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**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**.

**“On” means in contact with and links “restrictions” only to war powers authority**

**Graham 16** (Arthur Butler, “Brief for Appellants – Wilson v. Dorflinger& Sons”, Court of Appeals – State of New York, Reg. 108, Fol. 387, 1916, p. 11-12)

**The Standard Dictionary defines the word “on” as follows:** “In or into such a position with reference to something, as a vehicle, a table, or a stage, as to be **in contact with** and supported by it; in a position, state, or condition of adherence; as, he go on before the wagon had fully stopped.” In Webster’s International Dictionary, we find as follows: “on—The General signification of “on” is situation, motivation, motion, or condition with respect to contact or support beneath as (1) at or in contact with, the surface or upper part of a thing, and supported by it; placed or lying in contact with the surface; as, the book lies on the table, which stands on the floor of a house on an island.” It is submitted that an elevator is not operated on streets or on highways, as a car, truck or wagon is operated, and that **by the use of the word “on”** the **Legislature intended to include only those** appliances **therein enumerated**, namely, cars, trucks, and wagons. An elevator is not operated on anything, but is operated in or inside a shaft, and is controlled by guides, which deprive the operator of the power to change the course of the lift from right to left. Clearly the Legislature intended to include in Group 41, only those cars, trucks and wagons whose direction and guidance are controlled by the operator, in whatever direction he may deem advisable.

**Violation: texas limits “humanitarian justifications” not “war powers authority”**

**Vote neg  
limits 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**
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**The United States federal judiciary should rule unconstitutional the war powers authority of the President to use humanitarian justifications as grounds for introducing the United States Armed Forces into hostilities.**

**Courts solve, provide political cover**

Richard L. **Pacelle**, Associate Professor, Political Science, University of Missouri-St. Louis, THE ROLE OF THE SUPREME COURT IN AMERICAN POLITICS, 20**02**, p. 102.

The limitations on the Court are not as significant as they once seemed. They constrain the Court, but the boundaries of those constraints are very broad. Justiciability is self-imposed and seems to be a function of the composition of the Court rarther than a philosophical position. **Checks and balances are seldom successfully invoked against the judiciary, in part because the Court has positive institutional resource to justify its decision. The Supreme Court has a relatively high level of diffuse support that comes, in part, from a general lack of knowledge by the public and that contributes to its legitimacy. The cloak of the Constitution and the symbolism attendant to the marble palace and the law contribute as well. As a result, presidents and the Congress should pause before striking at the Court or refusing to follow its directives. Indeed, presidents and members of Congress can often use unpopular Court decisions as political cover. They cite the need to enforce or support such decision even though they disagree with them. In the end, the institutional limitations do not mandate judicial restraint, but turn the focus to judicial capacity**, the subject of the next chapter.

**Courts key—congress doesn’t solve precedent, won’t challenge prez power abuses in a crisis**

**Katyal & Tribe, ‘02**

[Neal K. and Laurence H., Visiting Professor @ Yale Law School and Professor @ Georgetown Law Center, April, “Waging War, Deciding Guilt: Trying the Military Tribunals,” Yale Law Journal, 111 Yale L.J. 1259, ln //]

**The President's legal claim - reflecting** an ambitious stretching of the Commander-in-Chief Clause, a dramatic disregard of Youngstown in the name of homeland security, and **a risky overreading of Quirin - thus sets a novel and dangerous course**. Following a logic not easy to distinguish from that needed to square President Bush's Order with the Constitution, a future president might unilaterally declare that America is engaged in a "War on Drugs" - with some justification given the annual death toll from [\*1296] narcoterrorism - and decide to subject certain narcotics traffickers to military trials in tribunals of his own creation. 136 Imagine another president who sees the private possession of guns as an outrage rather than a right. That president might proclaim that, because handguns and rifles kill thousands of Americans a year, military tribunals are necessary to try dealers in (and perhaps even buyers of) illegal guns, particularly those who ship such firearms from abroad. 137 These examples may seem far afield, but they represent smaller steps, in legal logic if not in political plausibility, than the one the administration has had to take in moving from what previous administrations have done (the Nazi saboteurs, the Civil War tribunals) to what President Bush claims authority to do today. 138 And, of course, the very precedent the President seeks to revitalize, **Quirin, explicitly permits military tribunals to be used against American citizens** who are "unlawful belligerents" within our own borders. 139 We must be extraordinarily careful when revitalizing an old and troubling court decision in this way, for **doing so will set new precedent for future presidents**. 140 [\*1297] For these reasons, **the possibility that Congress might supersede** the President's Order **with legislation** of its own even before anyone is convicted **by no means renders** the Order, and the **claim** underlying it, **harmless**. Because the executive branch has acted ultra vires in even issuing the Order, the Order lacks the constitutional basis necessary to survive separation-of-powers scrutiny. 141 The fact that President Truman's Executive Order to seize the steel mills, an order jeopardizing little beyond property, could have been promptly reversed by Congress (a possibility explicitly invoked by President Truman, who - unlike President Bush - sent messages to Congress stating that he would abide by a legislative determination to overrule his Executive Order), was deemed irrelevant by the Steel Seizure Court. 142 In any event, President Bush's very issuance of the Order has indelibly altered the status quo, creating numerous barriers to congressional reversal if and when Congress might be inclined to act: Military trials might by then be underway, in which case a congressional reversal might create double jeopardy problems; or **Congress might simply be disinclined to set up a dangerous confrontation between the branches in a time of crisis.** Moreover, reversal by Congress would require not a simple majority but a two-thirds vote (because of presidential power to veto the legislation proposing the reversal), so that **requiring Congress to reverse the executive decision would significantly shift power from Congress to the President**. **A future president could set up military tribunals in a crisis -** say, the "War on Drugs" tribunals we have posited for narcotics traffickers **- and essentially dare Congress to attain that two-thirds majority.** The separation of powers is designed precisely to guard against such transfers of constitutional authority.

