences of the government shutdown. The events will hammer home the White House’s argument that it is Republicans who are preventing the government from reopening, White House aides say. They will also portray Speaker John Boehner (R-Ohio) as unwilling to buck a “faction” of the Republican caucus. On Thursday, the president will appear at a local construction company that has benefited from federal loans. While there, he will highlight the real-world consequences of a shutdown, while casting blame for the crisis at the feet of House leadership. The speech will follow a meeting Wednesday between Obama and top corporate executives, intended to force the hand of Republicans and pressure them to come to the table with a deal. The meeting will remind the business leaders of the “consequences of the mere flirtation of default,” White House press secretary Jay Carney said on Tuesday. On Tuesday, Obama appeared in the Rose Garden, using the bully pulpit to underscore the fact that he would not compromise on the current budget fight or the upcoming debt-ceiling clash, which White House officials say would be catastrophic to the economy. “I will not negotiate over Congress’s responsibility to pay bills it’s already racked up,” Obama told reporters in a 20-minute statement. “I’m not going to allow anybody to drag the good name of the United States of America through the mud just to refight a settled election or extract ideological demands.” The president’s apparent resoluteness came even as the White House grappled with the practical consequences of a shutdown. In the White House press office, officials normally devoted to spinning the president’s message picked up some of the grunt work — like shepherding reporters across the White House grounds and placing the president’s remarks on his podium — usually reserved for now-furloughed low-level staffers. The White House’s Twitter feed even promoted the wrong time for Obama’s remarks, more indication of the behind-the-scenes strain. Most of the White House’s 438-member staff was deemed nonessential and sent home by midday, with only 129 staying at work. In the White House residence, only 15 of the 90 staffers were not furloughed. The administration wouldn’t comment on who specifically was allowed to continue working, and who was sent home. But both White House senior adviser Valerie Jarrett and photographer Pete Souza could be observed through the windows of the Oval Office Tuesday afternoon. The shutdown also threatened to throw a wrench in the president’s planned departure for an economic summit in Asia this weekend. Former President Clinton scrapped a trip to Japan during the 1995 shutdown, instead dispatching then-Vice President Al Gore. Carney would only say that the trip remained on the president’s schedule, dodging questions about whether it was even logistically possible for Obama to travel amid a shutdown. Despite the squeeze on resources, senior administration officials say the president has no intention to budge on this issue — or on the fight over the debt ceiling. “It would set a really bad precedent,” one former senior administration official said. “And it would be a mistake on both fronts.” There is a concern among White House officials that if Democrats accept a continuing resolution that includes concessions to the Tea Party, those House members would feel even more emboldened before fights over the debt ceiling or a funding bill that covers the entire year. The White House is also betting that House Republicans will feel pressured to give in over the course of the next few days, according to the former administration official. A spokesman for the president on Tuesday pointed to a pair of polls showing that voters are opposed to the idea of shutting down the government to oppose ObamaCare.

#### Boehner will fold – Obama just needs to keep pressing and stay on message.

Cohn 10/1 [Nate, The Failed Republican Moderate Revolt is Good News http://www.newrepublic.com/article/114935/shutdown-2013-failed-moderate-revolt-bodes-well-debt-ceiling]

Obviously, discontent wasn’t enough to avoid a government shutdown. But the mere existence of 20 to 30 Republicans willing to consider bolting from the party line over a budget shutdown bodes well for the country’s odds of avoiding a debt limit debacle, which would do far more harm than a government shutdown. And depending on how Boehner reassured antsy moderates, he may well have a relatively painless vision of how to proceed. Perhaps as importantly, Boehner's weak left flank has been exposed. It's now all but impossible to imagine Democrats backing down--even ahead of a debt ceiling showdown.

#### Obama only supports the plan on his own terms – he consistently opposes congressional intrusion. He’ll fight any attempts to control his foreign policy.

Kelley 12 [Christopher S. Kelley, Lecturer in the Department of Political Science at Miami University in Oxford, OH, Rhetoric and Reality? Unilateralism and the Obama Administration† 15 OCT 2012 Southwestern Social Science Association Issue Social Science Quarterly Social Science Quarterly Volume 93, Issue 5, pages 1146–1160, December 2012]

Obama has been fairly consistent in his use of the constitutional signing statement, employing it to **protect core presidential powers against congressional intrusion.** In particular, Obama has used the constitutional signing statement to protect his foreign policy/commander in chief powers, to protect separation of powers, in particular against the creation of executive agencies with legislative functions, or to protect his “Czars,” and he has used the constitutional signing statement to control inferior executive branch officers. To show that his actions are not out of the ordinary, Obama has also taken to invoking the names of previous presidents who have also made similar challenges in their signing statements. For instance, in challenging the creation of a “hybrid commission”—one that blends executive and legislative functions, Obama referred to a similar challenge made by President Reagan in 1982 (Obama, 2009c). Or, when signing an intelligence authorization bill in 2010, Obama based his challenge of a whistleblower provision on a similar challenge made by Bill Clinton in an intelligence authorization bill in 1998 (Obama, 2010).

