### 2AC AT Circumvention

#### Will comply – even if they disagree

Bradley and Morrison 13

[Curtis, William Van Alstyne Professor of Law, Duke Law School. and Trevor, Liviu Librescu Professor of Law, Columbia Law School, Presidential Power, Historical Practice, And Legal Constraint, 2013 Directors of The Columbia Law Review Association, Inc. Columbia Law Review May, 2013, L/N]

Insisting on a sharp distinction between the law governing presidential authority that is subject to judicial review and the law that is not also takes for granted a phenomenon that merits attention - that Presidents follow judicial decisions. n118 That assumption is generally accurate in the United States today. To take one relatively recent example, despite disagreeing with the Supreme Court's determination in Hamdan v. Rumsfeld that Common Article 3 of the Geneva Conventions applies to the war on terror, the Bush Administration quickly accepted it. n119 But the reason why Presidents abide by court decisions has a connection to the broader issue [\*1131] of the constraining effect of law. An executive obligation to comply with judicial decisions is itself part of the practice-based constitutional law of the United States, so presidential compliance with this obligation may demonstrate that such law can in fact constrain the President. This is true, as we explain further in Part III, even if the effect on presidential behavior is motivated by concerns about external political perceptions rather than an internal sense of fidelity to law (or judicial review). n120

#### Obama supports NEPA agency review

Goad & Kroh 13 -- \*Manager of Research and Outreach for American Progress’ Public Lands Project AND\*\* Deputy Editor of ClimateProgress, worked on the Energy policy team at American Progress as the Associate Director for Ocean Communications (Jessica and Kiley, 4/25/2013, "Using Executive Authority to Account for the Greenhouse-Gas Emissions of Federal Projects," http://www.americanprogress.org/issues/green/report/2013/04/25/61446/using-executive-authority-to-account-for-the-greenhouse-gas-emissions-of-federal-projects/)

While Congress has shown no signs that it will take action to address the growing threat of climate change, there are a **number of executive authorities** under existing laws to address the crisis. The National Environmental Policy Act, which requires analyses of the environmental impacts of federal activities, is frequently overlooked in this context but could be an important tool for assessing the potential climate impacts from a proposed project—a key first step in shaping informed decisions. The Council on Environmental Quality should finalize its draft guidance for federal agencies to include carbon pollution in NEPA analyses, and the president should issue an executive order on this subject to give it more clarity and permanence. Additionally, CEQ must be certain to include federal resource-management agencies in its final guidance. Burning the oil, coal, and natural gas that come from our public lands and waters accounts for nearly a quarter of all U.S. greenhouse-gas emissions. Ignoring the federal mineral estate in the guidance is leaving out a large portion of the federal governments’ activities related to climate change. As President **Obama made clear** in his 2013 State of the Union address: **I will direct my cabinet to come up with executive actions we can take**, now and in the future, to **reduce pollution**, prepare our communities for the consequences of climate change, and speed the transition to more sustainable sources of energy. Ensuring that federal agencies—especially the land- and ocean-management agencies—assess greenhouse-gas pollution generated by proposed federal actions when reviewing their impacts is an important step in making this promise a reality.

### Impact – Extinction – 2AC/1AR

#### Eco-collapse causes extinction –

#### Hotspots key

Mittermeier 11

(et al, Dr. Russell Alan Mittermeier is a primatologist, herpetologist and biological anthropologist. He holds Ph.D. from Harvard in Biological Anthropology and as conducted fieldwork for over 30 years on three continents and in more than 20 countries in mainly tropical locations and he is considered an expert on biological diversity. Mittermeier has formally discovered several monkey species. From Chapter One of the book Biodiversity Hotspots – F.E. Zachos and J.C. Habel (eds.), DOI 10.1007/978-3-642-20992-5\_1, # Springer-Verlag Berlin Heidelberg 2011 – available at: http://www.academia.edu/1536096/Global\_biodiversity\_conservation\_the\_critical\_role\_of\_hotspots)

Global changes, from habitat loss and invasive species to anthropogenic¶ climate change, have initiated the sixth great mass extinction event in Earth’s¶ history. As species become threatened and vanish, so too do the broader ecosystems¶ and myriad benefits to human well-being that depend upon biodiversity. Bringing¶ an end to global biodiversity loss requires that limited available resources be guided¶ to those regions that need it most. The biodiversity hotspots do this based on the¶ conservation planning principles of irreplaceability and vulnerability. Here, we¶ review the development of the hotspots over the past two decades and present an¶ analysis of their biodiversity, updated to the current set of 35 regions. We then¶ discuss past and future efforts needed to conserve them, sustaining their fundamental¶ role both as the home of a substantial fraction of global biodiversity and as the¶ ultimate source of many ecosystem services upon which humanity depends.

### T – Restriction =Prohibit– 2AC

#### 1. We meet – plan prevents the use of armed forces if their use violates environmental statutes – that’s a restriction

Lobel 8 (Jules – Professor of Law, University of Pittsburgh Law School, “Conflicts Between the Commander in Chief and Congress: Concurrent Power over the Conduct of War”, 2008, Ohio State Law Journal, 69 Ohio St. L.J. 391, lexis)

More generally, the Court held that Congress has the power to authorize limited, undeclared war in which the President's power as Commander in Chief would be restricted. In such wars, the Commander in Chief's power would extend no further than Congress had authorized. As President Adams recognized, Congress had as a functional matter "declared war within the meaning of the Constitution" against France, but "under certain restrictions and limitations." n123 Under this generally accepted principle in our early constitutional history, Congress could limit the type of armed forces used, the number of such forces available, the weapons that could be utilized, the theaters of actions, and the rules of combat. In short, it could dramatically restrict the President's power to conduct the war.

#### 2. Judicial restriction means regulation

**Kerrigan** **73** (Frank, Judge @ Court of Appeal of California, Fourth Appellate District, Division Two, 29 Cal. App. 3d 815; 105 Cal. Rptr. 873; 1973 Cal. App. LEXIS 1235, SUN COMPANY OF SAN BERNARDINO, CALIFORNIA, Petitioner, v. THE SUPERIOR COURT OF SAN BERNARDINO COUNTY, Respondent; THE PEOPLE et al., Real Parties in Interest. PROGRESS-BULLETIN PUBLISHING COMPANY, Petitioner, v. THE SUPERIOR COURT OF SAN BERNARDINO COUNTY, Respondent; THE PEOPLE et al., Real Parties in Interest. (Consolidated Cases.), lexis)

While the studies were in progress, the United States Supreme Court found the impact of television cameras and lights in a courtroom setting prejudicial to the conduct of a fair trial. ( Estes v. Texas (1965) 381 U.S. 532 [14 L.Ed.2d 543, 85 S.Ct. 1628].) Shortly thereafter, in Sheppard v. Maxwell (1966) 384 U.S. 333, 358 [16 L.Ed.2d 600, 618, 86 S.Ct. 1507], the defendant's conviction of his wife's murder [\*\*879] was reversed because of "[the] carnival atmosphere at trial" and pervasive publicity affecting the fairness of the hearing. In reversing Dr. Sheppard's conviction, the court stated [\*\*\*15] that: (1) the publicity surrounding a trial may become so extensive and prejudicial in nature that unless neutralized by appropriate judicial procedures, a resultant conviction may not stand; (2) the trial court has the duty of so insulating the trial from publicity as to insure its fairness; (3) a free press plays a vital role in the effective and fair administration of justice. But the court did not set down any fixed rules to guide trial courts, law enforcement officers or media as to what could or could not be printed. Instead, the majority suggested that judicial restrictions on speech might sometimes be appropriate in the following dicta: "The courts [\*823] must take such steps by rule and regulation that will protect their processes from prejudicial outside interferences. Neither prosecutors, counsel for defense, the accused, witnesses, court staff nor enforcement officers coming under the jurisdiction of the court should be permitted to frustrate its function. Collaboration between counsel and the press as to information affecting the fairness of a criminal trial is not only subject to regulation, but is highly censurable and worthy of disciplinary measures. [\*\*\*16] " (Ibid., p. 363 [16 L.Ed.2d p. 620].)

