# 2ac

## T-Subsets

US Armed Forces includes leading any forces, even if not US military

War Powers Act 73 War Powers Act Digital History ID 4064 Date:1973 Annotation: War Powers Act of 1973.

Document: War Powers Act Public Law 93-148 93rd Congress, H. J. Res. 542 Concerning the war powers of Congress and the President. http://www.digitalhistory.uh.edu/disp\_textbook.cfm?smtID=3&psid=4064

 (c) For purposes of this joint resolution, the term "introduction of United States Armed Forces" includes the assignment of member of such armed forces to command, coordinate, participate in the movement of, or accompany the regular or irregular military forces of any foreign country or government when such military forces are engaged, or there exists an imminent threat that such forces will become engaged, in hostilities.

## XO

### 2ac

#### **Perm do both**

#### **No cause of action – statutes are necessary to provide grounds to sue. Without lawsuits there will be no mechanism for enforcement.**

Konnoth 11 CRAIG KONNOTH, The Yale Law Journal March, 2011 120 Yale L.J. 1263 COMMENT: Section 5 Constraints on Congress Through the Lens of Article III and the Constitutionality of the Employment Non-Discrimination Act

ENDA raises exactly these concerns, as the remedies that states currently provide are anemic, and indeed, are subject to repeal. The Williams Institute notes that of the few cities and counties that responded to its survey, two incorrectly referred employee complaints regarding discrimination to the  [\*1275]  EEOC (which has no federal mandate to address them). [n60](http://www.lexisnexis.com/lnacui2api/frame.do?tokenKey=rsh-20.834391.4260498759&target=results_DocumentContent&returnToKey=20_T18281063812&parent=docview&rand=1380689849090&reloadEntirePage=true" \l "n60) One respondent was unaware of its own antidiscrimination provisions, another did not know what enforcement mechanisms were in place, and several lacked the resources to provide data or handle complaints. [n61](http://www.lexisnexis.com/lnacui2api/frame.do?tokenKey=rsh-20.834391.4260498759&target=results_DocumentContent&returnToKey=20_T18281063812&parent=docview&rand=1380689849090&reloadEntirePage=true" \l "n61) Similarly, local provisions often have lower caps on damages, lack compensation for attorney's fees, or fail to protect discrimination based on perceived orientation. [n62](http://www.lexisnexis.com/lnacui2api/frame.do?tokenKey=rsh-20.834391.4260498759&target=results_DocumentContent&returnToKey=20_T18281063812&parent=docview&rand=1380689849090&reloadEntirePage=true" \l "n62) Executive orders prohibiting discrimination fail to create a private cause of action and are not always backed up by investigative mechanisms. [n63](http://www.lexisnexis.com/lnacui2api/frame.do?tokenKey=rsh-20.834391.4260498759&target=results_DocumentContent&returnToKey=20_T18281063812&parent=docview&rand=1380689849090&reloadEntirePage=true" \l "n63) Courts have also found that some localities' provisions are preempted by federal law. [n64](http://www.lexisnexis.com/lnacui2api/frame.do?tokenKey=rsh-20.834391.4260498759&target=results_DocumentContent&returnToKey=20_T18281063812&parent=docview&rand=1380689849090&reloadEntirePage=true" \l "n64) Thus, only Congress can pass a bill that would definitively prevent localities' discrimination.

#### Legislation action is key to social change—debate is the only way to generate public perception

Stoddard 97Thomas B. Stoddard, attorney and adjunct professor at the New York University School of Law

New York University Law Review November, 1997 72 N.Y.U.L. Rev. 967 ESSAY: BLEEDING HEART: REFLECTIONS ON USING THE LAW TO MAKE SOCIAL CHANGE

"Rule-shifting" cannot possibly become "culture-shifting" without public awareness both that a change has taken place, and that that change will affect daily life. Ordinary citizens must know that a shift has taken place for that shift to have cultural resonance. Most lawmaking - legislative, judicial, or administrative - takes place quietly, influencing a limited universe of the interested and connected. In order for "rule-shifting" to become "culture-shifting," however, a change must be generally discerned and then absorbed by the society as a whole.

