## 1NC—Indef Detention

**1NC CP**

***Text: The Executive branch of the United States should* statutorily clarify that its authorization to use force is for zones of active hostilities**

**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.**

**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.**

### 1NC DA

**Debt ceiling bill gets passed now**

**Kapur, 9/9**

(Sahil is TPM’s senior congressional reporter and Supreme Court correspondent. 9/9/2013, “Is House GOP Backing Down In Debt Limit Fight?”[http://tpmdc.talkingpointsmemo.com/2013/09/house-gop-cantor-memo-debt-ceiling-cr-sequester-immigration.php](https://co1prd0211.outlook.com/owa/redir.aspx?C=fsVRzvvSzkK3bW9fzmwglqQHT4vIhNAIZh2k2UlcYIczFJU_Tvb5SujwnzWvT0yA_mZOgcx1pGw.&URL=http%3a%2f%2ftpmdc.talkingpointsmemo.com%2f2013%2f09%2fhouse-gop-cantor-memo-debt-ceiling-cr-sequester-immigration.php))

House **Republicans are taming members’ expectations ahead of the debt limit showdown, signaling that they may not be able to extract significant concessions from Democrats.**¶ **A** Friday **memo to GOP members by** Majority Leader Eric **Cantor** (R-VA) **says “the House will act to prevent a default on our obligations before” the mid-October deadline the Obama administration has established**. “House Republicans,” he says, “will demand fiscal reforms and pro-growth policies which put us on a path to balance in ten years in exchange for another increase in the debt limit.”¶ The language is vague — intentionally so, in order to maintain wiggle room for Republicans to avert a disastrous debt default. President Barack **Obama has vowed not to pay a ransom to ensure the U.S. can meet its obligations**.¶ **If and when they do cave, Republicans will be hard-pressed to show their base they got something in return for raising the debt ceiling.** In January, they got Senate Democrats to agree to pass a non-binding budget resolution. This time around, the possibilities for symbolic concessions range from a doomed Senate vote to delay or defund Obamacare or instructions to initiate the process of tax reform.¶ **There are a number of demands rank-and-file Republicans have urged leaders to make which could genuinely complicate the battle**, such as dollar-for-dollar spending cuts or unwinding Obamacare. Cantor’s memo mentioned neither. GOP members have also called on leadership not to bring up any debt limit bill that lacks the support of half the conference. Boehner hasn’t committed to this and Cantor didn’t mention it in his memo.¶ There are several reasons **Republicans will have a hard time extracting concessions. Backin January, when Obama held firm and refused to negotiate on the debt limit, Republicans folded and agreed to suspend the debt ceiling without substantial concessions** but rather symbolic ones. And due to deep divisions within the conference, House Republicans will face enormous challenges in rounding up 218 votes to pass any conceivable debt limit hike.¶ The party’s top priority is to cut safety-net programs like Social Security and Medicare. But there’s no internal consensus on what to cut. And Republicans, whose constituents are disproportionately older, have generally refused to vote on entitlement cuts without bipartisan cover from Democrats. In this case Democrats are highly unlikely to give it to them, which complicates their task of passing a debt limit bill.¶ **The Cantor memo makes it all but official that Republicans won’t seek to defund Obamacare in the fiscal battles.** The strategy, pushed by conservative activists, to withhold support for keeping the government running after Sept. 30 unless Democrats agree to defund Obamacare. Instead it vows to “hold a series of strategic votes throughout the fall to dismantle, defund, and delay Obamacare.” The memo says Republicans “will continue to pursue the strategy of systematically derailing this train wreck and replacing it with a patient-centered system.”¶ The GOP’s big stand in the fiscal battles will be to force Obama to accept the lower spending levels ordered by sequestration — automatic spending cuts enacted in 2011 — in a measure to keep the government funded. Here Republicans will refuse to cede and the White House has not suggested it’ll veto a bill that maintains sequester spending levels, although Obama wants to cut a deal to replace the sequester.¶ “In signing a CR at sequester levels,” Cantor writes, “the President would be endorsing a level of spending that wipes away all the increases he and Congressional Democrats made while they were in charge and returns us to a pre-2008 level of discretionary spending.”

**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.**

### Global Battlefield

**These impacts are terminally non-uniq – AMUF has been the “playbook” for more than a decade no impact**

**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**.

**Other actors won’t follow precedent set by the plan**

**Jacobson, 13**

(Mark, senior advisor to the Truman Project, "Five Myths About Obama’s Drone War", 2/11, trumanproject.org/doctrine-blog/five-myths-about-obamas-drone-war/ NL)

Armed drones are neither as simple as model airplanes nor as complex as high-performance fighter jets. Of course, a remote-controlled helicopter that you can build in your garage is certainly not as capable as the $26.8 million MQ-9 Reaper, the primary U.S. hunter-killer drone. But **drones are much less expensive than fighter aircraft, and in an age of increasing austerity, it is tempting for nations to consider replacing jet fleets with armed drones.**¶ **More than 50 countries operate surveillance drones, and armed drones will quickly become standard in military arsenals**. The challenge is to consider what international rules, if any, should govern the use of armed drones. **The United States is setting the precedent; our approach may define the global rules of engagement. Of course, we cannot expect other nations to adopt the oversight and restrictions we have.**

**What doors are we opening for other nations’ use of drones? What happens when terrorist groups acquire them? The United States must prepare for being the prey, not just the predator.**

**No drones arms race – multiple checks**

**Singh 12 – Researcher at the Center for a New American Security**

(Joseph, “Betting Against a Drone Arms Race”, 8-13-13, http://nation.time.com/2012/08/13/betting-against-a-drone-arms-race/#ixzz2TxEkUI37, accessed 9-14-13 //Bosley)