**Courts best promote national deliberation**

Christine **Bateup** (historical scholar and JSD Candidate at NYU, **06**. (71 Brooklyn L. Rev. 1109, “The Dialogic Promise Assessing The Normative Potential of Theories of Constitutional Dialogue,” ln)

The most prominent descriptions of constitutional dialogue in this vein have been developed by Barry Friedman and by Robert Post and Reva Siegel. 184 **Friedman's** is the most positive **account,** as it **is explicitly grounded in social science studies** regarding institutional interactions between the [\*1158] judiciary, the political branches, and the people. 185 These studies show that while the Supreme Court has significant leeway in making pronouncements, if it strays too far from what the other branches of government and the people accept, political constraints such as the power of judicial appointments and popular backlash will bring the Court back into line. 186 Friedman relies on this evidence principally to stress the role of public opinion as one of the principal forces controlling the Court. Although this mechanism is not understood perfectly, social science evidence increasingly suggests that judicial outcomes tend to run in line with public opinion over the longer term. 187 While these studies show that the Court is heavily constrained, Friedman argues that **judicial decisions** still **play an important function** in the constitutional system as they serve to **spark (or continue) a broader national discussion** about constitutional meaning. 188 As a result, the Court acts as the shaper and facilitator of society-wide discussion about constitutional values. When it declares its own views about the meaning of constitutional text**, the Court actively channels and fosters ongoing societal debate by synthesizing the various, and possibly disparate, views about constitutional meaning** and by articulating that debate in an explicitly constitutional form. 189 [\*1159] In the process, the Court also mediates the views of different participants in the debate and focuses the terms in which future debate might proceed. **The Court's decisions** then **facilitate** further **debate,** either by **acting as a catalyst for discussion** along particular lines or **by prodding other institutions into deliberative action.** As a result of these dynamics, Friedman describes the function of judicial review in the United States constitutional system as one of promoting and facilitating constitutional dialogue. 190 The Court's participation in this dialogue is dynamic -- not only does it spark a process of national discussion, but it is also, in turn, affected and shaped by this conversation. 191 When a decision is rendered it is subject to discussion and debate within society. Over time, if there is enough popular disagreement with the Court's ruling, new legislation may be passed and legal challenges brought that test the finality of the decision in a more concrete sense. As a result of this dissent and debate, the Court may ultimately come to reconsider and refashion its decision. Under this model, the perspectives of non-judicial actors may therefore influence the Court as much, if not more, than the Court itself influences the rest of society. 192 Over time, this process produces a relatively enduring constitutional equilibrium that is widely accepted by all the participants in the national discussion. Friedman further argues that **the dialogic role the judiciary performs is a valuable one, as it "achieves** the separation of constitutional requirements from immediate political preferences," 193 and, **in the long term, the production of** [\*1160] stable and **broadly supported answers to questions of constitutional meaning**. 194

**3**

**Obama pressure ensures debt limit will be raised now**

Edward **Dovere**, “Government Shutdown: President Obama Holds the Line,” POLITICO, **10—1**—13,

<http://www.politico.com/story/2013/10/government-shutdown-president-obama-holds-the-line-97646.html?hp=f3>

President Barack **Obama started September in an agonizing,** extended **display of how little sway he had** in Congress. **He ended** the month **with** a display of resolve and **strength** that could redefine his presidency. All it took was a government shutdown. This was less a White House strategy than simply staying in the corner the House GOP had painted them into — to the White House’s surprise, Obama was forced to do what he so rarely has as president: **he said no, and** he **didn’t stop** saying no. For two weeks ahead of Monday night’s deadline, Obama and aides rebuffed the efforts to kill Obamacare with the kind of firm, narrow sales pitch they struggled with in three years of trying to convince people the law should exist in the first place. There was no litany of doomsday scenarios that didn’t quite come true, like in the run-up to the fiscal cliff and the sequester. No leaked plans or musings in front of the cameras about Democratic priorities he might sacrifice to score a deal. After five years of what’s often seen as Obama’s desperation to negotiate — to the fury of his liberal base and the frustration of party leaders who argue that he negotiates against himself. Even his signature health care law came with significant compromises in Congress. Instead, **over and over** and over again, Obama delivered **the simple line: Republicans want to repeal a law** that was **passed and upheld** by the Supreme Court — to give people health insurance — **or they’ll do something** that everyone outside the GOP caucus meetings, including Wall Street bankers, seems to agree would be a **ridiculous** risk. “If we lock these Americans out of affordable health care for one more year,” Obama said Monday afternoon as he listed examples of people who would enjoy better treatment under Obamacare, “if we sacrifice the health care of millions of Americans — then they’ll fund the government for a couple more months. Does anybody truly believe that we won’t have this fight again in a couple more months? Even at Christmas?” The president and his advisers weren’t expecting this level of Republican melee, a White House official said. Only during Sen. Ted Cruz’s (R-Texas) 21-hour floor speech last week did the realization roll through the West Wing that they wouldn’t be negotiating because they couldn’t figure out anymore whom to negotiate with. And even then, they didn’t believe the shutdown was really going to happen until Saturday night, when the House voted again to strip Obamacare funding. This wasn’t a credible position, Obama said again Monday afternoon, but rather, bowing to “extraneous and controversial demands” which are “all to save face after making some impossible promises to the extreme right wing of their political party.” Obama and aides have said repeatedly that they’re not thinking about the shutdown in terms of political gain, but the situation’s is taking shape for them. Congress’s approval on dealing with the shutdown was at 10 percent even before the shutters started coming down on Monday according to a new CNN/ORC poll, with 69 percent of people saying the House Republicans are acting like “spoiled children.” “The Republicans are making themselves so radioactive that the president and **Democrats can win this** debate in the court of public opinion” **by waiting them out**, said Jim Manley, a Democratic strategist and former aide to Senate Majority Leader Harry Reid who has previously been critical of Obama’s tactics. Democratic pollster Stan Greenberg said the Obama White House learned from the 2011 debt ceiling standoff, when it demoralized fellow Democrats, deflated Obama’s approval ratings and got nothing substantive from the negotiations. “They didn’t gain anything from that approach,” Greenberg said. “I think that there’s a lot they learned from what happened the last time they ran up against the debt ceiling.” While the Republicans have been at war with each other, the White House has proceeded calmly — a breakthrough phone call with Iranian President Hassan Rouhani Friday that showed him getting things done (with the conveniently implied juxtaposition that Tehran is easier to negotiate with than the GOP conference), his regular golf game Saturday and a cordial meeting Monday with his old sparring partner Israeli Prime Minister Benjamin Netanyahu. White House press secretary Jay Carney said Monday that the shutdown wasn’t really affecting much of anything. “It’s busy, but it’s always busy here,” Carney said. “It’s busy for most of you covering this White House, any White House. We’re very much focused on making sure that the implementation of the Affordable Care Act continues.” Obama called all four congressional leaders Monday evening — including Boehner, whose staff spent Friday needling reporters to point out that the president hadn’t called for a week. According to both the White House and Boehner’s office, the call was an exchange of well-worn talking points, and changed nothing. **Manley advised Obama to make sure people continue to see Boehner and** the House **Republicans as the problem and not rush into any more negotiations until public outrage forces them to bend**. “He may want to do a little outreach, but not until the House drives the country over the cliff,” Manley said Monday, before the shutdown. “Once the House has driven the country over the cliff and failed to fund the government, then it might be time to make a move.” The White House believes Obama will take less than half the blame for a shutdown – with the rest heaped on congressional Republicans. The divide is clear in a Gallup poll also out Monday: over 70 percent of self-identifying Republicans and Democrats each say their guys are the ones acting responsibly, while just 9 percent for both say the other side is. If Obama is able to turn public opinion against Republicans, **the GOP won’t be able to turn the blame** back on Obama, Greenberg said. “Things only get worse once things begin to move in a particular direction,” he said. “They don’t suddenly start going the other way as people rethink this.”

