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### T: Restrictions Prohibit—1NC

#### Restrictions are prohibitions on action --- the aff is not

Jean Schiedler-Brown 12, Attorney, Jean Schiedler-Brown & Associates, Appellant Brief of Randall Kinchloe v. States Dept of Health, Washington, The Court of Appeals of the State of Washington, Division 1, http://www.courts.wa.gov/content/Briefs/A01/686429%20Appellant%20Randall%20Kincheloe%27s.pdf

3. The ordinary definition of the term "restrictions" also does not include the reporting and monitoring or supervising terms and conditions that are included in the 2001 Stipulation.

Black's Law Dictionary, 'fifth edition,(1979) defines "restriction" as;

A limitation often imposed in a deed or lease respecting the use to which the property may be put. The term "restrict' is also cross referenced with the term "restrain." Restrain is defined as; To limit, confine, abridge, narrow down, restrict, obstruct, impede, hinder, stay, destroy. To prohibit from action; to put compulsion on; to restrict; to hold or press back. To keep in check; to hold back from acting, proceeding, or advancing, either by physical or moral force, or by interposing obstacle, to repress or suppress, to curb.

In contrast, the terms "supervise" and "supervisor" are defined as; To have general oversight over, to superintend or to inspect. See Supervisor. A surveyor or overseer. . . In a broad sense, one having authority over others, to superintend and direct. The term "supervisor" means an individual having authority, in the interest of the employer, to hire, transfer, suspend, layoff, recall, promote, discharge, assign, reward, or discipline other employees, or responsibility to direct them, or to adjust their grievances, or effectively to recommend such action, if in connection with the foregoing the exercise of such authority is not of a merely routine or clerical nature, but required the use of independent judgment.

Comparing the above definitions, it is clear that the definition of "restriction" is very different from the definition of "supervision"-very few of the same words are used to explain or define the different terms. In his 2001 stipulation, Mr. Kincheloe essentially agreed to some supervision conditions, but he did not agree to restrict his license.

#### Violation: aff doesn’t directly limit executive authority- just makes it more difficult to employ

#### Vote neglimits and ground- anything can indirectly affect war powers-- makes the topic bidirectional and steals core neg counterplan ground

#### Precision- restrictions is a term of art—precision key to predictable division of ground and directs our research—uniquely important early in the year

### T: Authority 1NC

#### Restricting authority requires reducing the permission to act, not the ability to act.

Taylor, 1996 (Ellen, 21 Del. J. Corp. L. 870 (1996), Hein Online)

The term authority is commonly thought of in the context of the law of agency, and the Restatement (Second) of Agency defines both power and authority.'89 Power refers to an agent's ability or capacity to produce a change in a legal relation (whether or not the principal approves of the change), and authority refers to the power given (permission granted) to the agent by the principal to affect the legal relations of the principal; the distinction is between what the agent can do and what the agent may do.

#### Interpretation- “war powers authority must be an explicit authorization from congress

Bejesky 2012 (Robert, M.A. Political Science (Michigan), M.A. Applied Economics (Michigan), LL.M. International Law (Georgetown). The author has taught international law courses for Cooley Law School and the Department of Political Science at the University of Michigan, American government and constitutional law courses for Alma College, and business law courses at Central Michigan University and the University of Miami, WAR POWERS PURSUANT TO FALSE PERCEPTIONS AND ASYMMETRIC INFORMATION IN THE "ZONE OF TWILIGHT,” St. Mary's Law Journal, 44 St. Mary's L. J. 1, lexis)

V. CONCLUSION¶ The roles of war powers delegated to Congress and the Executive within the text of the United States Constitution are quite clear when Framer intent and historical records are considered. Congress authorizes the use of force; the President is Commander in Chief of the United States Military when using force within the confines of Congress's authorization. n560 Congress has authorized the use of military force in all but one major confrontation the United States has engaged in (the Korean War), which includes declaring war five times and authorizing large-scale military force four times. n561 Presidents largely adhere to the War Powers Resolution of 1973, which requires the President provide information to Congress and affirms Congress's right to authorize the use of force. n562¶ The Constitution states Congress funds, legislates over, and otherwise provides for the military and that the President is caretaker of the military during peacetime. n563 Once Congress authorizes the President to deploy military force, Congress cannot interfere with the President's execution of orders; however, Congress has limited, conditioned, and parameterized the use of force. n564 Presidents respected those restrictions at Jackson's lowest [\*94] ebb. Professors Barron and Lederman emphasized that there was no prior "sustained practice of [Presidents] actually disregarding statutes" until the last Bush Administration. n565¶ Due to drastic global changes since the Framers adopted the United States Constitution, it is possible for the Executive Branch and advocates of Executive powers to be immoderately risk-averse and propel presidential power. The President's informational advantages with the expansion of the administrative state and control over the national security apparatus, the reinterpretation of the use of force in the post-UN world and disparate levels of force, judicial hesitation to accept certiorari on use of force questions after the Vietnam War, and the President's advice from legal counsel are the primary variables that lead to confrontation within the zone of twilight. n566 Other considerations that should abate risk aversion since the Constitution's adoption include: today's elevated cooperation, UN restrictions on the use of force, United States hegemony, NATO as a global defense pact, and the role of the UN Security Council to prevent the use of force.¶ Advocates should be respected for their creativity in sponsoring a dominant executive position and so-called inherent presidential authority in war powers premised on originalism. n567 However, biased advisory memos classified under national security that contain faulty premises should not be regarded as legitimate opinions leading to precedent that expands presidential powers. It is toilsome to conceive that the text of the Constitution is so manipulable and that Supreme Court cases, legislation, [\*95] academics, and logic have been in discord about the scope of the Executive's war powers for nearly two centuries.

#### Violaion: Aff restricts the presidents power, and they expand authority--The AUMF currently only authorizes force against groups with a direct connection to 9/11 –but the affirmative expands the AUMF authorization to include new groups - which means it is an enhancement of presidential authority it is not a restriction

**Coronogue 12**, JD at duke

(Graham, A NEW AUMF: DEFINING COMBATANTS IN THE WAR ON TERROR, scholarship.law.duke.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1294&context=djcil)

The AUMF must be updated. In 2001, **the AUMF authorized force to fight against** America’s most pressing threat, **the architects of 9/11**. However, much has changed since 2001. Bin Laden is dead, the Taliban has been deposed, and it is extremist organizations other than al-Qaeda and the Taliban who are launching many of the attacks against Americans and coalition partners. In many ways, **the greatest threat is coming from groups not even around in 2001, groups such as AQAP and al Shabaab**. Yet **these groups do not fall under the AUMF’s authorization of force**. **These groups are not based in the same country that launched the attacks, have different leaders, and were not involved in planning or coordinating 9/11. Thus,** under a strict interpretation of the AUMF, **the President is not authorized to use force against these groups**. **Congress needs to specifically authorize force against groups outside of al-Qaeda and the Taliban**. Our security concerns demand that the President can act quickly and decisively when facing threats. **The current authorization does not cover many of these threats,** yet it is much more difficult to achieve this decisiveness if the President is forced to rely solely on his inherent powers. A clear congressional authorization would clear up much of this problem. Under Justice Jackson’s framework, granting or denying congressional authorization ensures that President does not operate in the “zone of twilight.”126 Therefore, if Congress lays out the exact scope of the President’s power, naming or clearly defining the targeted actors, the constitutionality or unconstitutionality of presidential actions will become much clearer. Removing the 9/11 nexus to reflect the current reality of war without writing a carte blanche is the most important form of congressional guidance regarding target authorization. **In order for the President to operate under the current AUMF, he must find a strong nexus between the target and the attacks on September 11.** As I have shown in this paper, **this nexus is simply non-existent for many groups** fighting the United States today. **Yet, the President should want to operate pursuant to congressional authorization, Justice Jackson’s strongest zone of presidential authority**. In order to achieve this goal, the administration has begun to stretch the statutory language to include groups whose connection to the 9/11 attacks, if any, is extraordinarily limited. The current presidential practice only nominally follows the AUMF, a practice Congress has seemingly consented to by failing to amend the statute for over ten years. This “stretching” is dangerous as Congress is no longer truly behind the authorization and has simply acquiesced to the President’s exercise of broad authority

#### Vote neg

#### Limits- the president claims authority over almost everything--setting the clear limit of explicitly ceded authority key to put a manageable lid on the topic especially early in the year

#### Precision- they avoid debates over the jurisdictional extent of authority which undermines the reason we chose a legal topic—destroys division of ground and bypasses the core of the controversy over authority

### 2

#### Institutional incentives– obama will fight harder than congress

Dickinson, Middlebury college political science professor, 2011

(Matthew, “Will You End Up in Guantanamo Bay Prison?”, 12-3, <http://sites.middlebury.edu/presidentialpower/2011/12/03/will-you-end-up-in-guantanamo-bay/>,)

Despite the overwhelming Senate support for passage (the bill passed 93-7 and will be reconciled with a House version. Senators voting nay included three Democrats, three Republicans and one independent), however, President Obama is still **threatening to veto** the bill in its current form. However, if administration spokespersons are to be believed, Obama’s objection is based not so much on concern for civil liberties as it is on **preserving the president’s authority and flexibility** in fighting the war on terror. According to White House press secretary Jay Carney, “Counterterrorism officials from the Republican and Democratic administrations have said that the language in this bill would jeopardize national security by restricting flexibility in our fight against Al Qaeda.” (The administration also objects to language in the bill that would restrict any transfer of detainees out of Guantanamo Bay prison for the next year.) For these reasons, the President is still threatening to veto the bill, which now goes to the Republican-controlled House where it is unlikely to be amended in a way that satisfies the President’s concerns. If not, this sets up an interesting scenario in which the President may have to decide whether to stick by his veto threat and hope that partisan loyalties kick in to prevent a rare veto override. The debate over the authorization bill is another reminder of a point that you have heard me make before: that when it comes to national security issues and the War on Terror, President Obama’s views are much closer to his predecessor’s George W. Bush’s than they are to candidate Obama’s. The reason, of course, is that once in office, the president—as the elected official that comes closest to embodying national sovereignty—feels the **pressure of protecting the nation** from attack much more acutely than anyone else. That pressure drives them to seek **maximum flexibility** in their ability to respond to external threats, and to **resist any provision that appears to constrain their authority**. This is why Obama’s conduct of the War on Terror has followed so closely in Bush’s footsteps—both are motivated by the same **institutional incentives** and concerns. The Senate debate, however, also illustrates a second point. We often array elected officials along a single ideological line, from most conservative to most liberal. Think Bernie Sanders at one end and Jim DeMint at the other. In so doing, we are suggesting that those individuals at the farthest ends of the spectrum have the greatest divergence in ideology. But on some issues, including this authorization bill, that ideological model is misleading. Instead, it is better to think of legislators arrayed in a circle, with libertarian Republicans and progressive Democrats sitting much closer together, say, at the top of the circle, joined together in their resistance to strong government and support for civil liberties. At the “bottom” of the circle are Republicans like Graham and Democrats like Levin who share an affinity for strengthening the government’s ability to protect the nation’s security. For Obama, however, the **central issue** is not the clash of civil liberties and national security—it is the **relative authority** of the President versus Congress to conduct the War on Terror. That explains why he has **stuck by his veto threat despite the legislative compromise**. And it raises an interesting test of power. To date he has issued only two presidential vetoes, by far the lowest number of any President in the modern era. His predecessor George W. Bush issued 12, and saw Congress override four—a historically high percentage of overrides. On average, presidential vetoes are overridden about 7% of the time. These figures, however, underplay the use of veto threats as a bargaining tool. In the 110th (2007-08) Congress alone, Bush issued more than 100 veto threats. I’ve not calculated Obama’s veto threats, but it is easy enough to do by going to the White House’s website and looking under its Statements of Administrative Policy (SAP’s) listings. Those should include veto threats. Note that most veto threats are relatively less publicized and often are issued early in the legislative process. This latest veto threat, in contrast, seems to have attracted quite a bit of press attention. It will be interesting to see whether, if the current authorization language remains unchanged, Obama will stick to his guns.

#### Covert Action Statute ensures AUMF gets circumvented

Lawfare, “Legality of U.S. Government’s Targeted Killing Program under Domestic Law,” 2012,

www.lawfareblog.com/wiki/the-lawfare-wiki-document-library/targeted-killing/legality-of-targeted-killing-program-under-u-s-domestic-law/

Nevertheless, Bradley and Goldsmith explain, even if Congress did not authorize the U.S. government’s targeted killing program with the AUMF, the President could in theory act against terrorists presenting an imminent threat under the Covert Action Statute (CAS), 50 U.S.C. §413b. The CAS is potentially an important authorizing authority, as its scope extends beyond that of the AUMF, namely in that it is not limited to those terrorist groups linked to the September 11, 2001 attacks. In other ways, though, the CAS may be narrower than the AUMF. For instance, Robert Chesney sets forth the argument that the CAS merely authorizes that which is otherwise lawful under Article II, and thus does not expand the scope of the President’s authority.

#### Wartime causes circumvention—AND the intractable battle creates a national diversion that impairs military wartime decisions—turns china and terrorism advantage

Lobel 8—Professor of Law @ University of Pittsburgh [Jules Lobel, “Conflicts Between the Commander in Chief and Congress: Concurrent Power over the Conduct of War,” Ohio State Law Journal, Vol. 69, 2008, pg. 391]

The critical difficulty with a contextual approach is its inherent ambiguity and lack of clarity, which tends to sharply shift the balance of power in favor of a strong President acting in disregard of congressional will. For example, the application of the Feldman and Issacharoff test asking whether the congressional restriction makes realistic sense in the modern world would yield no coherent separation of powers answer if applied to the current Administration’s confrontation with Congress. It would undoubtedly embolden the President to ignore Congress’s strictures. The President’s advisors would argue that the McCain Amendment’s ban on cruel and inhumane treatment, or FISA’s requirement of a warrant, does not make realistic sense in the context of the contemporary realities of the war on terror in which we face a shadowy, ruthless nonstate enemy that has no respect for laws or civilized conduct, a conclusion hotly disputed by those opposed to the President’s policies. Focusing the debate over whether Congress has the power to control the treatment of detainees on the President’s claim that the modern realities of warfare require a particular approach will merge the separation of powers inquiry of who has the power with the political determination of what the policy ought to be. Such an approach is likely to encourage the President to ignore and violate legislative wartime enactments whenever he or she believes that a statute does not make realistic sense—that is, when it conflicts with a policy the President embraces. 53

The contextual approach has a “zone of twilight” quality that Justice Jackson suggested in Youngstown. 54 Often constitutional norms matter less than political realities—wartime reality often favors a strong President who will overwhelm both Congress and the courts. While it is certainly correct— as Jackson noted—that neither the Court nor the Constitution will preserve separation of powers where Congress is too politically weak to assert its authority, a fluid contextual approach is an invitation to Presidents to push beyond the constitutional boundaries of their powers and ignore legislative enactments that seek to restrict their wartime authority.

Moreover, another substantial problem with a contextual approach in the war powers context is that the judiciary is unlikely to resolve the dispute. 55 The persistent refusal of the judiciary to adjudicate the constitutionality of the War Powers Resolution strongly suggests that courts will often refuse to intervene to resolve disputes between the President and Congress over the constitutionality of a statute that a President claims impermissibly interferes with her conduct of an ongoing war. 56 This result leaves the political branches to engage in an intractable dispute over the statute’s constitutionality that saps the nation’s energy, diverts focus from the political issues in dispute, and endangers the rule of law.

Additionally, in wartime it is often important for issues relating to the exercise of war powers to be resolved quickly. Prompt action is not usually the forte of the judiciary.

If, however, a constitutional consensus exists or could be consolidated that Congress has the authority to check the President’s conduct of warfare, that consensus might help embolden future Congresses to assert their power. Such a consensus might also help prevent the crisis, chaos, and stalemate that may result when the two branches assert competing constitutional positions and, as a practical matter, judicial review is unavailable to resolve the dispute.

Moreover, the adoption of a contextual, realist approach will undermine rather than aid the cooperation and compromise between the political branches that is so essential to success in wartime. In theory, an unclear, ambiguous division of power between the branches that leaves each branch uncertain of its legal authority could further compromise and cooperation. However, modern social science research suggests that the opposite occurs. 57 Each side in the dispute is likely to grasp onto aspects or factors within the ambiguous or complex reality to support its own self-serving position. This self-serving bias hardens each side’s position and allows the dispute to drag on, as has happened with the ongoing, unresolved dispute over the constitutionality of the War Powers Resolution. Pg. 407-409

### 3

#### The executive branch of the United States should establish a specific list of terrorist organizations that suffice to trigger the use of military force, not add new groups to the list without Congressional approval, and announce that this is the official terrorism policy of the United States. The executive branch of the United States should implement transparency reforms for the drone program.

#### The United States Federal Judiciary should affirm that the executive’s claimed authority under Public Law 107-40 is authorized under Public Law 107-40 in any relevant cases.

**president can get rid of aumf**

**Wittes 5/23**/13 – Senior Fellow in Governance Studies at the Brookings Institution, co-directs the Harvard Law School-Brookings Project on Law and Security (Benjamin, The President’s Speech: A Quick and Dirty Reaction—Part 1, <http://www.lawfareblog.com/2013/05/the-presidents-speech-a-quick-and-dirty-reaction-part-1/>, CMR)

A striking contrast, that is, unless one does not quite take Obama at face value on this. After all, Obama does not need Congress to narrow or repeal the AUMF or to get off of a war footing. He can do it himself, declaring hostilities over in whole or in part. And Obama, needless to say, did not do anything like that. To the contrary, he promised that “we must finish the work of defeating al Qaeda and its associated forces” and while he used a lot of nice words about law enforcement and a lot of disparaging words about perpetual states of war, he also promised to continue targeting the enemy with lethal force under the AUMF. In other words, he promised—without quite saying it directly—to keep waging war:¶ Moreover, America’s actions are legal. We were attacked on 9/11. Within a week, Congress overwhelmingly authorized the use of force. Under domestic law, and international law, the United States is at war with al Qaeda, the Taliban, and their associated forces. We are at war with an organization that right now would kill as many Americans as they could if we did not stop them first. So this is a just war—a war waged proportionally, in last resort, and in self-defense.

#### functional limits create accountability and don’t link to politics

Michaels 11 (Jon, Professor, UCLA School of Law, “The (Willingly) Fettered Executive: Presidential Spinoffs in National Security Domains and Beyond,” *Virginia Law Review,* <http://www.virginialawreview.org/content/pdfs/97/801.pdf>)

These are revealing case studies, weighty in their own right and interesting complements to one another. They give us insight into how these strategically important, but largely unknown, responsibilities are administered. They show how the Executive, rather than the Executive’s usual rivals—Congress and the courts—can constrain public administration, through mechanisms within the administrative state and outside of it. And, they suggest why the Executive might welcome those constraints (and possibly others as well). The studies bring into focus a new template, one with significant descriptive attributes and predictive power. They reveal an underappreciated phenomenon where (1) legal constraints and political accountability checks over administrative responsibilities are disabled, inapplicable, or dangerous; (2) the Executive seems surprisingly hamstrung by virtue of the absence of constraints; and (3) the Executive appears to take steps to impose an alternative regime of administrative discipline to better carry out the responsibilities in question. Combined, the studies reveal two alternative paths to compensate for the lack of conventional accountability assurances. With In-Q-Tel, the Executive uses an external institutional redesign seemingly to insulate the technology incubation process from perverse political pressures and to better align principal-agent interests. With CFIUS, the President employs an internal institutional redesign with the apparent effect of limiting White House control, both for the good of the parties engaged in the foreign-investment deal and in service of the President’s larger foreign-policy goals. Taken in tandem, In-Q-Tel and CFIUS present a challenge to the dominant view of the Executive as power-aggrandizing. Equally important, however, is the fact that the acts and mechanisms of self-constraint are not obvious or celebrated. The Executive’s subtlety in these domains thus itself serves as testament to the durability and primacy of the dominant understanding.

#### Congressional restrictions cause adversaries to doubt the credibility of our threats – causes nuclear escalation

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

A claim previously advanced from a presidentialist perspective is that stronger¶ legislative checks on war powers is harmful to coercive and deterrent strategies, because¶ it establishes easily-visible impediments to the President’s authority to follow through on¶ threats. This was a common policy argument during the War Powers Resolution debates¶ in the early 1970s. Eugene Rostow, an advocate inside and outside the government for¶ executive primacy, remarked during consideration of legislative drafts that any serious¶ restrictions on presidential use of force would mean in practice that “no President could¶ make a credible threat to use force as an instrument of deterrent diplomacy, even to head¶ off explosive confrontations.”178 He continued:¶ In the tense and cautious diplomacy of our present relations with the Soviet¶ Union, as they have developed over the last twenty-five years, the authority of the¶ President to set clear and silent limits in advance is perhaps the most important of¶ all the powers in our constitutional armory to prevent confrontations that could¶ carry nuclear implications. …¶ [I]t is the diplomatic power the President needs most under the¶ circumstance of modern life—the power to make a credible threat to use force in¶ order to prevent a confrontation which might escalate.179¶ In his veto statement on the War Powers Resolution, President Nixon echoed these¶ concerns, arguing that the law would undermine the credibility of U.S. deterrent and¶ coercive threats in the eyes of both adversaries and allies – they would know that¶ presidential authority to use force would expire after 60 days, so absent strong¶ congressional support they could assume U.S. withdrawal at that point.180 In short, those¶ who oppose tying the president’s hands with mandatory congressional authorization¶ requirements to use force sometimes argue that doing so incidentally and dangerously ties¶ his hands in threatening it. A critical assumption here is that presidential flexibility,¶ preserved in legal doctrine, enhances the credibility of presidential threats to escalate

### 4

**CIR passes now—new Obama strategy**

Brian **Bennett** and Christi Parsons, “Obama Softens Tone on Immigration Reform,” LOS ANGELES TIMES, 10—24—**13**, [www.latimes.com/nation/la-na-immigration-obama-20131025,0,6755968.story#axzz2ikONvPvJ](http://www.latimes.com/nation/la-na-immigration-obama-20131025%2C0%2C6755968.story#axzz2ikONvPvJ)

After months of insisting the House should take up the comprehensive immigration bill that passed the Senate in June, President **Obama changed tactics** Thursday **and said he might consider GOP proposals to overhaul separate parts** of the immigration system. The White House is hoping that public anger at the 16-day government shutdown has so badly damaged **the GOP** that House Republican leaders **will consider immigration** reform as a way **to improve their popularity** with moderate voters. Obama's aides also are intent on showing **the president is willing to compromise**, partly **to counter** GOP **charges** that **he was inflexible** during the bitter shutdown standoff. In remarks at the White House, Obama hinted that he was no longer tied to the Senate bill, the elaborate product of months of intense bipartisan negotiations, to achieve what he has called a major priority for his second term. **Obama** instead signaled that he **might consider** a package of **smaller bills**, if necessary, **as long as they provide a path to citizenship** for the estimated 11 million people in the country without legal status. "If House Republicans have new and different additional ideas on how we should move forward, then we want to hear them. I'll be listening," Obama told several dozen pro-reform activists from labor, business and religious groups. White House spokesman Jay Carney echoed the shift, telling reporters **there are "a variety of ways** that **you can reach the ultimate goal**" **of a bill** that **Obama could sign into law**. "The House's approach will be up to the House," Carney said. "There is a comprehensive bill the House Democrats have put together that is similar to the Senate bill and reflects the president's principles. But the means by which we arrive at our destination is in some ways of course up to the lawmakers who control the houses of Congress." The White House effort to resuscitate a bill that seemed all but dead in the House before the shutdown still faces steep and perhaps insurmountable odds. But **the jockeying** Thursday **raised** at least some **hope** that **compromise remains possible**. "I hope President Obama meant what he said today about listening to new and different ideas presented by House Republicans," House Judiciary Committee Chairman Robert W. Goodlatte (R-Va.) said in a statement. "**The president should work with Congress**, including House Republicans, **to achieve** immigration **reform**, and not against us." In recent weeks, **GOP leaders have worked** behind the scenes **to craft** legislative **proposals that might pass muster** with rank-and-file Republicans and — if joined with a legalization program — could appeal to the White House. Majority Leader Eric Cantor and other House Republicans have met in small groups to write bills that would change parts of the immigration system. GOP **proposals include** adding **high-tech visas**, revamping farm and **low-skilled immigrant** labor **programs, and** ramping up **border security**. "**I expect us to move forward this year** in trying to address reform and what is broken about our system," Cantor said on the House floor Wednesday.

#### Plan ensures massive fights, attacks on Obama

John Bresnahan, “Senators Discuss Revising 9/11 Resolution,” POLITICO, 5—7—13, http://dyn.politico.com/printstory.cfm?uuid=5D34D2EA-4EBE-461D-B44B-86AA6C3378A7

**Top senators** in both parties **have begun** talks to revise the congressional resolution authorizing the use of military force following the Sept. 11, 2001, attacks on the World Trade Center and the Pentagon, according to lawmakers and aides involved in the discussions. Though in its early stages, **such a debate** could cause serious heartburn for the White House **and party leaders seeking to push through any revised use-of-force resolution**. A Senate floor fight over replacing the **9/11** resolution could lead to broader political battles on **critical areas of** President Barack **Obama’s national security policy, including** the war in **Afghanistan**, the use of armed **drone attacks** against suspected terrorists, treatment of **detainees** held **in Guantanamo** Bay, **and** the scope of the president’s authority **as commander-in-chief to combat terrorism w**orldwide.

