**1NC DA**

**US heg high now**

**Hanson, 12**

(Victor Hanson, senior fellow at the Hoover Institution, 2/8/12, “A Post-American World?”, <http://www.nationalreview.com/articles/290335/post-american-world-victor-davis-hanson?pg=1>) NL

Post-Americans certainly have put themselves in a financial jam by borrowing an additional $12 trillion since 2000. If Obama were to be reelected, he would finish his presidency having borrowed more money than all prior presidents put together. We run chronic trade deficits and outsource millions of jobs overseas. Unemployment remains high, economic growth sluggish. Federal oil leases are canceled and pipelines not built. We did not pacify Iraq quickly, and we remain bogged down in Afghanistan. **Still, all of that hardly adds up to a post-American world**. **Instead, by almost any historical standard of assessing civilizations, the 21st century looks far brighter for America than for its rivals. American population growth is robust; post-Japan, post-Europe, and post-China are aging and shrinking. We are daily increasing our known fossil-fuel reserves; those in Europe and China are declining. Copying and rivaling America’s free-market economy are impressive Chinese achievements, but hardly proof that China can likewise emulate our Constitution, racial inclusion, transparency, or cultural dynamism.** With all the post-America talk, we forget that **one American on average still produces threes times as many goods and services as do three Chinese.** Our Constitution facilitates economic change; post-Communist Russia and China still cannot square the circle of authoritarian government and free markets. **In its worst financial crisis in the last 80 years, the United States nonetheless proved more robust and stable than the soon-to-be-post–European Union.** In some world rankings of the top 15 institutions of higher learning, California’s universities are more heavily represented than are those of any entire country — except the United States itself. India is still straitjacketed by caste impediments, Europe by class boundaries, China, Japan, and South Korea by sharp racial distinctions, and the Arab world by insidious tribal loyalties. **The idea of a Brazilian or Chinese President Obama is the stuff of fantasy.** All that retrograde typecasting seems pretty post-something to me. In contrast, **America, alone of the major powers, is a multiracial open society bound by one culture, where merit, more than race, tribe, birth, or class, determines success**. **When post-Americans unwisely talk about slashing the military, we still should remember that all the world’s other carrier battle groups combined will for decades lack the power of one of our eleven.** The productivity of American agriculture continues to be unsurpassed, in a world that will become increasingly food short and hungry. And a notable thing about American farming is that it has millions of acres idle or allotted to subsidized biofuels, suggesting that we could easily produce even more food than we do now. **China has riots; Russia has riots; Europe has riots; the Arab world is one large riot these days. America has a few sputtering Occupy Wall Street street carnivals. An authoritarian, aging, resource-starved, mercantilist, and racially intolerant China is hardly an inspiration for an aspiring Africa**. **Latin American elites do not send their children to Tokyo for medical training. American families are not emigrating to India or Brazil to find opportunity. Americans cross the border for vacation homes, not to find work in Latin America**. The equivalents of post-America’s Facebook, Amazon, Walmart, and Google do not sprout up in a supposedly ascendant Istanbul or Mumbai. **Nor does the United Nations offer much hope of replacing American influence. In Libya, the U.S. bragged that it had obtained U.N. approval for a no-fly zone and humanitarian relief — but then had to violate those resolutions in order to join its NATO allies in bombing Moammar Qaddafi’s forces**. **Whether Iran lets off a nuclear weapon, or North Korea uses one against South Korea or Japan, depends not on the U.N. Security Council, or Chinese deterrence, but only on whether those rogue states fear a response from the United States**. Again, as far as Syria goes, the U.N. is irrelevant. Of course, **the United States should work with its allies. It must be a good international citizen and where possible embrace international cooperation**. Who even minds if on occasion an unsure American president may feel obliged to bow or apologize to foreign leaders? America will have to reduce its borrowing, pay down its debts, and reformulate its entitlement system, or face a Greek-style financial crisis. That said, let us not confuse the trendy pumps of the hour with the unchanging water of the ages. A new Shanghai airport, a Brazilian Olympics, a new Russian pipeline, or a new Indian enterprise zone still does not tell us much about the underlying principles and values of nations that so far have not been able to create transparent institutions, stable consensual constitutions, sustainably lawful societies, and meritocratic, rather than racially or tribally based, advancement of the sort that allows a nation to meet crises, adapt, and grow stronger. **As far as the 21st century goes, compared to the alternatives, it is more likely that we are in a pre-American than a post-American age.**

**Indefinite Detention is key to heg**

**Meese, 12**

(Edward Meese III, Ronald Reagan Distinguished Fellow in Public Policy and chairman of the Center for Legal & Judicial Studies at the Heritage Foundation. He served as the 75th attorney general of the United States under President Reagan, "Guantanamo Bay Prison is Necessary", Jan 11, [www.heritage.org/research/commentary/2012/01/guantanamo-bay-prison-is-necessary](http://www.heritage.org/research/commentary/2012/01/guantanamo-bay-prison-is-necessary)) NL

**The detention and interrogation facility at Guantanamo Bay**, Cuba, which I have visited, **has served and continues to serve an important role in the war against terrorists** since it opened 10 years ago. **It houses high-value terrorist detainees**, like Khalid Sheikh Mohammed, the architect of September 11. The military commissions' courthouse, called the Expeditionary Legal Compound, is a world-class, state-of-the-art facility specifically designed to accommodate the needs of both defense and prosecutors dealing with classified information. The detainees there are represented by civilian and military counsel, and the Supreme Court has ruled that they enjoy the constitutional right of habeas corpus. **The conditions of detention there are safe, secure and humane and comply with national and international standards**, including Common Article 3 of the Geneva Conventions. **It is important to remember that the United States of America is engaged in armed conflict** and has been since September 11, 2001. The September 18, 2001, Authorization for Use of Military Force, relied upon by both the Bush and Obama administrations, **gives our military the legal authority to engage the enemy under appropriate circumstances. Under the law of armed conflict, also called the law of war, engaging the enemy includes killing or capturing the enemy. This age-old principle -- detention of the enemy during wartime for the duration of hostilities -- is just as applicable to al Qaeda as it was to Nazi POWs in World War II or other enemies in previous wars.** This principle has been upheld by our courts, including the United States Supreme Court. Shortly after September 11, it became evident that this war would be different from all previous wars in the sense that we would need to rely more on tactical and strategic intelligence to thwart and defeat the enemy than traditional military might. **To defeat al Qaeda and its affiliates, we needed to know what they knew; one of the obvious ways to learn their intentions was through lawful interrogation at a safe detention facility**. Guantanamo, used as a detention facility since the Clinton administration, was just such a place. There have been 779 detainees at Guantanamo. Today, there are only 171. But **over the past decade, we have not only kept dangerous terrorists at Guantanamo and thus away from the battlefield, we have learned a great deal from them during long-term, lawful interrogations. Without a safe, secure detention and interrogation facility, we would not have gained the tactical and strategic intelligence needed to degrade and ultimately defeat the enemy**. It has been said that the mere existence of Guantanamo is a recruiting tool for the enemy. However, recall that there was no Guantanamo detention facility when al Qaeda bombed the World Trade Center in the 1990s or blew up the U.S. embassies in East Africa in 1998 or attacked the USS Cole in 2000. And I suspect that if the Bush administration had brought the Guantanamo detainees not to Cuba but to a detention facility in the United States, that facility would have been the object of their scorn and derision. All things considered, **the detention facility at Guantanamo Bay has played an invaluable role in the war against terrorists by keeping them off the battlefield and allowing for lawful interrogations.** Neither the Bush nor Obama administrations has offered a reasonable and feasible alternative to Guantanamo. Unless and until a safe, reasonable alternative facility is proposed, **the United States should continue to use Guantanamo as a detention, interrogation and military commissions' facility.**

**Heg collapse triggers every impact**

**Kagan, 12**

(Robert Kagan, senior fellow at the Brookings Institution and serves on the foreign policy advisory board for the Secretary of State, “Why the World needs America”, 2/11/12, <http://online.wsj.com/article/SB10001424052970203646004577213262856669448.html>) NL