**Plan guts Obama’s negotiating cred**

**Seeking Alpha 9-10**, 9-10-2013, “Syria Could Upend Debt Ceiling Fight,” http://seekingalpha.com/article/1684082-syria-could-upend-debt-ceiling-fight

Unless President Obama can totally change a reluctant public's perception of another Middle-Eastern conflict, it seems unlikely that he can get 218 votes in the House, though he can probably still squeak out 60 votes in the Senate. **This defeat would be to**tally **unprecedented as a President has never lost a military authorization vote** in American history. **To forbid the Commander-in-Chief** of his **primary power renders him** all but **impotent**. At this point, a rebuff from the House is a 67%-75% probability. I reach this probability by looking within the whip count. I assume the 164 declared "no" votes will stay in the "no" column. To get to 218, Obama needs to win over 193 of the 244 undecided, a gargantuan task. Within the "no" column, there are 137 Republicans. Under a best case scenario, Boehner could corral 50 "yes" votes, which would require Obama to pick up 168 of the 200 Democrats, 84%. Many of these Democrats rode to power because of their opposition to Iraq, which makes it difficult for them to support military conflict. The only way to generate near unanimity among the undecided Democrats is if they choose to support the President (recognizing the political ramifications of a defeat) despite personal misgivings. The idea that all undecided Democrats can be convinced of this argument is relatively slim, especially as there are few votes to lose. In the best case scenario, the House could reach 223-225 votes, barely enough to get it through. Under the worst case, there are only 150 votes. Given the lopsided nature of the breakdown, the chance of House passage is about one in four. While a failure in the House would put action against Syria in limbo, I have felt that the market has overstated the impact of a strike there, which would be limited in nature. Rather, investors should focus on the profound ripple through the power structure in Washington, which would greatly impact impending battles over spending and the debt ceiling. Currently, the government loses spending authority on September 30 while it hits the debt ceiling by the middle of October. Markets have generally felt that Washington will once again strike a last-minute deal and avert total catastrophe. Failure in the Syrian vote could change this. **For the Republicans to beat Obama on a President's strength (foreign military action), they will likely be emboldened that they can beat him on domestic** spending **issues**. Until now, consensus has been that the two sides would compromise to fund the government at sequester levels while passing a $1 trillion stand

**Failure to raise debt ceiling collapses military effectiveness and heg**

**Masters 1/2/13** (Jonathan, Deputy Editor for the Council on Foreign Relations, “US Debt Ceiling Costs Consequences,” <http://www.cfr.org/international-finance/us-debt-ceiling-costs-consequences/p24751>)

The government must be able to issue new debt as long as it continues to run a budget deficit. **The debt limit**, or "ceiling," **sets the maximum amount of outstanding federal debt the U.S. government can incur by law. As of January 2013, this number stands at $16.39 trillion.** Increasing the debt limit does not enlarge the nation's financial commitments, but allows the government to fund obligations already legislated by Congress**. Hitting the debt ceiling would hamstring the government's ability to finance its operations, like providing for the national defense** or funding entitlements such as Medicare or Social Security**. Under normal circumstances, the government is able to auction off new debt** (typically in the form of U.S. Treasury securities) in order to finance annual deficits. However, **the debt limit places an absolute cap on this borrowing,** requiring congressional approval for any increase (or decrease) from this statutory level.