**Capital key**

Laura **Matthews**, “Immigration Reform Bill: ‘I’m Going to Push to Call a Vote,’ Says Obama,” INTERNATIONAL BUSINESS TIMES, **10—16**—13,

[www.ibtimes.com/2013-immigration-reform-bill-im-going-push-call-vote-says-obama-1429220](http://www.ibtimes.com/2013-immigration-reform-bill-im-going-push-call-vote-says-obama-1429220)

When Congress finally passes a bipartisan bill that kicks the fiscal battles over to early next year, the spotlight could return to comprehensive immigration reform before 2013 ends. At least that’s the hope of President Barack Obama and his fellow Chicagoan Rep. Luis Gutierrez, D-Ill., chairman of the Immigration Task Force of the Congressional Hispanic Caucus and one of the most vocal advocates for immigration reform in the House of Representatives. “When we emerge from this crazy partisan eruption from the Republicans, **there will be a huge incentive for sensible Republicans who want to repair some of the damage they have done to themselves,” Gutierrez said in a statement. “Immigration reform remains the one issue popular with both Democratic and Republican voters on which the two parties can work together to deliver real, substantive solutions in the Congress this year.”** Reforming the status quo has consistently been favored by a majority of Americans. Earlier this year, at least two-thirds of Americans supported several major steps to make the system work better, according to a Gallup poll. Those steps include implementing an E-verify system for employers to check electronically the immigration status of would-be employees (85 percent), a path to citizenship for undocumented immigrants, (72 percent), an entry-exit check system to make sure people who enter the country then leave it (71 percent), more high-skilled visas (71 percent) and increased border security (68 percent). The Senate passed its version of a 2013 immigration reform bill in June that includes, but is not limited to, a pathway to citizenship for immigrants without documentation and doubling security on the southern border. But that measure has stalled in the House, where Republicans are adamant they will take a piecemeal approach. The momentum that lawmakers showed for reform has been sapped by the stalemate that that has shut down the government for 16 days and brought the U.S. to the brink of default. The Senate has agreed on Wednesday to a bipartisan solution to break the gridlock. When the shutdown and default threat is resolved (for a time), that’s when **Obama will renew his push** to get Congress to move on immigration reform. On Tuesday the president said **reform will become his top priority. “**Once that’s done, you know, the day after, I’m going to be pushing to say, call a vote on immigration reform,” Obama told Univision affiliate KMEX-TV in Los Angeles. “And if I have to join with other advocates and continue to speak out on that, and keep pushing, I’m going to do so because I think it’s really important for the country. And now is the time to do it.” The president pointed the finger at House Speaker John Boehner, R-Ohio, for not allowing the bill to be brought to the floor for a vote. Boehner had promised that the Senate’s bill would not be voted on unless a majority of the majority in the House supports it -- the same principle he was holding out for on the government shutdown before he gave in. “We had a very strong Democratic and Republican vote in the Senate,” Obama said. “The only thing right now that’s holding it back is, again, Speaker Boehner not willing to call the bill on the floor of the House of Representatives. So we’re going to have to get through this crisis that was unnecessary, that was created because of the obsession of a small faction of the Republican Party on the Affordable Care Act.” Republicans are opposing the Democratic view of immigration reform because of its inclusion of a 13-year path to citizenship for undocumented immigrants. They said this amounted to “amnesty.” Some Republicans prefer to give them legal resident status instead. Immigration advocates have also been urging Obama to use his executive authority to halt the more than 1,000 deportations taking place daily. Like the activists, Gutierrez said the government shutdown didn’t do anything to slow the number of daily deportations. Some Republicans who welcomed Sen. Ted Cruz’s filibuster over Obamacare because it shifted the focus from immigration. “If Ted [didn’t] spin the filibuster, if we don’t make this the focus, we had already heard what was coming,” Rep. Louie Gohmert, R-Texas, told Fox News on Tuesday. “As soon as we got beyond this summer, we were going to have an amnesty bill come to the floor. That’s what we would have been talking about. And that’s where the pivot would have been if we had not focused America on Obamacare.” Still, pro-immigration advocates are hopeful they can attain their goal soon. “**With more prodding from the president** and the American people,” Gutierrez said, “**we can get immigration reform legislation passed in the House and signed into law.”**

**That solves competitiveness and terrorism**

Spencer **Abraham**, former Secretary of Energy and U.S. Senator and Carlos Guittierez, “Immigration reform can power U.S. economy” FREE REPUBLIC, 10—6—**13**, www.freep.com/article/20131006/OPINION05/310060069/immigration-reform-citizenship-Abraham-Gutierrez

**Immigration** reform is a secret weapon that **can** help **unleash the full power of the U.S. economy**. Except that it’s not really much of a secret. **Study after study** **has shown** **what** **revamping** our outdated **immigration** system **can do**. The CATO Institute estimates that comprehensive immigration **reform would increase** U.S. **g**ross **d**omestic **p**roduct by $**1.5 trillion** over 10 years. The nonpartisan Congressional Budget Office believes that **it would trim the federal deficit** by $**135 billion** over the same time period. Analysis published by the U.S. Chamber of Commerce indicates that a pathway to **citizenship** for undocumented workers — which would unleash their full contribution to our economy — **would create** 123,000 new jobs for U.S. citizens in 2014, increasing to **594,000 jobs** by 2018. Additionally, it would **increase GDP by** more than $10 billion the first year, and by almost $**50 billion** four years later. In Michigan, one study found that the pathway to citizenship would increase the gross state product by more than $800 million in 2020, while adding almost 10,000 new jobsfor Michiganders. Just expanding the availability of H1B visas for high-skilled immigrants would create 5,600 new jobs in the first year, and increase the Michigan GSP by more than $500 million. That is the potential. Here is what we have today. **Our broken immigration policies deny businesses** — from farms to contractors to cutting edge high-tech companies — the **employees** they need **to compete,** expand and create more jobs for all American workers. **Current** immigration **statutes do not give law enforcement** agencies **a** realistic **method of dealing with the** 11 million **undocumented** workers living among us. The years of **ineffective** security **strategies** perpetuated by present day immigration laws **have created a porous border that** not only disrupts legitimate commerce and legal immigration, but also **puts us at risk of** increased criminal activity and possible acts of **terrorism**. Visa policies also fail to welcome entrepreneurial immigrants who are eager to start new companies in the U.S. and force many would-be business founders to stay in jobs that constrain their ambitions for fear of losing the work visas they presently hold. In short, the status quo is a mess, and **failing to fix it will** virtually **guarantee** limited economic progress, fewer jobs and **gloomier prospects**, not only for ourselves, but also for our children and grandchildren. Immigration reform is not a political issue. It can be approached as one

 — as people at the extreme edges of both parties have proved — but doing so is a tragic error that ignores the basic problems and opportunities at stake. More than anything, immigration reform is an economic issue. Failure to enact immigration reform will also leave in place a system that has completely failed to stem the tide of illegal immigration to the U.S., and that will mean millions more undocumented individuals entering the country in coming years. **The Senate was able to** overcome its political differences and **approve a** comprehensive immigration reform **package that addresses major issues,** **such as border security**, bringing illegal immigrants back into the system **and** more realistic **visa allocations**. The U.S. House must make whatever effort is necessary to devise and pass its own constructive plan. Putting off the important task of immigration reform is no longer a viable option.

**Nuclear war**

Zalmay **Khalilzad**, former U.S. Ambassador to Afghanistan, and Iraq, and the United Nations, “The Economy and National Security,” NATIONAL REVIEW, 2—8—**11**, [www.nationalreview.com/articles/print/259024](http://www.nationalreview.com/articles/print/259024)

Today**, economic** and fiscal **trends pose the most severe** long-term **threat to the U**nited **S**tates’ **position as global leader**. While the United States suffers from fiscal imbalances and low economic growth, the economies of rival powers are developing rapidly. The continuation of these two trends could lead to a shift from American primacy toward a multi-polar global system, leading in turn to increased geopolitical rivalry and even war among the great powers. The current recession is the result of a deep financial crisis, not a mere fluctuation in the business cycle. Recovery is likely to be protracted. The crisis was preceded by the buildup over two decades of enormous amounts of debt throughout the U.S. economy — ultimately totaling almost 350 percent of GDP — and the development of credit-fueled asset bubbles, particularly in the housing sector. When the bubbles burst, huge amounts of wealth were destroyed, and unemployment rose to over 10 percent. The decline of tax revenues and massive countercyclical spending put the U.S. government on an unsustainable fiscal path. Publicly held national debt rose from 38 to over 60 percent of GDP in three years. Without faster economic growth and actions to reduce deficits, publicly held national debt is projected to reach dangerous proportions. If interest rates were to rise significantly, annual interest payments — which already are larger than the defense budget — would crowd out other spending or require substantial tax increases that would undercut economic growth. Even worse, if unanticipated events trigger what economists call a “sudden stop” in credit markets for U.S. debt, the United States would be unable to roll over its outstanding obligations, precipitating a sovereign-debt crisis that would almost certainly compel a radical retrenchment of the United States internationally. Such scenarios would reshape the international order. It was the economic devastation of Britain and France during World War II, as well as the rise of other powers, that led both countries to relinquish their empires. In the late 1960s, British leaders concluded that they lacked the economic capacity to maintain a presence “east of Suez.” Soviet economic weakness, which crystallized under Gorbachev, contributed to their decisions to withdraw from Afghanistan, abandon Communist regimes in Eastern Europe, and allow the Soviet Union to fragment. If the U.S. debt problem goes critical, **the U**nited **S**tates **would** be compelled to retrench, **reduci**ng its **military spending and shed**ding **international commitments.** We face this domestic challenge while other major powers are experiencing rapid economic growth. Even though countries such as China, India, and Brazil have profound political, social, demographic, and economic problems, their economies are growing faster than ours, and this could alter the global distribution of power. These trends could in the long term produce a multi-polar world. If U.S. policymakers fail to act and other powers continue to grow, it is not a question of whether but when a new international order will emerge. **The closing of the gap** between the United States and its rivals **could intensify** geopolitical **competition among major powers,** increase incentives for local powers to play major powers against one another, **and undercut our will to preclude** or respond to **international crises** because of the higher risk of escalation. The stakes are high. In modern history, **the longest period of peace** among the great powers **has been the era of U.S. leadership.** By contrast, multi-polar systems have been unstable, with their competitive dynamics resulting in frequent crises and major wars among the great powers. Failures of multi-polar international systems produced both world wars. American retrenchment could have devastating consequences. Without an American security blanket, regional powers could rearm in an attempt to balance against emerging threats. Under this scenario, **there would be** a heightened possibility of **arms races, miscalc**ulation, **or other crises spiraling into all-out conflict.** Alternatively, in seeking to accommodate the stronger powers, weaker powers may shift their geopolitical posture away from the United States. Either way, **hostile states would** be emboldened to **make aggressive moves** in their regions.

### 5

**Aff’s use of the term “unmanned” reinforces violent systems of patriarchal domination—reject the team, reps come first**

**Kleinman 07** (Sherryl, teaches in the Department of Sociology at the University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill, 3/11/07, “Why Sexist Language Matters” AlterNet) http://www.alternet.org/story/48856/why\_sexist\_language\_matters

**Because male-based generics are another indicator -- and** more importantly, **a reinforcer -- of a system in which "man" in the abstract and men in the flesh are privileged over women. Some say that language merely reflects reality** and so we should ignore our words and work on changing the unequal gender arrangements that are reflected in our language. Well, yes, in part. **It's no accident that "man" is the anchor in our language and "woman" is not. And of course we should make social change all over the place. But the words we use can also reinforce current realities when they are sexist** (or racist or heterosexist). **Words are tools of thought. We can use words to maintain the status quo or to think in new ways -- which in turn creates the possibility of a new reality**. It makes a difference if I think of myself as a "girl" or a "woman"; it makes a difference if we talk about "Negroes" or "African-Americans." Do we want a truly inclusive language or one that just pretends? Before I discuss how benign-sounding words like "freshman" and "you guys" reinforce the gender inequalities on my list, above, let me tell you about an article that made a difference in my own understanding of sexist language. In 1986 Douglas Hofstadter, a philosopher, wrote a parody of sexist language by making an analogy with race. His article ("A Person Paper on Purity in Language") creates an imaginary world in which generics are based on race rather than gender. In that world, people would use "fresh white," "chair white" and yes, "you whiteys." People of color would hear "all whites are created equal" -- and be expected to feel included. Substituting "white" for "man" makes it easy to see why using "man" for all human beings is wrong. Yet, women are expected to feel flattered by "freshman," "chairman" and "you guys." And can you think of one, just one, example of a female-based generic? Try using "freshwoman" with a group of male students or calling your male boss "chairwoman." Then again, don't. There could be serious consequences for referring to a man as a "woman" -- a term that still means "lesser" in our society. If not, why do men get so upset at the idea of being called women? And why do so many women cling to "freshman," "chairman" and "you guys?" I think I know why, though it doesn't make me feel any better. "Man" is a high-status term, and women want to be included in the "better" group. But while being labeled "one of the guys" might make us feel included, it's only a guise of inclusion, not the reality. If we were really included, we wouldn't have to disappear into the word "guys." I'm not saying that people who use "you guys" have bad intentions, but think of the consequences. **All those "man" words -- said many times a day by millions of people every day -- cumulatively reinforce the message that men are the standard and that women should be subsumed by the male category. We know from history that making a group invisible makes it easier for the powerful to do what they want with members of that group.** And we know, from too many past and current studies, that **far too many men are doing "what they want" with women. Most of us can see a link between calling women "sluts" and "whores" and men's sexual violence against women. We need to recognize that making women linguistically a subset of man/men through terms like "mankind" and "guys" also makes women into objects.** If we, as women, aren't worthy of such true generics as "first-year," "chair" or "you all," then how can we expect to be paid a "man's wage," be respected as people rather than objects (sexual or otherwise) on the job and at home, be treated as equals rather than servers or caretakers of others, be considered responsible enough to make our own decisions about reproduction, define who and what we want as sexual beings? **If we aren't even deserving of our place in humanity in language, why should we expect to be treated as decent human beings otherwise?**  **Now and then someone tells me that I should work on more important issues -- like men's violence against women -- rather than on "trivial" issues like language. Well, I work on lots of issues. But that's not the point. What I want to say** (and do say, if I think they'll give me the time to explain) **is that working against sexist language is working against men's violence against women. It's one step.**  If we cringe at "freshwhite" and "you whiteys" and would protest such terms with loud voices, then why don't we work as hard at changing "freshman" and "you guys?" Don't women deserve it? **If women primarily exist in language as "girls" (children), "sluts" and "guys," it does not surprise me that we still have a long list of gendered inequalities to fix. We've got to work on every item on the list. Language is one we can work on right now**, if we're willing. **It's easier to start saying "you all" instead of "you guys"** than to change the wage gap tomorrow. Nonsexist English is a resource we have at the tip of our tongues. Let's start tasting this freedom now.

### Solvency

**Plan crushes counterterror**

Geoffrey **Corn**, Professor, Law, Testimony before the Senate Armed Services Committee, FEDERAL NEWS SERVICE, 5—16—**13**, LN.

Because I do not believe there is inconsistency between the nature of U.S. operations to date and these inherent limitations, I do not believe it is necessary at this point in time to modify the AUMF. Instead, I believe that Congress should continue to engage in oversight to remain fully apprised of the strategic, operational, and at times tactical decisionmaking processes that result in the employment of U.S. combat power pursuant to the statute, enabling Congress to ensure that such use falls within the scope of an authorization targeted at al Qaeda, intended to protect the Nation from future terrorist attacks, and that these operations reflect unquestioned commitment to the principles of international law that regulate the use of military force during any armed conflict. I believe the AUMF effectively addresses the belligerent threat against the United States posed by terrorist groups. I emphasize the term ‘‘belligerent’’ for an important reason. It is obvious that the AUMF has granted authority to use the Nation’s military power against threats falling within its scope. Therefore, only those organizations that pose a risk of sufficient magnitude to justify invoking the authority associated with armed conflict should be included within that scope as a result of their affiliation with al Qaeda. Determining what groups properly fall within this scope is, therefore, both critical and challenging. **The AUMF provides the President with the necessary flexibility to tailor U.S. operations to the evolving nature of this unconventional enemy, maximizing the efficacy of U.S. efforts to deny al Qaeda the freedom of action** they possessed in Afghanistan prior to Operation Enduring Freedom. In reaction to this evolution, the United States has employed combat power against what the prior panel referred to as associated forces or co-belligerents of al Qaeda, belligerent groups assessed to adhere to the overall terrorist objectives of the organization and engage in hostilities alongside al Qaeda directed against the United States or its interests. The focused on shared ideology, tactics, and indicia of connection between high-level group leaders seems both logical and legitimate for including these offshoots of al Qaeda within the scope of the AUMF as co-belligerents, a determination that, based on publicly available information, has to date been limited to groups seeking the sanctuary of the Afghanistan-Pakistan border areas, Yemen, or Somalia. If Congress does, however, choose to revise the AUMF, I do not believe that the revision should incorporate **an exclusive list of defined co-belligerent groups, a geographic scope limitation, or some external oversight of targeting decisions, all of which would undermine the efficacy of U.S. operations by signaling to the enemy limits on U.S. operational and tactical reach. It is an operational and tactical axiom that insurgent and non- state threats rarely seek the proverbial toe-to-toe confrontation** with clearly superior military forces. Al Qaeda is no different. Indeed, their attempts to engage in such tactics in the initial phases of Operation Enduring Freedom proved disastrous. Incorporating such **limitations into the AUMF would, therefore, be inconsistent with the operational objective of seizing and retaining the initiative against this unconventional enemy** and the strategic objective of preventing future terrorist attacks against the United States. Finally, I believe to target decisionmaking during armed conflict is a quintessential command function and that **the President,** acting in his own capacity or through subordinate officers, **should make these decisions**. He and his subordinates bear an obligation to ensure compliance with the Law of Armed Conflict and other principles of international law when employing U.S. combat power. Every subordinate officer in the chain of command is sworn to uphold and defend the constitution which, by implication, also requires compliance with this law. I believe the level of commitment to ensuring such compliance in structure, process, education, training, and internal oversight is more significant today than at any time in our Nation’s history. As one familiar with all these aspects of the compliance process, I am discouraged by the common assertion that there is insufficient oversight for targeting decisions. Furthermore, I believe few people better understand the immense moral burden associated with a decision to order lethal attack than experienced military leaders who never take these decisions lightly. If our confidence in these leaders to make sound military decisions is sufficient to entrust to them the lives of our sons and daughters—and on this point, again I must admit my self-interest as my son is a second-year cadet in the U.S. Air Force Academy and my brother is a serving colonel in the United States Army—I believe it must be sufficient to judge when and how to employ lethal combat power against an enemy. These leaders spend their entire professional careers immersed in the operational, moral, ethical, and legal aspects of employing combat power. I just do not believe some external oversight mechanism or a Federal judge is more competent to make these extremely difficult and weighty judgments as the people that this Nation entrusts for that responsibility. Finally, I would like to make one comment on the very hotly discussed issue of associated forces and the scope of the AUMF. In my view, when the administration refers to an associated or affiliated force, it is referring to a process of mutation that this organization undergoes. Obviously, we are dealing with an enemy that is going to seek every asymmetrical tactic to avoid the capability of the United States to disrupt or disable its operations. Part of that tactic, I think is to recruit and grow affiliated organizations. I certainly understand the logic of wanting to include those organizations within the scope of a revised AUMF. My concern echoes that of Senator Inhofe, which is **the risk is if you open that Pandora’s box, what other changes to this authority might be included in the statute which I believe could denigrate or limit the effectiveness of U.S. military operations**. And so while I believe Congress absolutely has an important function to ensure that the use of force under the statute is consistent with the underlying principles that frame the enactment of the AUMF, which is to defeat al Qaeda as an entity in the corporate sense and protect the United States from future terrorist attacks, I do not believe at this point in time it is necessary to modify the statute.

### A2AD

**No internal link whatsoever – internal links are about Obama losing authority to use drones against terrorists, not in inter-state conflict like against China or Iran – they have no ev that such a SCOTUS ruling would apply to these countries**

**Naval drones fail—cost overruns, delay**

**GAO** September **2013** (us government accountability office, “DEFENSE ACQUISITIONS Navy Strategy for Unmanned Carrier- Based Aircraft System Defers Key Oversight Mechanisms“ <http://www.gao.gov/assets/660/658236.pdf>)

**UCLASS faces several programmatic risks going forward**. First, **the** UCLASS **cost estimate of $3.7 billion exceeds the level of funding that the Navy expects to budget for the system through** fiscal year **2020**. Second, **the Navy has scheduled** **8 months between the time it issues its request for** air vehicle **design proposals** **and the time it awards the air vehicle contract, a process that** DOD officials note **typically takes 12 months to complete**. Third, **the UCLASS system is heavily reliant on** the successful development and delivery of **other systems and** **software, which creates additional schedule risk**. Fourth, **the Navy will be challenged to effectively manage and act as the lead integrator for three separate but interrelated segments**—air vehicle, carrier, and control system—**and 22 other government systems**, such as the aircraft landing system, the timing and alignment of **which are crucial to achieving the desired UCLASS capability.** **While the Navy recognizes** many of **these risks and has mitigation plans** in place, **they could lead to cost increases and schedule delays** if not effectively addressed.

**China--SCS 1NC**

**No impact to South China Sea conflict**

**Goldstein, 2011,** Lyle, associate professor in the China Maritime Studies Institute at the U.S. Naval War College in Newport, R.I. He is co-editor of the recent volumes China, the United States and 21st-Century Sea Power: Defining a Maritime Security Partnership and Chinese Aerospace Power: Evolving Maritime Roles. “The South China Sea's Georgia Scenario,” <http://www.foreignpolicy.com/articles/2011/07/11/the_south_china_seas_georgia_scenario?page=0,2>

The brutal truth, however, is **that Southeast Asia matters not a whit in the global balance of power. Most of the region comprises small, poor countries of no consequence** whatsoever, but the medium powers in the region, such as Vietnam, Indonesia, and Australia will all naturally and of their own accord stand up against a potentially more aggressive China. **If China and Vietnam go to war over some rocks in the ocean, they will inevitably both suffer a wide range of deleterious consequences, but it will have only a marginal impact on U.S. national security.** True, these sea lanes are critical to **the Japanese and South Korean economies, but both of these states are endowed with large and capable fleets -- yet another check on Beijing's ambitions.China, moreover, is all too aware of what happened to Georgia in 2008**. In that unf

ortunate case, the United States showered a new ally with high-level attention and military advisors. But when Russian tanks rolled in, effectively annexing a large section of the country and utterly destroying Tbilisi's armed forces, **Washington's response amounted to a whimper: There was, in the end, no appetite for risking a wider conflict** with Moscow over a country of marginal strategic interest. The lessons for Southeast Asia should be clear. Washington must avoid the temptation -- despite local states cheering it on at every opportunity -- to overplay its hand**. The main principle guiding U.S. policy regarding the South China Sea has been and should remain nonintervention.** Resource disputes are inherently messy and will not likely be decided by grand proclamations or multilateral summitry. Rather, progress will be a combination of backroom diplomacy backed by the occasional show of force by one or more of the claimants. In fact, **Beijing's record of conflict resolution over the last 30 years is rather encouraging: China has not resorted to a major use of force since 1979.**

**Senkaku 1NC**

**No war—economic and political constraints**

**Park 12** International Affairs Review By Sungtae “Jacky” Park Contributor Sungtae Park is a M.A. Security Policy Studies student at the George Washington University’s Elliott School of International Affairs. He has also written articles for CSIS (Center for Strategic and International Studies) and Brandeis International Journal.http://www.iar-gwu.org/node/434

**There is a growing fear among many Asia observers** and pundits **that** the on-going **territorial dispute could become a spark for a destructive, general war in Asia.** The **reality**, however, **is that there are several economic, political, as well as logistical (in military terms) constraints that make a war highly unlikely.**  **In economic terms, trade between the two countries is at historic high levels. A war would have devastating human as well as material costs**. **While economic interests and interdependence do not necessarily lead to peace, as history has proven with World War I, the current situation is different. Both political and military leaders before World War I believed that a war would be quick with small costs.** Each side also believed that it would win. **Leaders** **of** both **China and Japan** today **understand** that **the costs of a war would be astronomical** and understand that victory is no certainty. **The CCP** (the Chinese Communist Party) **has a strong interest in making sure that the conflict does not turn into a war. One of the key pillars of the CCP’s legitimacy is economic growth. The Chinese economy is already slowing. A war would** certainly put a halt to the so-called Chinese miracle. In the beginning of the dispute this year, **Beijing** actually **discreetly encouraged protests in hope that they would divert the Chinese people’s attention away from China’s slowing economic growth and deteriorating socioeconomic conditions**. As of now, however, Beijing is attempting to restrain the protests, fearing that they could pressure the government into an actual war. Despite constitutional constraints, Japan's military has continued to evolve over the past half century, but **the pacifist sentiment among the Japanese public still remains very strong.** The Japanese who are inflaming the tension between the two countries do not represent the majority. At the official level, Japan’s decision to purchase the disputed islands is in fact a way for the Japanese government to be able to exercise more control and restraint over the entire situation by taking the islands out of private hands.

**Hormuz 1NC**

**Iran can’t and won’t close the strait—its saber rattling**

Mark **Thompson, 12/31/**2011. Pulitzer Prize-winner, has covered national security in Washington since 1979, and for Time since 1994. “Can Iran Close the Strait of Hormuz?” Iran Review, http://iranreview.org/content/Documents/Can\_Iran\_Close\_the\_Strait\_of\_Hormuz\_\_2.htm.

Of course, **brandishing a threat and carrying it out are two different things**. “By presuming that Iran can easily close the strait, Western diplomats concede leverage, and the current U.S. habit of reacting immediately and aggressively to Iranian provocations risks unnecessary escalation,” Eugene **Gholz**, a professor at the University of Texas, **wrote** in Foreign Policy in 2009. “**Iran would find it so difficult, if not impossible, to close the strait that the world can afford to relax from its current hair-trigger alert**.” **Most U.S. military thinkers, speaking privately, seem to agree**. There are two linked issues at play here: military and monetary. While it might be challenging for the Iranian navy to shut down commerce flowing through the strait, Iranian moves to carry out that threat could have much the same effect. Oil companies, and the shippers that transport their product by water, are conservative business types, not given to putting their costly tankers and crews in harm’s way. But they’d get over it pretty quickly, and commerce would resume, with higher insurance rates. One point worth noting: analyses of possible Iranian military action to plug the strait generally note that Iran gets about half of its national budget from oil exports that transit the strait. But if the next round of sanctions keeps Iranian oil off the world market, that brake on Iranian military action will be gone. **Iran has been practicing such saber-rattling for decades, and it always sends a nervous twitch through the world oil markets**, spiking prices upward. It has done so this week, and oil’s per-barrel price has flirted with the $100 mark. That’s a drag on the world economic powers seeking to punish Iran for its nuclear-development efforts, and Tehran plainly views it as a net-positive for itself. That’s especially true in the year leading up to a U.S. presidential election, where the incumbent is seeking a second term. About a fifth of the world’s oil flows through the strait, which is only 34 miles wide at its narrowest point. But the navigable part of the strait is 20 miles across, although shipping is supposed to use a pair of two-mile wide channels, one inbound and the other outbound. Iran borders the strait to the north and east, and it has a major naval base – and its key submarine base – close by. “**While closing the Strait may be possible for Iran for a short period of time, the U.S. military would prevail in a conflict with Iran in order to re-open the Strait at a great cost to the Iranian armed forces**,” Brenna **Schnars wrote** in a 2010 study at the Naval Postgraduate School. “With international mistrust concerning the Iranian nuclear program already at the height of world concerns, an Iranian closure of the Strait would only enrage the majority of the international community, as their economies would severely suffer without its oil imports from the Persian Gulf.”