#### 3. **Restrictions” means “regulations”**

Davies 30 (Major George, “CLAUSE 1.—(Scheme regulating production, supply and sale of coal.),” February, vol 235 cc2453-558, http://hansard.millbanksystems.com/commons/1930/feb/27/clause-1-scheme-regulating-production)

Major GEORGE DAVIES The hon. Member says he has heard no reason advanced for this Amendment. I am willing to give him one, and I will tell him that the reason why the benches are not full, as they were a short time ago, is that man cannot live by bread alone and, as there is a rule against the introduction of newspapers and foodstuffs, it is necessary for some of us to refresh ourselves after a late Division. I am not going to transgress the ruling of the Chair, as we have been given very great latitude, but I want to confine myself to the point at issue, which is the regulation of sale. I have had experience in the past of efforts to regulate the sale of sugar. Like the coal industry to-day, there has been in the past an over-production of many of the fundamental articles of the life of a nation. I will not dwell on the case of rubber, but the sugar situation was entirely on all fours with this situation, as it was a question of the regulation of sale. Facing a situation very similar in kind and not dissimilar in degree to the problem now before us, those connected with that particular industry in certain countries thought it an advantage to control and regulate the sale. As soon as you use the word "regulation" in this connection it is idle to suggest that it does not mean restriction. Obviously, that is the point—to restrict—and, while 2541 it is true the word "restrict" is not in this particular Clause, and cannot be argued in connection with this Amendment, yet behind the word "regulate" is the word "restrict," in other words, controlling what has been uncontrolled, production thrown on markets not able to receive it.

### Executive CP – 2AC

#### Counterpan isn’t applied extraterritorially

Hilbert 12 (Sarah – J.D. Candidate, William & Mary Law School, “A Legislative Solution to Environmental Protection in Military Action Overseas”, 2012, 37 Wm. & Mary Envtl. L. & Pol'y Rev. 263, lexis)

III. Solution A. Executive Orders It has been suggested that the solution to the inadequate DoD environmental regulation is an executive order. n119 Executive orders have been proposed because of the power of the executive branch and its ability to produce change. n120 Laporte points to President Carter's executive order as a successful way to promote NEPA's ideals overseas and cites DoD action prompted by President Carter's executive order as an indication that the executive order was successful. n121 Although Laporte acknowledges the downfalls of the DoD's response to President Carter's executive order, she attributes the response to "exemptions or ambiguities in the Order itself," rather than the DoD's response to the Order. n122 Executive orders, however, are not the best answer. It is true that executive orders can affect the extraterritorial application of environmental principles as President Carter's executive order furthered the goals of NEPA, n123 but this benefit is limited. n124 President Carter's executive order's purpose was to further the goals of NEPA, n125 but it did not have the power to override the presumption that NEPA could not apply extraterritorially. n126 The executive order may be able to capture general [\*278] ideals or priorities of the executive, but President Carter's executive order illustrated that those ideals and priorities can be implemented very differently after the DoD interprets the meaning of the executive order. n127 Laporte assumes that the executive branch has the expertise and time to draft an executive order that has the perfect amount of specificity, flexibility, and practicality, n128 but this is not realistic. Creating standards for the DoD in the way that Laporte describes the ideal executive order n129 is not a job for the executive branch.

#### E) Certainty – Legal decision key

Pildes 13 (Rick, udler Family Professor of Constitutional Law and Co-Faculty Director for the Program on Law and Security at NYU School of Law, "Does Judicial Review of National-Security Policies Constrain or Enable the Government?," 8/5, <http://www.lawfareblog.com/2013/08/does-judicial-review-of-national-security-policies-constrain-or-enable-the-government/>)

First, government actors have a need for legal clarity, particularly in national-security areas where the legal questions are novel and the stakes of guessing wrong particularly high. In the absence of more definitive court guidance, government lawyers and policymakers have spent a staggering number of hours trying to anticipate what courts might conclude is the valid scope of the government’s power to detain, or to use military trials, and similar questions. In many contexts, a significant element in what government actors need is simply legal clarity; knowledge of where the lines lie between the permitted and the forbidden can help government actors figure out how best to reach their legitimate goals. Surely there is something not fully functional about a system that requires a decade’s worth of guesswork, and all the resources involved, about exactly where the legal boundaries lie.

#### 3. Congress will roll back the counterplan during a conflict – kills solvency

Tisler **11**

[Tiffany, J.D. Candidate, University of Toledo, 2011., FEDERAL ENVIRONMENTAL LAW WAIVERS AND HOMELAND SECURITY: ASSESSING WAIVER APPLICATION IN HOMELAND SECURITY SETTINGS AT THE SOUTHERN BORDER IN COMPARISON TO NATIONAL SECURITY SETTINGS INVOLVING THE MILITARY, Spring, 2011 The University of Toledo Law Review, L/N]

In times of war, the conflict between national-security goals and environmental laws tends to come out in favor of national security, n54 and shortly after 9/11 the United States was at war. As it was, the U.S. military never particularly liked the pre-9/11 waiver system, finding the scope of waivers too narrow and the time limits incompatible with long-term activities. n55 Thus, sensing the time to strike, the military began lobbying for changes to environmental-waiver provisions in the aftermath of 9/11. n56 The military has since actively and successfully sought changes to the waiver system, giving them much broader authority to disregard environmental laws, especially for reasons of "military readiness." n57 First, the military convinced Congress to attach riders to the 2004 and 2005 Defense Appropriations Acts exempting them from provisions of the Marine Mammal Protection Act ("MMPA"), some provisions of the ESA, and the entire Migratory [\*784] Bird Treaty Act. n58 Not only did the military successfully change the application of various sections of statute, it also changed the waiver structure for the MMPA, giving the Secretary of Defense the authority to grant waivers in addition to the President. n59 Though not always successful, military lobbying efforts have removed many external checks on military activities that impact the environment, creating a dim future for the environment. n60

#### 5. **CP is misconstrued – military avoids change**

Hilbert 12 (Sarah – J.D. Candidate, William & Mary Law School, “A Legislative Solution to Environmental Protection in Military Action Overseas”, 2012, 37 Wm. & Mary Envtl. L. & Pol'y Rev. 263, lexis)

IV. Call to Action Judicial action through liability for the government and government contractors in the courts is not a viable solution for the environmental degradation and human health problems that result from military action overseas because the burdens that plaintiffs must overcome are too heavy to result in consistent decisions, or in any decisions at all. n180 Executive action through an executive order would not cause the kind of change in military behavior that is needed at this point, and Executive Orders have been ineffective in the past because the DoD was able to [\*287] misconstrue each Order through its own interpretations. n181 Legislative action provides the best option for a long-term solution that will apply to all military action, will have the intent of many federal statutes that already apply within United States borders, will hold military leaders accountable to a rigid set of procedures and standards, and will effectuate the change our country needs. n182

#### Takes out solvency - Empirically proven

Hilbert 12 (Sarah – J.D. Candidate, William & Mary Law School, “A Legislative Solution to Environmental Protection in Military Action Overseas”, 2012, 37 Wm. & Mary Envtl. L. & Pol'y Rev. 263, lexis)

II. Current Government Direction The current environmental protection plan for military efforts overseas has allowed burn pits to continue to cause health and environmental problems. Through an Executive Order, President Carter first emphasized the importance of government actors considering the environmental effects of proposed actions, n60 but the DoD interpreted the key parts of the Executive Order n61 and created the environmental protection plan it currently follows. Allowing the DoD to essentially create their own regulatory regime is contrary to environmental interests and poses a classic "fox guarding the hen house" problem. A. Executive Order 12,114 President Carter issued Executive Order 12,114-Environmental Effects Abroad of Major Federal Actions ("Executive Order 12,114") on January 4, 1979. n62 Executive Order 12,114 required officials of Federal Agencies to examine environmental effects of proposed actions and consider these effects in making decisions about actions. n63 The Executive Order mandated an information exchange between the Department of State, the Council on Environmental Quality, and any other interested agency or nation to provide information to decisionmakers through the use of environmental impact statements, bilateral or multilateral environmental studies, or concise reviews of environmental issues. n64 The Executive Order sought to further the goals of the National Environmental Policy Act ("NEPA") n65 which required environmental [\*271] assessment for governmental actions having environmental effects within the United States. n66 Executive Order 12,114 forced federal agencies to consider the environmental effect of their actions abroad, but it provided no substantive requirements or procedure for ensuring that protocol was followed. n67 The Executive Order was a start down the long road of a comprehensive environmental protection plan for the United States military, yet it was hardly a binding plan for the military to live by. Because President Carter's Executive Order lacked any substantial guidance but still mandated the military to consider the environmental effects of proposed actions, the DoD was left to interpret what the Executive Order required of it. B. Department of Defense Directive 6050.7 The DoD issued Directive 6050.7 soon after President Carter issued Executive Order 12,114 to define key terms of Executive Order 12,114 and elaborate as to what the DoD must consider when approving "major actions." n68 Because Executive Order 12,114 was not specific, the DoD granted ample discretion to commanders reviewing proposed actions. n69 The DoD interpreted "major action" to mean actions "of considerable importance involving substantial expenditures of time, money, and resources, that affect[] the environment on a large geographic scale or has substantial environmental effects on a more limited geographical area," and it sought to establish procedures for review of these actions. n70 Beyond establishing what is meant by "major action," the DoD does not define any other standard for determining when an environmental assessment is necessary. There is no definition of "substantial expenditures" or an elaboration on the geographic area requirements. n71 [\*272] The DoD also defined exceptions. Included in the list of exceptions are actions taken by the President, actions taken at the direction of the President or a cabinet officer in the course of armed conflict or when a national security risk is involved, activities of intelligence components, actions of the Office of the Assistant Secretary of Defense or the Defense Security Assistance Agency, and actions relating to nuclear activities and nuclear material except actions providing to a foreign nation a nuclear production or utilization facility. n72 The DoD's interpretation of what is required from President Carter's Executive Order weighs in the favor of the DoD. The amount of discretion given to reviewing officers allows an officer to decide that a project does not require an environmental review simply by finding that it is not a major action, which, according to DoD's interpretation of a "major action," would be easy for an officer to find. n73