**Cutting military spending jacks hegemony – signals perception of weakness**

**Kagan ‘09** (Robert, senior associate at the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, 2/3/09, “No Time To Cut Defense,”)

A reduction in defense spending this year would unnerve American allies and undercut efforts to gain greater cooperation. There is already a sense around the world, fed by irresponsible pundits here at home, that the United States is in terminal decline. Many fear that the economic crisis will cause the United States to pull back from overseas commitments. The announcement of a defense cutback would be taken by the world as evidence that the **American retreat has begun.**

**Hegemony solves conflicts that cause extinction**

Thomas P.M. **Barnett,** chief analyst, Wikistrat, “The New Rules: Leadership Fatigue Puts U.S. and Globalization, at Crossroads,” WORLD POLITICS REVIEW, 3—7—**11**, www.worldpoliticsreview.com/articles/8099/the-new-rules-leadership-fatigue-puts-u-s-and-globalization-at-crossroads

Events in Libya are a further reminder for **Americans** that we **stand at a crossroads in our continuing evolution as the** world's sole full-service **superpower.** Unfortunately, we are increasingly seeking change without cost, and shirking from risk because we are tired of the responsibility. We don't know who we are anymore, and our president is a big part of that problem. Instead of leading us, he explains to us. Barack Obama would have us believe that he is practicing strategic patience. But many experts and ordinary citizens alike have concluded that he is actually beset by strategic incoherence -- in effect, a man overmatched by the job. It is worth first examining the larger picture: We live in a time of arguably the greatest structural change in the global order yet endured, with this historical moment's most amazing feature being its relative and absolute lack of mass violence. That is something to consider when Americans contemplate military intervention in Libya, because if we do take the step to prevent larger-scale killing by engaging in some killing of our own, we will not be adding to some fantastically imagined global death count stemming from the ongoing "megalomania" and "evil" of American "empire." We'll be engaging in the same sort of system-administering activity that has marked our stunningly successful stewardship of global order since World War II. Let me be more blunt: **As the guardian of globalization, the U.S. military has been the greatest force for peace the world has ever known. Had America been removed from the global dynamics** that governed the 20th century, the mass murder never would have ended. Indeed, it's entirely conceivable **there would now be no** identifiable **human civilization left, once nuclear weapons entered the killing equation. But the world did not keep sliding down** that path of **perpetual war**. Instead**, America** stepped up and **changed everything by ushering in** our now-perpetual **great-power peace. We introduced** the international liberal trade order known as **globalization** and played loyal Leviathan over its spread. **What resulted was the collapse of empires, an explosion of** **democracy**, the **persistent spread of** **human rights, the liberation of women, the doubling of life expectancy, a roughly 10-fold increase in adjusted global GDP and a profound and persistent reduction in battle deaths from state-based conflicts.** That is what American "hubris" actually delivgered. Please remember that the next time some TV pundit sells you the image of "unbridled" American military power as the cause of global disorder instead of its cure. With self-deprecation bordering on self-loathing, we now imagine a post-American world that is anything but. Just watch who scatters and who steps up as the Facebook revolutions erupt across the Arab world. While we might imagine ourselves the status quo power, we remain the world's most vigorously revisionist force. As for the sheer "evil" that is our military-industrial complex, again, let's examine what the world looked like before that establishment reared its ugly head. The last great period of global structural change was the first half of the 20th century, a period that saw a death toll of about 100 million across two world wars. That comes to an average of 2 million deaths a year in a world of approximately 2 billion souls. Today, with far more comprehensive worldwide reporting, researchers report an average of less than 100,000 battle deaths annually in a world fast approaching 7 billion people. Though admittedly crude, these **calculations suggest a 90 percent absolute drop and a 99 percent relative drop in deaths due to war**. We are clearly headed for a world order characterized by multipolarity, something the American-birthed system was designed to both encourage and accommodate. But given how things turned out the last time we collectively faced such a fluid structure, we would do well to keep U.S. power, in all of its forms, deeply embedded in the geometry to come. To continue the historical survey, after salvaging Western Europe from its half-century of civil war, the U.S. emerged as the progenitor of a new, far more just form of globalization -- one based on actual free trade rather than colonialism. America then successfully replicated globalization further in East Asia over the second half of the 20th century, setting the stage for the Pacific Century now unfolding.
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#### Obama will use his executive authority to intervene in Syria now—the Russian deal is doomed to failure

Goldberg 9-11 (Jeffrey, author of "Prisoners: A Story of Friendship and Terror"9-11-13, "Obama's Syria Pause Only Delaying the Inevitable") www.bloomberg.com/news/2013-09-11/obama-s-syria-pause-only-delaying-the-inevitable.html