#### Obama’s bandwidth is limited – plan trades off with domestic economic priorities.

Moore 9/10 [Heidi, Guardian's US finance and economics editor, “Syria: the great distraction; Obama is focused on a conflict abroad, but the fight he should be gearing up for is with Congress on America's economic security,” http://www.theguardian.com/commentisfree/2013/sep/10/obama-syria-what-about-sequester]

Political capital – the ability to horse-trade and win political favors from a receptive audience – is a finite resource in Washington. Pursuing misguided policies takes up time, but it also eats up credibility in asking for the next favor. It's fair to say that congressional Republicans, particularly in the House, have no love for Obama and are likely to oppose anything he supports. That's exactly the reason the White House should stop proposing policies as if it is scattering buckshot and focus with intensity on the domestic tasks it wants to accomplish, one at a time.

#### Even popular legislation leads to fights over healthcare and other unrelated amendments.

USA Today 9/18 [Energy bill debate shows Congress' dysfunction Deirdre Shesgreen, Gannett Washington Bureau http://www.usatoday.com/story/news/politics/2013/09/18/energy-bill-sidetracked/2834289/]

WASHINGTON -- Forget the high-stakes showdown over a spending bill to keep the federal government from shutting down. When it comes to political dysfunction of this Congress, Exhibit A is unfolding in the Senate over a modest, bipartisan energy-efficiency bill. Sponsored by Sen. Rob Portman, R-Ohio, the legislation has become **entangled in a nasty debate over** completely unrelated issues -- including "Obamacare" and prostitution allegations. The spat has even sparked an ethics complaint raising allegations of bribery and intimidation. All that has put in limbo a relatively non-controversial bill that Portman and his co-sponsor, Sen. Jeanne Shaheen, D-N.H., had hoped would sail through the Senate. Instead, debate over the measure has essentially ground to a halt. "We do need a way forward here," Portman said on the Senate floor Tuesday as he pleaded for a resolution to the stalemate. At the center of the logjam are two bills that have collided on the Senate floor. First is the Portman-Shaheen bill, which would create new incentives to spur greater use of energy-saving technologies in office buildings, manufacturing plants and residences. It's a narrow proposal that has significant bipartisan support. And it's been endorsed by about 260 groups that run the political gamut -- from the pro-business U.S. Chamber of Commerce to the Natural Resources Defense Council, an environmental advocacy group. Enter Sen. David Vitter, R-La., who has offered an amendment to the Portman-Shaheen bill. Vitter's proposal would reduce or eliminate the insurance premium subsidies that lawmakers and their aides will receive next year, after they switch from federally provided health insurance to new health care exchanges created under the 2010 Affordable Care Act. The health reform law is **one of the most contentious issues on the congressional docket**, as Republicans seek myriad ways to unravel it before key elements go into effect on Oct. 1. Vitter has put a "hold" on the Portman-Shaheen bill -- blocking all action on the bill and more than 30 pending amendments -- until he gets a vote on his health care legislation. "Bipartisan bills that are relatively non-controversial should move quickly through a legislative body that's working," said Larry Sabato, head of the University of Virginia's Center for Politics. "This tells you all you need to know. (The Senate) isn't working."

#### Economic decline crushes leadership.

Lieberthal and O’Hanlon 12 [Kenneth Lieberthal and Michael O'Hanlon are foreign policy scholars at the Brookings Institution and coauthors with Martin Indyk of "Bending History: Barack Obama's Foreign Policy." The real national security threat: America's debt July 3, 2012 http://www.latimes.com/news/opinion/commentary/la-oe-ohanlon-fiscal-reform-20120703,0,1409615.story]

Lastly, American economic weakness undercuts U.S. leadership abroad. Other countries sense our weakness and wonder about our purported decline. If this perception becomes more widespread, and the case that we are in decline becomes more persuasive, countries will begin to take actions that reflect their skepticism about America's future. Allies and friends will doubt our commitment and may pursue nuclear weapons for their own security, for example; adversaries will sense opportunity and be less restrained in throwing around their weight in their own neighborhoods. The crucial Persian Gulf and Western Pacific regions will likely become less stable. Major war will become more likely.