**Hormuz won’t disrupt oil prices**

**Faucon 12/28** Benoit Faucon, WSJ, 12/28/11, Strait of Hormuz Closure May Not Be Oil’s Doomsday, blogs.wsj.com/dispatch/2011/12/28/strait-of-hormuz-closure-may-not-be-oils-doomsday/

**Back in** the summer of **2008**, a reported **Israeli threat to bomb Iran triggered an oil-price jump to** an all-time high of $**147 a barrel.** **Now crude markets are rattled again by repeated warnings by Tehran that it could block the Strait of Hormuz**—a narrow corridor through which one-third of the world’s seaborne oil exports transits—in case sanctions escalate into a de facto embargo. **Yet, even such a scenario may not** **end up with the doomsday climax it may appear at first blush**—as **there would be plenty of ways to mitigate it. For idle oil traders, toying with oil-supply disruptions in the Persian Gulf has turned into a favorite pastime** during numb holiday periods—a bit like watching characters playing ping pong with cannon balls in a Looney Tunes cartoon. A recent report alleging Iran is building nuclear weapons has led to speculation the fuse could soon be lit—either by a preemptive Iranian blockade of the strait or an airstrike by the U.S. or Israel. With the euro zone seemingly on the brink, most oil consumers don’t find the prospect amusing. But even **if** one assumes **such a scenario were to materialize, it may not be the disaster movie oil markets expect**. For one, **Gulf oil’s stakeholders have gone through similar turmoil before**—**and they have now developed an impressive toolbox to cope with the risk**. For instance, **the** called “**tanker war**” between Iran and Iraq **led the U.S. to protect third-party oil vessels** and, wary of further unrest, **Washington has** since heavily **expanded its naval presence** in the region. **Iran doesn’t have the firepower** to match and **that** **may limit its chances to close the strait**. Tehran may only be able to block the strait for a short period, according to Kevin Liu, a director at U.K. risk consultancy Exclusive Analysis. “Iran has the capability to disrupt shipping in the strait for up to a few weeks but its relative military weakness means it could not block traffic indefinitely,” he wrote in a recent report. **Neither is the strait the only way to ship oil from the Gulf**. **Arab sheikdoms could** still **divert some of their crude through onshore pipelines going to the Red Sea or Oman. Releases from strategic stockpiles**—**set up after an earlier disruption due to a 1973 embargo also emanating from the Gulf—could also act as a buffer.** Finally, **Iran itself has sounded conflicting noises,** which suggest it would not sustain such a blockade for long. **Contrary to hard-liners, officials in the oil industry—which prides itself on being reliable even in the dark days of the war with Iraq—have ruled out a voluntary interruption of supplies**. And **even the country’s Arab neighbors say it would be against the Islamic republic’s own interests to interrupt its oil exports.** So **once the confetti and laces clear up, the strait’s own red herring may deflate like a zeppelin**—as fast as it was pumped up. If the Revolutionary Guards were ever to trade in oil futures, I would advise them to buy “short” and sell “long.”

**Oil Shocks--War—1NC**

**Oil shocks don’t cause war**

Peter **van der Windt 9**, Graduate Fellow at Columbia's Center for the Study of Development Strategies, 4-28-2009, Oil Price Shocks and the Onset of Civil War, <http://www.columbia.edu/cu/polisci/pdf-files/miniapsavanderwindt.pdf>

Figure 3 gives the probability for the onset of civil war for di erent values of it. It is clear from the figure that something strange is going on; it seems likely that the result is driven by a few outliers. Returning to the data this observation seems to be correct. Out of the 4915 observations for it only 17 of them are over 2,000 percent. 29 As a robustness check I therefore rerun regression 3 excluding the observations for which it > 2; 000. The results are given in regression 6 in table 5 in the appendix. While a change a domestic price shock still seems to have a positive e ect on the onset of civil war its signicance is gone. The bottom gure in gure 3 gives the simulation again. Indeed, **the effect of an oil price shock on the onset of civil war is extremely small**. Taking 2,000 as the cuto value seems and is arbitrary. However, similar results are obtained if one takes any other value. 30 6.3 Di erent environments Finally, I ran regression 3 by including the two di erent environments that were discussed in section 4.2. That is, by making use of variable RESi , I ran a regression that separates countries with oil reserves from countries without oil reserves. The results are given in regression 7 in table 5 in the appendix. In addition, by making use of variable RESi , I ran a regression that separates countries that are dependent on oil revenues from countries that are not. The results are given in regression 8 in table 5 in the appendix. We do not obtain shockingly new results. 7 Conclusion **This paper looked at the potential e ects of shocks in the price of natural resources on the onset of civil war; this is in contrast to previous large-N studies that solely look at the abundance or dependence of a country on natural resources**. Theoretically **there are reasons why we should expect that a sudden shock in the price of a country's natural resource could trigger a civil war from one year to the next. By looking at the yearly change in the price of oil, I do not find evidence that an oil price shock leads to civil war.**

### Terror

**Foreign backlash won’t kill the program**

**Byman 13** (Daniel, Professor in the Security Studies Program at the Edmund A. Walsh School of Foreign Service at Georgetown University and a Senior Fellow at the Saban Center for Middle East Policy at the Brookings Institution, Foreign Affairs, “Why Drones Work: The Case for Washington’s Weapon of Choice”, July/August 2013, ZBurdette)

FOREIGN FRIENDS

**It is** also **telling that drones have earned the backing, albeit secret, of foreign governments. In order to maintain popular support, politicians in Pakistan and Yemen routinely rail against the U.S. drone campaign. In reality, however, the governments of both countries have supported it.** During the Bush and Obama administrations, **Pakistan has even periodically hosted U.S. drone facilities and has been told about strikes in advance.** Pervez Musharraf, president of Pakistan until 2008, was not worried about the drone program’s negative publicity: “In Pakistan, things fall out of the sky all the time,” he reportedly remarked. **Yemen’s former president**, Ali Abdullah **Saleh**, also at times allowed drone strikes in his country and **even covered for them by telling the public that they were conducted by the Yemeni air force**. When the United States’ involvement was leaked in 2002, however, relations between the two countries soured. Still, Saleh later let the drone program resume in Yemen, and **his replacement**, Abdu Rabbu Mansour **Hadi, has publicly praised drones**, saying that “they pinpoint the target and have zero margin of error, if you know what target you’re aiming at.” **As officials in both Pakistan and Yemen realize, U.S. drone strikes help their governments by targeting common enemies**. A memo released by the antisecrecy website WikiLeaks revealed that Pakistan’s army chief, Ashfaq Parvez Kayani, privately asked U.S. military leaders in 2008 for “continuous Predator coverage” over antigovernment militants, and the journalist Mark Mazzetti has reported that **the U**nited **S**tates **has conducted “goodwill kills” against Pakistani militants** who threatened Pakistan far more than the United States. **Thus, in private, Pakistan supports the drone program.** **As then Prime Minister** Yousaf Raza **Gilani told** Anne Patterson, then the U.S. ambassador to Pakistan, in 2008, **“We’ll protest [against the drone program] in the National Assembly and then ignore it.”** Such **concerns are valid, but the level of local anger over drones is often lower than commonly portrayed.**

 **Many surveys of public opinion** related to drones **are conducted by** anti-drone organizations, **which results in biased samples**. **Other surveys exclude those who are unaware of the drone program** and thus overstate the importance of those who are angered by it. In addition, many Pakistanis do not realize that the drones often target the very militants who are wreaking havoc on their country. And **for most Pakistanis and Yemenis, the most important problems they struggle with are corruption, weak representative institutions, and poor economic growth;** **the drone program is only a small part of their overall anger**, most of which is directed toward their own governments. A poll conducted in 2007, well before the drone campaign had expanded to its current scope, found that only 15 percent of Pakistanis had a favorable opinion of the United States. **It is hard to imagine that alternatives to drone strikes, such as seal team raids or cruise missile strikes**, **would make the U**nited **S**tates **more popular.**

**Al Shabaab: No Threat—F/L**

**Al Shabaab has been significantly weakened**

**Bass and Zimmerman 13** (Breuk and Katherine, senior analyst and the al Qaeda and Associated Movements Team Lead for the American Enterprise Institute's Critical Threats Project, 6-10-13, “Challenges to America's Counterterrorism Strategy in Somalia” Critical Threats AEI) http://www.criticalthreats.org/somalia/zimmerman-challenges-americas-counterterrorism-strategy-somalia-june-10-2013

Al Qaeda’s affiliate in Somalia**, al Shabaab, has suffered a series of defeats at the hands of Somali clan militia forces, internationally-backed African Union peacekeeping troops, and Somali federal government forces.** Notably, **al Shabaab lost a major stronghold in the southern Somali port city of Kismayo at the end of September 2012**.[1] **As al Shabaab suffered setbacks, the Somali government made major progress**: The United States formally recognized a government of Somalia in January 2013 for the first time since 1991, for example.[2**] The government controls the majority of Mogadishu today, whereas it held only a few blocks of the capital city in 2010.**

**Defense: WMD Terror 1NC**

**--A chemical attack would cause minimal casualties**

**Mueller, professor of political science @ Ohio State, ’99** [JOHN MUELLER is Professor of Political Science at the University of Rochester. KARL MUELLER is Assistant Professor of Comparative Military Studies at the School of Advanced Airpower Studies at Maxwell Air Force Base, Alabama, “Sanctions of Mass Destruction”, May/June, lexis]

**Chemical weapons**, meanwhile, **are** virtually **incapable of killing masses of people** in open areas except when used in vast quantities, and so **their inclusion in the WMD category is highly dubious unless the concept is so diluted that bullets or machetes could be included as well. As with terrorism, the problem here is primarily fear rather than actual consequences.** Matthew Meselson, a biologist at Harvard University, calculates that **it would take a ton of nerve gas or five tons of mustard gas to produce heavy casualties** among unprotected people in an open area one kilometer square. Even for nerve gas **this would require the concentrated delivery into a rather small area of about 300 heavy artillery shells or seven 500-pounds bombs.** A 1993 analysis by Congress' Office of Technology Assessment concluded that a ton of sarin perfectly delivered under absolutely ideal conditions over a heavily populated area against unprotected people might cause between 3,000 and 8,000 deaths. **Under slightly less ideal circumstances** -- if there were a moderate wind or if the sun were out, for example -- **the death rate would be a tenth as great. Discussions of chemical weapons often stress their ability to cause many casualties -- both dead and wounded -- glossing over the fact that historically most of those incapacitated by such weapons have not actually died.** When, following its unsuccessful efforts with biological weapons, Aum Shinrikyo released "deadly" sarin into a Japanese subway, the attack caused 5,000 casualties but only 12 deaths (although a more competent attack would have taken a higher toll). Iraq used chemical weapons against substantially unprotected Iranians during the Iran-Iraq War, but Iran reported that of the 27,000 gassed through March 1987, only 262 died.

**No WMD terrorism – lack of desire and capability – empirically the threat is overblown**

**Mueller 11**. John Mueller, Professor and Woody Hayes Chair of National Security Studies, Mershon Center for International Security Studies and Department of Political Science, “The Truth About al Qaeda”, 8/2/2011, <http://www.foreignaffairs.com/articles/68012/john-mueller/the-truth-about-al-qaeda?page=show>, CMR

The chief lesson of 9/11 should have been that small bands of terrorists, using simple methods, can exploit loopholes in existing security systems. But instead, **many** preferred to **engage in mass**ive **extrapolation**: **If 19 men could hijack four airplanes** simultaneously, the thinking went, then **surely al Qaeda would soon make an atomic bomb.** As a misguided Turkish proverb holds, "If your enemy be an ant, imagine him to be an elephant." The new information unearthed in Osama bin Laden's hideout in Abbottabad, Pakistan, suggests that the United States has been doing so for a full decade. **Whatever al Qaeda's threatening rhetoric and occasional nuclear fantasies, its potential as a menace**, particularly as an atomic one, **has been much inflated**. **The public has** now **endured a decade of dire warnings about** the imminence of a **terrorist atomic attack**. In 2004, the former CIA spook Michael Scheuer proclaimed on television's 60 Minutes that it was "probably a near thing," and in 2007, the physicist Richard Garwin assessed the likelihood of a nuclear explosion in an American or a European city by terrorism or other means in the next ten years to be 87 percent. By 2008, Defense Secretary Robert Gates mused that what keeps every senior government leader awake at night is "the thought of a terrorist ending up with a weapon of mass destruction, especially nuclear." **Few**, it seems, **found** much **solace in** the fact **that** **an al Qaeda computer** seized in Afghanistan in 2001 **indicated** that **the group's budget for research on w**eapons of **m**ass **d**estruction (almost all of it focused on primitive chemical weapons work) **was** some **$2,000** to $4,000. In the wake of the killing of Osama bin Laden, officials now have more al Qaeda computers, which reportedly contain a wealth of information about the workings of the organization in the intervening decade. A multi-agency task force has completed its assessment, and according to first reports, it has found that **al Qaeda members have** **primarily been engaged in dodging drone strikes and complaining about how cash-strapped they are**. Some **reports suggest** **they've** also **been looking at quite a bit of porn**ography. The full story is not out yet, but **it seems breathtakingly unlikely that the miserable little group has** had **the time or inclination, let alone the money, to set up and staff a uranium-seizing operation, as well as a** fancy, super-high-tech **facility to fabricate a bomb**. **It** is a process that **requires trusting corrupted foreign collaborators** and other criminals, **obtaining and transporting** highly guarded **material**, **setting up a** machine **shop staffed with top scientists** and technicians, **and rolling the** heavy, cumbersome, and untested finished **product into position to be detonated by a skilled crew**, all the **while attracting no attention from outsiders.** The documents also reveal that after fleeing Afghanistan, bin Laden maintained what one member of the task force calls an "obsession" with attacking the United States again, even though 9/11 was in many ways a disaster for the group. It led to a worldwide loss of support, a major attack on it and on its Taliban hosts, and a decade of furious and dedicated harassment. And indeed, bin Laden did repeatedly and publicly threaten an attack on the United States. He assured Americans in 2002 that "the youth of Islam are preparing things that will fill your hearts with fear"; and in 2006, he declared that his group had been able "to breach your security measures" and that "operations are under preparation, and you will see them on your own ground once they are finished." Al Qaeda's animated spokesman, Adam Gadahn, proclaimed in 2004 that "the streets of America shall run red with blood" and that "the next wave of attacks may come at any moment." The **obsessive desire notwithstanding**, such **fulminations have clearly lacked substance**. Although hundreds of millions of people enter the United States legally every year, and countless others illegally, **no true al Qaeda cell has been found in the country since 9/11** and exceedingly few people have been uncovered who even have any sort of "link" to the organization. The closest effort at an al Qaeda operation within the country was a decidedly nonnuclear one by an Afghan-American, Najibullah Zazi, in 2009. Outraged at the U.S.-led war on his home country, Zazi attempted to join the Taliban but was persuaded by al Qaeda operatives in Pakistan to set off some bombs in the United States instead. Under surveillance from the start, he was soon arrested, and, however "radicalized," he has been talking to investigators ever since, turning traitor to his former colleagues. Whatever training Zazi received was inadequate; he repeatedly and desperately sought further instruction from his overseas instructors by phone. At one point, he purchased bomb material with a stolen credit card, guaranteeing that the purchase would attract attention and that security video recordings would be scrutinized. Apparently, his handlers were so strapped that they could not even advance him a bit of cash to purchase some hydrogen peroxide for making a bomb. For al Qaeda, then, the operation was a failure in every way -- except for the ego boost it got by inspiring the usual dire litany about the group's supposedly existential challenge to the United States, to the civilized world, to the modern state system. Indeed, **no** Muslim **extremist has succeeded in detonating** even **a simple bomb in the U**nited **S**tates **in the last ten years**, and except for the attacks on the London Underground in 2005, neither has any in the United Kingdom. **It seems wildly unlikely that al Qaeda is remotely ready to go nuclear**. Outside of war zones, the amount of killing carried out by **al Qaeda** and al Qaeda linkees, maybes, and wannabes throughout the entire world since 9/11 stands at perhaps a few hundred per year. That's a few hundred too many, of course, but it **scarcely presents an existential**, or elephantine, **threat**. And **the likelihood that a**n **American will be killed by a terrorist** of any ilk **stands at one in 3.5 million per year**, even with 9/11 included. **That probability will remain unchanged** unless terrorists are able to increase their capabilities massively -- and obtaining nuclear weapons would allow them to do so. Although al Qaeda may have dreamed from time to time about getting such weapons, no other terrorist group has even gone so far as to indulge in such dreams, with the exception of the Japanese cult **Aum Shinrikyo**, which leased the mineral rights to an Australian sheep ranch that sat on uranium deposits, purchased some semi-relevant equipment, and tried to buy a finished bomb from the Russians. That experience, however, **cannot be very encouraging to** the would-be atomic **terrorist**. Even though it was flush with funds and undistracted by drone attacks (or even by much surveillance), **Aum Shinrikyo abandoned its atomic efforts in frustration very early on. It then moved to bio**logical **weapons**, another complete failure that inspired its leader to suggest that fears expressed in the United States of a biological attack were actually a ruse to tempt terrorist groups to pursue the weapons. **The group did** finally **manage to release some sarin gas** in a Tokyo subway **that killed 13 and led to the group's terminal shutdown, as well as to 16 years** (and counting) **of pronouncements that WMD terrorism is the wave of the future. No elephants there, either**.

## 2NC

### T

#### Authority must be ceded—distinct from power

Rob Jenkins.—associate professor of English at Georgia Perim¶ 27-year veteran of higher education, as both a faculty member and an administrator April 3, 2012, 12:22 pm¶ How Much Do You Work? <http://chronicle.com/blogs/onhiring/author/rjenkins/page/5>. Gender edited

Anytime the President of the United States sends American servicemen and women into harm’s way, politicians and pundits are sure to argue over whether or not [s]he has the authority to do so. I’m not qualified to participate in that kind of constitutional debate. But I can offer the following observation: whether or not the President has the authority to deploy troops in a given situation, [s]he certainly has the power to do so. That’s because authority and power are not the same thing, even though many leaders fail to grasp the distinction. In particular, an alarming number of academic administrators these days don’t seem to understand the difference between exercising duly constituted authority and merely wielding power. Authority is essentially the capacity to carry out one’s duties and responsibilities. Faculty members have the authority to assign final grades, because doing so is one of their responsibilities. Likewise, department chairs have authority to evaluate faculty members, deans have authority to assign faculty lines, presidents have authority to determine budgets, and so on. For authority to be valid, it must be ceded, which is to say derived from something larger than itself. The officers of a college, for instance, typically derive their authority from elected or appointed boards. At an institution that truly embraces the principles of shared governance, other stakeholders are also ceded authority in certain areas by the properly constituted bylaws and policies of the institution–for example, the faculty’s authority over curricular issues. Even a college president does not have the authority, outside of the policies by which all are bound, to tell faculty members how to teach, how to conduct research, or what to write. However, this does not mean that presidents and other administrators do not sometimes take such authority upon themselves. They can do so, even if illegitimately, because of the enormous power they wield. Power is something quite different from authority. It tends to be seized rather than ceded. It is essentially the ability to force others to conform to one’s wishes, whether they want to or not, because of what might happen to them if they don’t. People with power can make other people’s lives miserable, prevent them from getting promotions and raises, perhaps cost them their jobs–even when such actions are not strictly within their properly ceded authority.

#### Confusing the distinction between the two guts precision and creates a limits disaster

Tammy A.S. Kohl 13 (Mar 27, President of Resource Associates Corporation. For over 30 years, RAC has specialized in business and management consulting, strategic planning, leadership development, executive coaching, and youth leadership. “Authority Vs Power” <http://ezinearticles.com/?Authority-Vs-Power&id=3784778>

Successful leaders are individuals with high levels of personal power. Understanding the difference between personal power and granted authority is a significant distinction. Many people have the tendency to use the words authority and power interchangeably; however, these terms refer to two very different aspects of leadership. Authority is the right granted from a person or organization to another to represent or to act in a specified way. For example, a CEO of a company is given the authority by the Board of Directors to run the company. In turn, the CEO places managers in positions of authority over the various divisions, business units, or departments of the organization. Power is the capacity or ability to direct or influence the behavior of others. Former United States President, Dwight D. Eisenhower, captured the essence of this definition when he said, "Leadership is the art of getting someone else to do something you want done because he wants to do it." Everyone possesses the potential to be powerful. Power is a personal talent that you can develop and use to achieve worthwhile goals. It does not depend upon title, rank, position, or authority. It's simply the ability to motivate others to take specific actions. Authority is granted but always has defined limits. Power is earned and can be limitless. Authority is derived through the position. Power is derived from an individual's personal influence, which increases effectiveness. Two leaders in exactly the same position of authority can and will have different amounts of power. A person can possess a great deal of power and absolutely no authority. Conversely, someone can have authority and absolutely no power. Leaders who have not earned sufficient power sometimes make the mistake of trying to influence others by overexerting their authority. But excessive use of authority can cause employees to rebel in much the same way that children rebel against restrictive parents.

#### Obama acting doesn’t prove authority exists- for targeted killing, indefinite detention and armed forces into hostilities

Graham Cronogue, Duke Journal Of Comparative & International Law, 2012, “A New AUMF: Defining Combatants In The War On Terror” Vol. 22:377 <http://scholarship.law.duke.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1294&context=djcil> p. 394

Still, the threat from these groups is just as real and the need to use force is just as great. The President has responded to these threats with force, claiming congressional authorization and inherent constitutional authority. In this context, it is unclear if or to what extent either of these authorizations actually exist. This ambiguity is especially apparent in the President’s use of extraterritorial force as well as the detention and targeted killings of American citizens.

### ER Solv: Announcement

#### All 2ac solvency deficits are solved by Obama publicly renouncing his legal authority - the distinction is key

Posner, 9/3 (eric,Eric Professor of Law at Chicago Law School. An editor of The Journal of Legal Studies, he has also published numerous articles and books on issues in international law, Slate Magazine, 9/3/13, http://www.slate.com/articles/news\_and\_politics/view\_from\_chicago/2013/09/obama\_going\_to\_congress\_on\_syria\_he\_s\_actually\_strengthening\_the\_war\_powers.html)

President Obama’s surprise announcement that he will ask Congress for approval of a military attack on Syria is being hailed as a vindication of the rule of law and a revival of the central role of Congress in war-making, even by critics. But all of this is wrong. Far from breaking new legal ground, President Obama has reaffirmed the primacy of the executive in matters of war and peace. The war powers of the presidency remain as mighty as ever.¶ It would have been different if the president had announced that only Congress can authorize the use of military force, as dictated by the Constitution, which gives Congress alone the power to declare war. That would have been worthy of notice, a reversal of the ascendance of executive power over Congress. But the president said no such thing. He said: “I believe I have the authority to carry out this military action without specific congressional authorization.” Secretary of State John Kerry confirmed that the president “has the right to do that”—launch a military strike—“no matter what Congress does.”¶ Thus, the president believes that the law gives him the option to seek a congressional yes or to act on his own. He does not believe that he is bound to do the first. He has merely stated the law as countless other presidents and their lawyers have described it before him.

### transparency

te **This empirically solves transparency**

**Pearlstein, 13** --- Professor of Public and International Affairs at Princeton

(3/26/2013, Congress Shouldn’t Give the President New Power to Fight Terrorists, www.slate.com/articles/news\_and\_politics/jurisprudence/2013/03/congress\_shouldn\_t\_give\_president\_obama\_new\_power\_to\_fight\_terrorists.html)

This is hardly to say the president’s decision to use force operates under no constraint at all. Using force is expensive, it is alienating, it is provocative, and it may create greater threats to the American people than it prevents. Presidents have to convince the American public that war is worth fighting. This has even been true when they respond to acts of terror in self-defense. **When** President **Reagan ordered strikes against Libya following the bombing of the civilian airliner over Lockerbie, Scotland, he made a speech from the Oval Office. Ditto for** President **Clinton when he bombed Sudan in response to al-Qaida’s attacks on the U.S. Embassies in Kenya and Tanzania. Mission details were rightly few, but both presidents explained who we had targeted and why.** And the public, if they were displeased, could hold accountable the president or his party. Today, **it is this lack of transparency—not Congress’ relative apathy—that** has boosted executive power and **threatened the legitimacy of current drone operations.** If Congress wants to do something about this, it should start by beefing up its own oversight efforts. Current federal laws require the president to notify the intelligence committees of all covert actions carried out by CIA (after the fact if need be). Congress should also require the same degree of notification of the Senate and House Armed Services Committees for operations carried out by the military’s Joint Special Operations Command, an active participant in U.S. targeting operations. The much maligned War Powers Resolution has been modestly effective in requiring the White House to report the introduction of military forces into hostilities. In the age of drones, Congress should explore strengthening that reporting requirement further.