Obama's Syria Pause Only Delaying the Inevitable Rule No. 1 in the Middle East is this: The only thing you can count on is sudden and dramatic change. Rule No. 2: The Middle East makes fools of optimists. Rule No. 3: Political projects involving many moving parts and many competing ideologies will most likely fail. The Arab-Israeli peace process comes to mind, as does the invasion of Iraq and the Arab Spring. Add to this list now the nascent global effort, inspired by the government of Russian President Vladimir Putin, to remove from Syrian dictator Bashar al-Assad's hands several hundred tons of chemical weapons. The Bloomberg View editorial on this chemical-weapons project, which was also the subject of President Barack Obama's no-one-is-sure-why-he's-making-this-speech speech last night, states: "The Russian proposal is worth pursuing because, if successful, it would be more effective than airstrikes in preventing the further use of chemical weapons." All true, except that there's very little chance here of success. Virtually none, in fact. Why? Because the process of securing several hundred tons of chemical weapons, and thousands of warheads and rockets, would take years, even if Syria were at peace. The U.S. has been destroying its chemical weapons stocks for roughly 15 years, and it still isn't finished. In Syria, Hezbollah and al-Qaeda, among others, are struggling violently, even nihilistically, for supremacy. So how would the “international community” -- which is actually a chimera, as Russia and China, which possess veto power on the United Nations Security Council, have shown us -- secure all of these chemical weapons? With boots on the ground? Well, the best boots in the chemical-weapons-eradication business belong to Americans. Are we going to place American weapons inspectors between Hezbollah and al-Qaeda? Especially after last year's terrorist attacks on the American diplomatic mission in Libya? Other reasons that this Russian-inspired diplomatic pause is an illusion: It isn't plausible to think that Assad would truly give up his chemical-weapons capability. Has he done anything, ever, to suggest that he would unilaterally disarm in this manner? And why would Russia, which is Assad's main weapons supplier, participate with sincerity and alacrity in this process? I agree that the Russian proposal is worth pursuing, but not because I think it will be successful. I think it's worth pursuing because Syrian noncompliance will help buttress the case for tougher action. Not missile strikes, necessarily -- I've been dubious about those -- but a new commitment to a long-term strategy of regime change. In this extended pause -- a pause in which John Kerry, the secretary of state, will be traveling to Geneva to get into arguments with his Russian counterpart, and in which Americans (and all the West) can return to their default position of not paying attention to Syria's mass slaughter -- Assad will be able to sleep well at night, knowing that no punishment is coming for his astonishing violation of a baseline norm of civilization, much less for his astonishing acts of murder committed with conventional weapons. For those, he is perfectly safe. Remember a couple of years ago, when the (rhetorical) position of the U.S. was that Assad should go? Well, after two years of saying that Assad should go, the message is now that Assad can stay, just minus one piece of his arsenal. When I posted the previous thought on Twitter last night, in reaction to the president's speech, Ben Rhodes, his deputy national security adviser, wrote back, "US position remains Assad leaving power as part of political process. But we must also act to specifically remove CW threat." One surefire way to remove the chemical-weapons threat, though, is to remove the regime that uses chemical weapons. Millions of Syrians are waiting for the White House to embrace this truth. This much can be said in the president's favor: His speech did keep the pressure on, in some form. The Russians are on notice that he's still contemplating military action. That isn't much, but it's something. And he's making himself look statesmanlike in comparison to many Republicans on Capitol Hill, who apparently have no interest in, or knowledge of, American responsibilities in the world -- responsibilities we have fulfilled since we created the post-World War II international order. Obama remains an internationalist who is seeking, in a flawed and sometimes scattershot way, to convince the U.S., and its allies, that we have obligations in the world. Another rule of the Middle East is that it can sink presidencies. To Obama's credit, it hasn't sunk his. Yet. Glenn Thrush, of Politico, wrote this on Twitter: “Perspective on Obama's many screw-ups on Syria: they are NOTHING compared 2 Bush-Iraq, Reagan-Lebanon, Carter-Iran, LBJ-Nam.” The next real test for the president comes not when his jet-lagged secretary of state inadvertently floats another fantastical idea, but when it becomes clear that Putin and Assad are playing games and that the plan being discussed isn't credible. Then Obama will have to try once again to convince Congress that American leadership on this issue is a moral, strategic and political necessity. And if Congress doesn't listen, he will have to make decisions by himself.

#### Using the justification of humanitarian intervention is key to coalition-building

Myles 13 (Robert, august, “http://www.allvoices.com/contributed-news/15371010-obama-risking-a-coalition-of-one-if-us-strikes-syria-early

The moral case against chemical weapons use is unanswerable but trying to justify reprisals with talk of America’s “best interests” or “core interests” immediately devalues the case for action. For the moment, the United States holds the moral high ground, much as it did after 9/11. Obama will continue to hold that position by delaying a decision on action against Syria for a few more days. If the US strikes early, it could so easily find itself in a coalition of one.

#### Unilateral action kills multilateral coop over Iran prolif, Israel-palestine, and causes massive middle east instability

AFP 13 (9-12-13 Putin: Unilateral Syria strike would up-end world order Read more at: http://english.astroawani.com/news/show/putin-unilateral-syria-strike-would-up-end-world-order-22075?cp"english.astroawani.com/news/show/putin-unilateral-syria-strike-would-up-end-world-order-22075

Russia issued a stark warning Thursday that unilateral US military action could destroy world order, as the rival great powers discussed a plan to remove Syria's chemical weapons. In a bid to appeal directly to US voters and policy-makers over the head of President Barack Obama, Kremlin leader President Vladimir Putin penned a commentary in the New York Times. His article appeared at the same time as US Secretary of State John Kerry took off for Geneva, where he was to work with his Russian counterpart Sergei Lavrov on a plan to neutralize Syria's chemical arsenal. Putin welcomed Washington's willingness to engage with the Moscow initiative, but he rebuked Obama for his previous threat to launch US military strikes to punish Bashar al-Assad's regime. He warned that carrying out such a move without the approval of the United Nations Security Council, where Moscow wields a veto, would destroy the credibility of the world body. "No-one wants the United Nations to suffer the fate of the League of Nations, which collapsed because it lacked real leverage," he said, referring to the United Nations' failed inter-war predecessor. "A strike would increase violence and unleash a new wave of terrorism," Putin wrote, in a piece that emphasized that many of the rebels ranged against Assad have ties to Al-Qaeda. "It could undermine multilateral efforts to resolve the Iranian nuclear problem and the Israeli-Palestinian conflict and further destabilize the Middle East and North Africa," he continued. "It could throw the entire system of international law and order out of balance," he said.

#### Mid-east wars cause extinction

Russell, 9 (James A. Russell, Senior Lecturer, National Security Affairs, Naval Postgraduate School, ‘9 (Spring) “Strategic Stability Reconsidered: Prospects for Escalation and Nuclear War in the Middle East” IFRI, Proliferation Papers//, #26, \_\_http://www.ifri.org/downloads/PP26\_Russell\_2009.pdf\_\_)

Strategic stability in the region is thus undermined by various factors: (1) asymmetric interests in the bargaining framework that can introduce unpredictable behavior from actors; (2) the presence of non-state actors that introduce unpredictability into relationships between the antagonists; (3) incompatible assumptions about the structure of the deterrent relationship that makes the bargaining framework strategically unstable; (4) perceptions by Israel and the United States that its window of opportunity for military action is closing, which could prompt a preventive attack; (5) the prospect that Iran’s response to pre-emptive attacks could involve unconventional weapons, which could prompt escalation by Israel and/or the United States; (6) the lack of a communications framework to build trust and cooperation among framework participants. These systemic weaknesses in the coercive bargaining framework all suggest that escalation by any the parties could happen either on purpose or as a result of miscalculation or the pressures of wartime circumstance. Given these factors, it is disturbingly easy to imagine scenarios under which a conflict could quickly escalate in which the regional antagonists would consider the use of chemical, biological, or nuclear weapons. It would be a mistake to believe the nuclear taboo can somehow magically keep nuclear weapons from being used in the context of an unstable strategic framework. Systemic asymmetries between actors in fact suggest a certain increase in the probability of war – a war in which escalation could happen quickly and from a variety of participants. Once such a war starts, events would likely develop a momentum all their own and decision-making would consequently be shaped in unpredictable ways. The international community must take this possibility seriously, and muster every tool at its disposal to prevent such an outcome, which would be an unprecedented disaster for the peoples of the region, with substantial risk for the entire world.