**Bold predictions of a coming drones arms race are all the rage** since the uptake in their deployment under the Obama Administration. Noel Sharkey, for example, argues in an August 3 op-ed for the Guardian that rapidly developing drone technology — coupled with minimal military risk — portends an era in which states will become increasingly aggressive in their use of drones.¶ As drones develop the ability to fly completely autonomously, Sharkey predicts a proliferation of their use that will set dangerous precedents, seemingly inviting hostile nations to use drones against one another. Yet**, the narrow applications of current drone technology coupled with what we know about state behavior in the international system lend no credence to these ominous warnings.**¶ Indeed, critics seem overly-focused on the domestic implications of drone use.¶ In a June piece for the Financial Times, Michael Ignatieff writes that “virtual technologies make it easier for democracies to wage war because they eliminate the risk of blood sacrifice that once forced democratic peoples to be prudent.”¶ Significant public support for the Obama Administration’s increasing deployment of drones would also seem to legitimate this claim. Yet, **there remain equally serious diplomatic and political costs that emanate from beyond a fickle electorate, which will prevent** the likes of the **increased drone aggression** predicted by both Ignatieff and Sharkey.¶ Most recently, **the serious diplomatic scuffle instigated by Syria’s downing a Turkish reconnaissance plane in June illustrated the very serious risks of operating any aircraft in foreign territory.**¶ States launching drones must still weigh the diplomatic and political costs of their actions, which make the calculation surrounding their use no fundamentally different to any other aerial engagement.¶ This recent bout also illustrated a salient point regarding drone technology: **most states maintain at least minimal air defenses that can quickly detect and take down drones**,

 as the U.S. discovered when it employed drones at the onset of the Iraq invasion, while Saddam Hussein’s surface-to-air missiles were still active.¶ What the U.S. also learned, however, was that drones constitute an effective military tool in an extremely narrow strategic context. They are well-suited either in direct support of a broader military campaign, or to conduct targeted killing operations against a technologically unsophisticated enemy.¶ In a nutshell, then, the very contexts in which we have seen drones deployed. Northern Pakistan, along with a **few** other **regions in the world**, **remain conducive to drone usage given a lack of air defenses**, **poor media coverage**, **and difficulties in accessing the region**.

**Congress won’t enforce the plan**

Druck, 12

(Judah A., , J.D. Candidate at Cornell “Droning On: The War Powers Resolution and the Numbing Effect of Technology-Driven Warfare,” Cornell Law Review 98:209-237, accessed 6-12-13 //Bosley)

Of course, despite these various suits, **Congress has received much of the blame for the WPR’s treatment and failures**. For example, Congress has been criticized for doing little to enforce the WPR in using other Article I tools, such as the “power of the purse,”76 or by closing the loopholes frequently used by presidents to avoid the WPR in the first place.77 Furthermore, **in those situations where Congress has decided to act, it has done so in such a disjointed manner as to render any possible check on the President useless**. For example, **during** President **Reagan’s invasion of Grenada, Congress failed to reach an agreement to declare the WPR’s sixty-day clock operative**,78 **and** later **faced** similar **“deadlock”** in deciding how best **to respond to** President Reagan’s actions in **the Persian Gulf**, eventually settling for a bill that reflected congressional “ambivalence.”79 Thus, between the lack of a “backbone” to check rogue presidential action and general ineptitude when it actually decides to act,80 **Congress has demonstrated its inability to remedy WPR violations**. Worse yet, **much of Congress’s interest in the WPR is politically motivated**, **leading to inconsistent review of presidential military decisions filled with post-hoc rationalizations**. **Given the political risk associated with wartime decisions**,81 **Congress lacks any incentive to act unless and until it can gauge public reaction**—**a process that often occurs after the fact**.82 As a result, missions deemed successful by the public will rarely provoke “serious congressional concern” about presidential compliance with the WPR, while failures will draw scrutiny.83 For example, in the case of the Mayaguez, “liberals in the Congress generally praised [President Gerald Ford’s] performance” despite the constitutional questions surrounding the conflict, simply because the public deemed it a success.84 Thus, **even if Congress was effective at checking potentially unconstitutional presidential action**, **it would only act when politically safe to do so**. This result should be unsurprising: making a wartime decision provides little advantage for politicians, especially if the resulting action succeeds.85 Consequently, **Congress itself has taken a role in the continued disregard for WPR enforcement**.

#### No widespread proliferation

Hymans, USC Associate Professor of International Relations, 12

(Jacques, “North Korea's Lessons for (Not) Building an Atomic Bomb,” 4-16-12, [www.foreignaffairs.com/articles/137408/jacques-e-c-hymans/north-koreas-lessons-for-not-building-an-atomic-bomb?page=show](http://www.foreignaffairs.com/articles/137408/jacques-e-c-hymans/north-koreas-lessons-for-not-building-an-atomic-bomb?page=show), accessed 9-26-12 //Bosley)

Washington's miscalculation is not just a product of the difficulties of seeing inside the Hermit Kingdom. It is also a result of the broader tendency to overestimate the pace of global proliferation. For decades, Very Serious People have predicted that strategic weapons are about to spread to every corner of the earth. Such warnings have routinely proved wrong - for instance, the intelligence assessments that led to the 2003 invasion of Iraq - but they continue to be issued. In reality, despite the diffusion of the relevant technology and the knowledge for building nuclear weapons, the world has been experiencing a great proliferation slowdown. Nuclear weapons programs around the world are taking much longer to get off the ground - and their failure rate is much higher - than they did during the first 25 years of the nuclear age. As I explain in my article "Botching the Bomb" in the upcoming issue of Foreign Affairs, the key reason for the great proliferation slowdown is the absence of strong cultures of scientific professionalism in most of the recent crop of would-be nuclear states, which in turn is a consequence of their poorly built political institutions. In such dysfunctional states, the quality of technical workmanship is low, there is little coordination across different technical teams, and technical mistakes lead not to productive learning but instead to finger-pointing and recrimination. These problems are debilitating, and they cannot be fixed simply by bringing in more imported parts through illicit supply networks. In short, as a struggling proliferator, North Korea has a lot of company.