**History shows that world orders**, including our own, **are transient**. They rise and fall, **and the institutions they erect, the beliefs and "norms" that guide them, the economic systems they support—they rise and fall, too**. The downfall of the Roman Empire brought an end not just to Roman rule but to Roman government and law and to an entire economic system stretching from Northern Europe to North Africa. Culture, the arts, even progress in science and technology, were set back for centuries. Modern history has followed a similar pattern. After the Napoleonic Wars of the early 19th century, British control of the seas and the balance of great powers on the European continent provided relative security and stability. Prosperity grew, personal freedoms expanded, and the world was knit more closely together by revolutions in commerce and communication. With the outbreak of World War I, the age of settled peace and advancing liberalism—of European civilization approaching its pinnacle—collapsed into an age of hyper-nationalism, despotism and economic calamity. The once-promising spread of democracy and liberalism halted and then reversed course, leaving a handful of outnumbered and besieged democracies living nervously in the shadow of fascist and totalitarian neighbors. **The collapse of the British and European orders in the 20th century did not produce a new dark age—though if Nazi Germany and imperial Japan had prevailed, it might have—but the horrific conflict that it produced was, in its own way, just as devastating**. **Would the end of the present American-dominated order have less dire consequences?** A surprising number of American intellectuals, politicians and policy makers greet the prospect with equanimity. There is a general sense that the end of the era of American pre-eminence, if and when it comes, need not mean the end of the present international order, with its widespread freedom, unprecedented global prosperity (even amid the current economic crisis) and absence of war among the great powers. American power may diminish, the political scientist G. John Ikenberry argues, but "the underlying foundations of the liberal international order will survive and thrive." The commentator Fareed Zakaria believes that even as the balance shifts against the U.S., rising powers like China "will continue to live within the framework of the current international system." And there are elements across the political spectrum—Republicans who call for retrenchment, Democrats who put their faith in international law and institutions—who don't imagine that a "post-American world" would look very different from the American world. If all of this sounds too good to be true, it is. **The present world order was largely shaped by American power and reflects American interests and preferences. If the balance of power shifts in the direction of other nations, the world order will change to suit their interests and preferences. Nor can we assume that all the great powers in a post-American world would agree on the benefits of preserving the present order, or have the capacity to preserve it, even if they wanted to.**

**1NC CP**

**Text: The Executive branch of the United States should require that terrorism suspects are tried in federal court within 18 months of detention or release the suspects.**

**Only the CP solves – Guantanamo proves - the problem is not congressional opposition, it’s the administration fearing the danger of transferring the detainees which means presidential action alone is sufficient to solve**

**Joscelyn 13**

(Thomas Joscelyn, senior fellow at the Foundation for Defense of Democracies, “Obama, Not Congress, Is the Reason Guantánamo Is Still Open” May 3, 2013, <http://www.thedailybeast.com/articles/2013/05/03/obama-not-congress-is-the-reason-guantanamo-is-still-open.html>, KB)

During a news conference earlier this week, President Obama was asked about the mass hunger strike at the Guantánamo Bay detention facility. The president said it does not surprise him “that we’ve got problems in Guantánamo,” and it’s why he still believes “that we’ve got to close” it down. Obama ordered Guantánamo shuttered as one of his first acts in office, but more than four years later it is open. The president blamed Congress for the failure to deliver on his pledge. “I’m going to go back at this” and “reengage with Congress,” Obama vowed.¶ **Congressional restrictions have made it more difficult to transfer or relocate Guantánamo detainees. But congressional opposition is not the only reason Guantánamo’s cells are occupied.** Closing Guantánamo has always been a tricky proposition—one that is far more difficult than the president’s rhetoric implies.¶ Consider **the** findings of Obama’s own **Guantánamo Review Task Force**, which reviewed the files on the 240 detainees held as of January 2009. The task force’s final report, issued in January 2010, outlined the various national security challenges closing Guantánamo entails. Indeed, the report goes a long way toward explaining why 166 detainees remain in their cells to this day.¶ The task force **split the detainee population into three** general **categories: those who will stay in indefinite detention, those who should be prosecuted, and detainees who have been approved for transfer.**¶ Forty-eight detainees were placed in the first category, as they were “determined to be too dangerous to transfer but not feasible for prosecution.” They will stay in indefinite detention at Guantánamo or some other location for the foreseeable future.¶ Oddly, the president’s discussion of Guantánamo this week was at odds with his own task force’s recommendations. The president ticked off the reasons why he believes indefinite detention is unnecessary. “Why are we doing this?” Obama asked rhetorically. “I mean, we’ve got a whole bunch of individuals who have been tried who are currently in maximum-security prisons around the country. Nothing’s happened to them. Justice has been served.”¶ But **the Obama administration has determined that dozens of men must remain in detention without prosecution**. Moving them to a maximum-security prison without trial simply substitutes Gitmo North for Gitmo South.¶ **The task force referred a second category of detainees**, 36 in all, **“for prosecution** either **in federal court or a military commission**.” These proceedings have progressed far too slowly, and few trials have been brought to a close. Still, **the task force slated these detainees for prosecution, not freedom.**¶ The precise counts have changed since the task force issued its final report in 2010, but about half of today’s detainee population falls into these first two categories. According to a recent article published by Reuters, **80 of the 166 detainees are held in indefinite detention, awaiting prosecution, or have already been either charged or convicted by a military commission.**¶ **The final 86 detainees have been “approved for transfer,”** but their status is widely misunderstood. The press frequently reports that these detainees have been “cleared for release.” The implication is that these detainees have been deemed innocent and can be safely released without any cause for concern. If that were true, of course it would be outrageous for the U.S. government to continue holding them.¶ It is not true, however. Obama’s task force made it clear that other than 17 Chinese Uighur detainees, most of whom have since been released from Guantánamo, “no detainees were approved for ‘release’ during the course” of its review. Instead, the task force “approved for transfer” 126 detainees “subject to security measures.” Dozens of the detainees “approved for transfer” have since left Cuba, but 86 of them remain in detention.¶ The task force did not “clear” these men of any wrongdoing, nor does the Obama administration think transferring them out of Guantánamo is a risk-free endeavor.¶ “There were considerable variations among the detainees approved for transfer,” the task force wrote in its final report. “For a small handful of these detainees, there was scant evidence of any involvement with terrorist groups or hostilities against Coalition forces in Afghanistan.” However, “for most of the detainees approved for transfer, there were varying degrees of evidence indicating that they were low-level foreign fighters affiliated with al-Qaida or other groups operating in Afghanistan.”¶ The task force stressed “that **a decision to approve a detainee for transfer does not reflect a decision that the detainee poses no threat or no risk of recidivism**.” On the contrary, the task force concluded that **“any threat posed by the detainee can be sufficiently mitigated through feasible and appropriate security measures in the receiving country.”**¶ And there’s the rub. **Mitigating the threat posed by transferred detainees is an inherently difficult proposition.** The Obama administration worked hard to transfer detainees, to both their home countries and allied nations. But 56 of the remaining 86 detainees who have been “approved for transfer” are from Yemen. The task force approved 30 of the 56 Yemeni detainees for “conditional” detention. They can only be transferred home if security conditions improve and other measures are met. That isn’t happening anytime soon.¶ Obama himself issued a moratorium on transfers to Yemen on Jan. 5, 2010. The move was in response to al Qaeda in the Arabian Peninsula’s attempted attack on a Detroit-bound airliner on Christmas Day 2009. The White House said this week that the moratorium “remains in place,” despite the president’s pledge “to go back at this.”¶ Look at the numbers again. Obama’s task force slated 80 of the current detainees for indefinite detention or prosecution. An additional 56 Yemeni detainees have been approved for transfer but are in custody because of al Qaeda’s rise in their home country and the president’s subsequent moratorium on transfers.¶ The bottom line is that **most of the Guantánamo detainees**—136 out of 166—**are in U.S. custody because that is where** the **Obama** administration **thinks they belong.**

**1NC DA**

**Obama is only focused on solving the fiscal crisis—his PC is key**

**Allen 9/19**

(Johnathan, Politico.com, “GOP Battles Boost Obama”, <http://www.politico.com/story/2013/09/republicans-budget-obama-97093.html#ixzz2fckpiE00>, accessed 9/22/13 DJS)