#### CP creates executive accountability and transparency

McNeal 13 – public policy professor @ Pepperdine University, national security specialist, and former Assistant Director of the Institute for Global Security

Gregory S., “Targeted Killing and Accountability” *Georgetown Law Journal*, Forthcoming [http://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract\_id=1819583] March 5 //mtc

V. ACCOUNTABILITY REFORMS¶ A. Defend the Process. Perhaps the most obvious way to add accountability to the targeted killing process is for someone in government to describe the process the way this article has, and from there, defend the process. The task of describing the government’s policies in detail should not fall to anonymous sources, confidential interviews, and selective leaks. Government’s failure to defend policies is not a phenomenon that is unique to post 9/11 targeted killings. In fact, James Baker once noted "In my experience, the United States does a better job at incorporating intelligence into its targeting decisions than it does in using intelligence to explain those decisions after the fact. This in part reflects the inherent difficulty in articulating a basis for targets derived from ongoing intelligence sources and methods. Moreover, it is hard to pause during ongoing operations to work through issues of disclosure…But articulation is an important part of the targeting process that must be incorporated into the decision cycle for that subset of targets raising the hardest issues…"519¶ Publicly defending the process is a natural fit for public accountability mechanisms. It provides information to voters and other external actors who can choose to exercise a degree of control over the process. However, a detailed public defense of the process also bolsters bureaucratic and professional accountability by demonstrating to those within government that they are involved in activities that their government is willing to publicly describe and defend (subject to the limits of necessary national security secrecy). However, the Executive branch, while wanting to reveal information to defend the process, similarly recognizes that by revealing too much information they may face legal accountability mechanisms that they may be unable to control, thus their caution is understandable (albeit self-serving).520 It’s not just the Executive branch that can benefit from a healthier defense of the process. Congress too can bolster the legitimacy of the program by specifying how they have conducted their oversight activities. The best mechanism by which they can do this is through a white paper. That paper could include:¶ A statement about why the committees believe the U.S. government's use of force is lawful. If the U.S. government is employing armed force it's likely that it is only doing so pursuant to the AUMF, a covert action finding, or relying on the President's inherent powers under the Constitution. Congress could clear up a substantial amount of ambiguity by specifying that in the conduct of its oversight it has reviewed past and ongoing targeted killing operations and is satisfied that in the conduct of its operations the U.S. government is acting consistent with those sources of law. Moreover, Congress could also specify certain legal red lines that if crossed would cause members to cease believing the program was lawful. For example, if members do not believe the President may engage in targeted killings acting only pursuant to his Article II powers, they could say so in this white paper, and also articulate what the consequences of crossing that red line might be. To bolster their credibility, Congress could specifically articulate their powers and how they would exercise them if they believed the program was being conducted in an unlawful manner. Perhaps stating: "The undersigned members affirm that if the President were to conduct operations not authorized by the AUMF or a covert action finding, we would consider that action to be unlawful and would publicly withdraw our support for the program, and terminate funding for it."¶ A statement detailing the breadth and depth of Congressional oversight activities. When Senator Feinstein released her statement regarding the nature and degree of Senate Intelligence Committee oversight of targeted killing operations it went a long way toward bolstering the argument that the program was being conducted in a responsible and lawful manner. An oversight white paper could add more details about the oversight being conducted by the intelligence and armed services committees, explaining in as much detail as possible the fo

rmal and informal activities that have been conducted by the relevant committees. How many briefings have members attended? Have members reviewed targeting criteria? Have members had an opportunity to question the robustness of the internal kill-list creation process and target vetting and validation processes? Have members been briefed on and had an opportunity to question how civilian casualties are counted and how battle damage assessments are conducted? Have members been informed of the internal disciplinary procedures for the DoD and CIA in the event a strike goes awry, and have they been informed of whether any individuals have been disciplined for improper targeting? Are the members satisfied that internal disciplinary procedures are adequate?¶ 3) Congressional assessment of the foreign relations implications of the program. The Constitution divides some foreign policy powers between the President and Congress, and the oversight white paper should articulate whether members have assessed the diplomatic and foreign relations implications of the targeted killing program. While the white paper would likely not be able to address sensitive diplomatic matters such as whether Pakistan has privately consented to the use of force in their territory, the white paper could set forth the red lines that would cause Congress to withdraw support for the program. The white paper could specifically address whether the members have considered potential blow-back, whether the program has jeopardized alliances, whether it is creating more terrorists than it kills, etc. In specifying each of these and other factors, Congress could note the types of developments, that if witnessed would cause them to withdraw support for the program. For example, Congress could state "In the countries where strikes are conducted, we have not seen the types of formal objections to the activities that would normally be associated with a violation of state's sovereignty. Specifically, no nation has formally asked that the issue of strikes in their territory be added to the Security Council's agenda for resolution. No nation has shot down or threatened to shoot down our aircraft, severed diplomatic relations, expelled our personnel from their country, or refused foreign aid. If we were to witness such actions it would cause us to question the wisdom and perhaps even the legality of the program." B. Use Performance Reporting to Encourage Good Behavior Another transparency related reform that could engender greater accountability would be to report performance data. Specifically, the government could report the number of strikes the CIA and the Department of Defense conducted in a given time period. As was discussed above, the law of armed conflict requires that any harm resulting from a strike may not be disproportionate when compared the military advantage anticipated. From this standard, some variables for a performance metric become clear: 1) Was there collateral damage resulting from the military action? 2) If so, was the collateral damage excessive in relation to the military advantage anticipated? Variable 1 lends itself to tracking and reporting (subject to the difficulties of AAR and BDA), Variable 2 only arises if collateral damage occurred, and the questions that should flow from it are A) Was the collateral damage expected? If it was, then the commander must have engaged in some analysis as to whether the anticipated harm was proportional to the military advantage anticipated. Thus, the only remaining metric that would need to be documented is whether the damage was proportional; and B) If the collateral damage was not expected, why not? Some causes of potentially unexpected collateral harm may be an intelligence failure, a failure to follow procedures, changes in the operational circumstances, inadequate procedures, among others. Each of these variables can be tracked as part of an accountability and performance metric. For example, the data could include the collateral harm anticipated before a strike, and the battle damage assessment after the fact. The data would not need to be reported on a strike-by-strike basis to be effective, rather aggregate data could prove quite useful. For example, in Part III.B. I describe how CENTCOM data indicates that less than 1% of targeted killing operations resulted in harm to civilians, whereas outside observers estimate that 8%-47% of CIA strikes in Pakistan inflicted harm to civilians. Imagine these data were official numbers published by the Department of Defense and CIA respectively. It’s safe to assume that such reports showing that the CIA was eight to forty seven times more likely to inflict harm to civilians would force a serious reexamination of CIA bureaucratic practices, extensive political oversight, professional embarrassment and perhaps even the prospect of judicial intervention. Moreover, the publication of such data may have the salutary effect of causing bureaucratic competition between the Department of Defense and CIA over which agency could be better at protecting civilians, a form of bureaucratic accountability with professionalism mixed in. Of course there are costs associated with such reporting. The tracking requirements would be extensive and may impose an operational burden on attacking forces --- however, an administrative burden is not a sufficient reason to not reform the process, especially when innocent lives are on the line. Another cost may be the cost to security of revealing information that even has the slightest possibility of aiding the enemy in developing countermeasures against American operations. C. Publish Targeting Criteria Related to defending the process, and using performance data is the possibility that the U.S. government could publish the targeting criteria it follows. That criteria need not be comprehensive, but it could be sufficiently detailed as to give outside observers an idea about who the individuals singled out for killing are and what they are alleged to have done to merit their killing. As Bobby Chesney has noted, "Congress could specify a statutory standard which the executive branch could then bring to bear in light of the latest intelligence, with frequent reporting to Congress as to the results of its determinations."521 What might the published standards entail? First, Congress could clarify the meaning of associated forces, described in Part I and II. In the alternative, it could do away with the associated forces criteria altogether, and instead name each organization against which force is being authorized,522 such an approach would be similar to the one followed by the Office of Foreign Assets Control when it designates financial supporters of terrorism for sanctions.523¶ The challenge with such a reporting and designation strategy is that it doesn’t fit neatly into the network based targeting strategy and current practices outlined in Parts I-III. If the U.S. is seeking to disrupt networks, then how can there be reporting that explains the networked based targeting techniques without revealing all of the links and nodes that have been identified by analysts? Furthermore, for side payment targets, the diplomatic secrecy challenges identified in Part I remain --- there simply may be no way the U.S. can publicly reveal that it is targeting networks that are attacking allied governments. These problems are less apparent when identifying the broad networks the U.S. believes are directly attacking American interests, however publication of actual names of targets will be nearly impossible (at least ex ante) under current targeting practices.¶ As was discussed above, the U.S. government and outside observers may simply be using different benchmarks to measure success. Some observers are looking to short term gains from a killing while others look to the long term consequences of the targeted killing policy. Should all of these metrics and criteria be revealed? Hardly. However, the U.S. should articulate what strategic level goals it is hoping to achieve through its targeted killing program. Those goals certainly include disrupting specified networks. Articulating those goals, and the specific networks the U.S. is targeting may place the U.S. on better diplomatic footing, and would certainly engender mechanisms of domestic political accountability. D. Publish costs (in dollars) A proven accountability technique in the public administration literature is publishing the costs associated with government activity. Targeted killings may be a worthwhile case for proving that publishing the financial costs of strikes can impose a mechanism of accountability. This is the case because unlike a traditional war where the American people understand victories like the storming of the beaches at Normandy, the expulsion of Iraqi troops from Kuwait, or even (in a nonhot war context) the fall of the Berlin wall – this conflict against nonstate actors is much harder to assess. As such, the American people may understand the targeted killing of a key al Qaeda leader like Anwar al Aulaqi, and they may be willing to pay any price to eliminate him. But what about less well known targets such as Taliban leaders? Take the example of Abdul Qayam, a Taliban commander in Afghanistan’s Zabul Province who was killed in an airstrike in October of 2011.524 Do the American people even know who he is, let alone the money spent to kill him? According to a report, the Navy spends $20,000 per hour on strikes like the one that killed Qayam, and each sortie generally lasts eight hours.525 While the American people may be generally supportive of targeted killings, they are unaware of the financial costs associated with the killings. Publishing the aggregate cost of strikes, along with the number of strikes would not reveal any classified information, but would go a long way towards ensuring political accountability for the targeted killing program. Such an accountability reform might also appeal to individuals across the ideological spectrum, from progressives who are opposed to strikes on moral grounds to fiscal conservatives who may oppose the strikes on the basis of financial cost. In fact, according to the 9/11 Commission Report, during the 1990’s, one of the most effective critiques of the cruise missile strikes against al Qaeda training camps was cost. Specifically some officials questioned whether “hitting inexpensive and rudimentary training camps with costly missiles would not do much good and might even help al Qaeda if the strikes failed to kill Bin Ladin.”526 E. Establish Independent Review by a Defense and Intelligence Review Board for Targeted Killings The transparency related accountability reforms specified above have the ability to expose wrongdoing; however that’s not the only goal of accountability. Accountability is also designed to deter wrongdoing. By exposing governmental activity, transparency oriented reforms can influence the behavior of all future public officials—to convince them to live up to public expectations 527 The challenge associated with the reforms articulated above is a bias towards the status quo.528 Very few incentives exist for elected officials to exercise greater oversight over targeted killings and interest group advocacy is not as strong in matters of national security and foreign affairs as it is in domestic politics.529¶ To overcome the bias towards the status quo, Congress should consider creating an independent review board within the executive branch.530 That review board should be composed of individuals selected by the minority and majority leadership of the House and Senate, thus ensuring bi-partisan representation. The individuals on the review board should be drawn from the ranks of former intelligence and military officers, lending their report enhanced credibility. These individuals should be responsible for publishing an annual report analyzing how well the government’s targeted killing program is performing. The goal would be a strategic assessment of costs and benefits, including the fiscal costs, potential blowback, collateral damage and other details that are currently held deep within the files of the targeting bureaucracy.¶ Such a commission has the potential to be quite successful. As Posner and Vermeule have highlighted, bipartisan independent commissions can be established to review policies before and after the fact, and the president might gain credibility by binding himself to give the commission some authority on some dimension.531 A president might publicly promise to follow the recommendations of such a commission and may give power to a commission to review the success of his policy choices after the fact.532 These commissions can be successful because they signal the executive’s interest in maintaining credibility, winning the support of the public, and a willingness to give up control of information that allows others to subject the executive branch to critiques. The legislature may prefer this solution because it allows them to claim they are holding the executive branch accountable while at the same time shifting the blame for poor accountability decisions to others. The commission could review the program in its entirety, or could conduct audits on specified areas of the program.

### ER NB: Politics 2NC

#### CP is executive action—obviously avoids Congressional fights

Fine 12

Jeffrey A. Fine, assistant professor of political science at Clemson University. He has published articles in the Journal of Politics, Political Research Quarterly, and Political Behavior. Adam L. Warber is an associate professor of political science at Clemson University. He is the author of Executive Orders and the Modern Presidency, Presidential Studies Quarterly, June 2012, " Circumventing Adversity: Executive Orders and Divided Government", Vol. 42, No. 2, Ebsco

We also should expect presidents to prioritize and be strategic in the types of executive orders that they create to maneuver around a hostile Congress. There are a variety of reasons that can drive a president’s decision. For example, presidents can use an executive order to move the status quo of a policy issue to a position that is closer to their ideal point. By doing so, presidents are able to pressure Congress to respond, perhaps by passing a new law that represents a compromise between the preferences of the president and Congress. Forcing Congress’s hand to enact legislation might be a preferred option for the president, if he perceives Congress to be unable or unwilling to pass meaningful legislation in the ﬁrst place. While it is possible that such unilateral actions might spur Congress to pass a law to modify or reverse a president’s order, such responses by Congress are rare (Howell 2003, 113-117; Warber 2006, 119). Enacting a major policy executive order allows the president to move the equilibrium toward his preferred outcome without having to spend time lining up votes or forming coalitions with legislators. As a result, and since reversal from Congress is unlikely, presidents have a greater incentive to issue major policy orders to overcome legislative hurdles.

#### The CP triggers Congressional follow-on and avoids confrontation

Zbigniew Brzezinski, national security advisor under U.S. President Jimmy Carter, 12/3/12, Obama's Moment, www.foreignpolicy.com/articles/2012/12/03/obamas\_moment

In foreign affairs, the central challenge now facing President Barack Obama is how to regain some of the ground lost in recent years in shaping U.S. national security policy. Historically and politically, in America's system of separation of powers, it is the president who has the greatest leeway for decisive action in foreign affairs. He is viewed by the country as responsible for Americans' safety in an increasingly turbulent world. He is seen as the ultimate definer of the goals that the United States should pursue through its diplomacy, economic leverage, and, if need be, military compulsion. And the world at large sees him -for better or for worse -as the authentic voice of America.

To be sure, he is not a dictator. Congress has a voice. So does the public. And so do vested interests and foreign-policy lobbies. The congressional role in declaring war is especially important not when the United States is the victim of an attack, but when the United States is planning to wage war abroad. Because America is a democracy, public support for presidential foreign-policy decisions is essential. But no one in the government or outside it can match the president's authoritative voice when he speaks and then decisively acts for America.

This is true even in the face of determined opposition. Even when some lobbies succeed in gaining congressional support for their particular foreign clients in defiance of the president, for instance, many congressional signatories still quietly convey to the White House their readiness to support the president if he stands firm for "the national interest." And a president who is willing to do so publicly, while skillfully cultivating friends and allies on Capitol Hill, can then establish such intimidating credibility that it is politically unwise to confront him. This is exactly what Obama needs to do now.

### ER Solv: A2 “Signalling”

CP sends the most powerful signal

Zbigniew Brzezinski, national security advisor under U.S. President Jimmy Carter, 12/3/12, Obama's Moment, [www.foreignpolicy.com/articles/2012/12/03/obamas\_moment](http://www.foreignpolicy.com/articles/2012/12/03/obamas_moment) gender edited

In foreign affairs, the central challenge now facing President Barack Obama is how to regain some of the ground lost in recent years in shaping U.S. national security policy. Historically and politically, in America's system of separation of powers, it is the president who has the greatest leeway for decisive action in foreign affairs. He is viewed by the country as responsible for Americans' safety in an increasingly turbulent world. He is seen as the ultimate definer of the goals that the United States should pursue through its diplomacy, economic leverage, and, if need be, military compulsion. And the world at large sees him -- for better or for worse -- as the authentic voice of America.

To be sure, he is not a dictator. Congress has a voice. So does the public. And so do vested interests and foreign-policy lobbies. The congressional role in declaring war is especially important not when the United States is the victim of an attack, but when the United States is planning to wage war abroad. Because America is a democracy, public support for presidential foreign-policy decisions is essential. But no one in the government or outside it can match the president's authoritative voice when [s]he speaks and then decisively acts for America.

This is true even in the face of determined opposition. Even when some lobbies succeed in gaining congressional support for their particular foreign clients in defiance of the president, for instance, many congressional signatories still quietly convey to the White House their readiness to support the president if he stands firm for "the national interest." And a president who is willing to do so publicly, while skillfully cultivating friends and allies on Capitol Hill, can then establish such intimidating credibility that it is politically unwise to confront him. This is exactly what Obama needs to do now.

Congress doesn’t solve signal – Presidential leadership is key

Tobin, Senior Online Editor of *Commentary* magazine, 9/3/2013

(Jonathan, Congress Can’t Fill Obama’s Leadership Void, http://www.commentarymagazine.com/2013/09/03/congress-cant-fill-obamas-leadership-void-syria/)

The implications of the congressional debate that will ensue on the future of American foreign policy are clear. Given the growth of isolationism on the right and the left, Obama’s decision to punt on Syria has opened the gates for those who have advocated for an American retreat from global responsibilities to gain more influence. Even if, as it is to be hoped, a majority of both houses of Congress vote to back American action in Syria, it’s not likely that the result of what will follow in the coming days will convince the world that America is still prepared to lead. Although there are good reasons to worry about any intervention in Syria, the arguments for inaction are unpersuasive. Given the stakes involved in letting Assad survive in terms of increasing the power of his Iranian and Hezbollah allies and the precedent set in terms of allowing the use of chemical weapons, the case for action in Syria is powerful.

Boehner deserves credit for speaking up after meeting with the president and making it clear the leadership of the House of Representatives is not prepared to bow to the growing chorus of politicians who are more concerned with placing limits on the executive or opposing Obama at every turn than the need to stand up against genocidal dictators. Given the refusal of many Republicans to stand up to the Rand Paul wing of their party, it is refreshing for the normally cautious House speaker to show his willingness to put the national interest above partisan concerns.

But no matter what Boehner or people like John McCain or Peter King say this week, there is no substitute for presidential leadership. As I wrote last week, it is axiomatic that liberal Democrats are far better placed to convince a majority of Americans that military action is needed in any circumstance than a conservative Republican. Though the left is just as uncomfortable with the assertion of American power as many on the right, there is little doubt that the president is far better placed than his predecessor was or any Republican might be to rally the country behind a policy that would draw a line in the sand about weapons of mass destruction. But with Obama faltering, no one should labor under the illusion that a divided Congress can either stiffen his spin or step into the leadership vacuum he has left.

### Terror

### Ext1—Gov Dosen’t Care

#### foreign backlash irrel- courts key

**Gov won’t shut it down**

Benjamin **Wittes**, editor in chief of Lawfare and a Senior Fellow in Governance Studies at the Brookings Institution. He is the author of several books and a member of the Hoover Institution's Task Force on National Security and Law, 2/27/**13**, In Defense of the Administration on Targeted Killing of Americans, www.lawfareblog.com/2013/02/in-defense-of-the-administration-on-targeted-killing-of-americans/

**This view has currency among** European **allies**, among **advocacy groups,** and in the legal **academy**. Unfortunately for its proponents, it has no currency among the three branches of government of the United States. **The courts and the executive branch have both taken the opposite view, and the Congress passed a broad authorization for the use of force** and despite many opportunities, **has never revisited that document to impose limitations by geography or to preclude force on the basis of co-belligerency**—**much less to clarify that the AUMF** does not, any longer, authorize the use of military force at all. **Congress has been repeatedly briefed on U.S. targeting decisions,** including those involving U.S. persons.[5] It was therefore surely empowered to either use the power of the purse to prohibit such action or to modify the AUMF in a way that undermined the President’s legal reasoning. **Not only has it taken neither of these steps, but Congress has also funded the relevant programs**. Moreover, as I noted above, **Congress’s recent reaffirmation of the AUMF** in the 2012 NDAA **with respect to detention, once again contains no geographical limitation**. **There is**, in other words, **a consensus among the branches of government on the point that the United States is engaged in an armed conflict that involves co-belligerent forces and follows the enemy to the new territorial ground it stakes out**. **It is a consensus that rejects the particular view of the law advanced by numerous critics. And it is a consensus on which the executive branch is entitled to rely in formulating its legal views**.

#### it’s under the radar

Ezell 9-17 (Wayne, “Robotics revolution changing warfare and public's role, Brookings scholar says,” <http://jacksonville.com/news/metro/2013-09-17/story/robotics-revolution-changing-warfare-and-publics-role-brookings-scholar>)

Read more at Jacksonville.com: http://jacksonville.com/news/metro/2013-09-17/story/robotics-revolution-changing-warfare-and-publics-role-brookings-scholar#ixzz2fkMeKV1w

Drones and other robotics are changing the nature of war, making it easier to initiate attacks and even major conflicts without public opposition, says a leading expert in 21st century warfare.

The growth in robotics and the potential for sophisticated cyber warfare are redefining military power and conflicts, but the importance of humans, especially organizational leadership, will be enhanced, said Peter W. Singer, a senior fellow at the Brookings Institution.

What began as the robots of science fiction now face us as reality and is raising serious questions relating to war, politics, ethics and business, Singer said.

As the use of drones and other robotics moves to the private sector, beyond manufacturing and into policing, journalism and other fields, they will pose new challenges, especially when they get into the wrong hands.

Even our present concept of a drone, such as the slow-moving, propeller driven Predator now used by the military, will change. Think about drones with jet-engine and stealth capability.

“These are like the Model T compared to what is coming,” Singer said in an interview.

He will speak to the Jacksonville World Affairs Council Tuesday evening on the topic of his most recent book “Wired for War: The Robotics Revolution and Conflict in the 21st Century.” That event is sold out, but more about Singer’s views and publications can be found at www.pwsinger.com.

Changing risk calculations by limiting human losses and reducing the news profile alters the dynamics of how conflicts start and are waged, says Singer, who has written articles for many of the world’s major newspapers and magazines, and has provided commentary on the military for major TV outlets in the U.S. and abroad.

“Political leaders weigh things differently when boots are on the ground,” he said.

For example, hundreds of deadly drone strikes on military targets get little attention while insertion of even a few soldiers would make major headlines.

### Al Shabaab: No Threat—S/L

#### Al Shabaab is not a threat—new magazine issue reveals leadership gap

Boniface 13 (Bosire 3-15-13, “Al-Shabaab's latest online magazine exposes weaknesses” http://sabahionline.com/en\_GB/articles/hoa/articles/features/2013/03/15/feature-01

The third issue of al-Shabaab's online magazine Gaidi Mtaani attempts to depict the militant group as united and prospering, but also offers insight into its growing weaknesses, Kenyan security analysts say. Published on March 3rd in English and Swahili, the 42-page issue portrays democracy as incompatible with Islam, interprets accidents as divine intervention, and offers crash courses on topics ranging from mobile phone security to making a Molotov cocktail. The cover shows a photo of Sheikh Aboud Rogo Mohammed, a charismatic cleric and supporter of al-Shabaab who was killed in a drive-by shooting in Mombasa on August 27th, with the headline "Catalyst of Change". Al-Shabaab attempts to inspire Rogo's followers in Kenya to join its ranks by re-printing a statement the group released on the day of his killing and a publishing a feature story only in Swahili. The statement urges Kenyan Muslims to "stand united" and "take all necessary measures to protect their religion, their honour, their property and their lives from the enemies of Islam". The story blames the Kenyan government for colluding with Western countries in the cleric's death and legalising the killing of Muslims in the Coast region, which has long had grievances with the central government over development and allocation of funding. Forging alliances to appear relevant Gaidi Mtaani also goes so far as to accept an alliance between al-Shabaab and the Kenyan secessionist group Mombasa Republican Council (MRC). "By joining MRC, al-Shabaab is hoping to have a partner in crime to replace the losses it suffered in desertions and defeats," said Coast Police Chief Aggrey Adoli. "It may also be seeking to be hosted by the MRC." Adoli told Sabahi that security forces would crack down on criminal activities in the region, dismissing the magazine's allegations that Muslims have been persecuted as unsubstantiated. "The group is using every propaganda tool to disrupt the harmonious co-existence of different faiths in the country, but we are alert to the fact," he said. Wilberforce Onchiri, a Nairobi-based security consultant and retired army major, said the militants are attempting to exploit poor people who may be persuaded by reading the magazine to engage in violence because they feel disenfranchised. "The group is targeting individuals who may be frustrated in any way … To al-Shabaab, it does not matter whether the killing is carried in the name of jihad or disgruntlement. Any mass killings will do just fine for them," he told Sabahi. People such as these can afford to make the home-made bombs featured in the issue because they can be made from inexpensive and easily available materials, Onchiri said. The tutorials show that al-Shabaab no longer enjoys safe havens and cannot conduct training sessions as easily as it used to. "The bombs crash course is testimony that they do not have a place to train [recruits] and are willing to use anyone, regardless of their motivation, to cause instability," Onchiri said. "Their aim is to spark chaos of any kind and claim responsibility to show that they matter and have influence. They want to remain relevant." The article about mobile phone security also indicates that the group is feeling the pressure from security forces, he said. Al-Shabaab's growing desperation The magazine's new issue continues al-Shabaab's string of public relations initiatives that aim to counter reports about infighting and financial challenges that plague the group and undermine its leadership. On December 26th, the Muslim Youth Centre (MYC), which claims to be al-Shabaab recruiting arm in East Africa, released a press statement titled "Inciting and Inspiring Jihad: MYC in 2012", in which it boasts about the Kenyan mujahideen's supposed successes. On February 18th, an unknown author who claimed links to al-Shabaab released a document titled "Turning away from the truth won't make it disappear: Demystifying the Abu Mansur saga". The document aims to discredit American-born jihadist Omar Hammani, also known as Abu Mansour al-Amriki, a former spokesman for al-Shabaab who has recently become publicly critical of the group. On February 25th, al-Shabaab's media arm al-Kataib Foundation released a recruitment video called "Mujahideen Moments", which tried to underscore the group's message that all is well between local and foreign jihadists. The latest edition of Gaidi Mtaani also takes issue with democracy, a day before Kenya's general elections on March 4th, making the case that elections and the parliamentary system are incompatible with Islam. Yet Sheikh Mohammed Hassan, chairman of the National Muslim Forum's Wajir branch, said al-Shabaab is twisting the definition of democracy to suit its purpose of terror and take advantage of those who do not know any better. Hassan pointed out that al-Shabaab defines democracy as granting man absolute power to make laws. "Owing to this, it has made him a god besides God and a partner concerning the right of legislating for the creation," the magazine says. "Democracy, with its parliaments and elections, is nothing but a deception which drugs the Islamic capacities." But Hassan rejected al-Shabaab's depiction of democracy. "Politics and religion are very different," he told Sabahi. "No one is worshipped in politics to warrant the comparison with God. People participate in electing leaders so that they can have people to steer them to development." Al-Shabaab lacking leadership The first edition of Gaidi Mtaani, or "Terrorist on the Street", was published in April 2012 and mocked the Kenya Defence Forces' Operation Linda Nchi (Protect the Country) by changing the name to Operation Protect Islam. The second edition, published in July, focused on Kismayo, the militant group's last remaining major stronghold at that time, which it lost in September. Eight months later, al-Shabaab's waning influence has left it with little choice but to ratchet up the propaganda, said Nairobi-based security consultant Reuben Ngugi. "This third issue is all about reacting to events rather than providing the much needed leadership to the demoralised group," he told Sabahi. The magazine's inconsistent frequency shows that al-Shabaab's military capability has weakened and it is desperately seeking new recruits, he said. In addition, its sustained rebuttals clearly reveal internal rifts. "

are the so called al-Shabaab leaders like [Ahmed] Godane at this moment when they are most needed to provide [leadership]? Why are the bigwigs delegating their roles to the foot soldiers to deliver calls to action? It can only mean that the group lacks clear leadership," Ngugi said.