 Even many obviously important changes in law lack this element of public knowledge. In 1983 the New York State Board of Regents, which has legislative power over all the schools, public and private, in the state, promulgated a new regulation forbidding corporal punishment in schools. The change had potential for "culture-shifting." It made a fundamental - indeed, daring - change in rules that affected (at least hypothetically) all families in the state with children of school age, and it dealt with a subject of universal concern - whether children should be disciplined by bodily force, or not. Yet the new regulation received little attention, perhaps because it came through the speedy and quiet deliberations of a body that is itself little known or understood. A measure with "culture-shifting" potential became a mere shift in rules. Teachers and administrators took note of it, as did some interested parents, but the public by and large overlooked the change. What might have been the occasion for a statewide discussion of child-rearing was lost.

 Changes that occur through legislative deliberation generally entail greater public awareness than judicial or administrative changes do. Public awareness is, indeed, a natural concomitant of the legislative process. A legislature - any legislature - purports to be a representative collection of public delegates engaged in the people's business; its work has inherent public significance. Judicial and administrative proceedings, by contrast, involve private actors in private disputes. Those disputes may or may not have implications for others, and they are often subject to the principle of stare decisis, but they are not public by their very nature. (Administrative rulemaking is a diff- **[\*981]** erent animal, akin - at least in theory - to legislative activity, but it is still typically accorded less attention than the business of legislatures.)

 Legislative lawmaking is, by its nature, open, tumultuous, and prolonged. It encourages scrutiny and evaluation. Thus, it is much more likely than other forms of lawmaking to promote public discussion and knowledge. For that reason alone, such lawmaking possesses a special power beyond that of mere rulemaking. Indeed, the real significance of some forms of legislative lawmaking lies in the debate they engender rather than the formal consequences of their enactment.

#### The next president could repeal an xo and the military would just ignore it.

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

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

#### Object fiat bad – moots the 1ac since we can’t generate offense against the aff’s action. Produces a chilling effect that means we don’t discuss the core of the topic.

#### Xo links to politics – congress backlashes on other agenda items.

Clay Risen, assistant editor of *The New Republic*, 8.4.**10**

[http://www.prospect.org/web/page.ww?section=root&name=ViewPrint&articleId=8140]

Congress provides an additional, if somewhat less effective, check on executive orders. In theory, any executive order can be later annulled by Congress. But in the last 34 years, during which presidents have issued some 1,400 orders, it has defeated just three. More often, Congress will counter executive orders by indirect means, holding up nominations or bills until the president relents. “There’s always the potential that a Congress angry about one issue will respond by limiting other things you want,” says Mayer.

## Womyn

#### They are a strategy of privilege—their linguistic struggle changes nothing

Guevara 5

Veronica M. Guevara, Dept of Communications @ Weber State, 10/25/05 (Edebate post, <http://www.ndtceda.com/archives/200510/0479.html>)

But since there are so many concerned with stand point theory and personal narrative these days, I'll tell you something about the way I feel whenever I see the word "womyn" (or the newer "mynefestations" such as: "gyrl" and "femyie"). Every time I see an altered spelling on a block or an edebate post this is what goes through my mind: WOW - it must be nice, what a luxury, a privilege to be able to engage struggle at that level of minutia. Usually its people I like or respect and even often times friends and this is not meant to offend those folks. I know that they're good people with their hearts and minds in the right place. Still, I can't help but think that a focus on the spelling of pronouns and other nouns is a marker of privilege. When I was 17 and just out of high school rushing across the city to pick up my friend who had been married for less than 90 days at her house where I found her cowered on the floor in a pool of her own blood, this was the last thing I could think of. When she told me that her husband beat her into the ground in front of her 3 year old sister because they had received an unpaid notice from Florida Power & Light because they just couldn't afford it, linguistic struggle was the last thing I could think of. And when we were at the hospital, and I was helping fill out the police report, I really couldn't stop to write that the "femyie" victim was 3 months pregnant at the time of the assault. Today, she, as a struggling single mom couldn't possibly care less about how you spell the pronoun that denotes her biological sex. Adding a "y" doesn't make the child support payments that have never been made come any quicker, it doesn't make her double shifts any shorter, it doesn't make quality childcare any more accessible, it doesn't give her or her daughter health insurance, it doesn't disempower her ex-husband because you've taken his claim to manhood out of the pronoun, nor does it empower her in any meaningful way. This is not because she wouldn't grasp your argument because she was one of the brightest people I knew, taking all AP courses and working full time through high school to pay her mother's mortgage. It's because at the end of the day, linguistic protest does nothing towards the ends of material struggle. For the most part, I try to be apathetic to different spellings. I even try to understand the move as complimentary to material struggle, but ultimately find that the ones who attempt engage in Linguisitic struggle often times do not recognize their own privilege in making that move. You are flagging an educational and class privilege that the ones of whom we speak or seek to struggle for do not have,