#### Crushes global financial system.

Goldfarb 9/29 [Zachary, Washington Post, Danger to economy worries experts weighing potential government shutdown, default http://www.washingtonpost.com/business/economy/danger-to-economy-worries-experts-weighing-potential-government-shutdown-default/2013/09/29/651b7e5c-2793-11e3-ad0d-b7c8d2a594b9\_story.html]

A prolonged government shutdown — followed by a potential default on the federal debt — would have economic ripple effects far beyond Washington, upending financial markets, sending the unemployment rate higher and slowing already tepid growth, according to a wide range of economists. A shutdown of a few days might do little damage, but economists, lawmakers and analysts are increasingly bracing for a shutdown that could last a week or more, given the distance between Republicans and Democrats. Such an outcome would suck money out of the economy and spread anxiety among consumers and businesses in a way that is likely to hold back economic activity. And a default on the federal debt, which may occur within 30 days without congressional action, would be much worse, economists say. Failing to raise the debt ceiling would require the government, a major driver of growth, to cut spending by about a third, potentially forcing delays in Social Security checks, military pay and payments to doctors. There are other risks, too. On Oct. 17, the Treasury is scheduled to ask investors for $120 billion in loans. But if investors grow nervous about whether the United States will be able to pay them back, they are likely to demand higher interest rates, which would cause rates to spike throughout the financial system, leading to more expensive mortgages, auto loans and credit card bills. Doubt could grow about the safety of parking money in U.S. bonds, the **linchpin of the global financial system**. “It’s corrosive on the economy,” said Mark Zandi, chief economist of Moody’s Analytics. A lengthy shutdown followed by a default would be “**the nightmare of the recession all over again.”**

#### A strong economy is key to effective democracy promotion.

Takeyh and Nikolas Gvosdev, 12/15/04 (The Christian Science Publishing Society, Christian Science Monitor, "Flagging Winds of American Idealism across the Middle East Ray")

The economic model for reform can only work if the US and Europe pressure these states toward viable change, and not remain content with a series of small-scale programs. Preferential trade agreements, and access to US markets should be contingent on progress made toward meaningful reform. The US experience with Latin America - especially Mexico during the 1980s and 1990s - and that of the EU toward its eastern periphery, makes it clear that when political reform is linked to economic benefits, regimes can be induced to introduce changes that lay the basis for democratic transformation.

#### In economic decline the government will turn to fascism and governmental control.

Johansen 04 Marxist publicist – political commentator [Ralph, “[Marxism] Bush and the fascist menace by Jack A. Smith,” Nov. 25, http://archives.econ.utah.edu/archives/marxism/2004w47/msg00107.htm]

The mostly likely such crisis to afflict capitalism would be a complete economic breakdown caused by a devastating domestic and international economic depression. This is a chief ingredient in the move to fascism. The United States economy does not appear ready to experience a catastrophe of this nature in the near future. The 1930s Great Depression came relatively close, forcing the New Deal government of Franklin D. Roosevelt to initiate an impressive program of social reforms intended in part to prevent the possibility of socialist threats to a wounded capitalism.

### Impact – A2: Fed Checks

#### No tools left.

Irwin 9/18 [Neil Irwin is a Washington Post columnist and the economics editor of Wonkblog. Why didn’t the Fed taper? Because Congress is horrible. http://www.washingtonpost.com/blogs/wonkblog/wp/2013/09/18/why-didnt-the-fed-taper-because-congress-is-horrible/?wprss=rss\_ezra-klein&clsrd]

What is the Fed going to do about it if there is a confidence-rattling failure to take care of basic business — funding the government, and raising the federal debt ceiling — by Congress? Bernanke, in what is probably is next-to-last press conference, was blunt. "The Federal Reserve's policy is to do whatever we can to keep the economy on course," Bernanke continued. "If these actions led the economy to slow, we would have to take that into account, surely. That being said, our ability to offset these shocks is very limited, particularly a debt limit shock, and it's very important that Congress and the administration work together to ensure the government is funded, that the government pay its bills, and that we avoid any event like 2011 that had for a time a noticeable effect on confidence in the economy." Got that? Yes, the Fed is powerful. Yes, it's program of open-ended money printing and a pledge to keep low interest rates in place for years has helped keep the economy growing despite fiscal tightening thus far. And yes, if Congress really blows it and brings on a new wave of crisis by messing around with the country's creditworthiness, the Fed will do what it can to try to offset the damage. **But it** probably **won't be enough.** The Fed's tools are blunt, and are already arguably at the outer limits of their effectiveness. So the best thing to happen would be for Congress and the president to have a nice, crisp, clean negotiation that leads to a prompt deal to fund government operations and raise the federal debt ceiling as needed.