#### B) Counterplan doesn’t overcome the national security exemption – prevents solvency

Stellakis 10

[John C, J.D. Candidate, 2011, Villanova University School of Law; B.A.H, 2008, Villanova University., Villanova Law Review, U.S. Navy Torpedoes NEPA: Winter v. Natural Resources Defense Council May Sink Future Environmental Pleas Brought under the National Environmental Policy Act,1/1/10 <http://digitalcommons.law.villanova.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1035&context=elj>,

The Winter holding has shown the significance of national security interests when the Court exercises discretion in deciding to fashion equitable relief.175 The Court also expressly set, and arguably raised, the bar for a requisite showing of irreparable harm to obtain a preliminary injunction for NEPA actions.176 Although narrow, the Court's decision is binding upon all courts, and thus may affect all NEPA claims brought in the lower courts. A. Weight of National Security The Winter majority demonstrated the importance of national security for both the public interest and for the Navy's interest in effectively trained sailors. 177 Although the Court discounts neither the public's environmental interest nor the effect of denying the preliminary injunction on the NRDC's interests, the majority's focus on national security serves as the Court's justification for finding an abuse of discretion by the lower courts in fashioning equitable relief, and it may be used persuasively in future cases. 178 Potential national security arguments in future cases could appeal to the Winter rationale, serving as a proverbial trump card. Courts could distinguish Winter on its narrow scope or on the facts. The Ninth Circuit distinguished Winter six months later in Internet Specialties West, Inc. v. Milon-DiGiorgio Enterprises, Inc.,179 a case dealing with trademark issues, which affirmed an injunction despite an appeal to Winters heavy public interest factor.' 80 The weight of the national security argument, however, has not yet been disturbed and may **weaken pleas for environmental protection under NEPA** if these NEPA claims will infringe military activities or other actions relating to national security. 81 NEPA and the environment may fall victim to this appeal to the national security interest. B. Raising the Irreparable Harm Bar NEPA plaintiffs seeking relief in the form of a preliminary injunction have an increased burden after Winter.'82 The relaxed standard for irreparable harm for NEPA claims, as **established in previous cases**, appears to have been set to the ordinary requisite level of establishing a likelihood of irreparable harm.183 The District Court for the Northern District of California in Save Strawberry Canyon v. Department of Energy (Strawberry Canyon),184 however, distinguished Winter and issued injunctive relief for the plaintiff.1 85 The Strawberry Canyon court found that Winter only addressed one of the two prongs of the preliminary injunction standard as established by the Ninth Circuit prior to Winter-the likelihood of success on the merits and possibility of irreparable harm prong.186 The Supreme Court in Winter neglected, according to Strawberry Canyon, to address the second prong: "A preliminary injunction is appropriate when a plaintiff demonstrates... that serious questions going to the merits were raised and the balance of hardships tips sharply in the plaintiff's favor.' 87 The Winter holding, therefore, might not preclude injunctive relief where the plaintiff cannot show a likelihood of success on the merits, but can show irreparable injury is likely and imminent and demonstrates serious meritorious issues with a favorable balancing of the hardships.188 While this holding allows plaintiffs to obtain injunctive relief without showing a likelihood of success on the merits, it still requires a showing of a likelihood of irreparable harm.189 The Winter likelihood standard may continue to impose an increased burden for NEPA plaintiffs seeking relief via equitable remedies. 190 The Winter holding also forecloses relief for NEPA plaintiffs who have difficulty establishing likelihood of irreparable harm, or any degree of irreparable harm acceptable in court.191 For NEPA's and the environment's sake, hopefully the Winter holding continues to remain narrow and tailored to the Navy's particular interest in antisubmarine warfare training in California, other significant military operations and activities, or when national security is truly and directly at issue. Finally, to meet the Court's seemingly established likelihood standard of irreparable harm for all NEPA claims, future NEPA plaintiffs must meet a higher burden of proof in litigation before the courts

### CMR Add-On 2AC

#### Plan solves CMR

Nevitt 13

[Mark. He’s a badass and an American Patriot. Don’t take our word for it though, he is a Lieutenant Commander (LCDR), United States Navy. LCDR Mark P. Nevitt is an active duty Navy judge advocate. He obtained his LL.M. with distinction at the Georgetown University Law Center (GULC), his J.D. from Georgetown Law and his B.S.E. from the Wharton School at the University of Pennsylvania, where he was commissioned as a naval officer via the NROTC program. A former naval flight officer who has flown combat mission from aircraft carriers, LCDR Nevitt is currently assigned as the Region Environmental Counsel (REC) for the Mid-Atlantic Region in Norfolk, VA, DEFENDING THE ENVIRONMENT: A MISSION

FOR THE WORLD’S MILITARIES, March 12, 2013, pp. 42-53]

**U.S. Environmental Laws Serve to Uphold the Longstanding Tradition of Civilian Control of the Military** Ultimately, judicial enforcement through the APA and myriad citizen suit provisions within environmental statutes upholds the U.S.’s longstanding tradition of civilian control over the military. Such enforcement furthers the Constitution’s adherence to a civilian controlled military led by an elected President serving as Commander-in-Chief of the Army and Navy, and addresses the centuries-old concern about a standing Army as a potential danger and concerns regarding separation of powers. This is more important than ever, as there has been an increasing chasm between civil and military sectors with the emergence of an all-volunteer force emerging at the end of the Vietnam War and a comparative lower number of elected officials with military service. For example, James Madison, in Federalist No 51, warned that “usurpations are guarded against by a division of the government into distinct and separate departments.” The Founders desired to have all three branches of government assert some form of control over the military. Today, American environmental law is largely faithful to the Founders’ vision in not carving out a completely different set of laws for the military. This ensures constitutional control and day-to-day accountability to its citizens, reaffirming the longstanding tradition of civilian control of the military and serving as a bulwark against usurpation. This is significant. For many day-to-day matters, the U.S. military operates separately from the civilian world that it is sworn to protect. The importance of having a military accountable to, and representative of, the citizenry serves a democracy-reinforcing function that is aligned with the Founders’ concerns regarding a military. These concerns are particularly critical today in light of the sheer size of the today’s military and the continual existence of standing armed forces. A “standing Army,” no longer a Cold War novelty, is now the new normal. The Founders could not imagine the existing military-industrial complex that exists in the U.S. with its forces stationed throughout the globe. Today, the DoD is the largest single employer in the world, a hegemonic military power that is equal in size and power to the next twelve militaries of the world combined—and it is held accountable for its environmental stewardship. Contrast, too, environmental citizen suit provisions and APA civil remedies with the U.S. military’s existing criminal justice system. Only uniformed judge advocates currently serving in the military can prosecute service member charged with a crime in a military court-martial, and there is a distinct and separate criminal law system within the military governed by the Uniformed Code of Military Justice. Civilians play a limited role in this system and, while the judgments of military courts are ultimately reviewable by the U.S. Supreme Court, this is exceedingly rare and the military justice system is effectively self-contained within the uniformed military on DoD installations. The use of civil litigation pursuant to environmental laws, by contrast, ensures continual and important oversight of the military’s actions. Consider the inherent value of citizen suit and APA provisions that allow for judicial enforceability against the DoD. These judicial protections ensure a consistent nexus and thread of accountability between the larger population and the military. On a practical level, getting on a military installation without a DoD identification card can be difficult without an official purpose for the visit. Force protection and anti-terrorism measures have only increased the difficulty of obtaining installation access since September 11th. For example, prior to the attacks on 9/11, Norfolk Naval Station was largely an open base available for tours and visits by the general public. Now, general visitations on base are rare occurrences, only increasing the divide between the civilian and military sectors Indeed, DoD is often sued by people well outside the military sphere, such as environmental groups actively engaged in reviewing—and litigating—DoD’s actions. Provided that the Article III “case or controversy” requirements are met, any person or citizen group may bring a lawsuit in federal court against DoD seeking relief pursuant to a citizen suit provision embedded within the particular environmental regulation, or pursuant to the “arbitrary and capricious” standard of the APA. There is a considerable body of litigation against DoD by environmental groups well outside the military sphere that would otherwise not normally interact with the military.