There’s a simple reason President Barack **Obama is using his bully pulpit to focus the nation’s** attention on the battle over **the budget**: In this fight, he’s watching Republicans take swings at each other. And that GOP fight is a lifeline for an administration that had been scrambling to gain control its message after battling congressional Democrats on the potential use of military force in Syria and the possible nomination of Larry Summers to run the Federal Reserve. If House Republicans and Obama can’t cut even a short-term deal for a continuing resolution, the government’s authority to spend money will run out on Oct. 1. Within weeks, the nation will default on its debt if an agreement isn’t reached to raise the federal debt limit. For some Republicans, those deadlines represent a leverage point that can be used to force Obama to slash his health care law. For others, they’re a zero hour at which the party will implode if it doesn’t cut a deal. Meanwhile, “on the looming fiscal issues, **Democrats** — both liberal and conservative, **executive and congressional** — **are virtually 100 percent united**,” said Sen. Charles Schumer (D-N.Y.). Just a few days ago, all that Obama and his aides could talk about were Syria and Summers. Now, they’re bringing their party together and **shining a white hot light on Republican disunity** over whether to shut down the government and plunge the nation into default in a vain effort to stop Obamacare from going into effect. The squabbling among Republicans has gotten so vicious that a Twitter hashtag — #GOPvsGOPugliness — has become a thick virtual data file for tracking the intraparty insults. Moderates, and even some conservatives, are slamming Texas Sen. Ted Cruz, a tea party favorite, for ramping up grassroots expectations that the GOP will shut down the government if it can’t win concessions from the president to “defund” his signature health care law. “I didn’t go to Harvard or Princeton, but I can count,” Sen. Bob Corker (R-Tenn.) tweeted, subtly mocking Cruz’s Ivy League education. “The defunding box canyon is a tactic that will fail and weaken our position.” While it is well-timed for the White House to interrupt a bad slide, **Obama’s singular focus on the budget** battle is hardly a last-minute shift. Instead, it **is a return to the narrative arc** that the White House was working to build **before** the **Syria** crisis intervened. And it’s so important to the president’s strategy that White House officials didn’t consider postponing Monday’s rollout of the most partisan and high-stakes phase even when a shooter murdered a dozen people at Washington’s Navy Yard that morning. The basic storyline, well under way over the summer, was to have the president point to parts of his agenda, including reducing the costs of college and housing, designed to strengthen the middle class; use them to make the case that he not only saved the country from economic disaster but is fighting to bolster the nation’s finances on both the macro and household level; and then argue that Republicans’ desire to lock in the sequester and leverage a debt-ceiling increase for Obamacare cuts would reverse progress made. **The president is on firm ground**, White House officials say, because **he stands with the public** in believing that the government shouldn’t shut down and that the country should pay its bills.

**Massive Congressional opposition to the plan**

**AP, 13**

(Associated Press, "Obama's toughest sell to close Guantanamo might be Senate Democrats, not Republicans", July 6, [www.foxnews.com/politics/2013/07/06/obama-toughest-sell-on-guantanamo-might-be-senate-democrats-not-republicans/](http://www.foxnews.com/politics/2013/07/06/obama-toughest-sell-on-guantanamo-might-be-senate-democrats-not-republicans/) NL)

**President Obama's hardest sell in his renewed push to close the U.S. detention center at Guantanamo Bay, Cuba, may be members of his own party** -- not Republicans.¶ Despite Connecticut Sen. Kelly Ayotte and other congressional Republicans saying Americans want the prisoner to remain at the facility and not be relocated to the United States, **the president also will have a difficult time getting support from moderate Senate Democrats facing tough re-election bids next year in the strongly Republican South.**¶ Obama has stepped up the pressure to shutter the naval facility, driven in part by his revised counterterrorism strategy and the 4-month-old stain of the government force-feeding Guantanamo prisoners on hunger strikes to prevent them from starving to death. Civil liberties groups and liberals have slammed Obama for failing to fulfill his 2008 campaign promise to close the installation and find another home for the 166 terror suspects being held there indefinitely.¶ **Republicans and some Democrats in Congress have repeatedly resisted the president's attempts to close the facility, arguing that the prisoners are too dangerous to be moved to U.S. soil, that Guantanamo is a perfectly adequate prison and that the administration has failed to offer a viable alternative**.¶ White House counterterrorism adviser Lisa Monaco lobbied House members in advance of several votes last month to no avail. **The House delivered strong votes to keep Guantanamo open** and to prevent Obama from transferring detainees to Yemen. Separately, the president's recent appointment of a special envoy on Guantanamo, Cliff Sloan, has met with a collective shrug on Capitol Hill.¶ **In the coming weeks, the Senate will again vote on the future of Guantanamo. All signs point to a bipartisan statement to keep the facility open** despite a recent vow to end detention at the installation by two national security leaders -- Sens. Dianne Feinstein, D-Calif., and John McCain, R-Ariz.¶ "**When you go out, you talk to average Americans about it, they want to keep them there, they want to keep the terrorists there, they don't necessarily want to hold them here," said Sen. Kelly Ayotte,** R-N.H., a fierce proponent of keeping Guantanamo open.¶ Ayotte, who plans to push legislation on a sweeping defense policy bill later this summer, is likely to attract support from Republicans as well as several Democrats looking ahead to tight Senate races next year in Arkansas, Louisiana and North Carolina. Votes on the detention center will give these Democrats a high-profile chance to split with a president who is extremely unpopular in parts of the South.¶ Consider Sen. Mark Pryor of Arkansas, one of the most vulnerable incumbents in next year's congressional elections.¶ Last November, he was one of nine Democrats to vote for prohibiting the use of any money to transfer terror suspects from Guantanamo, backing an amendment by Ayotte. The Senate easily passed the measure, 54-41, as part of the defense policy bill.¶ Last month, a potential Republican challenger to Pryor, Arkansas Rep. Tom Cotton, was one of a handful of speakers during House debate on Guantanamo. Obama is pushing to transfer approved detainees -- there are 86 -- to their home countries and lift a ban on transfers to Yemen. Fifty-six of the 86 are from Yemen.¶ **Cotton, an Iraq and Afghanistan war veteran, pleaded with his colleagues to "ensure that terrorists at Guantanamo Bay do not escape back onto the battlefronts of the war on terror.**"¶ Asked recently whether he favors keeping Guantanamo opened or closed, Pryor said simply, "Open."¶ **Louisiana Sen. Mary Landrieu, another Democrat who voted last year to keep the facility open, indicated she's unlikely to change her position**.¶ "Honestly, I have mixed feelings about it," she said in a recent interview. "First of all, it's hard to imagine that people should be detained indefinitely without formal charges being brought. On the other hand, you know, **some of the people there are potential serious threats to national security**."¶ **Democratic Sen. Kay Hagan of North Carolina,** who faces re-election next year, **also voted with Pryor and Landrieu to keep Guantanamo open**. Her office had no comment on how she might vote later this summer.¶ Supporters of closing the installation were encouraged when the Senate Armed Services Committee produced its version of the defense policy bill last month. Pushed by Chairman Carl Levin, D-Mich., the committee gave the president flexibility in dealing with the installation and its prisoners.¶ The bill would allow the transfer of terror suspects to the United States for detention and trial if the defense secretary decides that it's in the interest of national security and any public safety issues have been addressed. The bill also makes it easier for the president to transfer prisoners to foreign countries.¶ Currently, 104 of the 166 prisoners are on a hunger strike in a protest of their indefinite detention, with up to 44 strapped down each day and force-fed liquid nutrients through a nasal tube. The bill would authorize the temporary transfer of prisoners to a Defense Department medical facility in the United States to prevent the death of or significant harm to the health of a prisoner.¶ But the committee took no votes on the provisions, deciding to defer the inevitable debate until the full Senate considers the bill. Ayotte said she will be ready, and she expects to have significant support in the Senate to keep Guantanamo operating.¶ "**While the president has said he wants to close Guantanamo, I don't think there's been a sufficient change of circumstance nor any plan laid out by the administration that could give members who voted against transfer last year any different assurances or any real new information other than an additional call to close Guantanamo again,**" Ayotte said.¶ McCain and Feinstein traveled to Guantanamo last month with White House Chief of Staff Denis McDonough. They returned from the trip saying it was in the national interest to end detention at the facility and vowing to take the necessary steps to make it happen.¶ Yet even McCain concedes that the failure of the Obama administration to spell out an alternative hampers any push to close the facility.¶ "**Really, honestly, they've never given us a plan," said McCain**, who cited the cost of some $1.6 million per inmate as one argument for shutting the detention center.¶ Ayotte said she's a fiscal conservative, "but I believe that **this facility is important for the safety of the nation and also to have a secure place to interrogate terrorists or terror suspects."**