1. Restricting the word doesn’t end the ideologies behind it – all they do is drive the root of the problem into invisibility.  This ends-based methodology is the root cause of war.

Gay, 1998

(William C., Prof. of Philosophy @ the University of North Carolina at Charlotte, *Peace Review*, December 1998, Vol. 10, No. 4, “The Practice of Linguistic Nonviolence,” Pg. 545-548)

As should be obvious, "linguistic nonviolence" is the antonym to "linguistic violence" as "peace" is the antonym to "war." Whether or not we are conscious of their effects, altered terminology and changed descriptions can comfort and even advantage us. Language can comfort us when used to affirm diversity and achieve recognition.  During one stage of the civil rights struggle, the phrase "Black is beautiful" came to express a growing sense of pride and self-affirmation among African Americans. Some feminists, responding to the lack of symmetry in designating all men as "Mr." and women as either "Miss" or "Mrs.," coined "Ms." as an alternative that facilitates more symmetrical titles for gender when adults are addressed in a formal manner. Phrases and terms such as these can advantage a social group even if its members do not always recognize the consequences of these linguistic changes. Many times the first step in reducing linguistic violence is to simply refrain from the use of of fensive and oppressive terms. However, just because linguistic violence is not being used, a genuinely pacific discourse is not necessarily present. Nonviolent discourse, like the condition of peace, can be negative or positive. "Negative peace" refers to the temporary absence of actual war or the lull between wars, while "positive peace" refers to the negation of war and the presence of justice. The pacific discourse that is analogous to negative peace can actually perpetuate injustice. Broadcasters in local and national news may altogether avoid using terms like "dyke" or "fag" or even "homosexual," but they and their audiences can remain homophobic even when the language of lesbian and gay pride is used. A government may cease referring to a particular nation as "a rogue state," but public and private attitudes may continue to foster prejudice toward this nation and its inhabitants. When prejudices remain unspoken, at least in public thrums, their detection and eradication are made even more difficult. Of course, we need to find ways to restrain hate speech in order to at least stop linguistic attacks in the public arena. Likewise, we need to find ways to restrain armed conflicts and hostile name calling directed against an adversary of the state. However, even if avoidance of linguistic violence is necessary, it is not sufficient. Those who bite their tongues to comply with the demands of political correctness are of ten ready to lash out vitriolic epithets when these constraints are removed. Thus, the practice of linguistic nonviolence is more like negative peace when the absence of hurtful or harmful terminology merely marks a lull in reliance on linguistic violence or a shift of its use from the public to the private sphere.The merely public or merely formal repression of language and behavior that expresses these attitudes builds up pressure that can erupt in subsequent outbursts of linguistic violence and physical violence. Pacific discourse that is analogous to positive peace facilitates and reflects the move from a lull in the occurrence of violence to its negation. The establishment of a genuinely pacific discourse that is analogous to positive peace requires a transformation of cultures oriented to violence and war. It also requires a commitment to the active pursuit of domestic and global justice. Efforts to establish a practice of linguistic nonviolence analogous to positive peace are part of a larger struggle to reduce cultural violence. They advance the quest for societies in which human emancipation, dignity, and respect are not restricted on the basis of irrelevant factors like race, gender, class, or sexual orientation. Correlative to the distinction between negative and positive peace is the distinction between coercive and nonviolent methods of advancing pacific discourse. Just as I advocate pacifism as the proper response to the physical violence of war, so I advocate pacific discourse as the proper response to linguistic violence. Some people do not think war can be eliminated. The term "warism" refers to taking war for granted, and ample evidence exists for challenging this assumption. Others think that insof ar as national security is to be. defended, the use of military force cannot be avoided. I am among those who maintain that a nonviolent model of national security is feasible. Likewise, some people do not think that language as currently structured can be changed. This view is termed "linguistic institutionalism" or "linguistic determinism," and ample evidence is also available for challenging this assumption. Others think that insof ar as the violence of language is to be countered, force will have to be exercised. I am also among those who maintain that holding fast to linguistic nonviolence as a means is as important as aiming for linguistic nonviolence as a goal. Hate speech can be prevented through legal or physical coercion. Likewise, politically correct discourse can be achieved through legal or even physical coercion. The use of legal or physical coercion to end hate speech or establish politically correct discourse entails the abandonment of nonviolence. When people are silenced by the threat posed in the words of law or by the constraint imposed through the deeds of authorities, verbally or physically violent means have been employed. By contrast, individuals can intentionally choose to eschew hate speech and to use politically correct discourse. They also can use linguistically nonviolent tactics to persuade others to do so as well. From a pacifist perspective or, even more generally, from a nonviolent perspective, much discourse that calls for an end to violence and war or that calls for the establishment of peace and social justice actually places a primacy on ends over means. When the end is primary, nonviolence may be practiced only so long as it is effective. For the pacifist and the practitioner of nonviolence, the primary commitment is to the means. The commitment to nonviolence requires that the achievement of political goals is secondary. Political goals must be foregone or at least postponed when they cannot be achieved nonviolently.