#### No impact to prolif

Tepperman 9

(Jonathan Tepperman, Deputy Editor at Newsweek. Former Deputy Managing Editor, Foreign Affairs. LLM, i-law, NYU. MA, jurisprudence, Oxford. “Why Obama Should Learn to Love the Bomb,” 8-28-9, <http://www.thedailybeast.com/newsweek/2009/08/28/why-obama-should-learn-to-love-the-bomb.html>, accessed 5/21/13, EGM)

A growing and compelling body of research suggests that nuclear weapons may not, in fact, make the world more dangerous, as Obama and most people assume. The bomb may actually make us safer. In this era of rogue states and transnational terrorists, that idea sounds so obviously wrongheaded that few politicians or policymakers are willing to entertain it. But that’s a mistake. Knowing the truth about nukes would have a profound impact on government policy. Obama’s idealistic campaign, so out of character for a pragmatic administration, may be unlikely to get far (past presidents have tried and failed). But it’s not even clear he should make the effort. There are more important measures the U.S. government can and should take to make the real world safer, and these mustn’t be ignored in the name of a dreamy ideal (a nukefree planet) that’s both unrealistic and possibly undesirable. The argument that nuclear weapons can be agents of peace as well as destruction rests on two deceptively simple observations. First, nuclear weapons have not been used since 1945. Second, there’s never been a nuclear, **or even a nonnuclear, war between two states that possess them**. Just stop for a second and think about that: it’s hard to overstate how remarkable it is, especially given the singular viciousness of the 20th century. As Kenneth Waltz, the leading “nuclear optimist” and a professor emeritus of political science at UC Berkeley puts it, “We now have 64 years of experience since Hiroshima. It’s striking and against all historical precedent that for that substantial period, there has not been any war among nuclear states.” To understand why—and why the next 64 years are likely to play out the same way—you need to start by recognizing that all states are rational on some basic level. Their leaders may be stupid, petty, venal, even evil, but they tend to do things only when they’re pretty sure they can get away with them. Take war: a country will start a fight only when it’s almost certain it can get what it wants at an acceptable price. Not even Hitler or Saddam waged wars they didn’t think they could win. The problem historically has been that leaders often make the wrong gamble and underestimate the other side—and millions of innocents pay the price. Nuclear weapons change all that by making the costs of war obvious, inevitable, and unacceptable. Suddenly, when both sides have the ability to turn the other to ashes with the push of a button— and everybody knows it—the basic math shifts. Even the craziest tin-pot dictator is forced to accept that war with a nuclear state is unwinnable and thus not worth the effort. As Waltz puts it, “Why fight if you can’t win and might lose everything?” Why indeed? **The iron logic of deterrence and mutually assured destruction is so compelling, it’s led to what’s known as the nuclear peace:** the virtually unprecedented stretch since the end of World War II in which all the world’s major powers have avoided coming to blows. They did fight proxy wars, ranging from Korea to Vietnam to Angola to Latin America. But these never matched the furious destruction of full-on, great-power war (World War II alone was responsible for some 50 million to 70 million deaths). And since the end of the Cold War, such bloodshed has declined precipitously. Meanwhile, the **nuclear powers have scrupulously avoided direct combat,** and there’s very good reason to think they always will. There have been some near misses, but a close look at these cases is fundamentally reassuring—because in each instance, very different leaders all came to the same safe conclusion. Take the mother of all nuclear standoffs: the Cuban missile crisis. For 13 days in October 1962, the United States and the Soviet Union each threatened the other with destruction. But both countries soon stepped back from the brink when they recognized that a war would have meant curtains for everyone. As important as the fact that they did is the reason why: Soviet leader Nikita Khrushchev’s aide Fyodor Burlatsky said later on, “It is impossible to win a nuclear war, and both sides realized that, maybe for the first time.” The record since then shows the same pattern repeating: nucleararmed enemies slide toward war, then pull back, always for the same reasons. The best recent example is India and Pakistan, which fought three bloody wars after independence before acquiring their own nukes in 1998. Getting their hands on weapons of mass destruction didn’t do anything to lessen their animosity. But it did dramatically mellow their behavior. Since acquiring atomic weapons, the two sides have never fought another war, despite severe provocations (like Pakistani-based terrorist attacks on India in 2001 and 2008). They have skirmished once. But during that flare-up, in Kashmir in 1999, both countries were careful to keep the fighting limited and to avoid threatening the other’s vital interests. Sumit Ganguly, an Indiana University professor and coauthor of the forthcoming India, Pakistan, and the Bomb, has found that on both sides, officials’ thinking was strikingly similar to that of the Russians and Americans in 1962. The prospect of war brought Delhi and Islamabad face to face with a nuclear holocaust, and leaders in each country did what they had to do to avoid it. Nuclear pessimists—and there are many—insist that even if this pattern has held in the past, it’s crazy to rely on it in the future, for several reasons. The first is that today’s nuclear wannabes are so completely unhinged, you’d be mad to trust them with a bomb. Take the sybaritic Kim Jong Il, who’s never missed a chance to demonstrate his battiness, or Mahmoud Ahmadinejad, who has denied the Holocaust and promised the destruction of Israel, and who, according to some respected Middle East scholars, runs a messianic martyrdom cult that would welcome nuclear obliteration. These regimes are the ultimate rogues, the thinking goes —and there’s no deterring rogues. But are Kim and Ahmadinejad really scarier and crazier than were Stalin and Mao? It might look that way from Seoul or Tel Aviv, but history says otherwise. Khrushchev, remember, threatened to “bury” the United States, and in 1957, Mao blithely declared that a nuclear war with America wouldn’t be so bad because even “if half of mankind died . . . the whole world would become socialist.” Pyongyang and Tehran support terrorism—but so did Moscow and Beijing. And as for seeming suicidal, Michael Desch of the University of Notre Dame points out that Stalin and Mao are the real recordholders here: both were responsible for the deaths of some 20 million of their own citizens. Yet when push came to shove, their regimes balked at nuclear suicide, and so would today’s international bogeymen. For all of Ahmadinejad’s antics, his power is limited, and the clerical regime has always proved rational and pragmatic when its life is on the line. Revolutionary Iran has never started a war, has done deals with both Washington and Jerusalem, and sued for peace in its war with Iraq (which Saddam started) once it realized it couldn’t win. North Korea, meanwhile, is a tiny, impoverished, family-run country with a history of being invaded; its overwhelming preoccupation is survival, and every time it becomes more belligerent it reverses itself a few months later (witness last week, when Pyongyang told Seoul and Washington it was ready to return to the bargaining table). These countries may be brutally oppressive, but nothing in their behavior suggests they have a death wish.