**Political capital is finite—specifically key to debt ceiling**

**Moore, 9/10**

(Heidi is Guardian's US finance and economics editor. 9/10/2013, “Syria: the great distraction; Obama is focused on a conflict abroad, but the fight he should be gearing up for is with Congress on America's economic security,”[http://www.theguardian.com/commentisfree/2013/sep/10/obama-syria-what-about-sequester)](https://co1prd0211.outlook.com/owa/redir.aspx?C=fsVRzvvSzkK3bW9fzmwglqQHT4vIhNAIZh2k2UlcYIczFJU_Tvb5SujwnzWvT0yA_mZOgcx1pGw.&URL=http%3a%2f%2fwww.theguardian.com%2fcommentisfree%2f2013%2fsep%2f10%2fobama-syria-what-about-sequester)))

Before President Obama speaks to the nation about Syria tonight, take a look at what this fall will look like inside America.¶ There are 49 million people in the country who suffered inadequate access to food in 2012, leaving the percentage of "food-insecure" Americans at about one-sixth of the US population. At the same time, Congress refused to pass food-stamp legislation this summer, pushing it off again and threatening draconian cuts.¶ **The country will crash into the debt ceiling in mid-October, which would be aneconomic disaster, especially with a government shutdown looming at the same time.These are deadlines that Congress already learned two years ago not to toy with, but memories appear to be preciously short.**¶ The Federal Reserve needs a new chief in three months, someone who will help the country confront its raging unemployment crisis that has left 12 million people without jobs. The president has promised to choose a warm body within the next three weeks, despite the fact that his top pick, Larry Summers, would likely spark an ugly confirmation battle – the "fight of the century," according to some – with a Congress already unwilling to do the President's bidding.¶ Congress was supposed to pass a farm bill this summer, but declined to do so even though the task is already two years late. As a result, the country has no farm bill, leaving agricultural subsidies up in the air, farmers uncertain about what their financial picture looks like, and a potential food crisis on the horizon.¶ The two main housing agencies, Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac, have been in limbo for four years and are desperately in need of reform that should start this fall, but there is scant attention to the problem.¶ These are the problems going unattended by the Obama administration while his aides and cabinet members have been wasting the nation's time making the rounds on television and Capitol Hill stumping for a profoundly unpopular war. The fact that all this chest-beating was for naught, and an easy solution seems on the horizon, belies the single-minded intensity that the Obama White House brought to its insistence on bombing Syria.¶ More than one wag has suggested, with the utmost reason, that if Obama had brought this kind of passion to domestic initiatives, the country would be in better condition right now. As it is, public policy is embarrassingly in shambles at home while the administration throws all of its resources and political capital behind a widely hated plan to get involved in a civil war overseas.¶ The upshot for the president may be that it's easier to wage war with a foreign power than go head-to-head with the US Congress, even as America suffers from neglect.¶ This is the paradox that President Obama is facing this fall, as he appears to turn his back on a number of crucial and urgent domestic initiatives in order to spend all of his meager political capital on striking Syria.¶ Syria does present a significant humanitarian crisis, which has been true for the past two years that the Obama administration has completely ignored the atrocities of Bashar al-Assad.¶ Two years is also roughly the same amount of time that key domestic initiatives have also gone ignored as Obama and Congress engage in petty battles for dominance and leave the country to run itself on a starvation diet imposed by sequestration cuts. Leon Panetta tells the story of how he tried to lobby against sequestration only to be told:¶ Leon, you don't understand. The Congress is resigned to failure.¶ Similarly, those on Wall Street, the Federal Reserve, those working at government agencies, and voters themselves have become all too practiced at ignoring the determined incompetence of those in Washington.¶ **Political capital – the ability to horse-trade and win political favors from a receptive audience – is a finite resource in Washington. Pursuing misguided policies takes up time,but it also eats up credibility in asking for the next favor.** It's fair to say that **congressionalRepublicans**, particularly in the House, **have no love for Obama and are likely to oppose anything he supports. That's exactly the reason the White House should stop proposing policies as if it is scattering buckshot and focus with intensity on the domestic tasks it wants to accomplish, one at a time.**¶ The president is scheduled to speak six times this week, mostly about Syria. That includes evening news interviews, an address to the nation, and numerous other speeches. Behind the scenes, he is calling members of Congress to get them to fall into line. Secretary of State John Kerry is omnipresent, so ubiquitous on TV that it may be easier just to get him his own talk show called Syria Today.¶ It would be a treat to see White House aides lobbying as aggressively – and on as many talk shows – for a better food stamp bill, an end to the debt-ceiling drama, or a solution to the senseless sequestration cuts, as it is on what is clearly a useless boondoggle in Syria.¶ **There's no reason to believe that Congress can have an all-consuming debate about Syria and then, somehow refreshed, return to a domestic agenda** that has been as chaotic and urgent as any in recent memory. The President should have judged his options better. As it is, he should now judge his actions better.

**Debt ceiling destroys the economy**

**Davidson, 9/10**

(Adam - co-founder of NPR’s “Planet Money” 9/10/2013, “Our Debt to Society,”[http://www.nytimes.com/2013/09/15/magazine/our-debt-to-society.html?pagewanted=all&\_r=0)](https://co1prd0211.outlook.com/owa/redir.aspx?C=fsVRzvvSzkK3bW9fzmwglqQHT4vIhNAIZh2k2UlcYIczFJU_Tvb5SujwnzWvT0yA_mZOgcx1pGw.&URL=http%3a%2f%2fwww.nytimes.com%2f2013%2f09%2f15%2fmagazine%2four-debt-to-society.html%3fpagewanted%3dall%26_r%3d0)))