#### Womyn with-a-y Still Links, it just means “Wife of Myn” Rather than “Wife of Man”

Dyer 97

Sarah Dyer, Feminist Author, “Why I am a Girl,” Kiki E-Zine, 1997 (<http://www.houseoffun.com/action/kikizine/k-girl.html>)

As I discussed last time, the word is girl. But I've

found even more reasons since then to believe so...I looked into the

origin of the word "woman" -- it originally comes from the term wifmann,

meaning basically "wife/female of a human being". It slowly evolved into

the words wimman, wumman, and finally woman. So even if you misspell it to

remove the male pronoun, it's still a crap word. It just makes you the

"wife of a myn" or something. So I looked up "female". Interestingly

enough, it has nothing to do with the word "male". It was misspelled

sometime between 1000 and 1500 as "female" to make it look more like the

word "male", but it was originally spelled femelle, and descended from the

Latin femina, or woman. This looked promising, as femina (plural feminie)

is totally unrelated to the Latin words for man/male, vir, or man/human

being, homo. But the probable (while hypothetical) origins of the Latin

term lie in a prehistoric root (dhe) meaning "to suckle", which somehow

became femina, (as well as felare, to suck; filius/filia, son/daughter;

and fetus, progeny). So the implications of the word are tied up in

motherhood and fertility. Keep looking. So, on to my word, girl. It comes

directly from the word girle (earlier gurle) which for several centuries

(until the 1500s or so) meant a young person of either gender. (It is

tentatively assumed, if you want to know, to come from an older word,

gyrele, which came from the prehistoric root gher, or small.) Eventually

it was only applied to young females until their marriage. (At which time

they got to be a woman, the "wife of a human being", oh boy!) "Girl" was

originally non-gender specific, carries no history of "womanly

occupations", and in fact implies not being an appendage to a man. (i.e.,

implies independence.) So, I still say I'm a GIRL. I guess this means

someday I'll have to be an old girl, but maybe by then we'll think of

something even better. And in the meantime I'll be whatever kind of girl I

want to be.