#### And proliferation-induced deterrence solves conventional warfare – comparatively outweighs their scenarios

**Preston, Associate Professor of IR at Washington State, 07**

(Thomas, also Faculty Research Associate at the Moynihan Institute of Global Affairs, “From Lambs to Lions: Future Security relationships in a World of Biological and Nuclear Weapons”, p. 31-32)

1.) The Cost of Deterrence Failure Is Too Great Advocates of deterrence seldom take the position that it will always work or that it cannot fail. Rather, they take the position that if one can achieve the requisite elements required to achieve a stable deterrent relationship between parties, it vastly decreases the chances of miscalculation and resorting to war—even in contexts where it might otherwise be expected to occur (George and Smoke 1974; Harvey 1997a; Powell 1990, 2003; Goldstein 2000). Unfortunately, critics of deterrence take the understandable, if unrealistic, position that if deterrence cannot be 100 percent effective under all circumstances, then it is an unsound strategic approach for states to rely upon, especially considering the immense destructiveness of nuclear weapons. Feaver (1993, 162), for example, criticizes reliance on nuclear deterrence because it can fail and that rational deterrence theory can only predict that peace should occur most of the time (e.g., Lebow and Stein 1989). Yet, were we to apply this standard of perfection to most other policy approaches concerning security matters — whether it be arms control or proliferation regime efforts, military procurement policies, alliance formation strategies, diplomacy, or sanctions —none could be argued with any more certainty to completely remove the threat of equally devastating wars either. Indeed, one could easily make the argument that these alternative means have shown themselves historically to be far less effective than nuclear arms in preventing wars. Certainly, the twentieth century was replete with examples of devastating conventional conflicts which were not deterred through nonnuclear measures. Although the potential costs of a nuclear exchange between small states would indeed cause a frightful loss of life, it would be no more costly (and likely far less so) than large-scale conventional conflicts have been for combatants. Moreover, if nuclear deterrence raises the potential costs of war high enough for policy makers to want to avoid (rather than risk) conflict, it is just as legitimate (if not more so) for optimists to argue in favor of nuclear deterrence in terms of the lives saved through the avoidance of far more likely recourses to conventional wars, as it is for pessimists to warn of the potential costs of deterrence failure. And, while some accounts describing the "immense weaknesses" of deterrence theory (Lebow and Stein 1989, 1990) would lead one to believe deterrence was almost impossible to either obtain or maintain, since 1945 there has not been one single historical instance of nuclear deterrence failure (especially when this notion is limited to threats to key central state interests like survival, and not to minor probing of peripheral interests). Moreover, the actual costs of twentieth-century conventional conflicts have been staggeringly immense, especially when compared to the actual costs of nuclear conflicts (for example, 210,000 fatalities in the combined 1945 Hiroshima and Nagasaki atomic bombings compared to 62 million killed overall during World War II, over three million dead in both the Korean and Vietnam conflicts, etc.) (McKinzie et al. 2001, 28).3 Further, as Gray (1999, 158-59) observes, "it is improbable that policymakers anywhere need to be educated as to the extraordinary qualities and quantities of nuclear armaments." Indeed, the high costs and uncontestable, immense levels of destruction that would be caused by nuclear weapons have been shown historically to be facts that have not only been readily apparent and salient to a wide range of policy makers, but ones that have clearly been demonstrated to moderate extreme policy or risk-taking behavior (Blight 1992; Preston 2001) Could it go wrong? Of course. There is always that potential with human beings in the loop. Nevertheless, it has also been shown to be effective at moderating policy maker behavior and introducing an element of constraint into situations that otherwise would likely have resulted in war (Hagerty 1998).

### US EU

#### EU collapse inevitable IBD 11

(Investors Business Daily, “Strained by its debts, EU is breaking” 11/11/11 up”<http://news.investors.com/article/591486/201111111828/strained-by-its-debts-eu-is-breaking-up.htm>, 7/8/13, EGM)

Euro Zone: It's been clear for some time that the European Union is in deep trouble. But now even its own leaders admit something shocking: The EU, and its currency the euro, may soon be a thing of the past. The EU has had a troubled existence since the euro was first rolled out on Jan. 1, 1999. Sure, the EU has advantages — a single currency, one giant market, freedom of movement for a well-educated workforce, all benefits. Still, it's impossible to have an economic union based on rules no one follows. And that's exactly what's happened in the EU. Under the 1993 Maastricht Treaty, no EU country was allowed to run a budget deficit of more than 3% of GDP or issue public debt in excess of 60% of GDP. This was to be the bedrock of the EU's financial stability. In recent years, Greece, Ireland and Portugal have all run deficits over 10% of GDP. Worse, the debts of Greece, Italy, Ireland, Portugal and Spain average 112% of GDP. In short, the countries on the EU's periphery have used membership as a way to redistribute wealth from Europe's rich north to its poorer south. For a while it worked. But now the debts are enormous, and the amounts needed to bail out the peripherals from their profligacy are so large that citizens in countries such as Germany are saying "no more." By some estimates, as much as $4 trillion will be needed — a number that would bankrupt the EU. Sure, the poor EU countries deserve blame for running their economies into the ground. But the real problem is the EU itself. Bureaucratic, overly regulated, undemocratic, inefficient and innovation-stifling, the EU and its single currency face a "moment of truth," British Prime Minister David Cameron accurately observed last week. Alarmed at the speed of the EU's financial deterioration and by the prospect that Greece and other spendthrift nations could bankrupt the EU, French President Nicolas Sarkozy wants to forge a "breakaway" group of nations within the EU — an EU Mini-Me on steroids. Subscribe to the IBD Editorials Podcast The basic idea is to take the high-debt loser nations — Greece, Italy, Spain, Portugal and others — and put them into a separate, Euro-ghetto confederation. Meanwhile, France, Germany and a core of hardy, relatively responsible, mostly northern European nations will have their own EU rules, parliament and capital — a "union within a union," as Britain's Telegraph put it. Well, good luck. It won't solve the underlying problems that have doomed the EU from the start. To wit: The EU has too many languages, too many cultures and too many economic preferences to make unity work. And it's all based on a model of cradle-to-grave welfare state spending that is now bankrupting its members. The pressure to dismantle the EU will only grow. For a long time, the EU and its currency let Europeans believe the fiction that they were still a large, dynamic, growing economic bloc, not the stagnant, aging, welfare state they've become. They now know their only hope is to dismantle infantilizing EU bureaucracy and return responsibility for finance and economics to national governments. The only question is, will they have the courage to do it?