### A2 “Retaliation (Ayson Indict)

#### Disregard their impact evidence – assumes the worst-case scenario

#### Ayson ’10 – Professor of Strategic Studies and Director of the Centre for Strategic Studies: New Zealand at the Victoria

University of Wellington (Robert, “After a Terrorist Nuclear Attack: Envisaging Catalytic Effects,” Studies in Conflict & Terrorism, Volume 33, Issue 7, July, Available Online to Subscribing Institutions via InformaWorld)

For argument's sake let it be assumed then that the hypothetical nuclear terrorist attack occurs in the continental United States, and that there are very serious civilian casualties and structural damage radiating out from ground zero.34 What response is most likely to eventuate from the superpower so targeted? It might be assumed that the response will automatically be a severe one: a magnified version of America's response to 9/11, which has had a major impact on international politics, including the campaigns that were launched in Afghanistan and Iraq, and the other components of the “War on Terror.” But before doing so, it is useful to realize that there is an entire spectrum of potential (or at least conceivable) responses that could result. These range from very little obvious action to the most formidable display of retaliatory power.

## 1NR

### CIR: Impact—Competitiveness 2NC

#### No impact defense

#### Immigration reform sustains US economic primacy – prevents military withdrawal and global nuclear war – controls the escalation of all global conflict – that’s Khalilzad

#### Economic leadership is the lynchpin to global cooperation – solves all existential threats

Haas 13 – President of the CFR, former director of policy planning at the Department of State (Richard N, “The World Without America”, April 2013, <http://www.cfr.org/us-strategy-and-politics/world-without-america/p30599>, )

But, like most temptations, the urge to gloat at America's imperfections and struggles ought to be resisted. People around the globe should be careful what they wish for. America's failure to deal with its internal challenges would come at a steep price. Indeed, the rest of the world's stake in American success is nearly as large as that of the US itself.¶ Part of the reason is economic. The US economy still accounts for about one-quarter of global output. If US growth accelerates, America's capacity to consume other countries' goods and services will increase, thereby boosting growth around the world. At a time when Europe is drifting and Asia is slowing, only the US (or, more broadly, North America) has the potential to drive global economic recovery.¶ The US remains a unique source of innovation. Most of the world's citizens communicate with mobile devices based on technology developed in Silicon Valley; likewise, the Internet was made in America. More recently, new technologies developed in the US greatly increase the ability to extract oil and natural gas from underground formations. This technology is now making its way around the globe, allowing other societies to increase their energy production and decrease both their reliance on costly imports and their carbon emissions.¶ The US is also an invaluable source of ideas. Its world-class universities educate a significant percentage of future world leaders. More fundamentally, the US has long been a leading example of what market economies and democratic politics can accomplish. People and governments around the world are far more likely to become more open if the American model is perceived to be succeeding.¶ Finally, the world faces many serious challenges, ranging from the need to halt the spread of weapons of mass destruction, fight climate change, and maintain a functioning world economic order that promotes trade and investment to regulating practices in cyberspace, improving global health, and preventing armed conflicts. These problems will not simply go away or sort themselves out.¶ While Adam Smith's "invisible hand" may ensure the success of free markets, it is powerless in the world of geopolitics. Order requires the visible hand of leadership to formulate and realize global responses to global challenges.¶ Don't get me wrong: None of this is meant to suggest that the US can deal effectively with the world's problems on its own. Unilateralism rarely works. It is not just that the US lacks the means; the very nature of contemporary global problems suggests that only collective responses stand a good chance of succeeding.¶ But multilateralism is much easier to advocate than to design and implement. Right now there is only one candidate for this role: the US. No other country has the necessary combination of capability and outlook.¶ This brings me back to the argument that the US must put its house in order – economically, physically, socially, and politically – if it is to have the resources needed to promote order in the world. Everyone should hope that it does: The alternative to a world led by the US is not a world led by China, Europe, Russia, Japan, India, or any other country, but rather a world that is not led at all. Such a world would almost certainly be characterized by chronic crisis and conflict. That would be bad not just for Americans, but for the vast majority of the planet's inhabitants.

#### Turns Iran and China – economic decline = pullout, percep of weakness

#### Turns terror – border terror, econ decline = root cause of terror

#### --khalizad

#### Perception alone triggers global war --- turns every impact

**O’Hanlon 12** — Kenneth G. Lieberthal, Director of the John L. Thornton China Center and Senior Fellow in Foreign Policy and Global Economy and Development at the Brookings Institution, former Professor at the University of Michigan, served as special assistant to the president for national security affairs and senior director for Asia on the National Security Council, holds a Ph.D. from Columbia University, and Michael E. O'Hanlon, Director of Research and Senior Fellow in Foreign Policy at the Brookings Institution, Visiting Lecturer at Princeton University, Adjunct Professor at Johns Hopkins University, holds a Ph.D. from Princeton University, 2012 (“The Real National Security Threat: America's Debt,” *Los Angeles Times*, July 10th, Available Online at http://www.brookings.edu/research/opinions/2012/07/10-economy-foreign-policy-lieberthal-ohanlon, Accessed 07-12-2012)

Lastly, American economic weaknessundercuts U.S. leadership abroad**. Other countries** sense our weakness **and wonder about our purport 7ed decline. If this perception becomes more widespread, and the case that we are in decline becomes more persuasive, countries will begin to** take actions that reflect their skepticism about America's future**. Allies and friends will** doubt our commitment **and may** pursue nuclear weapons **for their own security**, for example; **adversaries will** sense opportunity **and be** less restrained in throwing around their weight **in their own neighborhoods. The crucial Persian Gulf and Western Pacific regions will likely become** less stable**.** Major war will become more likely.

When running for president last time, **Obama eloquently articulated big foreign policy visions: healing America's breach with the Muslim world, controlling global** climate change**, dramatically** curbing global poverty **through development aid,** moving toward a world free of nuclear weapons**. These were, and remain, worthy if elusive goals. However**, for Obama or his successor, **there is now** a much more urgent big-picture issue: restoring U.S. economic strength**.** Nothing else is really possible if that fundamental prerequisite to effective foreign policy is not reestablished.

#### Collapse of the US economy causes global instability

Kagan 12 – Senior Fellow @ Brookings, PhD from American University (Robert, “How the fiscal crisis puts national security at risk”, <http://articles.washingtonpost.com/2012-11-12/opinions/35504289_1_defense-budget-financial-crisis-fiscal-crisis>, )

In the interest of national security, and the preservation of the world order the United States has upheld and benefited from since World War II, Republicans and Democrats must make the necessary compromises and agree on a deal to address the nation’s fiscal crisis in both the near and the long term.¶ I am not an economist or a budget analyst, so I don’t presume to know exactly what a “grand bargain” should look like. It seems pretty obvious that a compromise will require both tax reform, including if necessary some tax increases, and entitlement reform, since those programs are the biggest driver of the fiscal crisis. What I do know, as a national security analyst, is that our continuing failure to address the crisis in a way that makes possible a return to stable economic growth has become a serious foreign policy problem.¶ In a world that still looks to U.S. leadership on many issues, despite what some say, our utter dysfunction on matters involving the basic health of our economy does not inspire confidence. Nor will the United States act with confidence abroad while we are unable to address our problems at home. It is no accident that all the misguided talk of a “post-American world” came after the financial crisis exploded.¶ A principal victim in the absence of a deal to address the fiscal crisis has been and will continue to be the national security budget. Republicans and Democrats alike have been prepared to see hundreds of billions of dollars cut from the defense budget, with even more cuts coming if Congress fails to avoid the automatic “sequestration.” The already shrunken foreign-aid budget is also being cut at a time when, in the Middle East, for instance, we need to be spending more, not less, to support stable economies as the basis for democratic reform.¶ It would be one thing if the world were kindly affording us a timeout, a nice period of placidity in international affairs, while we get our house in order. But the world is not cooperating. The international environment is becoming more, not less, challenging. Iran continues to move closer to obtaining a nuclear weapon, and the prospect of a conflict cannot be dismissed. The outcome of the Arab revolutions remains uncertain. The tumult in Syria threatens to embroil the entire region. The future of Afghanistan and nuclear-armed Pakistan remains worrying. Terrorists continue to expand their efforts in the Middle East and Africa. China’s military is growing, and at a time of changing leadership some forces in the Chinese system are pushing for greater assertiveness in the South China Sea and elsewhere. Even absent some new crisis, both Leon Panetta and Bob Gates have warned of the catastrophic consequences of deeper defense cuts to the nation’s security.¶ We need to dispel the illusion that cuts to the national security budget really save us money. Some Republicans who oppose compromising on taxes make the same miscalculation as Democrats who favor deeper defense cuts. They think that if the United States would simply scale back its role in the world, it could save money and make raising further revenue unnecessary. This is a faulty assumption. The present global economic and political order, which has provided the environment in which the United States has grown and prospered for decades, is built on and around American power and influence. Were the United States to cease playing its role in upholding this order, were we to retreat from East Asia or to back away from the challenge posed by a nuclear Iran, the result could only be global instability. From a purely economic perspective, it would be far more costly to restore order and stability — both essential to a prosperous global economy — than it would be to sustain it. Indeed, if there is no deal on the fiscal cliff and the long-term fiscal crisis because Republicans and Democrats won’t make a sensible compromise on raising revenue and reforming entitlements, and the result is further cuts in the defense and foreign affairs budgets, then the cost — including the dollar cost — could make the present budget arguments look absurdly petty.¶ The point is, none of the elements of a deal to address the fiscal crisis — not taxes or entitlements or anything else — can be considered in isolation. We should have learned the lesson of the 1920s and 1930s, another period when a global economic crisis was inconveniently accompanied by an unsettled and dangerous geopolitical situation. Then, American leaders concentrated on trying to address their domestic economic problems, somehow imagining these could be separated from the broader international economic and political environment. The United States actively retreated from global involvement to focus on what these days we would call “nation-building at home.” The result was disastrous both at home and abroad.¶ The United States is far more deeply integrated in the global economy than it was 80 years ago, and the well-being of the global economy is far more dependent on the security and stability that U.S. power and influence provide. The world won’t stand still while Americans fight these political battles. And it won’t be forgiving of decisions that weaken our ability to defend the international order in which Americans have for so long prospered.

### CIR Thumper Ans: A2 “Health Care”

#### CIR is top of the agenda—not healthcare

Chakrabory 10-24-13 (Barnini, staff writer, "A pivot in priorities? Obama touts immigration reform" Fox News) www.foxnews.com/politics/2013/10/24/pivot-in-priorities-obama-touts-immigration-reform/

President Obama shifted focus Thursday from the pile-up of problems related to the rollout of his health care law to another prickly political topic: immigration. Obama made his case for comprehensive reform at a White House event and insisted that Congress had enough time to pass the immigration bill by the end of the year. “It doesn’t get easier to put it off,” Obama said.

#### Top of the docket – no healthcare thumper

AP 10/24 – Associated Press (“Obama urges Congress to finish work on an immigration overhaul,” Oct 24th, 2013, <http://www.nydailynews.com/news/politics/obama-speaks-immigration-reform-article-1.1495186>)//HAL

President Barack Obama called on Congress Thursday to finish work on an immigration overhaul by the end of the year, a lofty goal that will be difficult to meet given the staunch opposition of many House Republicans. While immigration remains one of Obama’s top second term priorities, the issue has been overshadowed for months, most recently by the 16-day partial government shutdown. The President’s shift to a greater focus on immigration came as the White House was seeking to shift the conversation away from the deeply problematic rollout of Obama’s health care law. During remarks at the White House, Obama insisted that Congress has the necessary time to finish an immigration bill by the end of the year. President Barack Obama and Vice President Joe Biden attend a talk Thursday in the East Room. The pair won an overwhelming majority of Hispanic voters in the 2012 presidential election. President Barack Obama and Vice President Joe Biden attend a talk Thursday in the East Room. The pair won an overwhelming majority of Hispanic voters in the 2012 presidential election. The Senate passed sweeping legislation this summer that would provide an eventual path to citizenship for some 11 million immigrants living here illegally and would tighten border security. But the measure has languished in the GOP-led House. “It doesn’t get easier to put it off,” Obama said, during an event in the East Room. The White House was buoyed by comments this week from House Speaker John Boehner, R-Ohio, who said he was optimistic his chamber could act on immigration by year’s end. But Boehner has long had trouble rallying support from the conservative wing of his caucus and it’s unclear whether he can get their backing for the comprehensive bill Obama is seeking. Most House Republicans have said they prefer a piecemeal approach to fixing the nation’s fractured immigration system. Immediately following Obama’s remarks, a spokesman said Boehner was opposed to “massive” legislation that no one understands. The President greets supporters of immigration reform after at an event in the East Room during which he asked members of the House of Representatives to pass immigration reform already approved by the Senate. The President greets supporters of immigration reform after at an event in the East Room during which he asked members of the House of Representatives to pass immigration reform already approved by the Senate. “The House is committed to a common sense, step-by-step approach that gives Americans confidence that reform is done the right way,” spokesman Brendan Buck said. “We hope that the president will work with us — not against us — as we pursue this deliberate approach.” Obama, along with some Republican leaders, had hoped that the growing political power of Hispanics would clear the way for an immigration overhaul, a goal that has long eluded Washington. No sweeping immigration legislation has been passed since a bill co-sponsored by Wyoming Republican Sen. Alan Simpson, more recently co-chairman of the Simpson-Bowles deficit commission, was enacted in 1986. Obama will call on Congress to act when he speaks in the East Room of the White House. Obama won an overwhelming majority of Hispanic voters in the 2012 presidential election and some political analysts believe that the country’s shifting demographics will make it difficult for Republicans to win the White House without boosting their appeal to the Latino community. But most tea party-backed Republicans oppose measures that would grant legal status to people already in the country illegally, even with the fines and long waiting period that would be imposed by the Senate measure. The recent shutdown and debt ceiling fight also fueled deeper resentment toward Obama among those lawmakers, who got virtually nothing out of the deal that was reached to reopen the government and lift the borrowing limit. In the wake of that messy stretch for Congress, Obama urged lawmakers to see immigration has an opportunity to show the public that government can work. “Rather than create problems, let’s prove to the American people that Washington can actually solve some problems,” Obama said.

#### Doesn’t thump

Rueters, 10/24 (“Amid Healthcare Woes, Obama Plans To Address Immigration Reform,” Oct 24th, 2013, [http://latino.foxnews.com/latino/politics/2013/10/24/amid-healthcare-woes-obama-plans-to-address-immigration-reform/)//HAL](http://latino.foxnews.com/latino/politics/2013/10/24/amid-healthcare-woes-obama-plans-to-address-immigration-reform/%29//HAL)

WASHINGTON –  As the White House struggles to fix the problem-plagued rollout of its healthcare reform law, President Barack Obama on Thursday will try to focus attention on another policy priority - immigration reform - with a call for congressional action. The president, who listed immigration as one of three priorities for this year after the 16-day government shutdown concluded, will make a statement at 10:35 a.m. (1435 GMT) at the White House urging lawmakers to finish work on measures to strengthen U.S. borders and provide a pathway toward citizenship for millions of people who are in the United States illegally.

#### Obama deflects health care controversy

Dallas Morning News 10-21-13 (“Obama defends Affordable Care Act, acknowledges tech problems”, <http://www.dallasnews.com/news/local-news/20131021-obama-defends-affordable-care-act-acknowledges-tech-problems.ece>, )

WASHINGTON — President Barack **Obama offered an** impassioned defense **of the Affordable Care Act** on Monday, **acknowledging** the **technical failures** of the HealthCare.gov website but providing little new information about the problems with the online portal or the efforts by government contractors to fix it. With Republican critics seizing on the website’s issues as evidence of deeper flaws in the health care law, **Obama sought to** deflect attention **from the continuing problems by focusing on ways to get coverage without going online**. Like a TV pitchman, the president urged viewers to call the government’s toll-free number for health insurance, acknowledging that “the wait times probably might go up a little bit now.” In remarks in the Rose Garden, Obama acknowledged serious technical issues with the website, declaring that “no one is madder than me.” He offered no new information about how many people have managed to enroll since the online exchanges opened Oct. 1. And he did not address questions about who, if anyone, might be held responsible for the failure. **The president and his top aides** played down **the importance of the online marketplace** that his administration once heralded as the key to the law’s success. Obama promised that officials are working to fix the website but said that Republican critics should “stop rooting” for the failure of a law that provides health insurance to people who do not have it. “**We did not wage this long and contentious battle just around a website**,” Obama told supporters. “That’s not what this was about. We waged this battle to make sure that millions of Americans in the wealthiest nation on earth finally have the same chance to get the same security of affordable, quality health care as anybody else.”

### CIR Will Pass: 2NC Wall

**Immigration will pass now—Obama’s new push will build House Republican support for incremental legislation that will be bundled with citizenship – FRAMING ISSUE – PC is the only relevant question because he can persuade remaining holdouts and sustain existing votes – that’s Bennett and Matthews**

#### The stars have aligned---Obama’s push secures quick passage in both houses

- a2 shutdown thumper

- a2 citizenship

- vote soon

Clift 10-25-13 (Eleanor, “Obama, Congress Get Back to the Immigration Fight”, <http://www.thedailybeast.com/articles/2013/10/25/obama-congress-get-back-to-the-immigration-fight.html>, )

After months of relative quiet on the subject of immigration reform, President **Obama reclaimed center stage** in an event in the East Room of the White House Thursday, **urging the Republican**-controlled **House to take up bipartisan legislation** passed in June by a big margin (68-32) in the Senate. “It doesn’t get easier to put off,” he said, a pointed reminder to Republicans that the politics are stacked against them if they punt on an issue of central importance to the fastest growing bloc of voters in the country. Neutralizing the Democrats’ advantage among Hispanics is crucial to the GOP’s presidential prospects, and could improve Congress’ image in the wake of the government shutdown. “Rather than create problems, let’s prove to the American people that Washington can actually solve some problems,” Obama implored. Among those assembled in the East Room for the president’s remarks was Frank Sharry, founder and director of America’s Voice and a longtime activist for immigration reform. Asked what he was thinking as he listened to Obama’s 12-minute speech, he termed it “a modest push,” noting that Obama has been “remarkably restrained” on the issue when you consider that overhauling the nation’s broken immigration system is his top second-term priority. Obama sidelined himself in deference to Republicans who needed room to build support without being aligned with a president so many in the GOP caucus reflexively dislike. But now with the shutdown behind them and Republicans on the defensive, Obama saw an opening to get back in the game. His message, says Sharry: “‘Hey, I’m flexible,’ which after the shutdown politics was important, and he implied ‘if you don’t do it, I’m coming after you.’” For Obama and the Democrats, **immigration reform is a win-win issue**. They want an overhaul for the country and their constituents. If they don’t get it, they will hammer Republicans in demographically changing districts in California, Nevada, and Florida, where they could likely pick up seats—not enough to win control of the House, but, paired with what Sharry calls “the shutdown narrative,” Democratic operatives are salivating at the prospect of waging that campaign. **Some Republicans understand the stakes**, **and** former vice-presidential candidate and budget maven Paul **Ryan is at the center of a newly energized backroom effort to craft legislation that would deal with the thorniest aspect of immigration reform** for Republicans: the disposition of 11 million people in the country illegally. Rep. Raul Labrador (R-ID), an early advocate of reform who abandoned the effort some months ago, argues that Obama’s tough bargaining during the shutdown means Republicans can’t trust him on immigration. “When have they ever trusted him?” asks Sharry. “Nobody is asking them to do this for Obama. They should do this for the country and for themselves.... We’re not talking about tax increases or gun violence. This is something the pillars of the Republican coalition are strongly in favor of.” Among those pillars is Chamber of Commerce President Tom **Donahue**, who on Monday **noted** the **generally good feelings about immigration reform** among disparate groups, among them business and labor. **He expressed optimism** that **the House could pass something, go to conference and resolve differences with the Senate, get a bill and have the president sign it** “and guess what, government works! Everybody is looking for something positive to take home.” The Wall Street Journal reported Thursday that **GOP donors are withholding contributions to lawmakers blocking reform**, and that Republicans for Immigration Reform, headed by former Bush Cabinet official, Carlos Gutierrez, is running an Internet ad urging action. Next week, evangelical Christians affiliated with the Evangelical Immigration Table will be in Washington to press Congress to act with charity toward people in the country without documentation, treating them as they would Jesus. The law-enforcement community has also stepped forward repeatedly to embrace an overhaul. House Speaker John Boehner says he wants legislation, but not the “massive” bill that the Senate passed and that Obama supports. **The House seems inclined to act**—if it acts at all—on a series of smaller bills starting with “Kids Out,” a form of the Dream Act that grants a path to citizenship for young people brought to the U.S. as children; then agriculture-worker and high-tech visas, accompanied by tougher border security. The sticking point is the 11 million people in the country illegally, and finding a compromise between Democrats’ insistence that reform include a path to citizenship, and Republicans’ belief that offering any kind of relief constitutes amnesty and would reward people for breaking the law. The details matter hugely, but **what a handful of Republicans, led by Ryan, appear to be crafting is legalization** for most of the 11 million but without any mention of citizenship. It wouldn’t create a new or direct or special path for people who came to the U.S. illegally or overstayed their visa. **It would allow them to earn legal status** through some yet-to-be-determined steps, and once they get it, they go to the end of a very long line that could have people waiting for decades. The Senate bill contains a 13-year wait. However daunting that sounds, **the potential for meaningful reform is** tantalizingly close **with Republicans actively engaged in preparing their proposal, pressure building** from the business community and religious leaders, **and a short window before the end of the year** to redeem the reputation of Congress and the Republican Party after a bruising takedown. The pieces are all there for long-sought immigration reform. **We could be** a few weeks away **from an historic House vote**, or headed for a midterm election where Republicans once again are on the wrong side of history and demography.