#### Their censorship makes every impact worse

Butler, 1997

(Judith, Maxine Elliot Professor in the Departments of Rhetoric and Comparative Literature and the Co-director of the Program of Critical Theory at the University of California, Berkeley, *Excitable Speech: A Politics of the Performative*, Routledge, ISBN 0-415-91587-2 eBook)

According to this view, **censorship is not merely restrictive and privative, that is, active in depriving subjects of the freedom to express themselves in certain ways, but also formative of subjects and the legitimate boundaries of speech.** **This notion of a productive or formative power is not reducible to the tutelary function of the state, that is, the moral instruction of its citizens, but operates to make certain kinds of citizens possible and others impossible.** Some who take this point of view make clear that **censorship is not primarily about speech**, that **it is exercised in the service of other kinds of social aims, and that the restriction of speech is instrumental to the achievements of other, often unstated, social and state goals.** **One example** of this **includes a conception of censorship as a necessary part of the process of nation-building, where censorship can be exercised by marginalized groups who seek to achieve cultural control over their own representation and narrativization.** **A similar**, but distinct kind of **argument**, however, **is also made** typically **on behalf of a dominant power that seeks to control any challenges posed to its own legitimacy. Another related example is the use of censorship in an effort to build (or rebuild) consensus within an institution**, such as the military, or within a nation; **another example is the use of censorship in the codification of memory, as in state control over monument preservation and building, or in the insistence that certain kinds of historical events only be narrated one way.**The view of censorship as "productive;' however, is not always coextensive with views that hold that censorship is always instrumental to the achievement of other socia1.aims. Consider that in the examples I have just suggested, **censorship is not primarily concerned with speech**, and that **the control or regulation of speech is incidental to the achievement of other kinds of social aims** (strengthening particular views of legitimacy, consensus, cultural autonomy, national memory), **In** the most extreme version of **this kind of instrumentalism, speech is cast as wholly incidental to the aims of censorship or, rather, speech works as a cover for the real political aims of censorship, ones that have nothing or little to do with speech.** Censorship is a productive form of power: it is not merely privative, but formative as well. I propose that **censorship seeks to produce subjects according to explicit and implicit norms, and that the production of the subject has everything to do with the regulation of speech. The subject's production takes place not only through the regulation of that subject's speech, but through the regulation of the social domain of speakable discourse.** The question is not what it is I will be able to say, but what will constitute the domain of the sayable within which I begin to speak at all. **To become a subject means to be subjected to a set of implicit and explicit norms that govern the kind of speech that will be legible as the speech of a subject**9 Here the question is not whether certain kinds of speech uttered by a subject are censored, but how a certain operation of **censorship determines who will be a subject depending on whether the speech of such a candidate for subjecthood obeys certain norms governing what is speakable and what is not.**  To move outside of the domain of speakability is to risk one~ status as a subject. To embody the norms that govern speakability in one's speech is to consummate one's status as a subject of speech. "Impossible speech" would be precisely the ramblings of the asocial, the rantings of the "psychotic" that the rules that govern the domain of speakability produce, and by which they are continually haunted. 10 Some would argue that no text can be fully freed from the shackles of censorship because every text or expression is in part structured through a process of selection that is determined in part by the decisions of an author or speaker and in part by a language that operates according to selective and differential rules that no individual speaker ever made (that may well be collectively forged, but not traceable to a single author, except in specific cases of grammatical revision and coinage). A highly generalized thesis, it appears to apply to any and all language. And though it may well be true and valid, I think that in its generalized form, it does not directly translate into a political consideration of censorship or a normative view on how best to decide issues of censorship. Indeed, taken in its most generalized form, one normative implication of such a view is the following: because all expression is always already censored to some degree, it makes no sense to try to oppose censorship, for that would be to oppose the conditions of intelligibility (and, thus, to oppose the very terms by which the opposition is articulated). The view that I am proposing, however, revises this more generalized thesis in the following direction: **the conditions of intelligibility are themselves formulated in and by power, and this normative exercise of power is rarely acknowledged as an operation of power at all. Indeed, we may classify it among the most implicit forms of power, one that works precisely through its illegibility: it escapes the terms of legibility that it occasions. That power continues to act in illegible ways is one source of its relative invulnerability.**

1. ADDING Y TO WORDS WITH MALE SPELLING REINFORCES GENDER DOMINATION OF THE MALE Y CHROMOSOME

Guevara – Professor of Communications – 2005.