#### No warming impact

* Recent cooling disproves climate models
* CO2 is not a pollutant – agriculture and wildlife trends prove
* Evidence is biased – scientists seeking funding
* Dissent is being quelled by warming theorists – crushes scientific inquiry

**Allegre et al. 12**

(Claude Allegre, former director of the Institute for the Study of the Earth, University of Paris; J. Scott Armstrong, cofounder of the Journal of Forecasting and the International Journal of Forecasting; Jan Breslow, head of the Laboratory of Biochemical Genetics and Metabolism, Rockefeller University; Roger Cohen, fellow, American Physical Society; Edward David, member, National Academy of Engineering and National Academy of Sciences; William Happer, professor of physics, Princeton; Michael Kelly, professor of technology, University of Cambridge, U.K.; William Kininmonth, former head of climate research at the Australian Bureau of Meteorology; Richard Lindzen, professor of atmospheric sciences, MIT; James McGrath, professor of chemistry, Virginia Technical University; Rodney Nichols, former president and CEO of the New York Academy of Sciences; Burt Rutan, aerospace engineer, designer of Voyager and SpaceShipOne; Harrison H. Schmitt, Apollo 17 astronaut and former U.S. senator; Nir Shaviv, professor of astrophysics, Hebrew University, Jerusalem; Henk Tennekes, former director, Royal Dutch Meteorological Service; Antonio Zichichi, president of the World Federation of Scientists, Geneva, "No Need to Panic About Global Warming" 1-26-12, online.wsj.com/article/SB10001424052970204301404577171531838421366.html, accessed 5-24-12//Bosley)

**There's no compelling scientific argument for drastic action to 'decarbonize' the world**'s economy. A candidate for public office in any contemporary democracy may have to consider what, if anything, to do about "global warming." Candidates should understand that **the oft-repeated claim that nearly all scientists demand that something dramatic be done to stop global warming is not true.** In fact, **a large and growing number of distinguished scientists and engineers do not agree that drastic actions on global warming are needed.** In September, **Nobel Prize-winning physicist** Ivar **Giaever**, a supporter of President Obama in the last election, **publicly resigned from the American Physical Society (APS) with a letter that begins: "I did not renew [my membership] because I cannot live with the [APS policy]** **statement: 'The evidence is incontrovertible: Global warming is occurring.** If no mitigating actions are taken, significant disruptions in the Earth's physical and ecological systems, social systems, security and human health are likely to occur. We must reduce emissions of greenhouse gases beginning now.' I**n the APS it is OK to discuss whether the mass of the proton changes over time and how a multi-universe behaves, but the evidence of global warming is incontrovertible?"** **In spite of a multidecade international campaign to enforce the message that increasing amounts of the "pollutant" carbon dioxide will destroy civilization, large numbers of scientists**, many **very prominent**, **share the opinions of Dr. Giaever. And the number of scientific "heretics" is growing with each passing year.** The reason is a collection of stubborn scientific facts. Perhaps the most inconvenient fact is the lack of global warming for well over 10 years now. This is known to the warming establishment, as one can see from the 2009 "Climategate" email of climate scientist Kevin Trenberth: "The fact is that **we can't account for the lack of warming at the moment** and it is a travesty that we can't." But **the warming is only missing if one believes computer models where so-called feedbacks involving water vapor and clouds greatly amplify the small effect of CO2. The lack of warming for more than a decade—indeed, the smaller-than-predicted warming over the 22 years since the U.N.'s** Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change **(IPCC) began issuing projections**—suggests that **computer models have greatly exaggerated how much warming additional CO2 can cause**. Faced with this embarrassment, **those promoting alarm have shifted their drumbeat** from warming to weather extremes, **to enable anything unusual** that happens **in our chaotic climate to be ascribed to CO2.** The fact is that **CO2 is not a pollutant.** CO2 is a colorless and odorless gas, exhaled at high concentrations by each of us, **and a key component of the biosphere's life cycle.** Plants do so much better with more CO2 that greenhouse operators often increase the CO2 concentrations by factors of three or four to get better growth. This is no surprise since **plants and animals evolved when CO2 concentrations were** about **10 times larger**