#### Nuclear war

**Cohen ’00** (Eliot A.-, Prof. @ Paul H. Nitze School of Advanced International Studies & director of the Strategic Studies department @ Johns Hopkins, worked for Dod, taught at the U.S. Naval War College, Fall, National Interest, “Why the Gap Matters - gap between military and civilian world”, <http://www.24hourscholar.com/p/articles/mi_m2751/is_2000_Fall/ai_65576871/pg_4?pi=scl>)

At the same time, the military exercises control, to a remarkable degree, of force structure and weapons acquisition. To be sure, Congress adds or trims requests at the margin, and periodically the administration will cancel a large program, such as the navy's projected replacement of the A-6 bomber. But by and large, the services have successfully protected programs that reflect ways of doing business going back for decades. One cannot explain otherwise current plans for large purchases of short-range fighter aircraft for the air force, supercarriers and traditional surface warships for the navy, and heavy artillery pieces for the army. Civilian control has meant, in practice, a general oversight of acquisition and some degree of control by veto of purchases, but nothing on the scale of earlier decisions to, for example, terminate the draft, re-deploy fleets, or develop counterinsurgency forces. The result is a force that looks very much like a shrunken version of the Cold War military of fifteen years ago- -which, indeed, was the initial post-Cold War design known as the "base force." The strength of the military voice and the weakness of civilian control, together with sheer inertia, has meant that the United States has failed to reevaluate its strategy and force structure after the Cold War. Despite a plethora of "bottom-up reviews" by official and semiofficial commissions, the force structure remains that of the Cold War, upgraded a bit and reduced in size by 40 percent. So What? WHAT WILL be the long-term consequences of these trends? To some extent, they have become visible already: the growing politicization of the officer corps; a submerged but real recruitment and retention crisis; a collapse of junior officers' confidence in their own leaders; [7] the odd antipathy between military and civilian cultures even as the two, in some respects, increasingly overlap; deadlock in the conduct of active military operations; and stagnation in the development of military forces for a geopolitical era radically different from the past one. To be sure, such phenomena have their precedents in American history. But such dysfunction occurred in a different context--one in which the American military did not have the task of maintaining global peace or a predominance of power across continents, and in which the armed forces consumed barely noticeable fractions of economic resources and decisionmakers' time. Today, the stakes are infinitely larger. For the moment, the United States dominates the globe militarily, as it does economically and culturally. It is doubtful that such predominance will long go unchallenged; were that to be the case it would reflect a change in the human condition that goes beyond all human experience of international politics over the millennia. Already, some of the signs of those challenges have begun to appear: increased tension with the rising power of China, including threats of force from that country against the United States and its allies; the development of modes of warfare--from terrorism through the spread of weapons of mass destruction--designed to play on American weaknesses; the appearance of problems (peacemaking, broadly defined) that will resist conventional solutions. None of these poses a mortal threat to the Republic, or is likely to do so anytime soon. Yet cumulatively, the consequences have been unfortunate enough; the inept conclusion to the Gulf War, the Somalia fiasco, and dithering over American policy in Yugoslavia may all partially be attributed to the poor state of American civil-military relations. So too may the subtle erosion of morale in the American military and the defense reform deadlock, which has preserved, to far too great a degree, outdated structures and mentalities. For now, to be sure, the United States is wealthy and powerful enough to afford such pratfalls and inefficiencies. But the **full consequences** will not be felt for some years, and not until a major military crisis--a challenge as severe in its way as the Korean or Vietnam War--arises. Such an eventuality; difficult as it may be to imagine today, could occur in any of a **number of venues**: in a conflict with China over Taiwan, in a desperate attempt to shore up collapsing states in Central or South America, or in a renewed outbreak of violence--this time with weapons of mass destruction thrown into the mix-in Southwest Asia. THE PARADOX of increased social and institutional vulnerability on the one hand and increased military influence on narrow sectors of policymaking on the other is the essence of the contemporary civil-military problem. Its roots lie not in the machinations of power hungry generals; they have had influence thrust upon them. Nor do they lie in the fecklessness of civilian leaders determined to remake the military in the image of civil society; all militaries must, in greater or lesser degree, share some of the mores and attitudes of the broader civilization from which they have emerged. The problem reflects, rather, deeper and more enduring changes in politics, society and technology.

### A2: Non –Shutdown DA – 2AC

#### Shutdown fight thumps the DA

CBS News 10/5/13 ("Government shutdown drags on; Congress to take Sunday off," http://www.cbsnews.com/8301-250\_162-57606174/government-shutdown-drags-on-congress-to-take-sunday-off/)

With much of the federal government shut down for the fifth day, Congress has its hands full trying to reach an agreement on reopening the government, but one brief spot of compromise emerged on Friday, with Republicans and Democrats both voicing support for a proposal to restore back pay to federal employees who have been furloughed during the shutdown.¶ ¶ The House will vote Saturday on the measure before recessing until Monday. The vote is expected to pass with bipartisan support. Senate Democratic leaders have not commented publicly on the proposal, but the White House has signaled its strong support.¶ "Federal workers keep the Nation safe and secure and provide vital services that support the economic security of American families," a statement from the White House read. "The Administration appreciates that the Congress is acting promptly to move this bipartisan legislation and looks forward to the bill's swift passage."¶ Restoring back pay to federal workers is "something Congresses have done every time there's been a shutdown, and it's something bipartisan majorities support," White House spokesman Jay Carney added on Friday.¶ Given the administration's aversion to other bills that would address some of the impacts of the shutdown without reopening the entire government - an aversion that has been supported strongly by Senate Democrats - it is likely that the bill will clear the Senate as well and head to the president's desk.¶ Unfortunately, that is where the bipartisan agreement ends, for the most part.¶ The parties remain as far apart on Saturday as they have been for much of the week, with Democrats in the House and Senate calling for a "clean" bill to reopen the government with no strings attached, and Republicans demanding some kind of concession from Democrats on Obamacare before they consent to end the shutdown.

### GOP Blocks

#### Won’t pass – new GOP demands for spending cuts

Schroder 10/3/13 (Peter, The Hill, “GOP puts new price on debt hike (Video),” <http://thehill.com/homenews/news/326271-gop-puts-new-price-on-debt-hike#ixzz2gh1fRpw7>)

GOP puts new price on debt hike (Video)¶ Rank-and-file members want Speaker John Boehner (R-Ohio) to return to the so-called “Boehner Rule,” which they say means any debt limit hike must be matched by an equal amount of spending cuts.¶ An earlier GOP measure to raise the debt ceiling included a host of GOP priorities, including defunding ObamaCare and constructing the Keystone XL pipeline, but not dollar-for-dollar spending cuts.¶ Now, as it looks increasingly like the government shutdown fight will be paired with raising the debt ceiling, Republicans are pushing hard for a strong opening bid and are adamant that changes to entitlement programs be included in any final deal.¶ “The American people are realizing that spending has got to be brought under control,” said Rep. Marsha Blackburn (R-Tenn.). “I want three dollars’ worth of cuts for any dollar [of debt limit increase.]”¶ Washington is struggling to find a way out of the standoff over the government shutdown with the Oct. 17 deadline for raising the debt ceiling fast approaching.¶ The earlier GOP plan has been shelved, but a spokesman for Boehner on Wednesday said it technically met the Boehner Rule when taking into account both cuts and economic growth.¶ Rep. Kevin Brady (R-Texas), who released an economic report touting the benefits of the earlier plan, told The Hill on Wednesday that his colleagues are looking for more “meaningful” cuts, particularly on entitlements.¶ “It’s very much in play,” he said of the dollar-for-dollar approach. “Discretionary savings were modest but important, but really to get a handle on our finances, we’ve got to really start to save the entitlements.”¶ Asked what he wants on the debt ceiling deal, Rep. Marlin Stutzman (R-Ind.) quickly replied, “dollar-for-dollar cuts.”¶ “We’ve got to start getting control of our spending,” he added. “I’d like to see us even address entitlement programs.”¶ In private, many in the financial industry are growing increasingly concerned about a possible default, given the broad gap between the two parties and the shrinking timeline for action.¶ President Obama has repeatedly said he will not negotiate over raising the debt limit even as he called congressional leaders to the White House on Wednesday to discuss both the shutdown and debt ceiling.¶ Some speculate stocks must crash to get the sides to compromise.¶ “People are willing to risk it all, the credibility of the country … for political reasons,” said one banking lobbyist. “You let the market fall by 400 or 500 points and watch the constituent calls start to come in.”¶ The president huddled Wednesday with the heads of the nation’s largest financial institutions, who reiterated their concern over using the debt limit as a political tool.¶ “Individual members of our group represent every point on the political spectrum,” Goldman Sachs head Lloyd Blankfein told reporters after the private meeting. “You can litigate these policy issues, you can re-litigate these policy issues in a public forum, but they shouldn’t use the threat of causing the U.S. to fail on its obligation to repay debt as a cudgel.”¶ Republicans have long argued they have public opinion on their side in the debt fight, but a new poll released Wednesday by CNN/ORC International found that a majority of the public believe failing to raise the debt limit would be a bad thing for the nation. Only 38 percent said it would be a positive.¶ A Quinnipiac University poll released one day earlier found 64 percent opposed blocking a debt-limit boost, while 27 percent favored it.¶ Those results suggest a significant shift from earlier polling, which typically found a large number of Americans opposed to hiking the borrowing limit. A Sept. 13 poll from NBC News and The Wall Street Journal found twice as many Americans opposed a debt limit boost than supported it.¶ Republicans insist they will have leverage in the debt-ceiling talks with the White House.