### Impact – A2: Obama Checks

#### Obama won’t use workarounds.

NBC 9/28 [Obama not reconsidering ways to sidestep Congress on debt ceiling, By Domenico Montanaro, Deputy Political Editor, NBC News]

The White House says despite watching Congress careen toward a government shutdown, it isn't making President Barack Obama reconsider ways to sidestep Congress on the debt ceiling. "Only Congress can raise the debt limit**. Period,"** a White House official told First Read. "We have said coin and 14th Amendment aren't workable." The last time the country was up against its debt limit earlier this year, far-flung alternatives to having Congress raise the debt ceiling were floated by liberal Democrats, like minting a $1 trillion coin and invoking the 14th Amendment to bypass Congress. Section 4 of the 14th Amendment states: "The validity of the public debt of the United States, authorized by law, including debts incurred for payments of pensions and bounties for services in suppressing insurrection or rebellion shall not be questioned." Former President Bill Clinton said in July he would invoke it if it came down to it "without hesitation and force the courts to stop me." President Obama, however, said he spoke with White House lawyers, and, "They are not persuaded that that is a winning argument." The Treasury Department says the U.S. will hit its debt limit Oct. 17. It could default on its debt soon afterward. President Obama has said he will "not negotiate when it comes to the full faith and credit of the United States."

## case

#### Working together is strong and increasing – despite detention

Archick 12 Kristin Archick, CRS Specialist in European Affairs, September 4, 2013, “U.S.-EU Cooperation Against Terrorism,” http://www.fas.org/sgp/crs/row/RS22030.pdf, accessed 9-29-13, CMM)

Contacts between U.S. and EU officials—from the cabinet level to the working level—on police, judicial, and border control policy matters have increased substantially since 2001, and have played a crucial role in developing closer U.S.-EU ties. The U.S. Departments of State, Justice, Homeland Security, and the Treasury have been actively engaged in this process. 4 The Secretary of State, U.S. Attorney General, and Secretary of Homeland Security meet at the ministerial level with their respective EU counterparts at least once a year, and a U.S.-EU working group of senior officials meets once every six months to discuss police and judicial cooperation against terrorism. In addition, the United States and the EU have developed a regular dialogue on terrorist financing and have established a high-level policy dialogue on border and transport security to discuss issues such as passenger data-sharing, cargo security, biometrics, visa policy, and sky marshals. Over the last few years, U.S. and EU officials have also engaged in expert-level dialogues on critical infrastructure protection and resilience, and preventing violent extremism.

U.S. and EU agencies have also established reciprocal liaison relationships. Europol has posted two liaison officers in Washington, DC, and the Unit ed States has stationed an FBI officer in The Hague, Netherlands, to work with Europol on counterterrorism. A U.S. Secret Service liaison posted in The Hague also works with Europol on counterfeiting issues. In 2006, a U.S. liaison position was established at Eurojust headquarters in The Hague as part of a wider U.S.-Eurojust agreement to facilitate cooperation between European and U.S. prosecutors on terrorism and other cross-border criminal cases.

#### Haters inevitable.

Heilbrunn 11 [Jacob, senior editor at the National Interest, Why America is Hated | June 16, 2011 http://nationalinterest.org/blog/jacob-heilbrunn/why-america-hated-5480]

America is hated abroad. Today's International Herald Tribune features a long article on Pakistan that provides a reminder of why it is hated. Gen. Kayani has apparently been touring military installations in the wake of the humiliating snatch of Osama bin-Laden. "We can't" was his response when queried about why Pakistan should trust America. Pakistan is not alone. The perception abroad that America is a willful superpower bent on imposing its will is not confined to Pakistan. In Germany, America continues to be viewed as the most dangerous power in the world. Now the Czechs are saying no to basing an early warning system against ballistic missiles in Prague. Geoffrey Wheatcroft cogently asks why we should even continue to have NATO exist. Why indeed? Western Europe is unable, or unwilling, to field significant military forces. It is also not clear who the enemy might be. Iran? The mullahs have no real beef with Europe. They want to engage in economic trade with it. If the United States could afford to pay for all of its commitments, including the defense of western Europe, that would be fine. But it can't. So NATO will continue to stumble along. America will continue to reel from the weight of its defense outlays. And it will continue to be abused by so-called allies such as Pakistan, which resents its dependence on Uncle Sam. Gratitude is rarely a category in international politics. But Americans would do well to recognize why such resentment exists. It may not be because we try to do too little, but too much.