**5**

**Congress link: Talking about ‘democracy” without discussing class is a joke--ignores the exploitive nature of our current political system**

Bob **Avakian**, Chairman, Revolutionary Communist Party, “Part 3: The Bourgeois View of Freedom and the Individual,” REVOLUTIONARY WORKER n. 1216, October 19, 20**03**. Available from the World Wide Web at: <http://rwor.org/a/1216/2hdem3.htm>, accessed 5/2/05.

In a world marked by profound class divisions and social inequalities, **to talk about "democracy"--without talking about the class nature of that democracy and which class it serves--is meaningless, and worse. So long as society is divided into classes, there can be no "democracy for all": one class** or another **will rule**, and it will uphold and promote that kind of democracy which serves its interests and goals. The question is: **which class will rule and whether its rule, and its system of democracy, will serve the continuation , or the eventual abolition , of class divisions and the corresponding relations of exploitation, oppression and inequality.**

**Identity link and root cause--oppression of women is a historical production of the emergence of a classed society founded on the logic of surplus accumulation.**

**Cloud** (Prof. Comm at UT) **03**

[Dana, “Marxism and Oppression”, Talk for Regional Socialist Conference, April 19, 2003, p. online]

**In order to challenge oppression, it is important to know where it comes from. Historians, archaeologists, and anthropologists tell us that in pre-class societies** such as hunter-gatherer societies, **racism and sexism were unheard of. Because homosexuality was not an identifiable category** of such societies**, discrimination on that basis did not occur** either. In fact, it is clear that racism**, sexism, and homophobia have arisen in particular kinds of societies, namely class societies**. Women’s oppression originated in the first class societies, while racism came into prominence in the early periods of capitalism when colonialism and slavery drove the economic system. The prohibition against gays and lesbians is a relatively modern phenomenon. But what all forms of oppression have in common is that they did not always exist and are not endemic to human nature. **They were created in the interest of ruling classes in society and continue to benefit the people at the top of society, while dividing and conquering the rest of us so as to weaken the common fight against the oppressors.** The work of Marx’s collaborator Friederich Engels onThe Origins of the Family, Private Property, and the State in some respects reflects the Victorian times in which in was written. Engels moralizes about women’s sexuality and doesn’t even include gay and lesbian liberation in his discussion of the oppressive family. However, anthropologists like the feminist Rayna Reiter have confirmed his most important and central argument that it **was in the first settled agricultural societies that women became an oppressed class. In societies where for the first time people could accumulate a surplus** of food and other **resources, it was possible for some people to hoard wealth and control its distributio**n. The first governments or state structures formed to legitimate an emerging ruling class. As settled communities grew in size and became more complex social organizations, and, most importantly, **as the surplus grew, the distribution of wealth became unequal—and a small number of men rose above the rest** of the population in wealth and power. **In the previous hunter-gatherer societies, there had been a sexual division of labor, but one without a hierarchy of value**. There was no strict demarcation between the reproductive and productive spheres. A**ll of that changed with** the development of **private property** in more settled communities. **The earlier division of labor** in which men did the heavier work, hunting, and animal agriculture, **became a system of differential control** over resource distribution. **The new system required more field workers** **and sought to maximize women’s reproductive potential**. Production shifted away from the household over time and women became associated with the reproductive role, losing control over the production and distribution of the necessities of life**. It was not a matter of male sexism, but of economic priorities of a developing class system. This is why Engels identifies women’s oppression as the first form of systematic class oppression in the world. Marxists** since Engels **have not dismissed the oppression of women as secondary** to other kinds of oppression and exploitation. **To the contrary, women’s oppression has a primary place in Marxist analysis and is a key issue that socialists organize around today. From this history we know that sexism did not always exist, and** that **men do not have an inherent interest in oppressing women as** domestic servants or sexual slaves. **Instead, women’s oppression always has served a class hierarchy in society. In our society** divided by sexism, **ideas about women’s nature as domestic caretakers or irrational sexual beings justify paying women lower wages compared to men, so that employers can pit workers against one another in competition for the same work.** Most women have always had to work outside the home to support their families. Today, women around the world are exploited in sweatshops where their status as women allows bosses to pay them very little, driving down the wages of both men and women. At the same time, **capitalist society relies on ideas about women to justify not providing very much in the way of social services** that would help provide health care, family leave, unemployment insurance, access to primary and higher education, and so forth—**all because these things are supposed to happen in the private family**, where women are responsible. This lack of social support results in a lower quality of life for many men as well as women. **Finally, contemporary ideologies that pit men against women encourage us to fight each other rather than organizing together**.

**The material determinism of capital is responsible for the instrumentalization of all life—makes all oppression inevitable.**

**Dyer-Witherford** (professor of Library and Info. Sciences @ the Univ. of Western Ontarion) **‘99** [Nick. Cyber Marx: Cycles and Circuits of Struggle in High Technology Capitalism.]