### Obama Good – 2AC

#### 1. Won’t pass –

#### 2. PC low –

#### 3. Congress likes the plan

Janofsky 05

[Michael, NY Times, 5/11/05, Pentagon Is Asking Congress to Loosen Environmental Laws, <http://www.nytimes.com/2005/05/11/politics/11enviro.html?_r=0>]

Dozens of groups have complained to Congress that the military's needs are covered by the laws that they seek to change and that waivers would result in conditions getting worse on and around the nation's military bases, endangering the health of millions of people. As the owner of 425 active bases and more than 10,000 training ranges, the Defense Department is widely regarded as one of the nation's leading polluters, producing vast amounts of chemicals from ordnance that leach into groundwater, as well as air pollution from military vehicles. The Environmental Protection Agency lists more than 130 Superfund sites on military bases. "Congress would never consider letting the nation's biggest corporate polluter off the hook," Heather Taylor, deputy legislative director for the Natural Resources Defense Council, said in a conference call with reporters. "Why, then, would Congress grant immunity to America's, and the world's, largest polluter?" Since 2001, the Pentagon has been asking Congress for greater latitude in complying with environmental laws. When it came to birds and animals, lawmakers were willing to compromise, granting exemptions to federal laws. But they have been more resistant to changes that might affect human health under the Clean Air Act; the Resource Conservation and Recovery Act, dealing with solid waste; and the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation and Liability Act, which deals with toxic wastes and is better known as the Superfund law.

#### 4. Courts don’t link

Litwick and Schragger 10/8/06(Dahlia and Richard, Legal Affairs Correspondent @ Slate Magazine + Prof of Law @ UVA, Wash Post, lexis)

Criticizing the court for overturning the laws passed by Congress -- as Specter did repeatedly during the confirmation hearings for John G. Roberts Jr. and Samuel A. Alito Jr. -- is fair . But crying "judicial activism" at the same time you rely on the courts for political cover when you're too timid to defy the electorate -- or your president -- is hypocritical . Why should the Supreme Court defer to a Congress that adopts laws it suspects are unconstitutional? And what should we think of those elected officials who would take so cavalier an attitude toward their oath to uphold the Constitution? Members of Congress take the same oath as Supreme Court justices do, after all. And Congress regularly asserts its institutional capacity to interpret the Constitution -- to act on an equal footing with the Supreme Court in deciding the constitutionality of a law. Moreover, the justices are supposed to assume that Congress never intentionally adopts an unconstitutional law, and you need attend oral argument for only a few moments to know how seriously they take that charge. So how is it possible that an oath-bound member of Congress can support a law that he or she believes violates the Constitution? Congress gives in to the temptation of passing bills that are of questionable constitutionality because it's easy and convenient . Political expediency seems to trump constitutional principle. The elected branches need never defy the popular will if the courts are available to do so instead. And those members of Congress who insist that the courts should stay out of Congress's business should recognize Congress for the enabler it has become. It's a two-way street: The courts work with what Congress sends them and sometimes Congress purposely sends them unconstitutional legislation, because it is politically expedient to do so. That's why lawmakers who know that legislation to ban flag burning violates the First Amendment regularly trot it out anyway. It is an easy way to mollify voters, while letting some other branch grapple with what the Constitution requires. As a bonus , lawmakers then can blame the courts for usurping the will of the electorate, turning an ordinary political pander into an Olympic-worthy double-pander. So instead of pointing fingers at the court, let's call the whole relationship what it is: dysfunctional . For all its railing against the court, Congress sometimes relies on it to achieve substantive aims. The court, sheltered from political fallout, can sometimes afford to be brave when Congress cannot . But this suggests that cries of "judicial activism" from the Congress should be suspect. As is the case in any dysfunctional relationship, Congress has a vested interest in being upheld when it wants to be, and struck down when it needs to be bailed out.

#### 5. Plan’s announced in June

Ward 10 (Jake, “Bilski Decision Tomorrow (Thursday, June 17th)? Maybe?”, Anticipate This! (Patent and Trademark Law Blog), 6-17, http://anticipatethis.wordpress.com/2010/06/16/bilski-decision-tomorrow-thursday-june-17th-maybe/)

In mid-May until the end of June, the Supreme Court of the United States (SCOTUS) releases orders and opinions.  SCOTUS has yet to issue a number of decisions this term, however, and it is rapidly moving toward summer recess.  Most notable from a patent law perspective is that the decision in [Bilski v. Kappos](http://anticipatethis.wordpress.com/?s=bilski), which was argued in November 2009, has yet to be decided.

#### Losers lose has already been triggered

**NPR 9/21**/13 (NPR, “Have Obama's Troubles Weakened Him For Fall's Fiscal Fights?”

[http://www.ideastream.org/news/npr/224494760](http://www.ideastream.org/news/npr/224494760m), September 21, 2013)

President Obama has had a tough year. He failed to pass gun legislation. Plans for an immigration overhaul have **stalled** in the House. He barely escaped what would have been a humiliating rejection by Congress on his plan to strike Syria.¶ Just this week, his own Democrats forced Larry Summers, the president's first choice to head the Federal Reserve, to withdraw.¶ Former Clinton White House aide Bill Galston says all these issues have **weakened the unity of the president's coalition.**¶"It's not a breach, but there has been some real tension there," he says, "and that's something that neither the president nor congressional Democrats can afford as the budget battle intensifies."¶ Obama is now facing showdowns with the Republicans over a potential government shutdown and a default on the nation's debt. On Friday, the House voted to fund government operations through mid-December, while also defunding the president's signature health care law — a position that's bound to fail in the Senate.¶ As these fiscal battles proceed, **Republicans have been emboldened by the president's recent troubles**, says former GOP leadership aide Ron Bonjean.

#### 7. PC not real

Hirsch 13

[Michael, chief correspondent for the National Journal and former senior editor and columnist at Newsweek, "There's no such thing as political capital.” 2/27/13, <http://news.yahoo.com/no-thing-political-capital-201002390--politics.html>]