#### Doesn’t spill over in between issues.

Brooks and Wohlforth, Government at Dartmouth, 5 [Professors Government – Dartmouth, Perspectives on Politics 3:509-524]

Drawing on rational choice theory, Downs and Jones show that a far more compelling theoretical case can be made that states have multiple reputations—each particular to a specific agreement or issue area. For this reason, they find that "the reputational consequences of defection are usually more bounded" than institutionalist scholarship currently presumes." 67 If America has, for example, one reputation associated with the UN and another regarding the WTO, then lack of compliance with the former organization will in **no way** directly undercut its ability to gain cooperation in the latter. As Downs and Jones note, viewing states as having multiple reputations "helps to explain why, despite the prevalence of the unitary reputation assumption, examples of a state's defection from an agreement in one area (for example, environment) jeopardizing its reputation in every other area (for example, trade and security) **are virtually nonexistent** in the literature."68 This conclusion is consistent with the **two most detailed studies of reputation in IR**, which decisively undercut the notion that states have a general reputation that will strongly influence how other states relate across different issue areas.69 In the end, the current lack of an empirical or theoretical justification for the notion that states carry a single reputation means that we have **no basis** for accepting the institutionalists' argument that America must endorse multilateralism across the board because to do otherwise has consequences that endanger the entire institutional order. That, together with theory's lack of purchase on the issues of coordination costs and bargaining power, invalidates the institutionalist argument about the high cost of unilateralism.

#### Ensures no cooperation.

Scoblete 9 [Gregory, associate editor at RealClearWorld, July 22, 2009 America's Last Stab at Global Leadership http://www.realclearworld.com/articles/2009/07/22/americas\_last\_stab\_at\_global\_leadership\_96965.html]

The hope is that the world will rally to President Obama's humbled America more than they rallied to President Bush's "cowboy" America. "We have taken off the table reflexive anti-Americanism as a reason not to deal with us," White House chief of staff Rahm Emanuel recently told the Washington Post's David Ignatius. The problem, of course, is that "reflexive anti-Americanism" was hardly the reason for a lack of global cooperation. The nations of the world have competing interests that **owe nothing to the disposition or tone of American diplomacy**. The administration's hope that a clean slate, with fulsome presidential apologies, will provoke a change of heart seems at odds with this reality. All countries share a generic interest in not seeing a terrrorist detonate a nuclear weapon on their soil, they may all be concerned about the impacts of climate change, and they all seek routes to prosperity. But none of that implies that America's preferred solutions are universally acceptable. In **North Korea**, the pro-forma desire for a "nuclear free peninsula" routinely take a back seat to China and South Korea's more urgent interest in not seeing North Korea collapse. **In Iran**, while China and Russia have acceded to rhetorical swipes at the Islamic Republic, they have balked at imposing the kinds of biting sanctions that could bring about a change in the regime's behavior. At the most recent G8 meeting of industrialized nations in Italy, China and India firmly rebuffed efforts to put a binding cap on **carbon emissions**. **Time and time again**, the vision of America rallying the world to confront common dangers blurs into the less-than-thrilling reality of a world with **more important things to do**. This should not surprise anyone. During the Cold War, when U.S. leadership was arguably at its apex, even allied nations (most famously France) **bucked America's will.** While the Obama administration has sought to paint the 21st century's threats in menacing terms, climate change and nuclear proliferation haven't quite sharpened as many minds as the Red Army.

#### No tech transfer – trade barriers prevent adoption

Hall and Helmers 10 [Bronwyn H. Hall, Professor of the Graduate School – UC Berkeley, Christian Helmers, University of Oxford - Department of Economics, The role of patent protection in (clean/green) technology transfer 24 October 2010 http://www.voxeu.org/index.php?q=node/5706]

There are a number of other issues apart from intellectual property rights that are of first-order importance in setting incentives for the development and transfer of technologies. Developing countries themselves may generate **powerful distortions inhibiting** the production and transfer of green technologies. A report by Copenhagen Economics (2009) suggests that subsidies for the consumption of fossil fuels in some developing countries, such as Venezuela, Iran and Indonesia, may represent a **significant barrier** to the development and transfer of green technologies in these countries. Barton (2007) suggests that import tariffs on photo-voltaic and wind technology in place in India and China may also act as a barrier to technology development and transfer. In contrast, import tariffs and subsidies for biofuels in place in industrialised countries, above all the EU and US, are viewed as hampering the development of this industry in developing countries, such as Brazil (World Bank 2010). Such import barriers on green technologies represent a complex issue. Due to the environmental externality, it is desirable to have policy interventions in place in developed countries dedicated to market creation, such as subsidies, to promote demand for green technologies (Taylor 2008). From a political economy perspective, however, it is unclear to what extent developed economies are willing to subsidise demand for green technology produced abroad, in particular in large emerging economies.