#### Momentum – GOP support coalescing

Jacoby 10-22-13 (Tamar, “Immigration reform would help GOP”, <http://www.cnn.com/2013/10/21/opinion/jacoby-immigration-after-shutdown/?hpt=ju_c2>, )

What are **the chances** that **the House will** now **move ahead on immigration**? The answer will **have** less **to do with** immigration than with **how the budget battle has changed the larger political dynamic in Washington.**¶House Republicans' views on immigration are untested, and **many** advocates for reform **believe they are implacably hostile.** But **the truth is Republican opinion has been** evolving **since the 2012 election**. More and more House Republicans, **perhaps** the majority, **know** that **reform is overdue and that the GOP must be part of the solution** -- to remain competitive with Latino voters and because it's the right thing to do.¶ **Individual lawmakers and essential staff continued to work on the issue even through the dark days of the shutdown.** And **members are** coalescing **around** answers to the hardest of the hard questions: what to do about immigrants living in the United States illegally? House Majority Leader Eric **Cantor is working on a bill that would create a path to citizenship** for "Dreamers" brought to the U.S. illegally as children.¶ And **one recent informal count found 84 House Republicans** -- more than one third of the total -- **in favor of legal status** for the Dreamers' parents.¶ Bottom line: If it weren't for the rancor of the budget brawl, the House might be in a good place on immigration, with Republicans ready to move forward and pass a package of measures they could send to a conference with the Senate bill.¶

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

#### Passage likely – opposition overstated

Leopold 10-24-13 (David, “Immigration Reform Is Alive and Kicking on Capitol Hill”, <http://www.huffingtonpost.com/david-leopold/immigration-reform-is-alive_b_4136478.html>, )

As it turns out, reports of the death of immigration reform were greatly exaggerated. Rep. Mario **Diaz-Balart** (R-Fla.), Rep. Darrell **Issa** (R-Calif.) **and other House Republicans and Democrats are** reportedly **working on various immigration plans,** some of which, including a bill to be released next week by Issa, deal with the toughest issue of all -- what to do about the nation's 11.7 million undocumented immigrants. And Speaker John **Boehner** (R-Ohio) **says** that **immigration reform could get to the floor of the House before the end of the year**. Is common sense breaking out on Capitol Hill? That might be too much to ask for. But at least the GOP leadership seems to be taking a hard look at political reality. Here are **four big reasons** why **an immigration overhaul is** likely to happen **by the end of the year**: 1. **Immigration reform is a political win-win for Democrats and Republicans**. I can't say that either the Democrats or Republicans came out of last week's shutdown and debt limit brinksmanship looking good to the American people, but **the whole debacle hurt the Republicans** much more. A recent NBCNews/Wall Street Journal poll found that the public blames the GOP more than President Obama by 53 percent to 31 percent, a 21 point margin. And approval ratings for the Republican party are at an all-time low -- never before in the history of polling have the numbers shown such blatant disappointment. **Immigration reform gives the Republicans a unique opportunity to do something big, to reach across the aisle and work with House Democrats to pass real immigration reform** either in a comprehensive package or as a series of bills that ultimately have a chance to fix what's wrong with our immigration system. It would be a colossal mistake for the House GOP not to seize the chance to lead on immigration reform. The American people want it, the country needs it, and it's a pathway to political redemption for the badly bruised Republican party. 2. **The immigration reform coalition is unified and ready to make** the final push. **A broad coalition** of business, labor, faith-based and ethnic groups are **full of energy and ready to** finish the jobthe Senate started in the spring. In the midst of the combined "shutdown and debt ceiling" crisis, thousands of Americans descended on Washington to join the "March for Dignity and Respect." Eight members of Congress, including civil rights icon John Lewis (D-Ga.), joined together in an historic act of civil disobedience and were arrested near the steps of the Capitol in a show of solidarity with the immigration reform movement. As Rep. Charles Rangel (D-N.Y.) wrote recently in his The Huffington Post column "Why I Went To Jail":

**Will pass --- enough Republicans will give in --- proponents have strong leverage**

Byron **York 10/23**/13, chief political correspondent at The Washington Examiner, “Commentary: Written off for dead, **immigration reform could still live**,” Elko Daily, http://elkodaily.com/news/opinion/commentary-written-off-for-dead-immigration-reform-could-still-live/article\_a6d24b4a-3c57-11e3-99c6-001a4bcf887a.html?comment\_form=true

The Senate and House had not even settled the final details of ending the government shutdown before President Obama was on to his next priority. “We still need to pass a law to fix our broken immigration system,” Obama said on the night of Oct. 16 as Capitol Hill scrambled to end the standoff. In case anyone missed it, the next morning he declared: “We should finish the job of fixing our broken immigration system.”¶ There’s no doubt **the president wants an immigration deal**; he’s talked about it for years, and now can’t put it off until another term. But could the Republican-controlled House of Representatives — exhausted, dazed and confused after the self-inflicted battering of the last few weeks — actually get itself together to pass a reform bill to go along with the Gang of Eight bill the Senate already passed?¶ The prospect alone makes some observers laugh. “People talking about immigration being next: have you been watching the House?” tweeted National Review’s Jonathan Strong during the worst of the shutdown battle, adding the hashtag “#craziness.” In this (entirely reasonable) view, there’s no way the fractured GOP could ever unite to pass such a far-reaching piece of legislation.¶ But that doesn’t keep immigration reformers from trying — and hoping. “**There is still a window,”** says one House GOP aide involved in crafting a reform proposal. “**The leadership has said keep working on it and see what you can do.”**¶ **Republican immigration proponents have been quietly talking to GOP members throughout** even the craziest days of **the shutdown and default fights. They report** some **progress**. Yes, the most conservative House Republicans are mostly against them. But **those with a libertarian bent are** more **open to the cause.** The aide says **reformers have had good meetings** “with a few of those guys who were with Ted Cruz at Tortilla Coast,” referring to the House conservatives who met with the Texas senator at a Washington, D.C. restaurant and ended up holding out longest against a deal to end the shutdown.¶ But the problem for reformers is not the fractiousness of House Republicans, although that doesn’t help. The problem is that the reformers have never found a way to balance the border security demands of conservatives with the reformers’ demand for quick legalization of the 11 million-plus immigrants currently in the United States illegally. The conservatives must have security first, and then legalization (and even then, some won’t ever support reform). The reformers won’t wait until security is in place before starting legalization.¶ The Senate papered over the problem by throwing billions of dollars at border security in the final rush to pass the Gang of Eight bill. But that didn’t make the Gang’s solution any more attractive to House conservatives. “I think there would be overwhelming opposition from within the ranks to going to conference with the Gang of Eight bill,” one conservative House member said in an email exchange. “Indeed, this would be way more divisive than the last four weeks have been for the House GOP.”¶ The conservatives seek to avoid a scenario in which the House passes some sort of immigration bill, goes to conference with the Senate, and comes out of the negotiations with a bill that looks a lot like the Gang of Eight’s. “Everyone has seen the bad faith exhibited by Obama and (Senate Majority Leader Harry) Reid during this fiscal fight, and I can’t imagine anyone making the case that a final (immigration) product would reflect conservative principles in any fashion,” the lawmaker says. “Reid has all but said that **no matter what the House passes the Senate will simply jam the Gang of Eight bill through a conference committee.”**¶ That skepticism is probably shared by a large number of House Republicans, perhaps enough to kill any reform proposal. But the **reformers**, led by Obama, are still trying. They have the Senate bill in their pocket. They **have nearly unanimous Democratic support plus a significant number of Republicans. They have the support of powerful interest groups. And they have money, money, money.**¶ At a recent Congressional Hispanic Conference meeting, Democratic Rep. John Yarmuth of Kentucky noted that the **forces of comprehensive immigration reform include vastly wealthy businesses willing to spend big to win. And the other side? “There is no money** on the other side of the issue,” Yarmuth said. “There is nobody out there ready to spend $100 million against this.” For the pro-reform side, supporters like Facebook founder Mark Zuckerberg — who wants looser visa standards for foreign high-tech workers — can rustle up that much with the help of a few Silicon Valley friends.

### CIR Will Pass: A2 “Shutdown Poisons Well”

#### Shut down doesn’t take out CIR - House Republicans are working on CIR—the extremists their cards cite aren’t representative

Benen 10-24-13 (Steve, staff writer, "Putting immigration back on the front burner" www.msnbc.com/rachel-maddow-show/putting-immigration-back-the-front-burner

But President Obama hasn’t given up hope on comprehensive immigration reform. It was the issue he emphasized as the shutdown crises neared its end, and it’s the issue he’ll push later this morning in a speech at the White House. The obvious question, of course, is whether there’s any reason at all to believe the Republican-led House will consider the bipartisan package already approved by the Senate. Several prominent GOP lawmakers, including “Gang of Eight” member Sen. Marco Rubio (R-Fla.), have said the recent crises make success less likely because Obama hurt Republicans’ feelings when they shut down the government. But my MSNBC colleague Benjy Sarlin had a report yesterday on a glimmer of hope from one key Republican in particular. Immigration reform faces an uphill climb this year, but Speaker John Boehner says the House is still working on its own legislation after abandoning the Senate’s already passed bipartisan plan. “I still think immigration reform is an important subject that needs to be addressed, and I’m hopeful,” Boehner told reporters on Wednesday when asked about the issue. Also note, Rep. Mario Diaz-Balart (R-Fla.) told Greg Sargent this week that an unspecified number of House Republicans are still in negotiations to develop a piecemeal immigration proposal. That’s not exactly a guarantee anyone can take to the bank, though as Greg noted, the fact that there’s any progress at all among House GOP lawmakers “means not all Republicans are using the shutdown loss as a way to bail on immigration reform.” For those who’ve followed the debate closely, skepticism has quickly become the norm, and for good reason. We’ve heard talk from Diaz-Balart and others for months about imminent progress, which is always just out of reach. That said, there are at least some indications that reform isn’t completely dead in the lower chamber, As the Speaker very likely knows, House Republicans won’t welcome the challenge of explaining why they killed a popular, bipartisan bill that lowers the deficit and boosts the economy, and which enjoys the support of the American mainstream, business leaders, religious leaders, GOP strategists, and leaders from the Latino community. For that matter, if the party wants to protect its majority next year, House Republicans would benefit from having at least one legislative accomplishment to represent four years in the majority.

#### Leadership will pressure the GOP to get into line because of the shutdown debacle

NATIONAL REVIEW 10—22, www.nationalreview.com/corner/361941/shutdown-amnesty-rich-lowry

My fear is that having stuck it to the establishment with a defund strategy that, unfortunately, could never work, House Republicans will now turn around and do the establishment’s bidding on so-called comprehensive immigration reform.**¶** 1) The Republican leadership is going to feel pressure to do some sort of bi-partisan pivot in a misbegotten attempt to repair the party’s image, which at least for now is uniformly in the toilet in every poll.¶ 2) The political judgment of the groups and members who favored the shutdown strategy and most strongly oppose amnesty is going to be highly suspect after defunding didn’t work. This will give them less influence in the immigration fight than they would have had otherwise.¶ 3) The supporters of defunding in the House could use a few dozen members to drive the rest of the caucus. The dynamic will be different on immigration. Because Democrats all opposed any fiscal measure offered by the Republican leadership, the votes of those few dozen members were essential to passing anything. On immigration, Democrats could well support incremental immigration measures to get to a conference with the Senate, meaning a few dozen Republican votes against don’t mean anything anymore.If the upshot of all this is that Obamacare is not defunded, the Republican party’s standing is diminished and we get a disastrous immigration bill, it will depressing indeed.

#### CIR will pass—1996 shutdown empirics prove

Beadle 10-21-13 (Amanda, staff writer, "After Government Reopens, Calls for Immigration Reform Build" Immigration Impact) immigrationimpact.com/2013/10/21/after-government-reopens-calls-for-immigration-reform-build/

Other members of Congress are more optimistic, particularly because immigration reform could be a boon for both parties. Rep. Luis Gutierrez (D-IL), long a champion of a bipartisan solution, told USA Today that lessons from the 1996 government shutdown could offer some optimism. The aftermath of the shutdown led to Congress passing several “big things,” including welfare reform, to prove that Congress could still function. “It was in people’s self-interest to pass some good stuff,” Gutierrez said. “That’s what’s going to drive a lot of what goes on around here.” And it would only take a few GOP House members, according to Rep. Xavier Becerra (D-CA). “We just need a few courageous Republicans to stand up and say they’re ready,” he said. The Washington Post wrote in an editorial last week that “it takes political courage to get important things done in Washington.” So far in the immigration debate, the editorial adds, House Judiciary Chairman Bob Goodlatte (R-VA) and other House leaders have only offered out of touch measures that would further militarize the border without offering a path to citizenship for the 11 million undocumented immigrants already in the U.S. “That won’t solve the problem, for the Republican Party or the country,” according to the Washington Post’s editorial. As members of Congress get closer to the 2014 midterm elections, the common wisdom holds that it becomes more difficult for any major piece of legislation to get sufficient support. Consequently, some commentators are arguing that the window for immigration reform is quickly closing. But the 2014 calculus also has to include issues like the fallout from the government shutdown and the breadth of support for an issue among constituents. From that angle, immigration reform, which has wide support even among Republican voters still has a fighting chance, assuming, as the Washington Post editorialized, that courage and common sense prevail.

### CIR Theory: A2 “Intrinsicness”

#### Link proves the DA is intrinsic – Obama will have to spend political capital to get the plan done.

#### We should evaluate the politics DA as an intrinsic cost of the plan

#### Decisionmaking – Willpower is a finite resource both in Congress and our personal lives – debating the politics DA lets us practice being realistic about our ability to make and stick to tough choices.

#### Negotiations – Politics gives us a unique opportunity to learn about how negotiations operate – that’s an essential skill for good advocates.

#### Especially important for this topic – Learning about domestic backlash to contentious Middle East policies equips us to design policies with better chances of implementation – the politics DA is often the only good neg ground.

#### Intrinsicness is a voting issue –1) Moving target - affs should have to defend the plan to the death2) Kills ground - we would have no DAs since the USFG has unlimited agential ambit.

#### Politics DAs are good they force current events research on a topic that stays the same and we gain education about the political effects of the plan – which is key to prevent civic disengagement later in life.3) Counterintep - they get topical intrinsicness, they should have to prove the necessity of the resolution

#### Politics tests a key opportunity cost

Steve **Saideman**, Associate Professor, Political Science, McGill University, “Key Constraint of Policy Relevance,” 7—25—**11**, http://duckofminerva.blogspot.com/2011/07/key-constraint-on-policy-relevance.html, accessed 10-2-11.

Dan Drezner has a great post today about how the foreign policy smart set (his phrase) gets so frustrated by domestic politics that they tend to recommend domestic political changes that are never going to happen. I would go one step further and suggest that one of the key problems for scholars who want to be relevant for policy debates is that we tend to make recommendations that are "incentive incompatible." I love that phrase. What is best for policy may not be what is best for politics, and so we may think we have a good idea about what to recommend but get frustrated when our ideas do not get that far. Lots of folks talking about early warning about genocide, intervention into civil wars and the like blame "political will." That countries lack, for whatever reason, the compulsion to act. Well, that is another way of saying that domestic politics matters, but we don't want to think about it. Dan's piece contains an implication which is often false--that IR folks have little grasp of domestic politics. Many IR folks do tend to ignore or simplify the domestic side too much, but there is plenty of scholarship on the domestic determinants of foreign policy/grand strategy/war/trade/etc. Plenty of folks look at how domestic institutions and dynamics can cause countries to engage in sub-optimal foreign policies (hence the tradeoff implied in my second book--For Kin or Country). The challenge, then, is to figure out what would be a cool policy and how that cool policy could resonate with those who are relevant domestically. That is not easy, but it is what is necessary. To be policy relevant requires both parts--articulating a policy alternative that would improve things and some thought about how the alternative could be politically appealing. Otherwise, we can just dream about the right policy and gnash our teeth when it never happens.

### AUMF Restrix Hurt Obama: 2NC

#### Plan causes massive fights—talks to revise the AUMF would be very unpopular, and be a loss for Obama—causes broader political battles—that’s Bresnahan 13

#### Changes hurt agenda—sparks fights between White House, Congress

Patricia Zengerle, “Amid New Security Threats, Some in Congress Look to Update 9/11 Law,” REUTERS, 5—2—13, www.reuters.com/article/2013/05/02/us-usa-congress-counterterrorism-idUSBRE94105V20130502

(Reuters) - **A** few **dozen words** rushed into law days after the September 11, 2001, attacks **have been used to justify** U.S. **counterterror**ism **efforts** **from** the **war** in Afghanistan **to** warrantless wiretapping and **drone strikes**, a**ll on orders of the White House - and with little congressional** oversight. Now, as criticism grows that the law has been stretched well beyond its original intent to go after militant groups that did not even exist on 9/11, **some Democrats** and **Republicans have begun** writing legislation to update the nearly 12-year-old resolution. That could restoke tensions between Congress and the White House over executive power, which were on display when Republican Senator Rand Paul staged a 13-hour filibuster in March to protest President Barack Obama's use of unmanned aircraft to conduct targeted killings. "If you look back at the 60-word authorization that was put in place on September 18, 2001, and look at where we are today, there's a very, very thin thread, if any, between that authorization and what is occurring today," said Senator Bob Corker, a leader of the effort to examine the 2001 resolution. Its formal title is the Authorization to Use Military Force, or AUMF. The top Republican on the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, Corker said he wanted to spell out the kind of counterterrorism activities that could be authorized, and to bring Congress back into the equation. "Congress has totally outsourced its foreign policy oversight," he said in an interview. "And a lot of people like it that way. Congress can take credit if things go well, criticize if things don't go well, but in essence Congress has no ownership over what we are carrying out right now. That's not an appropriate place for Congress to be." The AUMF gives the president authority to "use all necessary and appropriate force against those nations, organizations, or persons he determines planned, authorized, committed, or aided the attacks that occurred on September 11, 2001, or harbored such organizations or persons, in order to prevent any further acts of international terrorism against the United States by such nations, organizations, or persons." It has no geographic limits or expiration date and, as such, has been the legal justification for drone campaigns in Pakistan and Yemen that have sometimes killed civilians and increased tensions among local populations. In recent days, debates over U.S. national security policies have been roiled again by the Boston Marathon bombings, and a spreading hunger strike at the Guantanamo Bay prison for suspected foreign militants, which Obama pledged - and has failed - to close. While opponents want the AUMF repealed, a group of more moderate legislators wants it adjusted to account for a changing world and to set precedent as other countries build their own counterterrorism - especially drone - programs. It is not yet clear what a revised AUMF would look like. Some members of Congress want to spell out policies for conducting drone strikes. Many want its scope expanded to include militant groups not directly tied to or found to be "harboring" al Qaeda, including some operating in Africa, and to groups that target U.S. allies in its fight against terrorism. Some say a "Son of AUMF" should include more controls, such as defining who can be detained and for how long, including U.S. citizens. Others said there should be some definition of when hostilities under the AUMF would end. "The current AUMF is too broad, too narrow and too vague," Michael Leiter, former director of the National Counterterrorism Center, told the Senate Foreign Relations Committee in March. Most presidents, Obama included, guard their war-making powers jealously. White House officials have suggested they are open to changes in the AUMF, congressional aides said. Publicly at least, they have not offered specifics. Obama, who has pledged more transparency over U.S. drone operations, said in October, "One of the things we've got to do is put a legal architecture in place, and we need congressional help in order to do that, to make sure that not only am I reined in but any president's reined in in terms of some of the decisions that we're making." White House officials had no immediate comment. 'GETTING OLD' John Bellinger, then a legal adviser to Republican President George W. Bush's National Security Council, helped draft the AUMF "almost on the back of an envelope" when the ruins of the World Trade Center were still smoldering. Congress passed it three days after the attacks, and Bush signed it on September 18. Bellinger said the measure needed an update. He noted, for example, that it was now being used to justify going after targets who were only 8 or 9 years old when the September 11 attacks occurred. "It really is getting old," he said. "It was drafted extremely rapidly after September 11 and has covered a whole variety of different activities over the last 12 years that were not originally contemplated." Bellinger, now a partner at the law firm Arnold & Porter, said there was a tension between those on the left - an important part of Obama's base - who want to cut the law back or repeal it and those who would revise it to provide authority to engage in more activities. "If people ... were to delve into the legal theories, I think they would find that the administration is probably either really stretching the boundaries of the AUMF to cover some of the individuals or groups that they're targeting, or, without telling anyone, simply relying on the president's constitutional authority," Bellinger said. Democratic Senator Carl Levin, the chairman of the Senate Armed Services Committee, said any effort to change the AUMF should be done carefully. "It's a huge subject and there's not an easy answer to it. It takes a lot of thought and I myself have thought a lot about it, but I don't have an answer to (the question) if I could write a new AUMF, what would I say?" he said.

#### Changes ensure big fights that suck in Obama

Air Shaprio, “Why Obama Wants to Change the Key Law in the Terrorism Fight,” NPR, 5—29—13, http://www.npr.org/blogs/itsallpolitics/2013/05/29/187059276/why-obama-wants-to-change-the-key-law-in-the-terrorism-fight

"This law has served us well for over a decade," he says. "Much hangs from it, including the detention capability and the ability to use the U.S. military against clear and present dangers to the United States." That detention piece of the puzzle is key: The Guantanamo prison operates under the AUMF, so repealing this law is also part of the White House's effort to close the prison. Many in Congress want to keep the prison open. That's one reason this issue will not be easily resolved, says Thomas Kean, who co-chaired the 9/11 Commission. "I think it'll be a long debate, and it should be," Kean says. "[These are] very, very contentious issues, but the one thing you have to have, I think, in the United States, particularly for something lasting as long as this, is a framework of laws. We're a nation of laws. You can't just do ad hoc as we have in the past." It's pretty unusual for a president to ask Congress to take away some of his power. But Kate Martin of the Center for National Security Studies says if you look at it a different way, this situation doesn't seem so strange. "It's not unusual for presidents to end wars, right?" she says. "And if what we were talking about was ending military operations, that would not look like a president giving up power. It would look like a president ending wars." In fact, the White House wants to change this law authorizing the war on terrorism at the same time the Afghan war ends in 2014. That means it has a year and a half to wrestle with Congress over the details.

\_\_\_\_\_\_

#### GOP will use the plan to launch broader attacks against Obama—also turns solvency

John Bresnahan, “Senators Discuss Revising 9/11 Resolution,” POLITICO, 5—7—13, http://dyn.politico.com/printstory.cfm?uuid=5D34D2EA-4EBE-461D-B44B-86AA6C3378A7

Both the House and Senate would have to adopt the new resolution, giving the White House virtual veto authority through its Democratic allies on Capitol Hill. **Some Democrats**, for their part, **worry that vocal Obama critics** **like** Paul and Ted **Cruz** (R-Texas) — **or dozens of House Republicans** — would use such a debate to attack the president’s **policy ll military and national security issues**, not just terror-related topics. “Can you imagine what Paul or Cruz would do with this?” said one ton aop Democratic aide. “**It could be a disaster**. And it would be worse in the House.” Such unfettered political slams of Obama would not be accepted by Democratic leaders, and spurred predictions that **nothing substantive** would come out **of the calls for a new resolution** in the long run.

#### Changes will spark massive fights

Albert R. Hunt, “Will Congress Be Willing to Curb Obama’s Powers?” BLOOMBERG, 6—2—13, [www.bloomberg.com/news/2013-06-02/will-congress-be-willing-to-curb-obama-s-powers-.html](http://www.bloomberg.com/news/2013-06-02/will-congress-be-willing-to-curb-obama-s-powers-.html)

Changing the Authorization for Use of Military Force against terrorists, as President Barack Obama has proposed (see column), will face considerably more resistance in Congress than did the law itself in 2001. Other than the declaration of war after Pearl Harbor, few major pieces of legislation have rushed through Congress as quickly. Only days after the Sept. 11 attacks on the World Trade Center and the Pentagon, Congress passed the measure that gave the president sweeping authority to retaliate. **In the two houses,** 518 members voted for it and only one -- Representative Barbara Lee, a California Democrat -- voted against. The president was authorized to use any force necessary against the perpetrators of the attack or any nation or organization that "aided" or "harbored" these enemies. Some critics think presidents have gone beyond even the broad powers it grants. The Supreme Court rejected the George W. Bush administration's contention that the law sanctioned the military commissions at Guantanamo Bay, Cuba. Others question the legitimacy of the drone attacks in Pakistan ordered by Obama's administration under the use of military force powers. Bad guys have been killed -- including the supposed mastermind behind the assassination of former Prime Minister Benazir Bhutto in 2007 -- but some of the direct links to al-Qaeda are more tenuous. There are efforts in Congress to repeal the open-ended law, and even some defense hawks, such as Senator John McCain of Arizona, suggest it needs to be altered. Consensus on any changes, much less repeal, will be elusive.

#### GOP will hijack debate, use plan to attack Obama

Andrew Rosenthal, “Revisiting Post-9/11 Law,” NEW YORK TIMES, 5—7—13, http://takingnote.blogs.nytimes.com/2013/05/07/revisiting-the-a-u-m-f/

Reviewing the force resolution is not optional. And yet, the risk is obvious: this sort of discussion can go badly awry **in a Congress that has preyed on Americans’ fear of terrorism** to needlessly attack civil liberties and the rule of law. Congress could broaden, rather than rein in military power. Just for instance, the most recent National Defense Authorization Act — which Mr. Obama signed last year — seemed to expand the military’s authority on American soil. And as Politico pointed out, Mr. Obama’s implacable Republican enemies in Congress could hijack the debate over the resolution as a pretext to launch yet another attack on the president.

#### Changes risk a huge fight

Rick Moran, “Some Senators Seeking AUMF Revisions,” AMERICAN THINKER, 5—7—13,

www.americanthinker.com/blog/2013/05/some\_senators\_seeking\_aumf\_revisions.html#ixzz2cXdpdkA8

In truth, AUMF empowered the executive at the expense of congress. But some liberals are seeking to emasculate the president by tying his hands in responding to threats around the world. That's why these negotiations will be so sensitive. The goal will be to revise AUMF without making it too difficult for a president to act if he believes there is a threat. But even if the Armed Services Committee comes up with a package of reforms, there is no guarantee that the rest of the senate will accept them - or the House. Many lawmakers believe it is better to leave AUMF alone. That view has a good chance of prevailing at this point.

#### Changes invite fierce opposition

Spencer Ackerman, “Exclusive: Congressman Preps Bill to End Terror War Authority,” WIRED, 5—23—13, http://www.wired.com/dangerroom/2013/05/schiff-aumf/

Rep. Adam Schiff (D-Calif.) is preparing a piece of legislation that would “sunset” the 2001 Authorization to Use Military Force (AUMF), a foundational law passed in the days after the 9/11. “The current AUMF is outdated and straining at the edges to justify the use of force outside the war theater,” Schiff tells Danger Room.¶ Repealing the AUMF would be the boldest restriction of presidential war powers since 9/11. Both the Bush and Obama administrations have relied on the document to authorize everything from the warrantless electronic surveillance of American citizens to drone strikes against al-Qaida offshoots that did not exist on 9/11. Getting rid of it is certain to invite fierce opposition from more bellicose members of Congress, who have repeatedly demagogued efforts to roll back any post-9/11 wartime authority, let alone the most important one.¶ Rep. Barbara Lee (D-Calif.), the only legislator to vote against the authorization in 2001, has long fought unsuccessfully to repeal the AUMF. But Schiff is a moderate, not a firebreathing liberal, and while sunsetting the AUMF is sure to be a big legislative challenge, even conservative legislators like Rand Paul (R-Ky.) are raising fundamental questions about the merits of a never-ending war.

#### AUMF debates become easily politicized

Michael Crowley, “So, Who Can We Kill?” TIME, 4—1—13, [www.time.com/time/printout/0,8816,2139176,00.html](http://www.time.com/time/printout/0%2C8816%2C2139176%2C00.html)

Obama could also seek--or Congress could hand him--a renewed AUMF more clearly stating the mission, and enemy, in the antiterrorism war for the post-Afghanistan era. But that, too, could be fraught, involving an unpredictable process that, as someone familiar with the thinking of Administration officials puts it, "quickly becomes emotional and politicized. The extreme right and the extreme left have now converged on these issues, and they will team up." Others worry about just the opposite--that hawks like John McCain might seize control of the process and grant the President even broader new terrorist-hunting powers. "Proposing a new AUMF carries very significant risks," says Matthew Waxman, a former Bush Administration national-security official now at Columbia Law School, adding, "There would also be major risks to using force against other terrorist groups without a clear legislative basis."