Veronica M. Guevara, Dept of Communications @ Weber State, 10/25/05 (Edebate post, <http://www.ndtceda.com/archives/200510/0479.html>)

As a side note, why the "y" after all, isn't that the male chromosome? The one that genetically causes the second wave of testosterone in the womb that would make the fetus a male? Wouldn't that reassert masculine linguisitc power back into the word? It seems that the same justifications that are used to preserve spelling with the "y" could ultimately (excuse my debate parlance) be turned back on itself.

### Debt Ceiling 2ac

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

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

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

#### FERC thumps.

Dixon 10/1 [Darius Dixon, Politico, “Obama FERC nominee Ron Binz withdraws amid coal pushback”, http://www.politico.com/story/2013/10/ron-binz-ferc-nominee-withdraws-name-97623.html, October 1, 2013]

President Barack Obama’s nominee to lead the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission abandoned his quest Tuesday, complaining that the fight over his confirmation had become a **“blood sport”** for partisan attacks and opponents backed by the coal industry. The collapse of Ron Binz’s nomination to lead the little-known agency was a **stunning setback** for Obama, who had succeeded in winning Senate confirmations for far more controversial nominees at Environmental Protection Agency, the Pentagon and the Labor Department. Continue Reading The consultant and career energy regulator had won over supporters from the green energy world — some of whom took the unusual step of hiring a public relations firm to advance his cause. But Binz said he couldn’t overcome a **furious opposition campaign** in which his record was “spun and respun” to make him appear biased against fossil fuels. “The caricature that they created had nothing to do with who I am and nothing to do with what I might’ve brought to FERC. It was just a blood sport,” Binz told POLITICO in his first extensive interview since Obama nominated him in June. “I came to Washington with this 35-year career behind me only to encounter a fictional Ron Binz, a fictional character that I didn’t recognize and I would never even support,” he added. Conservative and libertarian groups celebrated Binz’s withdrawal as a setback for Obama’s climate agenda, while his supporters lamented that partisan bickering had defeated a qualified candidate.

#### Obama’s irrelevant

Fallows 9/27 [James, The Atlantic, Your False-Equivalence Guide to the Days Ahead http://www.theatlantic.com/politics/archive/2013/09/your-false-equivalence-guide-to-the-days-ahead/280062/]

As a matter of politics, this is different from anything we learned about in classrooms or expected until the past few years. We're used to thinking that the most important disagreements are between the major parties, not within one party; and that disagreements over policies, goals, tactics can be addressed by negotiation or compromise. This time, the fight that matters is within the Republican party, and that fight is over whether compromise itself is legitimate.\*\* Outsiders to this struggle -- the president and his administration, Democratic legislators as a group, voters or "opinion leaders" outside the generally safe districts that elected the new House majority -- have essentially no leverage over the outcome. I can't recall any situation like this in my own experience, and the only even-approximate historic parallel (with obvious differences) is the inability of Northern/free-state opinion to affect the debate within the slave-state South from the 1840s onward. Nor is there a conceivable "compromise" the Democrats could offer that would placate the other side. As a matter of journalism, any story that presents the disagreements as a "standoff," a "showdown," a "failure of leadership," a sign of "partisan gridlock," or any of the other usual terms for political disagreement, represents a failure of journalism\*\*\* and an inability to see or describe what is going on. For instance: the "dig in their heels" headline you see below, which is from a proprietary newsletter I read this morning, and about which I am leaving off the identifying details. This isn't "gridlock." It is a ferocious struggle within one party, between its traditionalists and its radical factions, with results that unfortunately can harm all the rest of us -- and, should there be a debt default, could harm the rest of the world too.