## Terrorism

#### Drones in Yemen now – key to prevent AQAP resurgence and Yemen instability

Terrill 13

Andrew Terrill, Research Professor of National Security Affairs, Strategic Studies Institute Middle East Specialist, "Op-Ed: Drones Are Making A Difference In Yemen", <http://www.strategicstudiesinstitute.army.mil/index.cfm/articles/Drones-Are-Making-A-Difference-In-Yemen/2013/03/13>

At least in the case of Yemen, drones appear to have been stunningly successful in achieving goals that support the U.S. and Yemeni national interests by helping to defeat the radical group al-Qaeda in the Arabian Peninsula (AQAP). This group is one of the most successful affiliates of the original al-Qaeda group led by Osama bin Laden until his death in 2011. In his struggle against AQAP, Yemeni reform President Abed Rabbu Hadi has spoken publicly of U.S. drones in glowing terms as a way of striking this enemy, while minimizing collateral damage. Several key examples support Hadi’s view of drones as a war-winning system.

The 2011 death of AQAP planner Anwar al-Awlaki in an apparent drone strike is especially informative. Despite Awlaki’s U.S. citizenship, President Obama was reported by Newsweek to have considered him a higher priority for capture or elimination than Ayman al-Zawahiri, bin Laden’s replacement as the leader of “al-Qaeda central.” Federal prosecutors, in a case involving an alleged Awlaki associate, maintain that he was the mastermind behind a variety of terrorist activities including the 2009 “Christmas bomber” plot. In this instance, a terrorist operative and Awlaki “student” sought to blow up a passenger aircraft traveling from Amsterdam to Detroit with 280 passengers aboard.

The unsuccessful bombing scheme appears to have had the diabolical purpose of attempting to provoke the U.S. leadership to invade Yemen in response to these innocent deaths. Such an intervention with ground troops could have produced catastrophic results. Yemen is a highly nationalistic country with around 24 million people and 60 million firearms. Any intervention there could last for years and swell rather than diminish the ranks of AQAP. This disaster was worth avoiding.

Drones may also have saved the United States from a serious foreign policy crisis a second time in Yemen. In May 2012, President Hadi unleashed a strong military offensive against AQAP forces which had seized large portions of several provinces in the south and were administering them in what one AQAP leader described as “the Taliban way.” Hadi had only recently taken office after a long and painful set of international and domestic negotiations to end the 33-year rule of President Ali Abdullah Saleh. If the Yemeni military had been defeated in the confrontation with AQAP, this outcome could well have led to the collapse of the Yemeni reform government and the emergence of anarchy there. Hadi needed every tool he could obtain to help him win.

Drones were widely reported in the U.S. and international press as helping to enable the government victory in southern Yemen, both by providing intelligence to combatant forces and by eliminating key leaders and small groups of individuals. Approximately 4 months after the Yemeni government’s June victory in the south, Secretary of Defense Leon Panetta stated that the role of drones in Yemen was “vital,” in one of the first authoritative statements on the combat role of these systems.

In considering these examples, it seems clear that drones are helping to prevent the emergence of an AQAP state in southern Yemen and prevent a major terrorist strike, either of which could create pressure for a risky and expensive U.S. military intervention in Yemen. At some point, a reformed Yemeni military should be effective enough to maintain domestic security without relying on these assets which remain unpopular among large segments of the Yemeni public. Until then, drone use seems like an option that should be kept open to avoid the need for much more frightening choices later.

#### Impact is WMD terror, Iran-Israel war, and Iran-Saudi war.

Berger et al 2012(May, Lars Berger, Lecturer in politics and contemporary history of the middle east at the university of salford/Manchester, Maurice Doring, MA in political science, international law and philosophy from the University of Bonn, Sven-Eric Fikenscher, research fellow at Geothe University, Ahmed Salf, Exeutive Director of the Sheba Center for Strategic Studies, Ahmed Al-Wahishi, Executive Secretary of the Yemeni International Affairs Center, “Yemen and the Middle East Conference The Challenge of Failing States and Transnational Terrorism”, <http://usir.salford.ac.uk/22952/1/Yemen_and_the_Middle_East_Conference.pdf>)