**than they are today.** Better plant varieties, chemical fertilizers and agricultural management contributed to the great increase in **agricultural yields** **of the past century**, but part of **the increase** almost certainly **came from additional CO2 in the atmosphere. Although the number of publicly dissenting scientists is growing, many young scientists** furtively say that while they also have serious doubts about the global-warming message, they **are afraid to speak up for fear of not being promoted**—**or worse.** They have good reason to worry. **In 2003**, Dr. Chris **de Freitas,** the editor of the journal Climate Research, **dared to publish a peer-reviewed article with the politically incorrect (but factually correct) conclusion that the recent warming is not unusual** in the context of climate changes over the past thousand years. **The international warming establishment quickly mounted a determined campaign to have** **Dr. de Freitas removed from his editorial job and fired from his university position**. Fortunately, Dr. de Freitas was able to keep his university job. This is not the way science is supposed to work, but we have seen it before—for example, in the frightening period when Trofim Lysenko hijacked biology in the Soviet Union. Soviet biologists who revealed that they believed in genes, which Lysenko maintained were a bourgeois fiction, were fired from their jobs. Many were sent to the gulag and some were condemned to death. Why is there so much passion about global warming, and why has the issue become so vexing that the American Physical Society, from which Dr. Giaever resigned a few months ago, refused the seemingly reasonable request by many of its members to remove the word "incontrovertible" from its description of a scientific issue? There are several reasons, but a good place to start is the old question "cui bono?" Or the modern update, **"Follow the money." Alarmism over climate is of great benefit to many, providing government funding for academic research and a reason for government bureaucracies to grow**. Alarmism also offers an excuse for governments to raise taxes, taxpayer-funded subsidies for businesses that understand how to work the political system, and a lure for big donations to charitable foundations promising to save the planet. Lysenko and his team lived very well, and they fiercely defended their dogma and the privileges it brought them.

#### CO2 inevitable and predictions fail

**Ayers, Professor of Environmental Science at Vanderbuilt, 11**

(John C., *The Sustainability Revolution: A scientific analysis of beneficial changes for societies, communities, and individuals*, Ch6 “Global Climate Change,” 5-31-11, <http://www.vanderbilt.edu/Sustainability/book/S1C6.pdf>, accessed 5-15-12//Bosley) \*Note – Tables and Figures Omitted

We have reviewed what we know about GCC based on study of modern and ancient records. We have also explored the more uncertain future projections of CO2 concentrations and temperatures. What effects will these higher temperatures have? This question is very difficult to answer because **we have not done this experiment before.** Furthermore, **the atmosphere and oceans form a very dynamic, complex climate system with countless feedback loops and rapid, nonlinear responses, making it very difficult to predict how climate will change.** For example, as the earth gets warmer, more water evaporates from the oceans; since water vapor acts as a greenhouse gas, it contributes to the greenhouse effect and promotes further warming (Mann and Kump 2009). GCM estimates of global climate change are improving, but **much uncertainty about the effects of increased atmospheric greenhouse gas concentrations remains.** However, **even if we stopped emitting greenhouse gases now, the greenhouse gases we have already emitted will continue to warm the earth for more than 1,000 years.**

This is **because** some **greenhouse gases such as CO2 have long atmospheric residence times** (Archer, Eby et al. 2009) **and because the oceans will retain for centuries the heat they have already absorbed** (Solomon, Plattner et al. 2009). Thus, **increases in temperature and the environmental changes they cause will be irreversible**, and we will be forced to adapt to them. Here we will examine potential consequences of AGW and attempt to give some measure of associated uncertainties.

#### No impact – ocean cycles solve

**Beisner, Former Associate Professor of Interdiscipinary Studies in Economics, Government, and Public Policy at Covenant, 10**

(Calvin, PhD from St. Andrews has frequently been used as an expert witness on climate change policy for Congress, “Forget Global Warming: Mini Ice Age May be on Its Way,” 1-12-10, <http://www.rightsidenews.com/201001128144/energy-and-environment/forget-global-warming-mini-ice-age-may-be-on-its-way.html>, accessed 5-3-12//Bosley)

Note – graph omitted

The UK's MailOnline did just that this week under the headline The mini ice age starts here. Lead paragraph? "The bitter winter afflicting much of the Northern Hemisphere is only the start of **a global trend towards cooler weather** that **is likely to last for 20 or 30 years, say some of the world's most eminent climate scientists."** Right. MailOnline reporter David Rose doesn't call them "the world's leading climate skeptics." He calls them "some of the world's most eminent climate scientists"--and he goes on to cite "Mojib **Latif, a leading member of the UN's Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC),"** "Anastasios **Tsonis, head of the University of Wisconsin Atmospheric Sciences Group," and** "William **Gray, emeritus Professor of Atmospheric Sciences at Colorado State University."** Contrary to fears of inexorably diminishing Arctic sea ice, Rose cites the **U.S. National Snow and Ice Data Center** as **report**ing **that "Arctic summer sea ice has increased by 409,000 square miles, or 26 per cent, since 2007."** Though snow's been unusual for most of the southern half of the United Kingdom in recent decades, the Mail published the accompanying satellite photo of Great Britain during the recent cold snap. The island is essentially all covered with snow. Rose reported record lows as far south as Cuba--something I can attest to, living near Miami in south Florida, where we experienced sub-freezing weather over the weekend. He quoted Tsonis as saying that last week 56% of the United States was covered by snow--something that hasn't happened in several decades. And the "**'Arctic oscillation'**--a weather pattern that sees the development of huge 'blocking' areas of high pressure in northern latitudes, driving polar winds far to the south . . . **is at its strongest for at least 60 years**. As a result, the jetstream--the high-altitude wind that circles the globe from west to east and normally pushes a series of wet but mild Atlantic lows across Britain--is currently running not over the English Channel but the Strait of Gibraltar." Consequently, most of the Northern Hemisphere is much colder this winter than it's been in decades--and the Southern Hemisphere is cooler, too. According to Rose, Latif, Tsonis, and other **scientists attribute the cold shift primarily to a shift in the world's dominant ocean circulations**--the Pacific Decadal Oscillation and the Atlantic Multidecadal Oscillation--**from a warm phase to a cool phase, something that happens about every 20 to 30 years. "The scientists' predictions also undermine the standard climate computer models, which assert that the warming of the Earth since 1900 has been driven solely by man-made greenhouse gas emissions and will continue as long as carbon dioxide levels rise**. They say that their **research shows that much of the warming was caused by oceanic cycles when they were in a 'warm mode'**