This is the definition of a deficit, and it illustrates why the government needs to borrow money almost every day to pay its bills. Of course, all that daily borrowing adds up, and we are rapidly approaching what is called the X-Date — the day, somewhere in the next six weeks, when the government, by law, cannot borrow another penny. **Congress** has imposed a strict limit on how much debt the federal government can accumulate, but **for nearly 90 years**, it **has raised the ceiling well before it was reached**. But **since a large number of Tea Party**-aligned **Republicans entered the House** of Representatives, in 2011, **raising that debt ceiling has become a matter of fierce debate**. This summer, House **Republicans have promised**, in Speaker John Boehner’s words, **“a whale of a fight” before they raise the debt ceiling — if they even raise it at all.**¶ **If the debt ceiling isn’t lifted** again this fall, **some serious financial decisions will have to be made**. Perhaps the government can skimp on its foreign aid or furlough all of NASA, but eventually the big-ticket items, like Social Security and Medicare, will have to be cut. At some point, **the government won’t be able to pay interest on its bonds and will enter what’s known as sovereign default, the ultimate national financial disaster** achieved by countries like Zimbabwe, Ecuador and Argentina (and now Greece). In the case of the United States, though,**it won’t be an isolated national crisis**. If the American government can’t stand behind the dollar, the world’s benchmark currency, **then the global financial system will very likelyenter a new era in which there is much less trade and much less economic growth. It would be**, by most accounts, **the largest self-imposed financial disaster in history**.¶ Nearly everyone involved predicts that someone will blink before this disaster occurs. Yet a small number of House Republicans (one political analyst told me it’s no more than 20) appear willing to see what happens if the debt ceiling isn’t raised — at least for a bit. This could be used as leverage to force Democrats to drastically cut government spending and eliminate President Obama’s signature health-care-reform plan. In fact, Representative Tom Price, a Georgia Republican, told me that the whole problem could be avoided if the president agreed to drastically cut spending and lower taxes. Still, it is hard to put this act of game theory into historic context. Plenty of countries — and some cities, like Detroit — have defaulted on their financial obligations, but only because their governments ran out of money to pay their bills. **No wealthy country has ever voluntarily decided — in the middle of an economic recovery, no less — to default**. And there’s certainly no record of that happening to the country that controls the global reserve currency.¶ Like many, I assumed a self-imposed U.S. debt crisis might unfold like most involuntary ones. **If the debt ceiling isn’t raised by X-Day, I figured, the world’s investors would begin to see America as an unstable investment and rush to sell their Treasury bonds. The U.S.government, desperate to hold on to investment, would then raise interest rates far higher**, hurtling up rates on credit cards, student loans, mortgages and corporate borrowing —**which would effectively put a clamp on all trade and spending. The U.S. economy would collapse far worse than anything we’ve seen in the past several years**.¶ Instead, Robert **Auwaerter, head of bond investing for Vanguard, the world’s largest mutual-fund company, told me that the collapse might be more insidious**. “You know what happens when the market gets upset?” he said. “There’s a flight to quality. Investors buy Treasury bonds. It’s a bit perverse.” In other words, **if the U.S. comes within shouting distance of a default (which Auwaerter is confident won’t happen), the world’s investors — absent a safer alternative, given the recent fates of the euro and the yen — might actually buy even more Treasury bonds. Indeed, interest rates would fall and the bond markets would soar.**¶ **While this possibility might not sound so bad, it’s really far more damaging than the apocalyptic one I imagined.** Rather than resulting in a sudden crisis, failure to raise the debt ceiling would lead to a slow bleed. Scott Mather, head of the global portfolio at Pimco, the world’s largest private bond fund, explained that while governments and institutions might go on a U.S.-bond buying frenzy in the wake of a debt-ceiling panic, they would eventually recognize that the U.S. government was not going through an odd, temporary bit of insanity. They would eventually conclude that it had become permanently less reliable. **Mather imagines institutional investors and governments turning to a basket of currencies, putting their savings in a mix of U.S., European, Canadian, Australian and Japanese bonds. Over the course of decades, the U.S. would lose its unique role in the global economy.**¶ **The U.S. benefits enormously from its status as global reserve currency and safe haven**. Our interest and mortgage rates are lower; companies are able to borrow money to finance their new products more cheaply. As a result, there is much more economic activity and more wealth in America than there would be otherwise. If **that status erodes, the U.S. economy’s peaks will be lower and recessions deeper**; future generations will have fewer job opportunities and suffer more when the economy falters. And, Mather points out, **no other country would benefit from America’s diminished status**. When you make the base risk-free asset more risky, the entire global economy becomes riskier and costlier.

**That causes nuclear war**

**Merlini, 11**

Cesare Merlini 11, nonresident senior fellow at the Center on the United States and Europe and chairman of the Board of Trustees of the Italian Institute for International Affairs, May 2011, “A Post-Secular World?”, Survival, Vol. 53, No. 2

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

**1NC K**

**Simulating images of hyper-violence anesthetizes us to real death and produces a culture of structural violence that makes infinite destruction appear desirable**

**Giroux 12** (Henry A Giroux, Frequent author on pedagogy in the public sphere, Truthout, “Youth in Revolt: The Plague of State-Sponsored Violence,” March 14, 2012, <http://truth-out.org/index.php?option=com_k2&view=item&id=7249:youth-in-revolt-the-plague-of-statesponsored-violence>)

One consequence is that "the sheer numbers and monotony of images may have a 'wearing off' impact [and] to stave off the 'viewing fatigue,' they must be increasingly gory, shocking and otherwise 'inventive' to arouse any sentiments at all or indeed draw attention. **The level of 'familiar' violence**, below which the cruelty of cruel acts escapes attention, **is constantly rising**."[(23)](http://truth-out.org/index.php#23.) **Hyper-violence** and spectacular **representations** of cruelty disrupt and **block our ability to respond politically and ethically to the violence as it is actually happening on the ground**. In this instance, unfamiliar violence such as **extreme images of** torture and **death become banal**ly familiar, **while** familiar **violence that occurs daily is** barely recognized relegated to the realm of the unnoticed and **unnoticeable**. How else to explain the public indifference to the violence waged by the state against nonviolent youthful protesters, who are rebelling against a society in which they have been excluded from any claim on hope, prosperity and democracy. As an increasing volume of violence is pumped into the culture, yesterday's spine-chilling and nerve-wrenching violence loses its shock value. As the need for more intense images of violence accumulates, **the** moral indifference and **desensitization to violence grows while** matters of cruelty and **suffering are offered** up **as** fodder for sports, entertainment, news media, and other outlets for seeking **pleasure**.

**Our alt is to vote neg to embrace a pedagogy outside of violent spectacles. Without it, continuously violence becomes desirable and militarizes the public sphere—we are a pre-requisite to solve their offense.**

**Giroux 12** (Henry A Giroux, Frequent author on pedagogy in the public sphere, Truthout, “Youth in Revolt: The Plague of State-Sponsored Violence,” March 14, 2012, <http://truth-out.org/index.php?option=com_k2&view=item&id=7249:youth-in-revolt-the-plague-of-statesponsored-violence>)

As the social is devalued along with rationality, ethics and any vestige of democracy, spectacles of war, violence and brutality now merge into forms of collective pleasure that constitute an important and new symbiosis among visual pleasure, violence and suffering. The control society is now the ultimate form of entertainment as the pain of others, especially those considered disposable and powerless, has become the subject not of compassion, but of ridicule and amusement in America. **High-octane violence and** human **suffering are** now **considered** another form of **entertainment designed to raise the collective pleasure quotient**. Reveling in the suffering of others should no longer be reduced to a matter of individual pathology, but now registers a larger economy of pleasure across the broader culture and social landscape. My emphasis here is on the sadistic impulse and how it merges spectacles of violence and brutality with forms of collective pleasure. No society can make a claim to being a democracy as long as it defines itself through shared fears rather than shared responsibilities. Widespread violence now functions as part of an anti-immune system that turns the economy of genuine pleasure into a mode of **sadism** that creates the foundation for **sap**ping **democracy of any political** substance and moral **vitality**. The prevalence of institutionalized violence in American society and other parts of the world suggests the need for a new conversation and politics that addresses what a just and fair world looks like. The **predominance of violence** in all aspects of social life **suggests** that **young people** and others marginalized by class, race and ethnicity **have been abandoned** as American society's claim on democracy gives way **to** the forces of militarism, market fundamentalism and **state terrorism**. **The prevalence of violence** throughout American society **suggests the need for** a **politics that not only negates the established order, but imagines a new one**, one informed by a radical vision in which the future does not imitate the present.[(27)](http://truth-out.org/index.php#27.) In this discourse, **critique merges with a sense of realistic hope and individual struggles merge into larger** social **movements**. The challenge that young people are posing to American society is being met with a state-sponsored violence that is about more than police brutality; it is more importantly about the transformation of the United States from a social state to a warfare state, from a state that embraced the social contract to one that no longer has a language for community - a state in which the bonds of fear and commodification have replaced the bonds of civic responsibility and democratic vision. **Until we address how the metaphysics of war and violence have taken hold on American society** (and in other parts of the world) and the savage social costs it has enacted, the forms of social, political and economic **violence** that young people are protesting against as well as the violence waged in response to their protests **will become impossible to recognize and act on.**

### Adv 1

**Drones are an alt cause**

**Mallette-Piasecki 12**

(Michelle is the executive editor of State Constitutional Commentary and a J.D. candidate at Albany Law School. She also graduated from the United States Military Academy in 2006 with a B.S. in American Legal System. "Comment: Missing the Target: Where the Geneva Conventions Fall Short in the Context of Targeted Killing ." *LexisNexis*. Albany Law School, n.d. Web. 16 Aug 2013. <http://www.lexisnexis.com/lnacui2api/results/docview/docview.do?docLinkInd=true&risb=21\_T17976815702&format=GNBFI&sort=BOOLEAN&startDocNo=1&resultsUrlKey=29\_T17976815706&cisb=22\_T17976815705&treeMax=true&treeWidth=0&csi=143869&docNo=11>. // SLP)