 While in a geographical and political sense Yemen is far from being a central actor in the envisioned MEC, its political future could easily shape the gathering on several levels. First, the Middle East Conference aims at establishing a WMD/DVs Free Zone. On the one hand, Yemen is a party to all three legal documents banning weapons of mass destruction: the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty, the Biological and Toxin Weapons Convention (BTWC), and the Chemical Weapons Convention (CWC). In addition, Sana’a has embraced the Gulf Cooperation Council’s (GCC) call for a Gulf WMD Free Zone, independent of Israeli nuclear policy. On the other hand, when it comes to the problématique of WMD and proliferation, Yemen might store chemical weapons, depending on whether rumors about the use of nerve gas against anti- government protesters in early 2011 turn out to be true. In addition, Yemen imported various WMD-capable aircraft and missiles and probably still operates most of them (see Table No. 1). In the aircraft realm, Yemeni decision-makers from the North, the South, and the unifi ed country alike have mostly received Soviet/Russian fighter jets and bombers. 1 The current level of instability and the threat of further deterioration could thus spoil any serious arms control effort in Yemen. This is particularly troublesome since the country, given its history and affiliation with the Arab League, will have to be part of far- reaching regional disarmament initiatives. The prospect of an Arab state with an uncontrolled chemical arsenal is likely to affect Israeli and Iranian calculations with regard to the MEC. Both states are suspicious of the Arab League and tensions between Iran and Saudi Arabia, which is particularly influential in Yemen, have recently worsened. Second, with a long history as one of the region’s eminent weapons markets, Yemen has the potential to serve as a major gateway for illicit weapons, both conventional and unconventional, entering the Arab peninsula and other parts of the Arab East. If the situation escalates, states with an interest in such technology might, for instance, try to obtain missiles and their spare parts or attempt to gain access to sensitive material from the country’s suspected chemical warheads. This could contribute to the prolif- eration of delivery systems as well as WMD thereby undermining the MEC. In 2011, protesters seized an army base in Sana’a, while Al-Qaeda in the Arab Peninsula (AQAP) has, on a frequent basis, been able to temporarily control several cities and launch deadly assaults on military bases in the southern province of Abyan. Such developments could offer AQAP the chance to use existing dual-use laboratories or even to build their own facilities capable of producing biological and chemical material in remote areas under their control. Third, Yemen has the potential to play a more prominent role in the ongoing tensions between Saudi Arabia and Iran. Riyadh has a long history of attempts to shape the course of political events in Yemen with which it shares a 1,800 km-long border. Saudi Arabia’s different reactions to domestic calls for change in Bahrain and Syria have made clear that it is viewing the ‘Arab Spring’ primarily through the lens of its long-running conflict with Iran. From a Saudi point of view, instability in Yemen opens up the specter of increased Iranian influence at a time when Tehran’s foothold in the Arab world’s northern tier comes under strain in the context of the popular uprising against the Assad regime in Syria. a number of narrowly foiled terrorist attacks on U.S. targets and the 2009 Fort Hood shooting in Texas have shifted global attention towards Yemen’s status as the home to Al-Qaeda in the Arab Peninsula. Continuing instability in Yemen allows AQAP to regroup and pose a direct threat to the security of Saudi Arabia and other countries on the Arab peninsula. It also puts AQAP into a position to intensify its support for the ‘home-grown’ attempted terrorist attacks the United States has witnessed over the last couple of years. In short, Yemen’s instability has the potential to allow transnational actors to undermine the security arrangements which the region’s state actors might contemplate as part of the envisioned MEC.

#### Reviews prevent timely executive action – can’t act on new intelligence

Taylor 13

Paul Taylor, Senior Fellow at the Center for Policy & Research, “A FISC for Drones?”, 2/9/13, http://transparentpolicy.org/2013/02/a-fisc-for-drones/ //jchen

I’m not sure that it does. Names may be placed on the list at any time, conceivably as the result of a time sensitive push within the intelligence community. While I am not an expert in the process of targeting decisions, I think that the executive may need to be able to act quickly on new information that indicates that a subject is targetable. Ex ante review would place an additional hurdle between the decisive intelligence and the operation. Chesney seems to realize this by admitting the need for an “exigent circumstances exemption.” But this exception would itself mean defaulting back to an ex post review.

#### Legal oversight hampers ability

The Hill 13

The Hill, Carlo Munoz, “Bill would require lawmakers be told of 'kill/capture' missions”, 5/09/13, http://thehill.com/blogs/defcon-hill/policy-and-strategy/298891-defense-lawmakers-demand-notice-on-future-killcapture-missions //jchen

But Senate Republicans, including Sens. John McCain (Ariz.), Lindsey Graham (S.C.) and Kelly Ayotte (N.H.), argued that type of legal oversight would hamstring the White House’s ability to take out key al Qaeda figures.

Drone strikes have been critical in the Obama administration’s counterterrorism campaign against Islamic militant groups.

U.S. national security officials claim the strikes have decimated the terror group’s top leaders in Afghanistan, Pakistan, Yemen and elsewhere.

#### Air force spends hundreds of hours constantly watching for a window to strike, review process can’t match that

Wood 13

David Wood, Senior Military Correspondent @ HuffPost, “Obama Drone War 'Kill Chain' Imposes Heavy Burden At Home ”, 5/5/13, http://www.huffingtonpost.com/david-wood/obama-drone-war\_b\_3149660.html //jchen

The airmen here do labor under an immense workload.