#### Their discourse of economic crisis papers over the perpetual crisis that is patriarchal capitalism

Shannon and Volcano (editor of the Routledge journal Contemporary Anarchist Studies; member of the Workers Solidarity Alliance and Queers without Borders) 12

(Deric and Abby, Capitalism in the 2000s in *The Accumulation of Freedom*, pg. 87-88)

As Asimakopoulos explains in this collection, capitalism is prone to periodic "crises." This isn't necessarily a new insight‑a. system based on capital investments creates "bubbles" in expanding industries (i.e., housing, the "dot corn boom," etc.) that cannot last, but that investors want to make a quick buck off (or a few million, for that matter). When these bubbles "burst" (when they are no longer profitable), investors stop raking in profits and this can lead to economic downturns‑to recessions or, in the case of the current crisis, depressions.

But what do we mean with this discourse of"crisis?" A quick look at the ultra‑rich doesn't show a drastic reduction in comfort and lifestyle. And while unemployment, poverty; precarity, and privation are affecting larger sections of the world's population, those problems are business as usual for a significant portion of the world. And yet we declare capitalism in "crisis" now, For children working in sweatshops, for entire countries struggling with food insecurity and hunger, for continents grappling with an AIDS crisis that disproportionately affects our most marginalized populations, for trafficked women and children, for queer youth struggling to obtain basic resources and kicked out of their homes by fundamentalist parents, for those people living with the legacy of colonization and slavery‑for the majority of the world's inhabitants capitalism IS the crisis. But the discourse of "crisis" isn't employed until it starts hurting the collective bottom line of the wealthy. 'This, in and of itself, can be used as an opportunity to discuss the need for socialist alternatives. And the truth is that capitalism requires these "crises" to function. People talk about events like the 1987 stock market crash, the Asian financial crisis of 1997, and the dot‑corn and housing bubbles and bursts as though they are anomalies. These things are regular features of capitalism. And those not at the top tiers of our global class system (about 95 percent of the world) are experiencing crisis every single day‑a constant crisis of sorts. So the discourse surrounding crises themselves seem to uphold that capitalism is more or less functioning the rest of the time. More and more people are coming to the realization that this is not the case‑and we need to be pressing this point as we battle against austerity. If we want to avoid "austerity," we need to smash capitalism to pieces. No amount of good‑hearted reform or Keynesian policy is going to substantively address the social crisis that is capitalism.

#### No debt deal—neither side will back down

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

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

#### Plan has bipart support

NYT, 13 (Pentagon Is Set to Lift Combat Ban for¶ Women. http://lebloglibredemonquartier.midiblogs.com/media/01/01/1176410493.pdf)

Although in the past some Republican members of the House have balked at allowing women in¶ combat, on Wednesday there appeared to be bipartisan endorsement for the decision, which was first¶ reported by The Associated Press and CNN in midafternoon.¶ “It reflects the reality of 21st century military operations,” Senator Carl Levin, Democrat of Michigan¶ and chairman of the Senate Armed Services Committee, said in a statement.Senator Patty Murray, Democrat of Washington and the chairwoman of the Senate Veterans Affairs¶ Committee, called it a “historic step for recognizing the role women have, and will continue to play, in the defense of our nation.”¶ Senator Kelly Ayotte, a New Hampshire Republican and a member of the Armed Services Committee,¶ said in a statement that she was pleased by the decision and said that it “reflects the increasing role¶ that female service members play in securing our country.”¶ Representative Loretta Sanchez, the California Democrat who has long pressed to have women’s role¶ in combat recognized, said that she was pleased that Mr. Panetta was removing what she called “the¶ archaic combat exclusion policy.”¶ Senator Kirsten E. Gillibrand, a New York Democrat who has pushed for lifting the ban, called it “a¶ proud day for our country” and an important step in recognizing “the brave women who are already¶ fighting and dying.”

### Pres Powers Good

#### Strong presidential constant interventionary wars

Schlesinger 04, (Arthur M. Jr., Professor Emeritus, City University of New York Graduate Center, THE IMPERIAL PRESIDENCY, 2004, p. 497-498.)