While **the international community has continuously condemned targeted killing since its emergence in 2000**, n16 criticism has not [\*265] deterred either the United States or Israel from continuing to conduct targeted killing operations. n17 In fact, **under the Obama administration, the number of U.S. drone strikes has steadily increased** n18 - **122 were launched in Pakistan in 2010 alone** n19 - **and shows no sign of diminishing anytime soon**. n20 Several high-ranking U.S. political figures have even called the applicability of the Conventions into question given the changing nature of warfare n21 - an ideology not shared by the international community. n22¶ **"The criticism of targeted killing is primarily based on the** [\*266**] premise that it constitutes either extra-judicial killing or assassination**," n23 **both of which are illegal under customary and international humanitarian law.** n24 Consequently, there is serious debate that targeted killing could ever be justified outside the framework of an armed conflict. n25 **The United States has repeatedly asserted that it is in a non-international armed conflict with al Qaeda to justify its drone program**. n26 Israel has taken an even more radical approach to legitimize its actions. In Public Comm. Against Torture in Israel (PCATI)v. Israel, the Israeli Supreme Court held that the conflicts between Israel and Palestinian terrorists constituted an international armed conflict, n27 and that the killings were lawful under the doctrine of anticipatory self-defense. n28 Under IHL, in an international armed conflict, Palestinian terrorists are lawfully subject to attack only so long as they are directly participating in hostilities. n29 According to PCATI, as long as it can be proven that "the target is an active terrorist organization [\*267] member, direct participation and an immediate threat are presumed." n30 The Israeli interpretation means that terrorists, technically civilians, can be targeted at any time - no matter how far removed from the battlefield or how remote their connection is to an ongoing or imminent attack. n31 Even though the PCATI holding is not binding outside of Israel, n32 State practice is moving towards its acceptance. n33 As a result**,** many scholars believe that targeted killing is eventually headed towards legitimizationas well. n34 But a trend toward legitimacy does not necessarily reflect legality under the law of armed conflict. So when is targeted killing lawful? The answer depends on how the conflict is classified.

**Ignoring Ilaw is inevitable—people go to war**

**Doebbler, 11**

(Chris, writer for Ahram online, "The international law we do not use", June 2, english.ahram.org.eg/NewsContent/4/0/13500/Opinion/The-international-law-we-do-not-use.aspx NL)

Although one may not realise it judging from recent events, **the use of force in international relations is prohibited by the most fundamental international law.**¶ As a complement to this prohibition, **all states are solemnly enjoined to resolve their disputes peacefully. In addition, states and their international organisations are prohibited from interfering in the domestic affairs of other states as this can lead to conflict between states.**¶ **These basic rules of international law are found in the UN Charter and legally bind states whether they are acting as solo sovereigns or through collective entities like the UN Security Council.**¶ It is true there are exceptions, but these are very, very narrow. They are the exception not the rule, and there are only two.¶ First, states may use force to defend against an attack. This does not include the suspicion that a state might be attacked, but only an actual attack, according to the UN’s preeminent judicial authority, the International Court of Justice.¶ Second, the UN Security Council may authorise the use of force under Chapter VII of the UN Charter, but only when the strict rules of this chapter have been followed. This means that the Security Council must make a determination based on demonstrated facts that all means of peaceful settlement have failed. In fact, **the UN Charter says the Council must determine all “measures not involving the use of armed force” have failed, before it can authorise the use of force.** Moreover, any use of force authorised by the Council must remain under the strategic direction of the Security Council Military Staff Committee.¶ These rules are the ABC’s of international law and any international lawyer, statesperson, or diplomat who does not understand them is not worthy of his or her post.¶ **Yet, it would seem like an extraordinary number of our leaders, our international lawyers, statespersons, and diplomats do not understand these basic concepts of international law. Instead, they twist the law in ways that run so contrary to its vital object and purpose that it is likely that few of the people who put the law down in writing in the UN Charter would even understand how we have abused their intentions.**

**UN Declaration of Human Rights solves now**

**Borton, 12**

(Verona, president of the United Nations Association of the United States of America, Davis chapter, "Universal Declaration of Human Rights is still powerful after 64 years", Dec 2, [www.davisenterprise.com/forum/opinion-columns/universal-declaration-of-human-rights-is-still-powerful-after-64-years/](http://www.davisenterprise.com/forum/opinion-columns/universal-declaration-of-human-rights-is-still-powerful-after-64-years/) NL)

**The Universal Declaration of Human Rights** turns 64 on Monday, Dec. 10.¶ Adopted by the General Assembly of the United Nations on Dec. 10, 1948, the document owes much of its content to the diligence and perseverance of Eleanor Roosevelt, head of the U.N. team that drafted the declaration.¶ **In this remarkable global effort to protect the rights of everyone, governments for the first time agreed that people everywhere would thereafter be entitled to rights, be entitled to know what they are and be entitled to claim them**.¶ **Almost every nation has adopted the declaration.** Without being legally binding, **this act represents a moral obligation to make the goals of universal human rights a reality.** Much has been accomplished, but a great deal more remains to be done. The struggle for human rights dominates life in all corners of the world today.¶ At 7 p.m. Monday, Dec. 10, the Universal Declaration of Human Rights will be read in 30 languages (followed by English translations), illustrating both the diversity of our community and the universality of the declaration, at International House, 10 College Park.¶ The Davis chapter of the United Nations Association observes this anniversary each year and invites community members to join in the event to reflect on such basic truths as “**Everyone has the right to life, liberty and security of person**.” (Article 3)¶ Copies of the declaration will be available as a gift from the United Nations Association for all who attend, to be kept as a permanent reminder of this powerful guide to human rights everywhere.¶ Some have wondered why we read the declaration in the relatively intimate setting of the Community Room at International House, rather than at a bigger venue. We draw our inspiration from Eleanor Roosevelt, who remarked, “Where, after all, do universal human rights begin? In small places, close to home — so close and so small that they cannot be seen on any maps of the world. Yet they are the world of the individual person; the neighborhood he lives in; the school or college he attends; the factory, farm or office where he works.¶ “Such are the places where every man, woman and child seeks equal justice, equal opportunity, equal dignity without discrimination. **Unless these rights have meaning there, they have little meaning anywhere. Without concerted citizen action to uphold them close to home, we shall look in vain for progress in the larger world.”**¶ **This statement rings as true today as it did when pronounced many decades ago**.

**No superpower draw in**

**Gelb, 10**

(Leslie, President Emeritus of the Council on Foreign Relations former senior official in the U.S. Defense Department and State Department, Foreign Affairs, November/December Foreign Affairs 2010)

Also reducing the likelihood of conflict today is that **there is no arena in which the vital interests of great powers seriously clash.** Indeed, **the most worrisome security threats today--rogue states with nuclear weapons and terrorists with weapons of mass destruction--actually tend to unite the great powers more than divide them**. In the past, and specifically during the first era of globalization**, major powers** would war over practically nothing. Back then, they fought over the Balkans, a region devoid of resources and geographic importance, a strategic zero. Today, they **are unlikely to shoulder their arms over almost anything, even the highly strategic Middle East. All have much more to lose than to gain from turmoil** in that region. To be sure, great powers such as **China and Russia** will tussle with one another for advantages, but they **will stop well short of direct confrontation.** To an unprecedented degree, **the major powers now need one another to grow their economies, and they are loath to jeopardize this interdependence by allowing traditional military and strategic competitions to escalate into wars.** In the past, U.S. enemies--such as the Soviet Union--would have rejoiced at the United States' losing a war in Afghanistan. Today, the United States and its enemies share an interest in blocking the spread of both Taliban extremism and the Afghan-based drug trade. China also looks to U.S. arms to protect its investments in Afghanistan, such as large natural-resource mines. More broadly, **no great nation is challenging the balance of power in either Europe or Asia.** Although nations may not help one another, they rarely oppose one another in explosive situations.