For hours at a stretch, they search through an avalanche of video, still photos, communications intercepts and other data in an intense manhunt to identify, track and target insurgents or terrorists to be captured or killed. Digital chat rooms, email and phones connect them with drone pilots, special forces commandos, battalion operations centers and others to nail down "actionable intelligence."

Often, they'll stare at a suspicious compound for days, logging every detail of daily life, tracking women to the market and kids to school, determining by watching their behavior whether visitors are locals or outsiders. The presence of women or children puts the target off-limits.

When a target is identified and the absence of non-combatants verified, a word will flash from the pilot of a circling armed drone -- "Rifle!" -- indicating that a Hellfire missile or other munition is streaking toward the target. Analysts here will watch to make sure no children wander into the target area -- the laser-homing Hellfire missile often fired from drones can be diverted at the last second if needed, Air Force officials said.

#### Fast and constant signature strikes key – degrades support network

Mudd 13

Philip Mudd, Senior Research Fellow, Counterterrorism Strategy Initiative, CIA analyst since 1985 working in counterterrorism, Foreign Policy, 5/24/13, “Fear Factor”, http://www.foreignpolicy.com/articles/2013/05/24/fear\_factor\_signature\_strikes //jchen

The impact of armed drones during the decade-plus of this intense global counterterrorism campaign is hard to overestimate: Without operational commanders and visionary leaders, terror groups decay into locally focused threats, or disappear altogether. Targeted strikes against al Qaeda leaders and commanders in the years immediately after 9/11 deprived the group of the time and stability required to plot a major strike. But the London subway attacks in July 2005 illustrated the remaining potency of al Qaeda's core in the tribal areas of Pakistan. The threat was fading steadily. But not fast enough.

So-called signature strikes -- in which target selection is based not on identification of an individual but instead on patterns of behavior or unique characteristics that identify a group -- accelerated this decline for simple reasons. Targeting leadership degrades a small percentage of a diffuse terror group, but developing the tactical intelligence required to locate an individual precisely enough to stage a pinpoint strike, in a no-man's land half a world away, is time-consuming and difficult. And it's not a perfect science; the leaders of groups learn over time how to operate more securely. Furthermore, these leaders represent only a fraction of the threat: Osama bin Laden might have been the public face of al Qaeda, but he was supported by a web of document-forgers, bombmakers, couriers, trainers, ideologues, and others. They made up the bulk of al Qaeda and propelled the apparatus that planned the murder of innocents. Bin Laden was the revolutionary leader, but it was the troops who executed his vision.

Signature strikes have pulled out these lower-level threads of al Qaeda's apparatus -- and that of its global affiliates -- rapidly enough that the deaths of top leaders are now more than matched by the destruction of the complex support structure below them. Western conceptions of how organizations work, with hierarchal structures driven by top-level managers, do not apply to al Qaeda and its affiliates. These groups are instead conglomerations of militants, operating independently, with rough lines of communication and fuzzy networks that cross continents and groups. They are hard to map cleanly, in other words. Signature strikes take out whole swaths of these network sub-tiers rapidly -- so rapidly that the groups cannot replicate lost players and their hard-won experience. The tempo of the strikes, in other words, adds sand to the gears of terror organizations, destroying their operational capability faster than the groups can recover.

#### Hatred inevitable – decreasing drone strikes doesn’t reduce resentment

Etzioni 13

Amitai Etzioni, professor of in- ternational relations at George Washington University and author of Hot Spots: American Foreign Pol- icy in a Post-Human-Rights World, 4/30/13, “Drones: Say it with figures”, http://www.upi.com/Top\_News/Analysis/Outside-View/2013/04/30/Outside-View-Drones-Say-it-with-figures/UPI-25571367294880/ //jchen

In reality, ample evidence shows that large parts of the population of several Muslim countries resent the United States for numerous and profound reasons, unrelated to drone attacks.

These Muslims consider the United States to be the "Great Satan" because it violates core religious values they hold dear; it promotes secular democratic liberal regimes; it supports women's rights; and it exports a lifestyle that devout Muslims consider hedonistic and materialistic to their countries.

These feelings, data show, are rampant in countries in which no drones attacks have occurred, were common in those countries in which the drones have been employed well before any attacks took place, and continue unabated, even when drone attacks are greatly scaled back.

As Marc Lynch notes in Foreign Affairs:

"A decade ago, anti-Americanism seemed like an urgent problem. Overseas opinion surveys showed dramatic spikes in hostility toward the United States, especially in the Arab world ... It is now clear that even major changes, such as Bush's departure, Obama's support for some of the Arab revolts of 2011, the death of Osama bin Laden, and the U.S. withdrawal from Iraq, have had surprisingly little effect on Arab attitudes towards the United States. Anti-Americanism might have ebbed momentarily, but it is once again flowing freely."