#### Becomes a platform to attack Obama

Alan Greenblatt, “Why the War Powers Act Doesn’t Work,” NPR, 6—16—11, www.npr.org/2011/06/16/137222043/why-the-war-powers-act-doesnt-work

"The War Powers resolution really does not work," says former Rep. Lee Hamilton (D-IN), who co-chaired the Iraq Study Group and the 9/11 Commission. Instead, the War Powers Act has largely been used as it's being used now — as a political tool that allows Congress to criticize a president about the prosecution of a war. "The rhetoric is sadly familiar," says Gordon Adams, a foreign policy professor at American University. "It just flips by party, depending on who's deploying the troops." No More Vietnams The law was passed over the veto of President Richard M. Nixon. The intention was to prevent America from entering into protracted military engagements, as Vietnam had become, without the approval of Congress. The president has 60 days to seek formal approval from Congress after engaging in hostilities, with the possibility of a 30-day extension. "When the United States makes a decision to go to war, it ought not to be made by one person," says Hamilton, who was chairman of the House Foreign Affairs Committee from 1993 to 1995. Rarely Declaring War The U.S. has engaged in dozens of military actions abroad, but Congress has declared war formally only a handful of times. War of 1812 Mexican War (1846) Spanish-American War (1898) World War I (1917) World War II (1941) Source: Congressional Research Service But, as Hamilton notes, no president has accepted the constitutionality of the War Powers Act, viewing it as a violation of the separation of powers and the president's authority as commander in chief. In 2000, the Supreme Court turned back a challenge brought by a group of 31 members of Congress who complained that U.S. participation in a bombing campaign in Yugoslavia violated the act. "There's a long pattern of members going to court on War Powers cases," says Louis Fisher, a constitutional scholar who retired last year after 40 years as an adviser to Congress. "Ninety-five percent of the time, courts say, 'Thirty of you are saying the president violated the law, 30 others in an amicus brief are saying he didn't. We're not going to get involved,' " Fisher says. A Political Cudgel As a result, the debate over violations of the War Powers Act has devolved into a distraction. Hamilton says the law's intent was valid and that "Congress ought to hold the administration's feet to the fire with regard to Libya." But he argues that the 1973 law has become a "political tool that allows members of Congress to dodge taking a position on the intervention itself. As is often the case, they argue the process rather than the substance." Both the Republican and Democratic congressional caucuses are divided about Libya. Some would prefer a more concerted effort to target Libyan leader Moammar Gadhafi, while others worry about an expansion of the mission from protecting civilians to seeking regime change. As a result, it's difficult for Congress to speak with one voice in its battle with Obama. On June 3, the House approved a resolution criticizing the president for not providing a "compelling rationale" for the Libya campaign, but turned back legislation that would have pulled out U.S. forces within 15 days. Party Vs. Principle Both Hamilton and Adams say the War Powers Act is being used primarily as a political cudgel **against Obama**. "Is the War Powers Act about protecting the power of Congress relative to the president, or about the two political parties?" asks Noah Feldman, a professor of international law at Harvard University. While some members of Congress may use the law to criticize the president for political reasons, others will defend a president of their own party — even those who had invoked the War Powers Act the last time the other party held the White House.

### CIR Will Pass: A2 “House GOP Blocks”

#### CIR can pass the House—multiple House Republicans are working on a comprehensive bill and Boehner will break the Hastert rule

Silver 10-23-13 (Mary, Epoch Times, "Prospects for Immigration Reform Improving" Epoch Times) www.theepochtimes.com/n3/326406-prospects-for-immigration-reform-improving/

The tide may be about to change in the immigration reform debate. The Senate has developed a broad immigration reform proposal, but the standstill in the House has made reform seem out of reach until recent developments. Bipartisan support for a bill that would provide a pathway to citizenship for the estimated 11 million people in America without documents may be within reach. Rep. Mario Diaz-Balart (R-Fla.) is working on a House bill to reform American immigration laws. He said in a statement that it “must be a solution that will secure the border, strengthen our economy, respect the rule of law, modernize our visa system, and address the issue of the millions of undocumented immigrants in a way that is both reasonable and humane.” Rep. Darrell Issa (R-Calif.) is also working on a proposal to give temporary legal status to undocumented immigrants. Immigration reform advocates plan to keep pressing legislators for change. Current law demands that undocumented people to leave the country and re-enter legally before they can begin the process that could ultimately lead to citizenship. Even the DREAM Act, also known as Deferred Action for Childhood Arrivals (DACA), is only a stopgap, deferring deportation for people under 30. A plan for President Obama to expand DACA to all ages is an unlikely, temporary solution. The constitutionality of such a sweeping executive order is questionable and the president has declined to consider it an option. Wide Public Support Frank Sharry, executive director of immigration advocacy group America’s Voice, encourages Diaz-Balart and Issa’s efforts to introduce legislation to the House. “The public overwhelmingly supports reform with a path to citizenship and the Senate has already approved, on a bipartisan basis, a reform package that includes a path to citizenship. It’s time for the House to step up,” he said in a statement. Angela Kelley, vice president for Immigration Policy at the Center for American Progress, thinks there is hope if the Senate bill can stay alive through the end of this year. The country is just emerging from “a highly dysfunctional and frankly, bizarre time in Washington,” she said. The Hastert Rule House Speaker John Boehner was able to avoid a national default when he broke the Hastert rule, meaning he allowed the vote to reopen the government and raise the debt ceiling to pass without the support of a majority of Republicans. This suggests that he may also break the Hastert rule again, if necessary, to pass immigration reform, according to Kelly. The Hastert rule is named for former Republican Speaker Dennis Hastert. Staying Alive If the House could bring an immigration reform bill into a conference committee, the bill could stay alive into 2014. This is the first year of this Congress, so legislation that has advanced into a committee could still be passed in 2014, according to Kelley. She said 27 Republicans have come out in support of a path to citizenship, and therefore could sponsor a bill that provides one.

\_\_\_\_

**House proposals prove immigration is still in play – Obama needs to keep the press on.**

**Buckhout 10/23** [Immigration Reform: Alive, Not Dead, in the House Submitted by Emma Buckhout on 10/23/13, New Democrat Network, http://ndn.org/blog/2013/10/immigration-reform-alive-not-dead-house]

A surprising number of recent media reports declare once again that immigration reform is dead- surprising because **numerous House Republicans are signaling the exact opposite**. It is true that responsibility for action lies with the House GOP after the Senate passed its bipartisan comprehensive immigration reform bill in June, House Democrats have introduced both CIR ASAP and H.R. 15 (now with 184 cosponsors), and President Obama has declared immigration reform a legislative priority. However, the House GOP passed five separate bills out of committee, and this week members have affirmed they are still working on more related to legalization of undocumented immigrants. As long as a contingent of the House majority is willing to keep moving on meaningful pieces of legislation, immigration reform is **very much alive.**

#### Progress is being made among House Republicans—Libertarians are open to it

York 10-24 (Byron, staff writer for the Washington Examiner, 10-24-13 "York - Written Off for Dead, Immigration Reform Could Still Live" Poncacity News) www.poncacitynews.com/York2013-10-24T13-46-15

The Senate and House had not even settled the final details of ending the government shutdown before President Obama was on to his next priority. “We still need to pass a law to fix our broken immigration system,” Obama said on the night of Oct. 16 as Capitol Hill scrambled to end the standoff. In case anyone missed it, the next morning he declared: “We should finish the job of fixing our broken immigration system.” There’s no doubt the president wants an immigration deal; he’s talked about it for years, and now can’t put it off until another term. But could the Republican-controlled House of Representatives — exhausted, dazed and confused after the self-inflicted battering of the last few weeks — actually get itself together to pass a reform bill to go along with the Gang of Eight bill the Senate already passed? The prospect alone makes some observers laugh. “People talking about immigration being next: have you been watching the House?” tweeted National Review’s Jonathan Strong during the worst of the shutdown battle, adding the hashtag “#craziness.” In this (entirely reasonable) view, there’s no way the fractured GOP could ever unite to pass such a far-reaching piece of legislation. But that doesn’t keep immigration reformers from trying — and hoping. “There is still a window,” says one House GOP aide involved in crafting a reform proposal. “The leadership has said keep working on it and see what you can do.” Republican immigration proponents have been quietly talking to GOP members throughout even the craziest days of the shutdown and default fights. They report some progress. Yes, the most conservative House Republicans are mostly against them. But those with a libertarian bent are more open to the cause. The aide says reformers have had good meetings “with a few of those guys who were with Ted Cruz at Tortilla Coast,” referring to the House conservatives who met with the Texas senator at a Washington, D.C. restaurant and ended up holding out longest against a deal to end the shutdown.

#### Will pass the House—leadership supports it, viable plans being introduced

Fox News Latino 9-30-13 “House Republicans Quietly Work To Move Forward On Immigration Reform” http://latino.foxnews.com/latino/politics/2013/09/30/house-republicans-quietly-work-to-move-forward-on-immigration-reform/

Don't start an obituary for immigration reform just yet. While the spotlight on Congress is on the partisan brawl over government spending and President Barack Obama's health care law, some Republicans in the House are quietly working to bring some momentum to work on fixing the immigration system. In June, the Senate passed a bipartisan immigration reform measure. But in the House, where Republicans are in control, efforts to come up with a bill or bills have run into problems, as many of those most conservative members of the party vow not to support a measure that would provide a pathway to legal status to undocumented immigrants. So efforts to move along an immigration bill or bills seemed to have reached a dead end. The chairman of the House Judiciary Committee, Rep. Bob Goodlatte, has been discussing possible legal status for the estimated 11 million immigrants living in the U.S. illegally. He's also been working with House Majority Leader Eric Cantor, a fellow Virginia Republican, on a bill offering citizenship to immigrants brought illegally to the U.S. as children. Reps. Raul Labrador, R-Idaho, and Ted Poe, R-Texas, are working on a plan to create a visa program allowing more lower-skilled workers into the country. Goodlatte and the chairman of the House Homeland Security Committee, Rep. Mike McCaul, R-Texas, hold out hopes for floor action by late October on a series of immigration bills that already have passed their committees. "I would think that would be the next agenda item in the queue after we're done with this mess," McCaul said this past week, referring to bitter divisions over the health law, the level of government spending and the growing federal debt. The attention of House GOP leaders seems certain to remain squarely focused on the fiscal disputes until they are resolved, leaving immigration on a back burner for some time to come. But lawmakers and outside advocates insist that three months after the Democratic-led Senate passed a sweeping immigration bill, the issue is showing signs of life in the Republican-run House. "Despite the appearance that would suggest everyone in Washington is focused on one thing, work is going on on other issues beneath the radar," said Tamar Jacoby, head of ImmigrationWorks USA, a coalition of small businesses that supports comprehensive immigration legislation. Goodlatte has made it clear he wants to see the issue solved. Speaker John Boehner, R-Ohio, and other members of the House Republican leadership also support a resolution to an issue that has become a political drag for their party.

### CIR IL: A2 “Poisons the Well”—2NC

#### No uniqueness to this argument --- Obama is already involved in aggressive negitiations --- 1NC ev

#### Empirically denied --- all of our uniqueness proves immigration is passing despite Obama’s involvement.

#### Their evidence is biased --- it cites Republican sources who have an incentive to demonize the president.

 -Note: Most likely from the Weekly Standard or a different conservative writer. Reference this.

#### Their ev is old news – Obama’s balanced approach solves

Bennett 10-24-13 (Brian, and Christi Parsons, “Obama softens tone on immigration reform,” [http://www.latimes.com/nation/la-na-immigration-obama-20131025,0,6755968.story#axzz2ikONvPvJ](http://www.latimes.com/nation/la-na-immigration-obama-20131025%2C0%2C6755968.story#axzz2ikONvPvJ), )

Rep. Luis V. Gutierrez (D-Ill.), who asked the president in a meeting at the White House earlier this year to step back from negotiations in Congress for fear his involvement would spook Republicans, thought Obama struck the right tone Thursday. "He didn't say, 'It's my way or the highway,'" said Gutierrez, who is involved in discussions with House Republicans on immigration proposals. Gutierrez wants Obama to step up his involvement in crafting a deal, including bringing together both sides for a face-to-face meeting. "Camp David is a nice place in the fall," Gutierrez said.

#### This is only the crazies – most will side with Obama

Mason 10-20-13 (Jeff, “Obama Will Have To Rely More And More On Executive Orders,” <http://www.businessinsider.com/obama-will-have-to-rely-more-and-more-on-executive-orders-2013-10#ixzz2ifRFmdLZ>, )

Democrats believe, however, that **Obama's bargaining hand may be strengthened by the thrashing Republicans took** in opinion polls **over their handling of the shutdown**. "**This shutdown re-emphasized the overwhelming public demand for compromise and negotiation**. And that may open up a window," said Ben LaBolt, Obama's 2012 campaign spokesman and a former White House aide. "There's no doubt that some Republican members (of Congress) are going to oppose policies just because the president's for it. But the hand of those members was significantly weakened." If he does have **an upper hand**, **Obama is likely to apply** it **to immigration reform**. The White House had hoped to have a bill concluded by the end of the summer. A Senate version passed with bipartisan support earlier this year but has languished in the Republican-controlled House. "It will be hard to move anything forward, unless the **Republicans** find the political pain of obstructionism too much to bear," said Doug Hattaway, a Democratic strategist and an adviser to Hillary Clinton's 2008 presidential campaign. "That may be the case with immigration - they'll **face pressure from business and Latinos to advance immigration reform**," he said.

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

#### Even absent Obama’s push, plan ruins compromise

Reuters 3/21 (“Gang Of Eight, Bipartisan Senate Group, On Path To Immigration Bill”, 2013, <http://www.huffingtonpost.com/2013/03/21/gang-of-eight_n_2921084.html>, )

"Everyone in there wants to get it done," said Flake. "No one is looking for scoring political points. That makes all the difference."¶ "There have been hard and tough negotiations, but it has been done all in the spirit of achieving the goal, in which compromise has been made on both sides," said New Jersey's Democratic senator, Robert Menendez, another group member.¶ A group of eight House members - also four Democrats and four Republicans - began working on its own plan years ago, long before the Senate group even formed.¶ The emerging and comprehensive House plan, like the one in the Senate, has a proposed path toward citizenship.¶ Republicans Flake, McCain and Graham recently meet with a number of House Republicans to explain their efforts.¶ "I don't want to say what their positions were, but they were cordial," said Flake, elected to the Senate in November after 12 years in the House. "They listened."¶ Flake said he expected the Senate to pass a comprehensive bill while the House approved a limited one. But differences between the two measures could then be worked out, he said.¶ McCain said he believed "we can convince our House Republican friends - if we can make sure that they are convinced that we have an effective control of the border and it is not amnesty."¶

### CIR Thumper Ans: Topshelf

#### All of our uniqueness evidence answers this—he’s only spending political capital on CIR

#### Their conception of link uniqueness is wrong --- the plan introduces an entirely new initiative on Obama’s agenda. He has a carefully calibrated agenda now and has accounted for issues like \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_, but not the plan.

#### And, default to issue specific uniqueness --- recent evidence proves CIR is likely now and there is only a chance the plan disrupts the agenda.

**Immigration reform will pass --- it’s Obama’s top priority**

Eleanor **Clift**, **10-25**-2013, “Obama, Congress Get Back to the Immigration Fight,” Daily Beast, http://www.thedailybeast.com/articles/2013/10/25/obama-congress-get-back-to-the-immigration-fight.html

But now **with the shutdown behind them and Republicans on the defensive, Obama saw an opening to get back in the game**. His message, says Sharry: “‘Hey, I’m flexible,’ which after the shutdown politics was important, and he implied ‘if you don’t do it, I’m coming after you.’” For Obama and the Democrats, immigration reform is a win-win issue. They want an overhaul for the country and their constituents. If they don’t get it, they will hammer Republicans in demographically changing districts in California, Nevada, and Florida, where they could likely pick up seats—not enough to win control of the House, but, paired with what Sharry calls “the shutdown narrative,” Democratic operatives are salivating at the prospect of waging that campaign. Some Republicans understand the stakes, and former vice-presidential candidate and budget maven Paul **Ryan is at the center of a newly energized backroom effort to craft legislation that would deal with the thorniest aspect of immigration reform for Republicans**: the disposition of 11 million people in the country illegally. Rep. Raul Labrador (R-ID), an early advocate of reform who abandoned the effort some months ago, argues that Obama’s tough bargaining during the shutdown means Republicans can’t trust him on immigration. “When have they ever trusted him?” asks Sharry. “Nobody is asking them to do this for Obama. They should do this for the country and for themselves.... We’re not talking about tax increases or gun violence. This is something the pillars of the Republican coalition are strongly in favor of.” Among those pillars is Chamber of Commerce President Tom **Donahue**, who on Monday **noted** the generally **good feelings about immigration reform among disparate groups**, among them business and labor. **He expressed optimism that the House could pass something, go to conference and resolve differences with the Senate, get a bill and have the president sign** it “and guess what, government works! Everybody is looking for something positive to take home.” The Wall Street Journal reported Thursday that **GOP donors are withholding contributions to lawmakers blocking reform**, and that Republicans for Immigration Reform, headed by former Bush Cabinet official, Carlos Gutierrez, is running an Internet ad urging action. Next week, evangelical Christians affiliated with the Evangelical Immigration Table will be in Washington to press Congress to act with charity toward people in the country without documentation, treating them as they would Jesus. The law-enforcement community has also stepped forward repeatedly to embrace an overhaul. House Speaker John Boehner says he wants legislation, but not the “massive” bill that the Senate passed and that Obama supports. The House seems inclined to act—if it acts at all—on a series of smaller bills starting with “Kids Out,” a form of the Dream Act that grants a path to citizenship for young people brought to the U.S. as children; then agriculture-worker and high-tech visas, accompanied by tougher border security. The sticking point is the 11 million people in the country illegally, and finding a compromise between Democrats’ insistence that reform include a path to citizenship, and Republicans’ belief that offering any kind of relief constitutes amnesty and would reward people for breaking the law. The details matter hugely, but what **a handful of Republicans**, led by Ryan, **appear to be crafting** is **legalization** for most of the 11 million but without any mention of citizenship. It wouldn’t create a new or direct or special path for people who came to the U.S. illegally or overstayed their visa. It would allow them to earn legal status through some yet-to-be-determined steps, and once they get it, they go to the end of a very long line that could have people waiting for decades. The Senate bill contains a 13-year wait. However daunting that sounds, **the potential for meaningful reform is tantalizingly close with Republicans actively engaged in preparing their proposal, pressure building from the business community and religious leaders, and a short window before the end of the year to redeem the reputation of Congress** and the Republican Party after a bruising takedown. **The pieces are all there** for long-sought immigration reform. **We could be a few weeks away from an historic House vote**, or headed for a midterm election where Republicans once again are on the wrong side of history and demography.

#### No thumpers---Obama focusing attention on immigration

Shear 10-24-13 (Michael D, <http://www.nytimes.com/2013/10/25/us/politics/obama-urges-house-republicans-to-act-on-immigration.html?_r=0>, )

President **Obama** on Thursday **renewed his call for an immigration overhaul**, telling an audience of activists at the White House that the fate of a bipartisan Senate bill now rests with Republicans in the House. “Anyone still standing in the way of this bipartisan reform should at least explain why,” Mr. Obama said to repeated applause in the East Room. “**If House Republicans have new and different** additional **ideas** **for how we should move forward**, then **we should** hear them. I will **be listening**.” The Senate passed legislation in June by a vote of 68-32, giving a lift to Mr. Obama’s plans to improve border security, require employers to verify the immigration status of their workers, and provide a path to citizenship for 11 million undocumented immigrants. White House strategists hoped that the vote would prompt action in the House, where Republicans had resisted similar calls for an overhaul of the system. But the effort stalled this summer, with many House Republicans expressing dissatisfaction with the increases in border security and saying they do not support any plan that would allow people in the country illegally to eventually become citizens. Mr. Obama’s remarks on Thursday were aimed at rebooting the discussion after months in which attention shifted to concerns about Iran and Syria and contentious disputes at home with the House Republicans that led to a government shutdown.

#### No thumpers

CNN, 10/24 (“Obama puts immigration back in spotlight,” Oct 24th, 2013, <http://www.cnn.com/2013/10/24/politics/immigration-reform/>)//HAL

Washington (CNN) -- It's time to fix the United States' "broken immigration system," President Barack Obama said Thursday, citing bipartisan support to revamp immigration laws. His speech didn't reveal anything that hasn't been said before, but the announcement put the immigration issue back in the spotlight. "We've kicked this particular can down the road for too long," Obama said. Immigration reform was placed on the back burner after the Democratic-controlled Senate passed a bill in June that went nowhere in the House of Representatives. Controlled by Republicans, the House has said it would prefer to undertake a number of smaller bills instead of the one large package passed by the Senate. Obama on Thursday called it a good bill that was supported by several Republicans. [UK's message to immigrants: Stay out](http://www.cnn.com/2013/10/24/opinion/navarrette-anti-immigration-uk/index.html) "It's good for our economy, it's good for our security, it's good for our people and we should do it this year," he said. But don't expect a bill to sail through Congress that easily, a senior House GOP leadership aide told CNN. "Expectations are low" that any immigration bill could pass this year, the aide said. "There is a sincere desire to work on this issue, but there's also very little good will after the President spent the last two months refusing to work with us." Republican lawmakers have said that they prefer reform on a piecemeal basis and that border security measures must be put in place before the status of undocumented immigrants can be discussed. Obama lauded the Senate's immigration bill, but House Majority Leader Eric Cantor has already said that the House won't do anything with it because the GOP opposes it. "I expect us to move forward this year in trying to address reform and what is broken about our system," he said. A CBS News poll released Wednesday found public support for immigration reform. There is widespread support for providing a path to citizenship for undocumented immigrants if they meet certain requirements, including undergoing a waiting period, paying fines and back taxes, passing criminal background checks and learning English, the poll found. The same poll, however, found that more people think that securing the country's borders should be a priority over resolving the status of undocumented immigrants. "It doesn't make sense to have 11 million people who are in this country illegally without any ... way to come out of the shadows, get right with the law, meet their responsibility and permit their families, then, to move ahead," Obama said. House Democrats introduced their own version of an immigration bill at the beginning of the month, one without the huge expansion of the Border Patrol included in the Senate bill. One of the most contentious parts of the Senate version was a one-year path to citizenship for undocumented immigrants. Many Republicans have rejected any route to legal status as amnesty for lawbreakers. House Oversight Committee Chairman Darrell Issa also is working on a proposal to offer temporary status as early as next week for some undocumented immigrants, a spokesman for the California Republican said. The bill would provide temporary legal status, likely for six years, for those who meet economic tests. An aide says this approach could help "break the logjam" on the issue of undocumented immigrants currently in the United States.

### CIR Internal: A2 “PC Not True”

#### Political capital is finite and drives decisionmaking

**Schier 9**, Professor of Poliitcal Science at Carleton, (Steven, "Understanding the Obama Presidency," The Forum: Vol. 7: Iss. 1, Berkely Electronic Press, http://www.bepress.com/forum/vol7/iss1/art10)

 In additional to formal powers, a president’s informal power is situationally derived and highly variable. Informal power is a function of the “political capital” presidents amass and deplete as they operate in office. Paul Light defines several components of political capital: party support of the president in Congress, public approval of the presidential conduct of his job, the President’s electoral margin and patronage appointments (Light 1983, 15).Richard Neustadt’s concept of a president’s “professional reputation” likewise figures into his political capital. Neustadt defines this as the “impressions in the Washington community about the skill and will with which he puts [his formal powers] to use” (Neustadt 1990, 185). In the wake of 9/11, George W. Bush’s political capital surged, and both the public and Washington elites granted him a broad ability to prosecute the war on terror. By the later stages of Bush’s troubled second term, beset by a lengthy and unpopular occupation of Iraq and an aggressive Democratic Congress, he found that his political capital had shrunk.Obama’s informal powers will prove variable, not stable, as is always the case for presidents. Nevertheless, he entered office with a formidable store of political capital. His solid electoral victory means he initially will receive high public support and strong backing from fellow Congressional partisans, a combination that will allow him much leeway in his presidential appointments and with his policy agenda. Obama probably enjoys the prospect of a happier honeymoon during his first year than did George W. Bush, who entered office amidst continuing controversy over the 2000 election outcome.Presidents usually employ power to disrupt the political order they inherit in order to reshape it according to their own agendas. Stephen Skowronek argues that “presidents disrupt systems, reshape political landscapes, and pass to successors leadership challenges that are different from the ones just faced” (Skowronek 1997, 6). Given their limited time in office and the hostile political alignments often present in Washington policymaking networks and among the electorate, presidents must force political change if they are to enact their agendas. In recent decades, Washington power structures have become more entrenched and elaborate (Drucker 1995) while presidential powers – through increased use of executive orders and legislative delegation (Howell 2003) –have also grown. The presidency has more powers in the early 21st century but also faces more entrenched coalitions of interests, lawmakers, and bureaucrats whose agendas often differ from that of the president. This is an invitation for an energetic president – and that seems to describe Barack Obama – to engage in major ongoing battles to impose his preferences.

#### Presidents perceive their capital as finite – our theory is true in practice

**Marshall and Prins 11**, BRYAN W. MARSHALL Miami University BRANDON C. PRINS University of Tennessee & Howard H. Baker, Jr. Center for Public Policy Power or Posturing? Policy Availability and Congressional Influence on U.S. Presidential Decisions to Use Force Presidential Studies Quarterly 41, no. 3 (September) 2011

We argue that the more important effect of Congress occurs because presidents anticipate how the use of force may affect the larger congressional environment in which they inevitably have to operate (Brulé, Marshall, and Prins 2010). It may be true that presidents consider the chances that Congress will react to a specific use of force with countervailing tools, but even more importantly they anticipate the likelihood that a foreign conflict may damage (or advantage) their political fortunes elsewhere—in essence, the presidential calculus to use force factors in how such actions might shape their ability to achieve legislative priorities. To be clear, presidents can and do choose to use force and press for legislative initiatives in Congress. Taking unilateral actions in foreign policy does not preclude the president from working the legislative process on Capitol Hill. However, political capital is finite so spending resources in one area lessens what the president can bring to bear in other areas. That is, presidents consider the congressional environment in their decision to use force because their success at promoting policy change in either foreign or domestic affairs is largely determined by their relationship with Congress. Presidents do not make such decisions devoid of calculations regarding congressional preferences and behavior or how such decisions may influence their ability to achieve legislative objectives. This is true in large part because presidential behavior is motivated by multiple goals that are intimately tied to Congress. Presidents place a premium on passing legislative initiatives. The passage of policy is integral to their goals of reelection and enhancing their place in history (Canes-Wrone 2001; Moe 1985). Therefore, presidents seek to build and protect their relationship with Congress.

#### Prefer issue specific evidence

**Jacobs and King 10**, University of Minnesota, Nuffield College, (Lawrence and Desmond, “Varieties of Obamaism: Structure, Agency, and the Obama Presidency,” Perspectives on Politics (2010), 8: 793-802)

Yet if presidential personality and leadership style come up short as primary explanations for presidential success and failure, this does not render them irrelevant. There is no need to accept the false choice between volition and structure—between explanations that reduce politics to personality and those that focus only on system imperatives and contradictions. The most satisfying explanations lie at the intersection of agency and structure—what we describe as structured agency. Presidents have opportunities to lead, but not under the circumstances they choose or control. These circumstances both restrict the parameters of presidential impact and highlight the significance of presidential skill in accurately identifying and exploiting opportunities. Indeed, Obama himself talks about walking this tightrope—exercising “ruthless pragmatism” in seizing opportunities for reform while accepting the limits and seeking to “bridge that gap between the status quo and what we know we have to do for our future”.12

### CIR IL: PC Key—2NC

**And- err neg- your won’t pass args are just pc key warrants- Obama can overcome opposition**

Neil **Munro** White House Correspondent **10-21**-2013 <http://dailycaller.com/2013/10/21/u-s-chamber-of-commerce-pleads-for-obamas-help-to-pass-immigration-boost/2/>

**The president needs to get** **personally involved** **in the** high-stakes **immigration battle** **to** **overcome growing GOP distrust**, Tom Donohue, head of the U.S. Chamber of Commerce, said Monday.¶ “I have **serious concerns about trust** all around in town right now, which **suggests the way to get out is leadership**,” Donohue told reporters at a breakfast meeting hosted by the Christian Science Monitor.¶ “We need leadership in the business community, we need leadership in the House, we need leadership in the Senate, and **we need leadership in the White House,**” he said.¶ However, he indirectly acknowledged the difficulty of getting the unpopular bill through Congress this year, amid bitter partisan fights over higher-priority budgets bills.¶ “We’ve got a whole year plus [left to go] of this Congress,” he said.¶ The backers of the immigration bill had initially hoped to get it done by August 2013.¶ **Donohue’s call for Obama to get more involved** **comes as** more **GOP legislators say** the **immigration** deal **should be sidelined because Obama can’t be trusted** to negotiate in good faith, or even to implement provisions that he doesn’t like.