#### No impact to Afghanistan collapse – empirically proven

**Finel, Senior Fellow at the American Security Project, 2009**

(Dr. Bernard I., also contributing editor of the Atlantic Council, “Afghanistan is Irrelevant” 4/27/09, http://www.acus.org/new\_atlanticist/afghanistan-irrelevant, accessed 6/23/11//Bosley)

**It is now** a deeply entrenched **conventional wisdom that the decision to “abandon” Afghanistan** after the Cold War **was a tragic mistake. In the oft-told story, our “abandonment” led to civil war, state collapse, the rise of the Taliban, and inevitably terrorist attacks on American soil. This narrative is now reinforced by dire warnings about the risks to Pakistan from instability in Afghanistan**. Taken all together, critics of the Afghan commitment now find themselves facing a nearly unshakable consensus in continuing and deepen our involvement in Afghanistan. The problem with the consensus is that virtually every part of it is wrong**. Abandonment did not cause the collapse of the state. Failed states are not always a threat to U.S. national security. And Pakistan’s problems have little to do with the situation across the border.** First, the **collapse of the Afghan state** after the Soviet withdrawal **had little to do with Western abandonment**. Afghanistan has always been beset by powerful centrifugal forces. **The country is poor, the terrain rough, the population divided** into several ethnic groups. Because of this, the country has rarely been unified even nominally and has never really had a strong central government. **The dominant historical political system in Afghan is warlordism. This is** not a consequence of Western involvement or lack thereof. It **is a function of geography, economics, and demography. Second, there is no straight-line between state failure and threats to the United States**. Indeed, the problem with Afghanistan was not that it failed but rather that it “unfailed” and becameruled by the Taliban. Congo/Zaire is a failed state. Somalia is a failed state. There are many parts of the globe that are essentially ungoverned. Clearly criminality, human rights abuses, and other global ills flourish in these spaces. But **the notion that any and all ungoverned space represents a core national security threat to the United States is simply unsustainable.** Third, the problem was the Taliban regime was not that it existed. It was that it was allowed to fester without any significant response or intervention. We largely sought to ignore the regime — refusing to recognize it despite its control of 90% of Afghan territory. Aside from occasional tut-tutting about human rights violations and destruction of cultural sites, the only real interaction the United States sought with the regime was in trying to control drugs. Counter-drug initiatives are not a sound foundation for a productive relationship for reasons too numerous to enumerate here. Had we recognized the Taliban and sought to engage the regime, it is possible that we could have managed to communicate red lines to them over a period of years. Their failure to turn over bin Laden immediately after 9/11 does not necessarily imply an absolute inability to drive a wedge between the Taliban and al Qaeda over time. Fourth, **we are now told that defeating the Taliban in Afghanistan is imperative in order to help stabilize Pakistan**. But, most observers seem to think that **Pakistan is in worse shape now — with the Taliban out of power and American forces in Afghanistan — than it was when the Taliban was dominant in Afghanistan**. For five years **from 1996 to 2001, the Taliban ruled Afghanistan and the Islamist threat to Pakistan then was unquestionably lower**. This is not surprising actually. **Insurgencies are at their most dangerous — in terms of threat of contagion — when they are fighting for power.** The number of insurgencies that actually manage to sponsor insurgencies elsewhere after taking power is surprising low. **The domino theory is as dubious in the case of Islamist movements as it was in the case of Communist expansion.**

#### Alt cause – drug and arms trafficking

**Pakistan Daily Times 6-22-11**

(6/22/11, " ANALYSIS: Kidnapping and arms smuggling in Afghanistan —Musa Khan Jalalzai ", http://www.dailytimes.com.pk/default.asp?page=2011%5C06%5C23%5Cstory\_23-6-2011\_pg3\_3//Bosley)

'Don't go to Afghanistan if you want to save the money.' These are the words quoted from a recently filed news story of my journalist friend returned from Afghanistan. **Over the last three decades of civil war, Afghanistan largely depended on the black market economy, criminal trade, and smuggling of opium, heroin and arms. Drug and arms trafficking business and jihadism left devastating effects on the lives of common Afghans.** **The recent large-scale transfer of arms to Afghanistan from Central Asia** and its distribution across the country **is a bigger threat to the stability of the country as these arms may be used in a future civil war against ethnic rivals.** From northern Afghanistan, these weapons are further transferred to Pakistan via the Hindu Kush mountainous regions.

### Adv 2

**Syria makes US-Russia war inevitable**

**PressTV, 13**

(Press TV, "Israel can spark US-Russia thermonuclear war: LaRouche", Aug 8, [www.presstv.com/detail/2013/08/08/317842/israel-can-spark-usrussia-nuclear-war/](http://www.presstv.com/detail/2013/08/08/317842/israel-can-spark-usrussia-nuclear-war/) NL)

American political activist **Lyndon LaRouche has warned that the continuation of Israeli behavior towards Syria, including the recent air strikes against the Arab country, could end in a US-Russia thermonuclear war**.¶ His comments appeared in an article by Jeffrey Steinberg, which has been published in the latest issue of Executive Intelligence Review, a weekly news magazine founded by LaRouche himself. “**Lyndon LaRouche warned on Aug. 3 that ongoing Israeli actions, including the July 5 Israeli Air Force (IAF) bombing of a depot near Latakia, Syria which held Russian-made anti-ship cruise missiles, could trigger a wider war, drawing the United States into thermonuclear conflict with Russia,”** the article starts. **Following the attack, American officials said the air strike had failed to destroy all the missiles.** Steinberg said the leak proved that the US wanted to distance itself from any military measure against Russian targets in Syria to avoid further escalation of any future conflict with Moscow. “According to U.S. intelligence sources contacted by EIR, the leaks are intended to make clear that the United States is not supporting the Israeli strikes against Russian targets against Syria. Such strikes could lead to an escalation that directly draws the United States into a head-on confrontation with Russia,” the piece read. LaRouche, an eight times presidential candidate, said in 2004 that “ the ongoing drive to induce President George W. Bush to launch a war against Iraq, is a 1996 Israeli government policy that is being foisted on the President by a nest of Israeli agents inside the U.S. government.”

**Aff kills flexibility**

**Vermeule 6**

Adrian Vermeule, Professor of Law, Harvard Law School, 2006,¶ “THE EMERGENCY CONSTITUTION IN THE POST-SEPTEMBER 11 WORLD ORDER: SELF-DEFEATING¶ PROPOSALS: ACKERMAN ON EMERGENCY POWERS,” Fordham Law Review, Nov., pp. LN.

**The reason for the failure of statutory frameworks is plain. When an emergency or war or**

**crisis arises, the executive needs flexibility; because statutory limitations determined in¶ advance can only reduce flexibility, and do so in a way that does not anticipate the particular¶ requirements of a new emergency**, no one has any ex post interest in insisting that these limitations be respected.¶ Ackerman acknowledges the grim historical record but provides no valid reason for thinking that his framework statute - which is far¶ more ambitious than the other ones - might fare differently.

**That causes extinction**

**Yoo 12**

(John Yoo, American attorney, law professor, and author. He served as a political appointee, the Deputy Assistant US Attorney General in the Office of Legal Counsel, Department of Justice (OLC), during the George W. Bush administration. “War Powers Belong to the President”¶ Posted Feb 1, 2012,¶ <http://www.abajournal.com/magazine/article/war_powers_belong_to_the_president>, KB)

**A radical change in the system for making war might appease critics of presidential power. But it could also seriously threaten American national security. In order to forestall another 9/11 attack, or to take advantage of a window of opportunity to strike terrorists or rogue nations**, **the executive branch needs flexibility**. It is not hard to think of situations where **congressional consent cannot be obtained in time to act.** Time for congressional deliberation, which leads only to passivity and isolation and not smarter decisions, will come at the price of speed and secrecy.¶ The Constitution creates a presidency that can respond forcefully to prevent serious threats to our national security. Presidents can take the initiative and Congress can use its funding power to check them. Instead of demanding a legalistic process to begin war, the framers left war to politics. **As we confront the new challenges of terrorism, rogue nations and WMD proliferation, now is not the time to introduce sweeping, untested changes in the way we make war.**

**Zero risk of US-Russia war – weak Russian military and economic interdependence check**

**Graham 07 - senior advisor on Russia in the US National Security Council staff 2002-2007**

Thomas, "Russia in Global Affairs” July - September 2007, The Dialectics of Strength and Weakness An astute historian of Russia, AND long-term relations with Russia..