**as opposed to the present 'cold mode'."** That's a point made by Dr. Roy W. Spencer in the science chapter of the Cornwall Alliance's new document A Renewed Call to Truth, Prudence, and Protection of the Poor: An Evangelical Examination of the Theology, Science, and Economics of Global Warming and illustrated in the graph below. The Pacific Decadal Oscillation, an index of weather patterns over the North Pacific Ocean, has coincided with periods of warming and cooling over the last century (JISAO, 2008). "A significant share of the warming we saw from 1980 to 2000 and at earlier periods in the 20th Century was due to these cycles," said Latif, "perhaps as much as 50 per cent. They have now gone into reverse, so winters like this one will become much more likely. Summers will also probably be cooler, and all this may well last two decades or longer. **The extreme retreats that we have seen in glaciers and sea ice will come to a halt. For the time being, global warming has paused, and there may well be some cooling."** Tsonis also believes that the **ocean current cycles dominated global climate change in the 20th century, including the post-1970s, the period many point to as driven by human greenhouse gas emissions**, but he doesn't venture to attribute specific percentages to the natural and human causes. "I do not believe in catastrophe theories," Rose quoted him as saying. "**Man-made warming is balanced by the natural cycles**, and I do not trust the computer models which state that if CO2 reaches a particular level then temperatures and sea levels will rise by a given amount. These **models cannot be trusted to predict the weather for a week, yet they are running them to give readings for 100 years**." Gray went farther: "**Most of the rise in temperature from the Seventies to the Nineties was natural. Very little was down to CO2**--in my view, as little as five to ten per cent." Gray, Tsonis, and Latif all agreed that the findings about the ocean currents undermined the credibility of the computer climate models on which the IPCC and other alarmists rely.

#### And the impact will be minimal – means adaptation solves

Lendzen, Professor of Meterology at MIT, 10

(Richard, “Global Warming: The Origin and Nature of the Alleged Scientific Consensus,” Problems of Sustainable Development 5:2 13-28, http://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract\_id=1638860, accessed 5-3-12//Bosley)

**Most of the literate world today regards "global warming'' as both real and dangerous.** Indeed, the diplomatic activity concerning warming might lead one to believe that it is the major crisis confronting mankind. The June 1992 Earth Summit in Rio de Janeiro, Brazil, focused on international agreements to deal with that threat, and the heads of state from dozens of countries attended. I must state at the outset, that, **as a scientist, I can find no substantive basis for the warming scenarios being popularly described.** Moreover, **according to many studies** I have read **by economists, agronomists, and hydrologists, there would be little difficulty adapting to such warming if it were to occur. Such was also the conclusion of the recent National Research Council's report on adapting to global change. Many aspects of the catastrophic scenario have already been largely discounted by the scientific community.** For example, **fears of massive sea-level increases accompanied many of the early discussions of global warming, but those estimates have been steadily reduced by orders of magnitude**, and now it is widely agreed that **even the potential contribution of warming to sea-level rise would be swamped by other more important factors.**

#### **No impact to warming for decades allows for adaptation to reverse it**

de Mesquita**, Professor of Political Science at NYU, 0**9

(Bruce, "Recipe for Failure," http://www.foreignpolicy.com/articles/2009/10/16/recipe\_for\_failure?page=full, accessed 5-3-12//Bosley)

So how might we solve global warming and make the world in 500 years look attractive to our future selves? My short answer: **New technologies will solve the problem** for us. **There is an equilibrium at which enough global warming** -- a very modest amount more than we may already have, probably enough to be here **in 50 to 100 years** -- **will create enough additional sunshine in cold places, enough additional rain in dry places, enough additional wind in still places, and, most importantly, enough additional incentives for humankind that solar panels, hydroelectricity, windmills, and as yet undiscovered technologies**

**will be good and cheap enough to replace fossil fuels.** **We have already warmed enough for there to be all kinds of interesting research going on**, but today such pursuits take more sacrifice than most people seem willing to make. Tomorrow that might not be true, and at that point, I doubt it'll be too late. And, looking out 500 years, we'll probably have figured out how to beam ourselves to distant planets where we can start all over, warming our solar system, our galaxy, and beyond with abandon.

#### intervening actors and tech solves warming

**Michaels 7** –

(Patrick Michaels, Cato senior fellow, Live with Climate Change, 2/2, <http://www.cato.org/pub_display.php?pub_id=7502>, accessed 5/13/13, EGM)

Consequently, the best policy is to live with some modest climate change now and encourage economic development, which will generate the capital necessary for investment in the more efficient technologies of the future. Fortunately, we have more time than the alarmists suggest. The warming path of the planet falls at the lowest end of today's U.N. projections. In aggregate, our computer models tell us that once warming is established, it tends to take place at a constant, not an increasing, rate. Reassuringly, the rate has been remarkably constant, at 0.324 degrees F per decade, since warming began around 1975. The notion that we must do "something in 10 years," repeated by a small but vocal band of extremists, enjoys virtually no support in the truly peer reviewed scientific literature. Rather than burning our capital now for no environmental gain (did someone say "ethanol?"), let's encourage economic development so people can invest and profit in our more efficient future. People who invested in automobile companies that developed hybrid technology have been rewarded handsomely in the past few years, and there's no reason to think environmental speculators won't be rewarded in the future, too.

#### Chaos theory means we can never accurately predict the effects of warming or the effects of environmental policy – this is terminal defense

**Peat, PhD and Physicist at the Canadian Institute of Physics, 08**

(F. David, “Non-Linear Dynamics (Chaos Theory) and its Implications for Policy Planning,” Last modified 4-25-08, <http://www.fdavidpeat.com/bibliography/essays/chaos.htm>, accessed 5-13-12//Bosley)