**Obama resolve causes the GOP to blink- shutdown proves**

**US News, 10-18**-2013 <http://www.usnews.com/news/blogs/Ken-Walshs-Washington/2013/10/18/obama-strengthened-for-now>

President **Obama emerges from his budget victory** this week **with** **a stronger hand** **as he heads into the next** round of **political fight**s in Washington.¶ **What's helping Obama** in particular **is the** new **perception that he is willing to stick to his guns. He demonstrated the ability to take a tough stand** against his adversaries **even** when he was **under enormous** **pressure to cave** in. And **this** **image of resolve** **is expected to help him in future showdowns with the Republicans regarding immigration**, farm legislation, climate change regulations, health care and economic policy. **Up to now, many legislators considered Obama a weak bargainer** and a vacillating leader; now **they have clear evidence that he isn't a pushover**, Democratic strategists say.¶ After accepting a congressional deal that ended Washington's embarrassing economic crisis for now, and largely on his own terms, Obama blamed the mess on Republican conservatives allied with the tea party. He said they stubbornly forced a partial government shutdown and threatened to allow a government default unless Obama weakened his signature health care law, known as Obamacare.¶ **Using his presidential bully pulpit to good effect**, **Obama declined to give in,** **and blasted the GOP day after day. In the end, the Republicans blinked.**

#### PC is key—Obama has the upper hand, needs to pressure GOP

Bob Ray Sanders is a columnist for the Fort Worth Star-Telegram 10-22-2013 <http://www.bnd.com/2013/10/22/2862687/bob-ray-sanders-theres-no-better.html>

 Now that the Republican hijacking of the federal government has been brought to an end, perhaps President Barack Obama and Congress can move on to other major issues that have been neglected too long.¶ The president, in addition to wanting to work out a long-term budget deal, has said that he is now ready to push for passage of a comprehensive immigration bill, as well as rescuing the farm bill, which was gutted when GOP lawmakers stripped out the food stamp section.¶ Just a few months ago, immigration reform looked promising, garnering bipartisan support in the Senate. A measure that was long overdue passed the upper chamber in Congress last June, but has been stalled in the House as recalcitrant Republicans simply couldn't stomach the idea of providing a path to citizenship for the millions of illegal immigrants already in the country.¶ While the Senate bill has its faults - including adding 700 miles of new fencing along the U.S.-Mexico border - it is a compromise that, if passed, would be a giant step toward improving the entire immigration system and, at the same time, bringing illegal immigrants out of the shadows.¶ Obama got re-elected partly on his promise to pursue the issue aggressively, receiving 71 percent of the Latino vote. He has not been as aggressive as many would like, even though they're willing to cut him a little slack because of all the uncontrollable international crises and manufactured domestic distractions (like the shutdown of the government) he has had to deal with.¶ But he shouldn't let anything get in his way this time, even though Republicans in the House are vowing not to negotiate with him because the president stood his ground and refused to negotiate on his healthcare law in connection with raising the debt ceiling and ending the government shutdown.¶ House Speaker John Boehner, who has refused to bring the Senate bill to a vote, has said he won't bring any immigration legislation to the floor until a majority of his Republican caucus agrees.¶ That, in effect, means never. Or, if there is a bill that the majority of his party would support, you can almost bet it will be terribly inadequate, one that would not pass the Senate and one that the president wouldn't sign if it did.¶ Boehner, who has been on the losing end a lot lately, ought to be pressured into bringing the Senate bill to a vote. It's clear that on many of the important matters facing this country, the majority of his party in the House will reject just about anything the president supports.¶ Therefore, it will be left up to the House Democrats and the moderate Republicans who are not afraid of the "tea party" to get an immigration bill passed.¶ Since the government shutdown fiasco, in which the GOP unmistakably was the loser, the president has the upper hand, and he should take the opportunity to press forward with his agenda.¶ By no means am I suggesting that Obama become a bully or deliberately attempt to undermine Boehner's leadership, but he shouldn't back away from this fight again.¶ Every time an election approaches - and there's always an approaching election - it is suggested that it's the wrong time to bring up immigration reform.¶ Frankly, there's no better time than right now as candidates prepare to file for office and gear up their campaigns for the 2014 contests.

**Leadership needed on issues like immigration**

**WSJ, 10-17**-2013 <http://online.wsj.com/news/articles/SB10001424052702303680404579141472200495820>

Yet it is far from certain Mr. **Obama** can exploit these tactical gains in coming months. In his remarks Thursday from the State Dining Room, he **said he wanted to pass** an **immigration** overhaul, a farm bill and reach a budget agreement that cuts the deficit and spurs economic growth. Not on the list were the more ambitious plans he laid out in his State of the Union speech in February: raising the minimum wage, expanding access to pre-school education and launching a sweeping program to upgrade the nation's roads and bridges.¶ Those **efforts require bipartisan consensus** **that may be** even more **elusive** amid the ill will carried over from the budget fight. Even Republicans who voted with the president believe Mr. Obama struck a hard-line posture that makes future collaboration difficult.¶ "A lot of us are resentful that he didn't negotiate as hard as we think he could have or should have," said Sen. John McCain (R., Ariz.) in an interview. "Let me put it this way: He didn't do himself any good."¶ Rep. Peter King (R., N.Y.), who opposed GOP efforts to strip funding from the health law, said Republicans need to reduce their expectations of what can be achieved in a time of divided government. Shutting down the government and other "D-Day-type victories" shouldn't be the goal so much as revising the nation's tax code and reducing the debt, Mr. King said.¶ Some Democrats, meanwhile, believe Mr. **Obama must be a more active player** **in looming fights**. Sen. Dianne Feinstein (D., Calif.) said in an interview Mr. **Obama "stepped back**" in part because he felt "burned" **by the grinding budget fights** that have played out over the past three years.¶ "**I hope that changes**, **because** **you do need presidential leadership on these" issues**, she said. In "three or four months, we could be back in the same place, and we can't let ourselves be back in the same place," she said.

#### Capital key, focus now

DAILY MAIL, “Immigration Battle Threatens to Dwarf Debt-Limit Fight as Many Republicans Fear Power of 17 Million Newly Legalized Democrats,” 10—17—13, [www.dailymail.co.uk/news/article-2464112/Immigration-battle-threatens-dwarf-debt-limit-fight-Republicans-fear-power-17-MILLION-newly-legalized-loyal-Democrats.html](http://www.dailymail.co.uk/news/article-2464112/Immigration-battle-threatens-dwarf-debt-limit-fight-Republicans-fear-power-17-MILLION-newly-legalized-loyal-Democrats.html)

The White House hasshifted gears andput its policy team in immigration overdrive, zooming past the debt crisis that threatened to sink the republic and on to the task of normalizing the estimated 11 million U.S. residents who have no legal basis for being there. The Democrat-dominated U.S. Senate passed a bill in June that would provide a citizenship path for those who have been in the U.S. since the end of 2011. But as with the early days of the debt crisis and the partial government shutdown, Republican leaders in the House of Representatives aren't eager to consider it. The White House has avoided saying that it take advantage of a weak House and spend its political capital to push an immigration policy, but Republicans have reason to suspect the other shoe is about to drop. The Center for Immigration Studies, a Washington, D.C. think-tank, projects that the Senate bill, S.744, would add 17.3 million new legal, voting-age U.S. residents to 14.9 million whom analysts already expect to appear without the proposed law. 'To place these figures in perspective,' writes Steven Camarota, the group's director of research, 'the last four presidential elections were decided by 4.5 million votes on average.' Converting illegal immigrants into citizens has long been a Democratic Party brass ring. And not only, as President Barack Obama told business leaders on Sept. 18, because 'we know ... that that can add potentially a trillion dollars to our economy, and that we will continue to attract the best and brightest talent around the world.' Hispanics are the biggest ethnic group involved in U.S. immigration. In the 2012 elections, 77 per cent of those who voted supported Democratic candidates for Congress, according to the polling group Latino Decisions. Seventy-five per cent voted for Obama. Among Hispanic voters who weren't born in the U.S., Democratic congressional candidates picked up 81 per cent of the vote. Obama rated 80 per cent. In fact, Republicans' share of Hispanic votes in presidential elections peaked in 2004, at 43 per cent before tumbling in the next two elections. And the Pew Research Center has consistently found that large majorities Hispanic voters favor policies that produce governments with bigger footprints and more social programs. 'There are things that we know will help strengthen our economy that we could get done before this year is out,' the president said Wednesday night as focus on the debt-limit fix bill moved from the Senate to the House. 'A law to fix our broken immigration system' was first on his wish-list. 'We had a very strong Democratic and Republican vote in the Senate,' Obama told the Los Angeles affiliate of the Spanish-language network Univision on Tuesday, comparing it to the debt battle. 'The only thing right now that’s holding it back is again, Speaker Boehner not willing to call the bill on the floor of the House of Representatives.' 'So we’re going to have to get through this crisis that was unnecessary, that was created because of the obsession of a small faction of the Republican Party on the Affordable Care Act. Once that’s done – you know, the day after – I'm going to be pushing to say, "call a vote on immigration reform."' Republicans in the House are less split on Obamacare than on immigration, with some arguing that rewarding lawbreakers sets a bad example and others pointing to economic advantages of a larger workforce willing to undertake manual labor, and a boom in fast-tracked visas for those with specialized skills. But if Obama thinks he has the GOP on the ropes, an aide to a conservative House Republican lawmaker told MailOnline, he will be surprised by the party unity that will return as soon as someone breathes 'the "A"-word: "Amnesty".' 'Everyone in the House Republican caucus wants to get rid of Obamacare,' the aide said, 'but not everyone agreed killing it was worth going to the mat.' 'But we're talking about changing voting patterns for maybe 100 years and creating natural advantages for candidates who will run against our guys. It's like giving my boss 40 pounds of rocks to carry over his shoulder, and letting his challenger walk around with a fanny pack full of feathers.' The debt-limit and shutdown fights, says Idaho GOP Rep. Raul Labrador, may have made immigration advocates' uphill climb even steeper, especially for Republicans who suspect President Obama of having an ulterior motive. 'I think what he's done over the last two and half weeks [is] he’s trying to destroy the Republican Party,' Labrador said Wednesday at the monthly Conversations with Conservatives meeting organized by the Heritage Foundation. 'And I think that anything we negotiate right now with the president on immigration will be with that same goal in mind, which is to destroy the Republican Party and not to get good policies.' 'There are things that we are on the same page about,' Labrador said, 'and if he is unwilling to negotiate on those things I don’t see how he could in good faith negotiate with us on immigration.' House Republicans' strategy so far has been to approach the Senate bill piecemeal, advancing parts of it – border security and more fences, for instance – that GOP leaders like. Speaker JohnBoehner has said Senate Democrats' more comprehensive approach won't reach the House floor, even though 14 Senate Republicans gave it 'yes' votes. But the fight over the partial government shutdown that occupied half of October mayhave given Democrats insights into how to combat that strategy. House Republicans offered a series of nearly a dozen one-off bills to fund government agencies and initiatives whose absence became a black eye, including the National Institutes of Health, the Department of Veterans Affairs and salary payments for active-duty military. Obama found he could stave off the pressure to sign all but a few, insisting on an all-or-nothing approach – which he eventually got. 'It's different, of course, because there's no economic catastrophe awaiting if Republicans sit on their hands with immigration,' a Democratic campaign strategist told MailOnline on Wednesday. 'But the White House has learned how stubborn some of the Republicans are willing to be. And more important, they've figured out which ones are worth trying to reason with.' While some Republican moderates will be unwilling to cross the tea party caucus while the sting of the debt defeat is still in the air, others havealready signaled their openness to meet Democrats halfway, mostly in one-off measures that carve out pet projects from the larger immigration issue. California Rep. Nancy Pelosi, a long-time supporter of immigration reform, said this month that she will do 'whatever it takes' to find a bill that the House can bring to the Senate. She's open to going to a House-Senate legislative conference with 'one bill, two bills, one at a time, singly, jointly, severally, whatever,' betting that whatever emerges from such a meeting would including 'comprehensive immigration reform that will lead to a pathway to citizenship.' Pelosi may find some help from a few Republicans. The Associated Press reported on Sept. 30 that Rep. Bob Goodlatte, who chairs the House Judiciary Committee, has been openly discussing how to change the immigration status of the 11 million illegal immigrants in the U.S. without awarding them special status. His idea is to allow illegal immigrants to have legal work status – a 'green card' – and then to allow them access to a list of existing routes to citizenship. They could be sponsored by a U.S. company, for instance, or by a relative who's already a citizen. Goodlatte favors this more narrow approach to the Senate's catch-all bill, which has a companion bill in the House that no Republicans have been willing to endorse. House Majority Leader Eric Cantor, another Virginia Republican, is also helping Goodlatte with a bill that would provide a path to citizenship for immigrants brought illegally to the U.S. as children. Idaho Rep. Raul Labrador and Texas Rep. Ted Poe are trying to create a visa program that would target low-skilled workers for migration into the U.S. Several of these narrow proposals have already passed through House committees, and their Republican chairman are hoping they see action. House Homeland Security Committee chairman Mike McCaul of Texas told the AP that he thinks a series ofimmigration bills 'would be the next agenda itemin the queue after we're done with this [debt limit] mess.' Cantor spokesman Doug Heye insists, however, that while 'moving immigration forward remains a priority ... right now there's no firm timetable.' Goodlatte has said, though, that he wants to see some movementby the end of Octoberon a bill that could give the Senate some basis to negotiate. A senior aide to a southern Republican House member said that ultimately, some Republicans don't want their party to be 'on the wrong side of the new electoral math,' and 'if we can create our own grateful constituency, that's just good politics in addition to doing the right thing.'

#### Political capital is key—Obama is pushing

Epstein 10-17-13 (Reid, reporter, "Obama’s latest push features a familiar strategy" Politico) www.politico.com/story/2013/10/barack-obama-latest-push-features-familiar-strategy-98512\_Page2.html

President Barack Obama made his plans for his newly won political capital official — he’s going to hammer House Republicans on immigration. And it’s evident from his public and private statements that Obama’s latest immigration push is, in at least one respect, similar to his fiscal showdown strategy: yet again, the goal is to boost public pressure on House Republican leadership to call a vote on a Senate-passed measure. “The majority of Americans think this is the right thing to do,” Obama said Thursday at the White House. “And it’s sitting there waiting for the House to pass it. Now, if the House has ideas on how to improve the Senate bill, let’s hear them. Let’s start the negotiations. But let’s not leave this problem to keep festering for another year, or two years, or three years. This can and should get done by the end of this year.” And yet Obama spent the bulk of his 20-minute address taking whack after whack at the same House Republicans he’ll need to pass that agenda, culminating in a jab at the GOP over the results of the 2012 election — and a dare to do better next time. “You don’t like a particular policy or a particular president? Then argue for your position,” Obama said. “Go out there and win an election. Push to change it. But don’t break it. Don’t break what our predecessors spent over two centuries building. That’s not being faithful to what this country’s about.” Before the shutdown, the White House had planned a major immigration push for the first week in October. But with the shutdown and looming debt default dominating the discussion during the last month, immigration reform received little attention on the Hill. Immigration reform allies, including Obama’s political arm, Organizing for Action, conducted a series of events for the weekend of Oct. 5, most of which received little attention in Washington due to the the shutdown drama. But activists remained engaged, with Dream Act supporters staging a march up Constitution Avenue, past the Capitol to the Supreme Court Tuesday, to little notice of the Congress inside. Obama first personally signaled his intention to re-emerge in the immigration debate during an interview Tuesday with the Los Angeles Univision affiliate, conducted four hours before his meeting that day with House Democrats. Speaking of the week’s fiscal landmines, Obama said: “Once that’s done, you know, the day after, I’m going to be pushing to say, call a vote on immigration reform.” When he met that afternoon in the Oval Office with the House Democratic leadership, Obama said that he planned to be personally engaged in selling the reform package he first introduced in a Las Vegas speech in January. Still, during that meeting, Obama knew so little about immigration reform’s status in the House that he had to ask Rep. Xavier Becerra (D-Calif.) how many members of his own party would back a comprehensive reform bill, according to a senior Democrat who attended. The White House doesn’t have plans yet for Obama to participate in any new immigration reform events or rallies — that sort of advance work has been hamstrung by the 16-day government shutdown. But the president emerged on Thursday to tout a “broad coalition across America” that supports immigration reform. He also invited House Republicans to add their input specifically to the Senate bill — an approach diametrically different than the House GOP’s announced strategy of breaking the reform into several smaller bills. White House press secretary Jay Carney echoed Obama’s remarks Thursday, again using for the same language on immigration the White House used to press Republicans on the budget during the shutdown standoff: the claim that there are enough votes in the House to pass the Senate’s bill now, if only it could come to a vote. “When it comes to immigration reform … we’re confident that if that bill that passed the Senate were put on the floor of the House today, it would win a majority of the House,” Carney said. “And I think that it would win significant Republican votes.”

#### Boehner will get CIR through—but White House pressure is key

Sullivan 10-24-13 (Sean, staff writer, "John Boehner’s next big test: Immigration" Washington Post) www.washingtonpost.com/blogs/the-fix/wp/2013/10/24/john-boehners-next-big-test-immigration-reform/

And that’s where immigration comes in. Even before the government shutdown showdown, a vocal part of the GOP (think Sen. John McCain) had been talking up the urgent need to do immigration reform or risk further alienating Hispanic voters. Now, amid hard times for the party driven by deeper skepticism from Democrats, independents and even some Republicans following the fiscal standoff, the political imperative is arguably even stronger. The policy imperative already exists for some House Republicans — perhaps enough of them that if Boehner allowed a vote, reform of some type could pass with a majority of House Democrats and a minority of House Republicans, as did last week’s deal to end the government shutdown and raise the debt ceiling. (What specifically could pass and whether Obama could accept it is another question.) What’s not clear is whether Boehner would be willing to chart a path with less than majority GOP support again so soon after the last time and without his back against the wall as it was in the fiscal standoff. This much we know: The White House and Senate Democrats will keep applying pressure on Boehner to act on immigration. Obama’s remarks are the latest example of his plan. The speaker will be feeling external and internal pressure to move ahead on immigration. But he will also feel pressure from conservatives to oppose it. Here’s the thing, though: Boehner listened to the right flank of his conference in the fiscal fight, and that path was politically destructive for his party. That’s enough to believe he will at least entertain the possibility of tuning the hard-liners out a bit more this time around. All of which is why it’s too soon to cross immigration off the “maybe it will still get done” list just yet.

#### Time and will to pass it is there – it’s a question of PC

Foley 10/17

Elise, Huffington Post, Obama To House On Immigration: If You Have Ideas, 'Let's Hear Them', 10/17/13, <http://www.huffingtonpost.com/2013/10/17/obama-house-immigration_n_4115818.html>

President Barack Obama vowed Thursday to restart his push for comprehensive immigration reform this year after a bruising fight on government spending that only increased bad blood between the two parties.¶ "The majority of Americans think this is the right thing to do, and it's sitting there waiting for the House to pass it," he said during remarks from the White House. "Now if the House has ideas on how to improve the Senate bill, let's hear them. Let's start the negotiations. But let's not leave this problem to keep festering for another year, or two years, or three years."¶ "This can and should get done by the end of this year," he added.¶ Obama and immigration reform advocates have insisted there's still time and the will to pass reform, even though House Republicans are showing little interest in doing so. After the Senate passed a comprehensive immigration bill in June, reform stalled in the house when House Speaker John Boehner (R-Ohio) vowed not to pick it up, regardless of likely support from most Democrats and some Republicans. Instead, the House GOP vowed to pass piecemeal measures -- with no talk of a path to citizenship for undocumented immigrants -- that have now faded from attention.

#### PC now, sole focus, will get it done

McMorris-Santoro 10/15

Evan, BuzzFeed Staff, Obama Has Already Won The Shutdown Fight And He’s Coming For Immigration Next, 10/15/13, http://www.buzzfeed.com/evanmcsan/obama-has-already-won-the-shutdown-fight-and-hes-coming-for

As the fiscal fight roiling Washington nears its end, the White House is already signaling that it plans to use the political momentum it has gained during the shutdown fight to charge back into the immigration debate. And this time, Democratic pollsters and advocates say, they could actually win.¶ The final chapter of the current crisis hasn’t been written yet, but Democrats in Washington are privately confident that they’ll emerge with the upper hand over the conservatives in Congress who forced a government shutdown. And sources say the administration plans to use its victory to resurrect an issue that was always intended to be a top priority of Obama’s second-term agenda.¶ Advocates argue the post-fiscal crisis political reality could thaw debate on the issue in the House, which froze in earlier this year after the Senate passed a bipartisan immigration bill that was led by Republican Sen. Marco Rubio and Democratic Sen. Chuck Schumer.¶ “It’s at least possible with sinking poll numbers for the Republicans, with a [GOP] brand that is badly damaged as the party that can’t govern responsibly and is reckless that they’re going to say, ‘All right, what can we do that will be in our political interest and also do tough things?’” said Frank Sharry, executive director of the immigration reform group America’s Voice. “That’s where immigration could fill the bill.”¶ The White House and Democrats are “ready” to jump back into the immigration fray when the fiscal crises ends, Sharry said. And advocates are already drawing up their plans to put immigration back on the agenda — plans they’ll likely initiate the morning after a fiscal deal is struck.¶ “We’re talking about it. We want to be next up and we’re going to position ourselves that way,” Sharry said. “There are different people doing different things, and our movement will be increasingly confrontational with Republicans, including civil disobedience. A lot of people are going to say, ‘We’re not going to wait.’”¶ The White House isn’t ready to talk about the world after the debt limit fight yet, but officials have signaled strongly they want to put immigration back on the agenda.¶ Asked about future strategic plans after the shutdown Monday, a senior White House official said, “That’s a conversation for when the government opens and we haven’t defaulted.” But on Tuesday, Press Secretary Jay Carney specifically mentioned immigration when asked “how the White House proceeds” after the current fracas is history.¶ “Just like we wish for the country, for deficit reduction, for our economy, that the House would follow the Senate’s lead and pass comprehensive immigration reform with a big bipartisan vote,” he said. “That might be good for the Republican Party. Analysts say so; Republicans say so. We hope they do it.”¶ The president set immigration as his next priority in an interview with Univision Tuesday.¶ “Once that’s done, you know, the day after, I’m going to be pushing to say, call a vote on immigration reform,” Obama said. He also set up another fight with the House GOP on the issue.¶ “We had a very strong Democratic and Republican vote in the Senate,” Obama said. “The only thing right now that’s holding it back is, again, Speaker Boehner not willing to call the bill on the floor of the House of Representatives.”¶ Don’t expect the White House effort to include barnstorming across the country on behalf of immigration reform in the days after the fiscal crisis ends, reform proponents predict. Advocates said the White House has tried hard to help immigration reform along, and in the current climate that means trying to thread the needle with Republicans who support reform but have also reflexively opposed every one of Obama’s major policy proposals.¶ Democrats and advocates seem to hope the GOP comes back to immigration on its own, albeit with a boost from Democrats eager to join them. Polls show Republicans have taken on more of the blame from the fiscal battle of the past couple of weeks. But Tom Jensen, a pollster with the Democratic firm Public Policy Polling, said moving to pass immigration reform could be just what the doctor ordered to get the public back on the side of the Republicans.¶ “We’ve consistently found that a sizable chunk of Republican voters support immigration reform, and obviously a decent number of Republican politicians do too,” Jensen said. “After this huge partisan impasse, they may want to focus on something that’s not quite as polarized, and immigration would certainly fit the bill since we see voters across party lines calling for reform.”

### Africa War--1NC

#### No risk of great power conflict over Africa

**Barrett ‘5** Robert Barrett, PhD student Centre for Military and Strategic Studies, University of Calgary, June 1, 2005,

http://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/Delivery.cfm/SSRN\_ID726162\_code327511.pdf?abstractid=726162&mirid=1

Westerners eager to promote democracy must be wary of African politicians who promise democratic reform without sincere commitment to the process. Offering money to corrupt leaders in exchange for their taking small steps away from autocracy may in fact be a way of pushing countries into anocracy. As such, world financial lenders and interventionists who wield leverage and influence must take responsibility in considering the ramifications of African nations who adopt democracy in order to maintain elite political privileges. The obvious reason for this, aside from the potential costs in human life should conflict arise from hastily constructed democratic reforms, is the fact that Western donors, in the face of intrastate war would then be faced with channeling funds and resources away from democratization efforts and toward conflict intervention based on issues of human security. This is a problem, as Western nations may be increasingly wary of intervening in Africa hotspots after experiencing firsthand the unpredictable and unforgiving nature of societal warfare in both Somalia and Rwanda. On a costbenefit basis, the West continues to be somewhat reluctant to get to get involved in Africa’s dirty wars, evidenced by its political hesitation when discussing ongoing sanguinary grassroots conflicts in Africa. Even as the world apologizes for bearing witness to the Rwandan genocide without having intervened, the United States, recently using the label ‘genocide’ in the context of the Sudanese conflict (in September of 2004), hasonly proclaimed sanctionsagainst Sudan, while dismissing any suggestions at actual intervention(Giry, 2005). Part of the problem is that traditional military and diplomatic approachesat separating combatants and enforcing ceasefires have yielded little in Africa. No powerful nations want to get embroiled in conflicts they cannot win– especially those conflicts in which the intervening nation has very little interest.