An astute historian of Russia, Martin Malia, wrote several years ago that “Russia has at different times been demonized or divinized by Western opinion less because of her real role in Europe than because of the fears and frustrations, or hopes and aspirations, generated within European society by its own domestic problems.” Such is the case today. To be sure, mounting Western concerns about Russia are a consequence of Russian policies that appear to undermine Western interests, but they are also a reflection of declining confidence in our own abilities and the efficacy of our own policies. Ironically, this growing fear and distrust of Russia come at a time when **Russia is** arguably **less threatening to** the West, and **the United States** in particular, **than it has been at any time since the end of the Second World War**. **Russia does not champion a totalitarian ideology intent on our destruction, its military poses no threat** to sweep across Europe**, its economic growth depends on constructive commercial relations with Europe, and its strategic arsenal** – while still capable of annihilating the United States **– is under more reliable control than it has been in the past fifteen years** and **the threat of a strategic strike approaches zero probability.** Political gridlock in key Western countries, however, precludes the creativity, risk-taking, and subtlety needed to advance our interests on issues over which we are at odds with Russia while laying the basis for more constructive long-term relations with Russia.

**NATO solves the impact**

**Benitez, 12**

(Jorge, Director of NATOSource and a Senior Fellow at the Atlantic Council, "US Pivot Doesn't Affect NATO's Asian Partnerships", Aug 14, [www.atlanticcouncil.org/blogs/new-atlanticist/us-pivot-doesnt-affect-natos-asian-partnerships](http://www.atlanticcouncil.org/blogs/new-atlanticist/us-pivot-doesnt-affect-natos-asian-partnerships) NL)

**The Obama administration's so-called pivot to Asia will have only a small and indirect impact** on the strengthening of NATO's partnerships in Asia.¶ The pivot is part of US defense policy, not NATO policy. It is primarily a result of the return of forces to the region from deployments in Iraq, Afghanistan, and elsewhere in the Middle East.¶ **NATO's partnerships in Asia** are not a result of the US pivot. They **exist due to the relative growth of Asia's geostrategic power and the need for greater cooperation against common threats to the peace and prosperity of Asia and the transatlantic community**.¶ There are many misperceptions that NATO partnerships are a precursor to NATO expansion into other regions and the addition of new members to NATO from Asia or the Middle East. This is not true.¶ NATO is not seeking new members in other regions, and NATO's partners in other regions are not seeking NATO membership. NATO partnerships outside of Europe are for improving cooperation, not for partners to become NATO members.¶ Secretary General of NATO Anders Fogh Rasmussen recently stated this very clearly. "Let there be no doubt. This is not about replacing our existing partnerships. It is not about expanding our footprint into other parts of the world. Nor is it about NATO assuming global responsibilities."¶ **NATO partnerships are being strengthened because it is in the interest of NATO, its partners and the international community as a whole, for countries to improve their ability to work together in the face of common security problems**.¶ **From the proliferation of WMD technology, to escalating cyber threats, to growing violence from extremist groups, the international community is facing numerous dangerous challenges.**¶ **At the same time, worldwide economic troubles are reducing national budgets and decreasing the capabilities of nations to deal with these rising threats**.¶ **NATO partnerships help countries continue to protect their people and interests by working together rather than separately**.¶ Asia and the transatlantic community already benefit from NATO partnerships. For example, NATO navies and naval units from Asian powers such as China and India work together in counter-piracy missions.¶ By working together, they not only help protect lives and keep the peace, but also prevent rogue actors from damaging the international trade in food, energy, and products, which all of our economies depend on.¶ NATO partnerships also contribute to the international community by increasing communication and understanding between NATO and its partners.¶ In addition to the Asian countries that participated in the meeting for International Security Assistance Force partners at the NATO summit in Chicago in May, Asian nations such as Japan and South Korea were also invited to attend what the White House described as "an unprecedented meeting to discuss ways to further broaden and deepen NATO's cooperation with partner nations."¶ In fact, improving relations with partners was one of NATO's three main priorities at the Chicago summit.¶ NATO partnerships will not expand NATO into Asia or other regions. The purpose of NATO partnerships is to expand international cooperation in security matters and help make the world safer for all of us.¶ As Rasmussen said, "This is about NATO assuming a global perspective. Playing its part globally, and strengthening our ability to act in concert with our partners around the globe."¶ **NATO partnerships** are not a threat to Asia. They **are an opportunity for Asia and the transatlantic countries to work together.** Asia should welcome NATO's willingness to contribute to the security of the international community and join NATO in building partnerships for peace.

**No US-China war**

**Perkovich, 09**

(George, vice president for studies and director of the Nuclear Policy Program at the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, "Extended Deterrence on the way to a nuclear-free world”, May 2009, icnnd.org/Documents/Perkovich\_Deterrence.pdf) NL

The reality today is that the taboo against using nuclear weapons has become so strong, especially in democracies, that the only threat against which it is justifiable and therefore credible to use these weapons is one where the survival of the U.S. or an ally is clearly jeopardized. Yet, with the possible exception of North Korea whose leadership could be imagined to use nuclear weapons against Japan or South Korea if its own survival were threatened, no other state poses a realistic threat to the national survival of U.S. allies in Europe or East Asia. Russia does not have the intention or capability to sustain an invasion of the new NATO states, let alone threaten their survival. Russia could destroy any state with its nuclear weapons, but because this, more than any other action, would practically guarantee nuclear retaliation, Russia would not run the risk. There is simply nothing important enough that Russia would want in any of the NATO states to merit such risk taking**. China has no interest and inadequate capabilities to take mainland Japanese territory or otherwise threaten it militarily**. It might pose military threats to Japanese positions regarding southern islands, but **the U.S. and China are not going to wage nuclear war over such islands,** and Japanese officials and public cannot realistically expect nuclear deterrence to operate here. Beijing does continue to increase its capabilities to deter Taiwan from declaring independence and the U.S. from defending Taiwan in such a scenario, but the surety of U.S. security assurances to Taiwan would be greater, not less, if neither China nor the U.S. possessed nuclear weapons. For the foreseeable future **China would be highly unlikely to use nuclear weapons on Taiwanese targets, as the Chinese goal is to integrate Taiwanese into China, not to kill them**. China would wish to deter U.S. intervention by threatening the American fleet, perhaps with nuclear weapons, and then deterring U.S. escalation against the Chinese homeland, by holding U.S. cities at risk. But **the trigger of nuclear use in these scenarios would be a move by Taiwan to achieve independence. The U.S. has no obligation to fight for Taiwanese independence** if China has not committed aggression against Taiwan first

**Iran makes the impact inevitable**

**Lyons, 13**

(James, retired admiral in the US Navy, "How to Bring Middle East Peace and Stability", April 14, [www.americanthinker.com/2013/04/how\_to\_bring\_middle\_east\_peace\_and\_stability.html](http://www.americanthinker.com/2013/04/how_to_bring_middle_east_peace_and_stability.html) NL)

**President Obama returned from his trip to the Middle East (ME) on March 23, leaving behind the illusion that peace and stability may still be an achievable goal** between Palestinians and Israelis. **The key issue which is always left unresolved is how to neutralize the destabilizing role the Iranian theocracy and its two terrorist proxies, Hamas and Hezb'allah, play in preventing any meaningful progress**.¶ **Complicating matters is Iran's drive to achieve a nuclear weapon capability**. President Obama in recent statements, repeated during his trip to Israel, declared that "Iran is still over a year or so" away from building a nuclear weapon. Such statements should give no small comfort to Israel or the United States. Director of National Intelligence LT General James R. Clapper, USAF (ret.)'s declaration that Iran could not produce weapons-grade uranium without it being detected is questionable. According to Reza Kahlili, a pseudonym for a former CIA operative in Iran's Revolutionary Guards Force, Iran has mastered the technology (probably with China and North Korea's help) to enrich uranium to the 20-percent level, which is 80-90 percent of the way to weapons grade.