**Systems sometimes enter regions of highly erratic and chaotic behavior. In such cases it becomes impossible to predict the future behavior of the system even when based on its entire past history. From moment to moment the system jumps violently in its behavior**, moreover, **it may be infinitely sensitive to any external change of fluctuation.** But is a chaotic system totally devoid of order? A chaotic system appears totally unpredictable in its behavior, moreover its behavior may be impervious to corrective measures. But scientists are now finding that what is called "deterministic chaos" exhibits certain regularities. For example, erratic swings, while entirely unpredictable, may nevertheless be confined to a particular limited region -- called a chaotic or strange attractor. So while the moment to moment behavior of the system is unpredictable, uncovering the geometry of the strange attractors give information about the overall range of behavior. It is also a matter of debate as to whether a chaotic system should be spoken of as totally devoid of any order, or as exhibiting a highly complex and subtle order. Moreover such systems may also exhibit "intermittency", periods of simple order which emerge again and again out of chaos. When faced with the alternation of order and chaos one may ask: "Does this represent a break down of good order, a failure of policy? Or is the order itself a temporary breakdown of a more general chaos - or infinite complexity of behavior?" That there can be order within chance can be seen in the following way: Suppose someone has tossed ten "heads" in a row. Most people would bet that the next throw must be tails. But knowing that the system is truly random indicates that there is a 50:50 chance that the next throw will be "heads". In this way an experienced gambler will, on the average, win over a gullible opponent. In a similar fashion, knowing the range of chaotic behavior enables one to hedge policy bets and come out marginally ahead over a long period of time. v Self similarity Chaotic systems have much in common with fractals, indeed their strange attractors have a fractal structure. Likewise there may be detailed fractal patterns in their dynamics that repeat at different scales of time. Having knowledge of such patterns would make it possible to, on the average, make better micropredictions. I.e. one computer analysis of stock market data suggests that there are selfsimilar patterns at 14, 5 and 2 yr. periods and in 5 month periods and that the same patterns may be present within each day. vi Feedforward Where two or more products compete for a given market a process of feedforward takes place. The effect of a tiny initial fluctuation may cause one particular product to eventually dominate the market. An example of this is the competition between VHS and Betamax videocassettes. V. Examples **The manifestation of non-linear effects can be discovered in a wide variety of examples, from sociology, population dynamics, economics and ecology.** In each case mathematical models can be built that have the potential for a wide range of behavior from stability, gradual growth, persistent oscillations, self-organization, rigidity to change, infinite sensitivity to externalities, all the way to chaotic and unpredictable swings. Of course **mathematical models are far from the real world** but the possibility that **a well behaved system could**, at some point, **engage in a radically different, and uncontrollable, form of behavior** gives food for thought. Moreover, as **more and more examples are found in the real world of qualitative changes in behavior, of chaos**, sensitivity or rigidity, it becomes important to take them into account wherever policies are being made and the implications of actions contemplated. i. **Ecology** Take **an obvious example where non-linear effects occur**. There has been much debate about the greenhouse effect. Suppose, therefore, we ask what will be the effect of increasing carbon dioxide on plant growth? **The whole question of the effects global warming, increased humidity and carbon dioxide** on vegetation **is a highly complex issue. Not only will growth rates change but the whole balance of a region will be modified,** with some species being favoured over others. For example, **what may be good conditions for the growth of a certain crop may be even better for weeds and predators.** In turn, **the effects of these changing vegetation patterns will feed back into the atmosphere, both directly** - in terms of the amount of carbon dioxide that is fixed by plant-life - **but also indirectly**, for as the mixes and yields of different vegetation changes so too will the economics and even the lifestyles of a given region. As **the economy and social structure of a region changes so too does its energy demands, which results in different amounts of carbon dioxide being released into the atmosphere**. Moreover**, there will be a variety of lags in the various feedback loops of such a system, so that attempts to control variations in one part of a cycle may have the effect of magnifying another. Even the attempt to isolate a single variable in this whole complex system becomes incredibly complex. A single variable will exhibit the whole range of behaviors from extreme sensitivity to extreme stability as well as limit cycles, bifurcation points, large oscillations and possibly even chaotic behavior.** Yet this system, by itself, is part of a much wider system that is embedded in global and local politics, attitudes towards agriculture and population density. **Each of these elements is, in turn, dependent upon yet other factors** which even include religious and ethical values - **of key importance in population growth and attitudes to the environments.** This single example shows how complex a system may be. It shows that a given problem may be sensitive to a wide range of externalities, each of which is linked to a variety of other factors. **No single policy, no rigid plan is capable of meeting the subtleties and range of possibilities within natural and social systems**. Clearly a whole new philosophy is demanded.

#### Climate leadership theory is false – it doesn’t cause success in international negotiations and having high emissions actually gives a country more leverage in negotiations

**Eckersley, Professor of Political Science at the University of Melbourne, 11**

(Robyn, “DOES CLIMATE LEADERSHIP MATTER?” September 2011, http://law.anu.edu.au/COAST/events/APSA/papers/89.pdf)

Nonetheless, **there are certain common purposes that cannot be effectively realised without the support of Great Powers**, which in this case study also happen to be the major emitters. **Yet the US’s ‘success’** at Kyoto in negotiating flexibility instruments, and especially its success at Copenhagen in shaping the new architecture of the Copenhagen Accord, **is best understood as success in bargaining, rather as an example of climate leadership. The US’s clear capacity to make a difference has placed it in a strong position to block negotiations and neutralise the climate leadership ambitions of other developed states**. In effect, at Copenhagen, **the US’s (and China’s) emissions power has overshadowed what Manners has called the EU’s ‘normative power’** (Manners 1992). **However, the US has not managed to redirect the ultimate purpose of the climate negotiations or undermine the principles of CBDR**, which are reaffirmed in the Copenhagen Accord and still provide the benchmark for judging climate leadership performance. CONCLUSION In this paper I have argued that **a leader is an actor or group of actors that performs a socially recognised role in facilitating the achievement of a shared social purpose in a particular constituency**. Given the scale of change required to move towards a low-carbon global economy, **state climate leaders are necessarily transformational leaders, and their performance and recognition as international leaders**, and their ability to attract followers, **may be considerably enhanced by climate leadership at the domestic level** by including sub-national governments, market actors, civil society actors and social networks. 14 This understanding of leadership sheds light on the modest success of the EU as a climate leader, and the US’s general failure as a climate leader, throughout the negotiations. **Leadership should not be conflated with success in bargaining in international negotiations**. **The US’s influence in the post-2007 negotiations is mainly a function of its ‘emissions power’ which it has used to lower expectations about what the climate regime may achieve.**