On Tuesday, in his State of the Union address, President Obama will do what every president does this time of year. For about 60 minutes, he will lay out a sprawling and ambitious wish list highlighted by gun control and immigration reform, climate change and debt reduction. In response, the pundits will do what they always do this time of year: They will talk about how unrealistic most of the proposals are, discussions often informed by sagacious reckonings of how much “political capital” Obama possesses to push his program through. Most of this talk will have no bearing on what actually happens over the next four years. Consider this: Three months ago, just before the November election, if someone had talked seriously about Obama having enough political capital to oversee passage of both immigration reform and gun-control legislation at the beginning of his second term—even after winning the election by 4 percentage points and 5 million votes (the actual final tally)—this person would have been called crazy and stripped of his pundit’s license. (It doesn’t exist, but it ought to.) In his first term, in a starkly polarized country, the president had been so frustrated by GOP resistance that he finally issued a limited executive order last August permitting immigrants who entered the country illegally as children to work without fear of deportation for at least two years. Obama didn’t dare to even bring up gun control, a Democratic “third rail” that has cost the party elections and that actually might have been even less popular on the right than the president’s health care law. And yet, for reasons that have very little to do with Obama’s personal prestige or popularity—variously put in terms of a “mandate” or “political capital”—chances are fair that both will now happen. What changed? In the case of gun control, of course, it wasn’t the election. It was the horror of the 20 first-graders who were slaughtered in Newtown, Conn., in mid-December. The sickening reality of little girls and boys riddled with bullets from a high-capacity assault weapon seemed to precipitate a sudden tipping point in the national conscience. One thing changed after another. Wayne LaPierre of the National Rifle Association marginalized himself with poorly chosen comments soon after the massacre. The pro-gun lobby, once a phalanx of opposition, began to fissure into reasonables and crazies. Former Rep. Gabrielle Giffords, D-Ariz., who was shot in the head two years ago and is still struggling to speak and walk, started a PAC with her husband to appeal to the moderate middle of gun owners. Then she gave riveting and poignant testimony to the Senate, challenging lawmakers: “Be bold.” As a result, momentum has appeared to build around some kind of a plan to curtail sales of the most dangerous weapons and ammunition and the way people are permitted to buy them. It’s impossible to say now whether such a bill will pass and, if it does, whether it will make anything more than cosmetic changes to gun laws. But one thing is clear: The political tectonics have shifted dramatically in very little time. Whole new possibilities exist now that didn’t a few weeks ago. Meanwhile, the Republican members of the Senate’s so-called Gang of Eight are pushing hard for a new spirit of compromise on immigration reform, a sharp change after an election year in which the GOP standard-bearer declared he would make life so miserable for the 11 million illegal immigrants in the U.S. that they would “self-deport.” But this turnaround has very little to do with Obama’s personal influence—his political mandate, as it were. It has almost entirely to do with just two numbers: 71 and 27. That’s 71 percent for Obama, 27 percent for Mitt Romney, the breakdown of the Hispanic vote in the 2012 presidential election. Obama drove home his advantage by giving a speech on immigration reform on Jan. 29 at a Hispanic-dominated high school in Nevada, a swing state he won by a surprising 8 percentage points in November. But the movement on immigration has mainly come out of the Republican Party’s recent introspection, and the realization by its more thoughtful members, such as Sen. Marco Rubio of Florida and Gov. BobbyJindal of Louisiana, that without such a shift the party may be facing demographic death in a country where the 2010 census showed, for the first time, that white births have fallen into the minority. It’s got nothing to do with Obama’s political capital or, indeed, Obama at all. The point is not that “political capital” is a meaningless term. Often it is a synonym for “mandate” or “momentum” in the aftermath of a decisive election—and just about every politician ever elected has tried to claim more of a mandate than he actually has. Certainly, Obama can say that because he was elected and Romney wasn’t, he has a better claim on the country’s mood and direction. Many pundits still defend political capital as a useful metaphor at least. “It’s an unquantifiable but meaningful concept,” says Norman Ornstein of the American Enterprise Institute. “You can’t really look at a president and say he’s got 37 ounces of political capital. But the fact is, it’s a concept that matters, if you have popularity and some momentum on your side.” The real problem is that the idea of political capital—or mandates, or momentum—is so poorly defined that presidents and pundits often get it wrong. “Presidents usually over-estimate it,” says George Edwards, a presidential scholar at Texas A&M University. “The best kind of political capital—some sense of an electoral mandate to do something—is very rare. It almost never happens. In 1964, maybe. And to some degree in 1980.” For that reason, political capital is a concept that misleads far more than it enlightens. It is distortionary. It conveys the idea that we know more than we really do about the ever-elusive concept of political power, and it discounts the way unforeseen events can suddenly change everything. Instead, it suggests, erroneously, that a political figure has a concrete amount of political capital to invest, just as someone might have real investment capital—that a particular leader can bank his gains, and the size of his account determines what he can do at any given moment in history. Naturally, any president has practical and electoral limits. Does he have a majority in both chambers of Congress and a cohesive coalition behind him? Obama has neither at present. And unless a surge in the economy—at the moment, still stuck—or some other great victory gives him more momentum, it is inevitable that the closer Obama gets to the 2014 election, the less he will be able to get done. Going into the midterms, Republicans will increasingly avoid any concessions that make him (and the Democrats) stronger. But the abrupt emergence of the immigration and gun-control issues illustrates how suddenly shifts in mood can occur and how political interests can align in new ways just as suddenly. Indeed, the pseudo-concept of political capital masks a larger truth about Washington that is kindergarten simple: You just don’t know what you can do until you try. Or as Ornstein himself once wrote years ago, “Winning wins.” In theory, and in practice, depending on Obama’s handling of any particular issue, even in a polarized time, he could still deliver on a lot of his second-term goals, depending on his skill and the breaks. Unforeseen catalysts can appear, like Newtown. Epiphanies can dawn, such as when many Republican Party leaders suddenly woke up in panic to the huge disparity in the Hispanic vote. Some political scientists who study the elusive calculus of how to pass legislation and run successful presidencies say that political capital is, at best, an empty concept, and that almost nothing in the academic literature successfully quantifies or even defines it. “It can refer to a very abstract thing, like a president’s popularity, but there’s no mechanism there. That makes it kind of useless,” says Richard Bensel, a government professor at Cornell University. Even Ornstein concedes that the calculus is far more complex than the term suggests. Winning on one issue often changes the calculation for the next issue; there is never any known amount of capital. “The idea here is, if an issue comes up where the conventional wisdom is that president is not going to get what he wants, and he gets it, then each time that happens, it changes the calculus of the other actors” Ornstein says. “If they think he’s going to win, they may change positions to get on the winning side. It’s a bandwagon effect.”

### PC Fails

#### PC fails on econ issues

Feldmann 10/1/13 (Linda, Staff @ Christian Science Monitor, "Government shutdown: Obama faces political risks, too," http://www.csmonitor.com/USA/DC-Decoder/2013/1001/Government-shutdown-Obama-faces-political-risks-too)

But this shutdown is different from those in the past. Obama has not been actively working with the House Republican leadership to break the impasse. The Senate majority leader, Harry Reid (D) of Nevada, has carried the president’s water in the upper chamber. Add to that a healthy dose of intramural conflict among Republicans – those who support going to the mat over the ACA, a.k.a. Obamacare, and those who don’t.¶ Obama’s Rose Garden approach can cut two ways: It keeps him above the fray, demonstrating that he doesn’t believe he should be negotiating over a law that has already passed Congress, been signed, and upheld by the US Supreme Court. But if the shutdown drags on for more than a few days and he remains hunkered down at 1600 Pennsylvania Avenue, he risks looking uninvolved and, perhaps, uncaring. Or, at least, the public could perceive him that way.¶ Under the Reagan and Clinton shutdowns, both presidents actively worked with opposition leaders – House Speakers Tip O’Neill (D) and Newt Gingrich (R), respectively. Obama has spoken on the phone with Speaker John Boehner (R) of Ohio, most recently Monday night, as the hours ticked down toward the shutdown, but there was no sense that could break the impasse.

### ECON I/L D

#### Fed Reserve and private sector fill in to solve impact

Henry 13 (Emil, former assistant Treasury secretary, January 21st, 2013, “Amid the Debt-Ceiling Debate, Overblown Fears of Default,” <http://online.wsj.com/article/SB10001424127887323442804578235970716809666.html>)

These concerns can be largely addressed by legislation or pre-emptive action by the private sector. For example, the first line of defense against default of interest or principal on our debt is legislation, such as that proposed in the Full Faith and Credit Act of 2011 by Sen. Pat Toomey (R., Pa.), which prioritizes payments of interest and principal before other government expenditures. We can afford this commitment because interest payments for 2013 are projected by the Congressional Budget Office to be 7% of tax receipts, **meaning 93% of the government's revenues can be deployed elsewhere**. Even with this legislation, however, there is further risk of principal default. Namely, once the ceiling is hit, the government will still need to issue new Treasury debt to retire maturing debt—and in large quantities. In 2013, the Treasury will need to issue about $3 trillion to refund maturing securities. A failed auction or the mass refusal of investors to roll over T-bills (a "buyer's strike") might trigger a default. Yet if the Treasury found itself in the highly unlikely position where no amount of interest-rate increase could create a clearing price for a successful auction, Congress always has the ability to raise the ceiling at any time and for any amount. And, as a last resort, if Congress were recalcitrant in such a difficult circumstance, **the Federal Reserve would be well within its mandate to intervene to provide liquidity by purchasing securities.** The Fed has purchased some $2 trillion of Treasury securities since the financial crisis began in 2007, and it owns more than a trillion dollars in non-Treasury securities that could be partially monetized. Treasury Secretary Timothy Geithner has warned of another form of technical default saying legislation would "not protect from nonpayment the other obligations of the United States, such as military and civilian salaries, tax refunds, contractual payments to individuals and businesses for services and goods, and many others" whose nonpayment would compromise the government's credit-worthiness. To this I suggest an ancient remedy: Figure it out, just as the private sector does when times are difficult. Rationalize bloated agencies. Eliminate duplicative programs. Reduce salaries. Initiate a hiring freeze. Negotiate with vendors to make payments over time. And if these are not workable solutions as Mr. Geithner implies, then he or his successor should come before Congress and explain why they are not. Republicans will listen. They too have no interest in an economic Armageddon. Regarding Social Security payments, there are typically timing differences between the receipt of tax revenues and the payment of entitlement expenses implying the potential for delayed checks. Legislation could allow for temporary increases in the debt ceiling to cover these timing differences and prevent delay. Some Wall Street firms warn of entangling complexities in the market for Treasury securities. They worry that the heightened risk of default will cause funds to divest themselves of Treasurys in such scale as to create mass dislocation. They also worry that the $4 trillion "repo" market, where Treasurys are the preferred collateral, would see rates rise to the extent Treasurys are seen as more risky. Banks might then redeploy capital away from lending to support the additional margin required by the market, thus hurting the economy. These may be reasonable concerns but House Republicans should recognize them as worries of an establishment with, first and foremost, a bottom line to protect. In the summer of 2011, amid great uncertainty over the debt ceiling and ultimately a downgrade by Standard & Poor's to AA+ from AAA, there was similar fear and divestitures of Treasurys, but markets functioned nonetheless. Interest rates even declined as the market continued to adorn U.S. Treasurys with the halo of being safe relative to other sovereign debt.