**For capitalism, the use of machines as organs of “will over nature” is an imperative**. The great insight of the Frankfurt School—an insight subsequently improved and amplified by feminists and ecologists—was that **capital’s dual project of dominating both humanity and nature was intimately tied to the cultivation of “instrumental reason” that systematically objectifies, reduces, quantifies and fragments the world for the purposes of technological control.** Business’s systemic need to cheapen labor, cut the costs of raw materials, and expand consumer markets gives it an inherent bias toward the piling-up of technological power. **This priority**—enshrined in phrases such as “progress,” “efficiency,” “productivity,” “modernization,” and “growth”—**assumes an automatism that is used to override any objection or alternative, regardless of the environmental and social consequences. Today, we witness global vistas** of toxification, deforestation, desertification, dying oceans, disappearing ozone layers, and disintegrating immune systems, **all interacting in ways that perhaps threaten the very existence of humanity and are undeniably inflicting social collapse, disease, and immiseration across the planet**. The degree to which this project of mastery has backfired is all too obvious.

**Vote Negative to validate and adopt the method of structural/historical criticism that is the 1NC.**

**one must understand the existing social totality before one can act on it—grounding the sites of political contestation or knowledge outside of labor and surplus value merely serve to humynize capital and prevent a transition to a society beyond oppression**

**Tumino** (Prof. English @ Pitt) **01**

[Stephen, “What is Orthodox Marxism and Why it Matters Now More than Ever”, Red Critiqu]

Any **effective political theory will have to do at least two things: it will have to offer an integrated understanding of social practices and, based on such an interrelated knowledge, offer a guideline for praxis. My main argument here is that among all contesting social theories now, only Orthodox Marxism has been able to produce an integrated knowledge of the existing social totality and provide lines of praxis that will lead to building a society free from necessity**. Bu

t first I must clarify what I mean by Orthodox Marxism. Like all other modes and forms of political theory, the very theoretical identity of Orthodox Marxism is itself contested—not just from non-and anti-Marxists who question the very "real" (by which they mean the "practical" as under free-market criteria) existence of any kind of Marxism now but, perhaps more tellingly, from within the Marxist tradition itself. I will, therefore, first say what I regard to be the distinguishing marks of Orthodox Marxism and then outline a short polemical map of contestation over Orthodox Marxism within the Marxist theories now. I will end by arguing for its effectivity in bringing about a new society based not on human rights but on freedom from necessity. I will argue **that to know contemporary society—and to be able to act on such knowledge—one has to first of all know what makes the existing social totality**. I will argue that the dominant social totality is based on inequality—not just inequality of power but inequality of economic access (which then determines access to health care, education, housing, diet, transportation, . . . ). This **systematic inequality cannot be explained by gender, race, sexuality, disability, ethnicity, or nationality. These are all secondary contradictions** and are all determined by the fundamental contradiction of capitalism which is inscribed in the relation of capital and labor. **All modes of Marxism now explain social inequalities primarily on the basis of these secondary contradictions and in doing so—and this is my main argument—legitimate capitalism. Why? Because such arguments authorize capitalism without gender, race, discrimination and thus accept economic inequality as an integral part of human societies. They accept a sunny capitalism—a capitalism beyond capitalism. Such a society, based on cultural equality but economic inequality, has always been the not-so-hidden agenda of the bourgeois** left—whether it has been called "new left," "postmarxism," or "radical democracy." This is, by the way, the main reason for its popularity in the culture industry—from the academy (Jameson, Harvey, Haraway, Butler,. . . ) to daily politics (Michael Harrington, Ralph Nader, Jesse Jackson,. . . ) to. . . . **For all, capitalism is here to stay and the best that can be done is to make its cruelties more tolerable,** more humane. This humanization (not eradication) of capitalism is the sole goal of ALL contemporary lefts (marxism, feminism, anti-racism, queeries, . . . ). **Such an understanding of social inequality is based on the fundamental understanding that the source of wealth is human knowledge and not human labor. That is, wealth is produced** by the human mind and is thus free from the **actual objective conditions that shape the historical relations of labor and capital. Only Orthodox Marxism recognizes the historicity of labor and its primacy as the source of all human wealth. In this paper I argue that any emancipatory theory has to be founded on recognition of the priority of Marx's labor theory of value and not repeat the technological determinism of corporate theory ("knowledge work") that masquerades as social theory.**

**Solvency 1NC**

**Obama will resist the plan**

**Lobel, Pittsburgh law professor, 2008**

(Jules, “Conflicts Between the Commander in Chief and Congress: Concurrent Power over the Conduct of War”, Ohio State Law Journal, vol 69, lexis)

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

**Means Obama just arbitrarily defines words to shirk enforcement**

**Pollack, 13** -- MSU Guggenheim Fellow and professor of history emeritus [Norman, "Drones, Israel, and the Eclipse of Democracy," Counterpunch, 2-5-13, www.counterpunch.org/2013/02/05/drones-israel-and-the-eclipse-of-democracy/, accessed 9-1-13]

Bisharat first addresses the transmogrification of international law by Israel’s military lawyers. We might call this damage control, were it not more serious. When the Palestinians first sought to join the I.C.C., and then, to receive the UN’s conferral of nonmember status on them, Israel raised fierce opposition. Why? He writes: “Israel’s frantic opposition to the elevation of Palestine’s status at the United Nations was motivated precisely by the fear that it would soon lead to I.C.C. jurisdiction over Palestinian claims of war crimes. Israeli leaders are unnerved for good reason. The I.C.C. could prosecute major international crimes committed on Palestinian soil anytime after the court’s founding on July 1, 2002.” **In response to the threat, we see the deliberate reshaping of the law:** Since 2000, “the Israel Defense Forces, guided by its **military lawyers, have attempted to remake the laws of war by consciously violating them and then creating new legal concepts to provide juridical cover** for their misdeeds.” (Italics, mine) In other words, habituate the law to the existence of atrocities; **in the US‘s case, targeted assassination, repeated often enough, seems permissible**, indeed clever and wise, **as pressure is steadily applied to the laws of war.** Even then, “collateral damage” is seen as unintentional, regrettable, but hardly prosecutable, and in the current atmosphere of complicity and desensitization, never a war crime. (**Obama is hardly a novice at this game of stretching the law to suit the convenience of**, shall we say, the **national interest**? **In order to ensure the distortion in counting civilian casualties, which would bring the number down, as Brennan with a straight face claimed, was “zero,” the Big Lie** if ever there was one, placing him in distinguished European company, **Obama redefined the meaning of “combatant” status to be any male of military age throughout the area** (which we) declared a combat zone, which noticeably led to a higher incidence of sadism, because it allowed for “second strikes” on funerals—the assumption that anyone attending must be a terrorist—and first responders, those who went to the aid of the wounded and dying, themselves also certainly terrorists because of their rescue attempts.) These guys play hardball, perhaps no more than in using—by report—the proverbial baseball cards to designate who would be next on the kill list. But funerals and first responders—verified by accredited witnesses–seems overly much, and not a murmur from an adoring public.