There is little more typically American than to despair of the republic. As early as 1802, Hamilton pronounced the Constitution a “frail and worthless fabric.” Seventy years later Henry Adams declared that “the system of 1789” has “broken down.” The dirges of our own day are hardly novel. But the constitutional strain imposed by chronic international crisi is new. Tocqueville’s warning lingers. International crisis has given American Presidents the opportunity to exercise almost royal prerogatives. Some Presidents have exercised these prerogatives with circumspection. Others have succumbed to the delusion that American has been charged by the Almighty with a global mission to redeem fallen humanity. In The Imperial Presidency I doubted that a messianic foreign policy, America as world savior, was reconcilable with the American Constitution (see pages 163-166, 206-208, 298). Nearly two decades later, I conclude with the same question. When an American President conceives himself the appointed guardian of the world in which an eternal foreign threat requires a rapid and incessant deployment of men, weapons and decisions behind a wall of secrecy, the result can only be a radical disruption of the balance of the American Constitution. It is hard to reconcile the separation of powers with a foreign policy driven by an indignant ideology and disposed to intervene unilaterally and secretly everywhere around the planet. The Constitution must buckle under the weight of a vainglorious policy, aiming at the redemption of lesser breeds without law, relying on secret actions and duplicitous methods, involving the United States in useless wars and grandiose dreams.

# 1ar

Comprehensive study proves no relationship.

Miller 2K [Morris, Adjunct Professor at the University of Ottawa's Faculty of Administration, Interdisciplinary Science Review, v 25 n4]

The question may be reformulated. Do wars spring from a popular reaction to a sudden economic crisis that exacerbates poverty and growing disparities in wealth and incomes? Perhaps one could argue, as some scholars do, that it is some dramatic event or sequence of such events leading to the exacerbation of poverty that, in turn, leads to this deplorable denouement. This exogenous factor might act as a catalyst for a violent reaction on the part of the people or on the part of the political leadership who would then possibly be tempted to seek a diversion by finding or, if need be, fabricating an enemy and setting in train the process leading to war. According to a study under- taken by Minxin Pei and Ariel Adesnik of the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, there would not appear to be any merit in this hypothesis. After studying ninety-three episodes of economic crisis in twenty-two countries in Latin America and Asia in the years since the Second World War they concluded that:19 Much of the conventional wisdom about the political impact of economic crises may be wrong ... The severity of economic crisis – as measured in terms of inflation and negative growth – **bore no relationship to the collapse of regimes** ... (or, in democratic states, rarely) to an outbreak of violence ... In the cases of dictatorships and semi-democracies, the ruling elites responded to crises by increasing repression (thereby using one form of violence to abort another).

They have no conclusive evidence that indicates anything will pass or that momentum even exists. Both sides refuse to budge because of ideological divides over healthcare and refusal to offer any concessions. That’s NBC.

Their pressure arguments are irrelevant – conservatives are deaf to the public’s concerns.

Sargent 10/2 [Greg, Washington Post, The Morning Plum: Governing crisis set to escalate dramatically http://www.washingtonpost.com/blogs/plum-line/wp/2013/10/02/the-morning-plum-governing-crisis-set-to-escalate-dramatically/]

But here’s the problem: Conservative Republicans remain convinced the public is on their side in this battle. Despite multiple polls showing disapproval of the law does not translate into public support for GOP sabotage of it, multiple Republicans are quoted today claiming the public will side with them over time. The real danger here is that many Republicans — who are in an **anti-Obamacare bubble** where no good news about the law ever penetrates; where the most minor glitch confirms the law is collapsing under its own weight; and where huge majorities will support any tactic, no matter how destructive, designed to hasten that supposedly inevitable collapse — will remain convinced the public is with them as this showdown drags into a debt ceiling crisis. This makes miscalculation about the Dem resolve not to cave on the debt limit more likely, which in turn makes default more likely. And with it, unpredictable levels of economic havoc and destruction.