### 1NC No Econ War

#### Economic decline doesn’t cause war

Tir 10 [Jaroslav Tir - Ph.D. in Political Science, University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign and is an Associate Professor in the Department of International Affairs at the University of Georgia, “Territorial Diversion: Diversionary Theory of War and Territorial Conflict”, The Journal of Politics, 2010, Volume 72: 413-425)]

Empirical support for the economic growth rate is much weaker. The finding that poor economic performance is associated with a higher likelihood of territorial conflict initiation is significant only in Models 3–4.14 The weak results are not altogether surprising given the findings from prior literature. In accordance with the insignificant relationships of Models 1–2 and 5–6, Ostrom and Job (1986), for example, note that the likelihood that a U.S. President will use force is uncertain, as the bad economy might create incentives both to divert the public’s attention with a foreign adventure and to focus on solving the economic problem, thus reducing the inclination to act abroad. Similarly, Fordham (1998a, 1998b), DeRouen (1995), and Gowa (1998) find no relation between a poor economy and U.S. use of force. Furthermore, Leeds and Davis (1997) conclude that the conflict-initiating behavior of 18 industrialized democracies is unrelated to economic conditions as do Pickering and Kisangani (2005) and Russett and Oneal (2001) in global studies. In contrast and more in line with my findings of a significant relationship (in Models 3–4), Hess and Orphanides (1995), for example, argue that economic recessions are linked with forceful action by an incumbent U.S. president. Furthermore, Fordham’s (2002) revision of Gowa’s (1998) analysis shows some effect of a bad economy and DeRouen and Peake (2002) report that U.S. use of force diverts the public’s attention from a poor economy. Among cross-national studies, Oneal and Russett (1997) report that slow growth increases the incidence of militarized disputes, as does Russett (1990)—but only for the United States; slow growth does not affect the behavior of other countries. Kisangani and Pickering (2007) report some significant associations, but they are sensitive to model specification, while Tir and Jasinski (2008) find a clearer link between economic underperformance and increased attacks on domestic ethnic minorities. While none of these works has focused on territorial diversions, my own inconsistent findings for economic growth fit well with the mixed results reported in the literature.15 Hypothesis 1 thus receives strong support via the unpopularity variable but only weak support via the economic growth variable. These results suggest that embattled leaders are much more likely to respond with territorial diversions to direct signs of their unpopularity (e.g., strikes, protests, riots) than to general background conditions such as economic malaise. Presumably, protesters can be distracted via territorial diversions while fixing the economy would take a more concerted and prolonged policy effort. Bad economic conditions seem to motivate only the most serious, fatal territorial confrontations. This implies that leaders may be reserving the most high-profile and risky diversions for the times when they are the most desperate, that is when their power is threatened both by signs of discontent with their rule and by more systemic problems plaguing the country (i.e., an underperforming economy).

#### No escalation

Robert Jervis 11, Professor in the Department of Political Science and School of International and Public Affairs at Columbia University, December 2011, “Force in Our Times,” Survival, Vol. 25, No. 4, p. 403-425

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-my-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 preexisting 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.

### Flexibility DA – 2AC

#### Obama will continue to consult for military actions – takes out the link

Rothkopf 13

[David, CEO and editor at large of Foreign Policy, The Gamble, 8/31/13, <http://www.foreignpolicy.com/articles/2013/08/31/the_gamble?page=0,1>]

Whatever happens with regard to Syria, the larger consequence of the president's action will resonate for years. The president has made it highly unlikely that at any time during the remainder of his term he will be able to initiate military action without seeking congressional approval. It is understandable that many who have opposed actions (see: Libya) taken by the president without congressional approval under the War Powers Act would welcome Obama's newly consultative approach. It certainly appears to be more in keeping with the kind of executive-legislative collaboration envisioned in the Constitution. While America hasn't actually required a congressional declaration of war to use military force since the World War II era, the bad decisions of past presidents make Obama's move appealing to the war-weary and the war-wary. But whether you agree with the move or not, it must be acknowledged that now that Obama has set this kind of precedent -- and for a military action that is exceptionally limited by any standard (a couple of days, no boots on the ground, perhaps 100 cruise missiles fired against a limited number of military targets) -- it will be very hard for him to do anything comparable or greater without again returning to the Congress for support. And that's true whether or not the upcoming vote goes his way. 4. This president just dialed back the power of his own office. Obama has reversed decades of precedent regarding the nature of presidential war powers -- and whether you prefer this change in the balance of power or not, as a matter of quantifiable fact he is transferring greater responsibility for U.S. foreign policy to a Congress that is more divided, more incapable of reasoned debate or action, and more dysfunctional than any in modern American history. Just wait for the Rand Paul filibuster or similar congressional gamesmanship. The president's own action in Libya was undertaken without such approval. So, too, was his expansion of America's drone and cyber programs. Will future offensive actions require Congress to weigh in? How will Congress react if the president tries to pick and choose when this precedent should be applied? At best, the door is open to further acrimony. At worst, the paralysis of the U.S. Congress that has given us the current budget crisis and almost no meaningful recent legislation will soon be coming to a foreign policy decision near you. Consider that John Boehner was instantly more clear about setting the timing for any potential action against Syria with his statement that Congress will not reconvene before its scheduled September 9 return to Washington than anyone in the administration has been thus far. Perhaps more importantly, what will future Congresses expect of future presidents? If Obama abides by this new approach for the next three years, will his successors lack the ability to act quickly and on their own? While past presidents have no doubt abused their War Powers authority to take action and ask for congressional approval within 60 days, we live in a volatile world; sometimes security requires swift action. The president still legally has that right, but Obama's decision may have done more -- for better or worse -- to **dial back the imperial presidency than anything his predecessors or Congress have done for decades.**

#### Court rules against executive now

Wong 13 -- PhD dissertation in Government to Georgetown University (U Jin, 4/22/2013, "THE BLANK CHECK: SUPREME COURT DECISION - MAKING IN NATIONAL SECURITY CLAIMS AND DURING WARTIME," http://repository.library.georgetown.edu/bitstream/handle/10822/558286/Wong\_georgetown\_0076D\_12276.pdf?sequence=1)

This study started out with two questions. The first was: ?Does war influence judicial decision - making?? The second was: ?Do **national security** claims influence judicial decision - making?? The answer to the first question is: In a general hypothetical s ignificant war, there is a **statistically significant finding** of voting against the government. In the models run using the Spaeth database where the government is a party, the influence of all significant wars on judicial decision - making generally was to vote against the government. Presidential approval ratings are statistically significant only in wartime, but with a positive coefficient. Outside of wartime, presidential approval ratings are not statistically likely to influence Supreme Court behavior. This result suggests that while Courts vote strategically and support a popular president, they are still statistically likely to find against the government in a significant war. These findings altogether suggest that that the Supreme Court votes strat egically with an eye towards the popularity of the president, but revert to skepticism of government‘s wartime claims as the war progresses. The answer to the second question is: National security claims brought by the government achieve a **statistically significant likelihood** that the Supreme Court will vote against the government. National security claims were statistically significant with a negative signifier. **This finding is consistent across all the major wars as well as peacetime**. It also suggest s that the Supreme Court generally is not predisposed to defer to the executive branch‘s arguments when it comes to national security claims

#### 2. Plan doesn’t affect all power – the president will do what he wants absent direct prohibition

Marshall 08

[William, Kenan Professor of Law, University of North Carolina, Eleven Reasons Presidential Power Inevitably Expands and Why It Matters, 2008,

<http://www.bu.edu/law/central/jd/organizations/journals/bulr/documents/MARSHALL.pdf>]

The first and perhaps overarching reason underlying the growth of presidential power is that the constitutional text on the subject is notoriously unspecific, allowing as one writer maintains, for the office “to grow with the developing nation.”19 Unlike Article I, which sets forth the specific powers granted to Congress,20 the key provisions of Article II that grant authority to the President are written in indeterminate terms such as “executive power,”21 or the duty “to take care that the laws be faithfully executed.”22 Moreover, unlike the other branches, the Presidency has consistently been deemed to possess significant inherent powers.23 Thus, many of the President’s recognized powers, such as the authority to act in times of national emergency24 or the right to keep advice from subordinates confidential,25 are nowhere mentioned in the Constitution itself. In addition, case law on presidential power is underdeveloped. Unlike the many precedents addressing Congressional26 or federal judicial27 power, there are remarkably few Supreme Court cases analyzing presidential power. And the leading case on the subject, Youngstown Sheet & Tube Co. v. Sawyer, 28 is known less for its majority opinion than for its concurrence by Justice Jackson, an opinion primarily celebrated for its rather less-than-definitive announcement that much of presidential power exists in a “zone of twilight.”29 Accordingly, the question whether a President has exceeded her authority is seldom immediately obvious because the powers of the office are so openended.30 This fluidity in definition, in turn, allows presidential power to readily expand when factors such as national crisis, military action, or other matters of expedience call for its exercise.31 Additionally, such fluidity allows political expectations to affect public perceptions of the presidential office in a manner that can lead to expanded notions of the office’s power.32 This perception of expanded powers, in turn, can then lead to the perceived legitimacy of the President actually exercising those powers. Without direct prohibitions to the contrary, expectations easily translate into political reality.33

#### 6. **Rules during crises don’t hurt flexibility**

Holmes 9 -- Walter E. Meyer Professor of Law, New York University School of Law (Stephen, 4/30/2009, "In Case of Emergency: Misunderstanding Tradeoffs in the War on Terror," http://scholarship.law.berkeley.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1140&context=californialawreview)

Thus, it also illustrates the truism, profoundly relevant to the war on terror, that limiting options available during emergencies can be good or bad, depending on what emergency responders, who may be tempted by sheer exhaustion to take hazardous shortcuts, will do with the latitudes they seize or receive. Campaigners for executive discretion routinely invoke the imperative need for "**flexibility**" to explain why counterterrorism cannot be successfully conducted within the Constitution and the rule of law. But general rules and situation-specific improvisation, far from being mutually exclusive, are perfectly compatible. 1 8 There is no reason why mechanically following protocols designed to prevent harried nurses from negligently administering the wrong blood type should preclude the same nurses from improvising unique solutions to the unique problems of a particular trauma patient. Drilled-in emergency protocols provide a **psychologically stabilizing floor**, shared by co- workers, on the basis of which **untried solutions can then be improvised**. 9 In other words, there is no reason to assert, at least not as a matter of general validity, that the importance of flexibility excludes reliance on rules during emergencies, including national-security emergencies. The emergency-room example can also deepen our understanding of national-security crises by bringing into focus an important but sometimes neglected distinction between threats that are novel and threats that are urgent. **Dangers may be unprecedented without demanding a split-second response**. Contrariwise, urgent threats that have appeared repeatedly in the past can be managed according to protocols that have become automatic and routine. Emergency-room emergencies are urgent even when they are perfectly familiar. Terrorists with access to weapons of mass destruction ("WMD"), by contrast, present a novel threat that is destined to endure for decades, if not longer. **Such a threat is not an "emergency"** in the sense of a sudden event, such as a house on fire, **requiring genuinely split-second decision making**, with no opportunity for serious consultation or debate. **Managing the risks of nuclear terrorism requires sustained policies, not short-term measures**. This is feasible precisely because, in such an enduring crisis, national-security personnel have **ample time to think and rethink, to plan ahead and revise their plans**. In depicting today's terrorist threat as "an emergency," executive-discretion advocates almost always blur together urgency and novelty. This is a consequential intellectual fallacy. But it also provides an opportunity for critics of executive discretion in times of crisis. If classical emergencies, in the house- on-fire or emergency-room sense, turn out to invite and require rule-governed responses, then the justification for dispensing with rules in the war on terror seems that much more tenuous and open to question. In crises where "time is of the essence" 2 1 and serious consultation is difficult or impossible, it is imperative for emergency responders to follow previously crafted first-order rules (or behavioral commands) to enable prompt remedial action and coordination. In crises that are not sudden and transient but, instead, endure over time and that therefore allow for extensive consultation with knowledgeable parties, it is essential to rely on previously crafted second-order rules (or decision-making procedures) designed to **encourage decision makers to consider the costs and benefits of, and feasible alternatives to, proposed action plans**. In medicine, a typical first-order rule is "always wash your hands before inserting a stent," and a typical second-order rule is "always get a second opinion before undertaking major surgery."

#### 8. Court expertise is sufficient—their link is blown out of proportion

Knowles 9 [Spring, 2009, Robert Knowles is a Acting Assistant Professor, New York University School of Law, “American Hegemony and the Foreign Affairs Constitution”, ARIZONA STATE LAW JOURNAL, 41 Ariz. St. L.J. 87]

A common justification for deference is that the President possesses superior competence due to expertise, information gathering, and political savvy in foreign affairs. These conclusions flow from the realist tenet that the external context is fundamentally distinct from the domestic context. The domestic realm is hierarchical and legal; the outside world is anarchical and political. The international realm is thus far more complex and fluid than the domestic realm. The executive is a political branch, popularly-elected and far more attuned to politics than are the courts. n258 Judges are, for the most part, generalists who possess no special expertise in foreign affairs. n259 Courts can only receive the information presented to them and cannot look beyond the record. n260 The President has a vast foreign relations bureaucracy to obtain and process information from around the world. Executive agencies such as the State Department and the military better understand the nature of foreign countries - their institutions and culture - and can predict responses in ways that courts cannot. n261 In the context of the political question doctrine, this rationale often appears when courts conclude that an issue lacks "judicially discoverable and manageable standards." n262 A stronger, related rationale is that the political branches are better suited for tracking dynamic and evolving norms in the anarchic international environment. n263 The meaning of international law changes over time and nations do not agree today on its meaning. Moreover, the relationships among nations in many instances will be governed by informal norms that do not correspond to international law. n264 In addition, many foreign affairs provisions in the Constitution had fixed meanings under international law in the Eighteenth Century - what it meant, for example, to "declare war" or to issue "letters of marquee and [\*129] reprisal" - but subsequent practice has substantially altered their meaning or rendered them irrelevant. n265 Courts are not adept at tracking these shifts. As many critics have observed, the "lack of judicially-manageable standards" argument is weak. Courts create rules to govern disputes regarding vague constitutional provisions such as the Due Process Clause. n266 Furthermore, if courts were to adjudicate foreign affairs disputes more often, they would have the opportunity to create clearer standards, making them more manageable. n267 Thus the lack-of-standards argument does not alone explain why foreign affairs should be off-limits. The argument regarding courts' limited access to information and lack of expertise seem persuasive at first, but it loses its force upon deeper inspection. For instance, expertise is also a rationale for Chevron deference in the domestic context. n268 Generalist judges handle cases involving highly complex and obscure non-foreign affairs issues while giving appropriate deference to interpretations of agencies charged with administering statutory schemes. n269 What makes foreign affairs issues so different that they justify even greater deference? n270 Perhaps foreign affairs issues are just an order of magnitude more complex than even the most complex domestic issues. However, this line of thinking very quickly leads to boundary problems. Economic globalization, rapid global information flow, and increased transborder movement have "radically increased the number of cases that directly implicate foreign relations" and have made foreign parties and conduct, as well as international law questions, increasingly [\*130] common in U.S. litigation. n271 If courts were to cabin off all matters touching on foreign relations as beyond their expertise, it would result in an ever-increasing abdication of their role. The political norm-tracking argument reveals the second major problem with using anarchy as a basis for special deference: it fails to account for the degree of deference that should be afforded to the President. Under the anarchy-based argument, the meaning of treaties and other concepts in foreign affairs depend entirely on politics and power dynamics, which the President is especially competent (and the courts especially incompetent) in tracking. If this is so, the courts must give total deference to the executive branch. If one does not wish to take the position that the courts should butt out altogether in foreign affairs, there must be other reasons for the courts' involvement. Even proponents of special deference generally acknowledge that some of the courts' strengths lie in protecting individual rights and "democracy-forcing." n272 But what is the correct balance to strike between competing functional goals of the separation of powers?