### advantage

**Humanitarian justifications key to hegemonic military operations**

Steven **Zunes**, Professor of International Relations at San Francisco State University, “Opposition to Intervention in Syria utilitarian, not ideological,” **9-23**-13, http://www.opendemocracy.net/civilresistance/stephen-zunes/opposition-to-intervention-in-syria-utilitarian-not-ideologicalFor example, the 1999 NATO **intervention** in Yugoslavia, rather than force Milosevic from power, initially strengthened the regime as people rallied around the flag in the face of more than 11 weeks of bombing by foreign forces. The leaders of Otpor, the youthful pro-democracy movement that would eventually lead the struggle that toppled the regime nonviolently, strongly opposed the bombing and recognized that it set back their cause. This nationalist reaction **is exacerbated by the understandable tendency to question the motivations** - sometimes justifiably and sometimes not - of those who advocate the so-called “responsibility to protect.” Indeed, **most foreign interventions by the U**nited **S**tates **which were viewed** by most of the international community **as acts of imperialism** – Vietnam, Iraq, the Dominican Republic, Grenada, and Panama, among others – **were rationalized on humanitarian grounds**. Meanwhile, the **US government remains,** by far, **the world’s primary military, economic, and diplomatic supporter of** the world’s remaining authoritarian regimes and occupying armies**, openly defending allies engaged in military operations** that, like those of the Syrian regime, have resulted in the widespread killing of civilians.

**Everything is getting better**

**Ridley**, visiting professor at Cold Spring Harbor Laboratory, former science editor of *The Economist*, and award-winning science writer, **10** (Matt, *The Rational Optimist*, pg. 13-15)

If my fictional family is not to your taste, perhaps you prefer statistics. **Since 1800**, **the population of the world has multiplied six times**, **yet average life expectancy has more than doubled and real income has risen more than nine times**. Taking a shorter perspective, **in 2005**, **compared with 1955**, **the average human being on Planet Earth earned nearly three times as much money** (corrected for inflation), **ate one-third more calories of food**, **buried one-third as many of her children and could expect to live one-third longer**. **She was less likely to die as a result of war**, **murder**, **childbirth**, **accidents**, **tornadoes**, **flooding**, **famine**, **whooping cough**, **tuberculosis**, **malaria**, **diphtheria**, **typhus**, **typhoid**, **measles**, **smallpox**, **scurvy or polio**. **She was less likely**, at any given age, **to get cancer**, **heart disease or stroke**. **She was more likely to be literate and to have finished school**. **She was more likely to own a telephone**, **a flush toilet**, **a refrigerator and a bicycle**. **All this during a half-century when the world population has more than doubled**, **so that far from being rationed by population pressure**, **the goods and services available to the people of the world have expanded**. It is, by any standard, an astonishing human achievement. **Averages conceal a lot**. **But even if you break down the world into bits**, **it is hard to find any region that was worse off in 2005 than it was in 1955**. Over that half-century, real income per head ended a little lower in only six countries (Afghanistan, Haiti, Congo, Liberia, Sierra Leone and Somalia), life expectancy in three (Russia, Swaziland and Zimbabwe), and infant survival in none. In the rest they have rocketed upward. Africa’s rate of improvement has been distressingly slow and patchy compared with the rest of the world, and many southern African countries saw life expectancy plunge in the 1990s as the AIDS epidemic took hold (before recovering in recent years). There were also moments in the half-century when you could have caught countries in episodes of dreadful deterioration of living standards or life chances – China in the 1960s, Cambodia in the 1970s, Ethiopia in the 1980s, Rwanda in the 1990s, Congo in the 2000s, North Korea throughout. Argentina had a disappointingly stagnant twentieth century. But **overall**, **after fifty years**, **the outcome for the world is** remarkably, astonishingly, **dramatically positive**. The average South Korean lives twenty-six more years and earns fifteen times as much income each year as he did in 1955 (and earns fifteen times as much as his North Korean counter part). **The average Mexican lives longer now than the average Briton did in 1955**. **The average Botswanan earns more than the average Finn did in 1955**. **Infant mortality is lower today in Nepal than it was in Italy in 1951**. **The proportion of Vietnamese living on less than $2 a day has dropped from 90 per cent to 30 per cent in twenty years**. **The rich have got richer**, **but the poor have done even better**. **The poor in the developing world grew their consumption twice as fast as the world as a whole between 1980 and 2000**. The Chinese are ten times as rich, one-third as fecund and twenty-eight years longer-lived than they were fifty years ago. Even Nigerians are twice as rich, 25 per cent less fecund and nine years longer-lived than they were in 1955. **Despite a doubling of the world population**, even **the raw number of people living in absolute poverty** (defined as less than a 1985 dollar a day) **has fallen since the 1950s**. **The percentage living in such absolute poverty has dropped by more than half** – to less than 18 per cent. **That number is**, of course, **still** all **too** horribly **high**, **but** the trend is hardly a cause for despair: **at the current rate of decline**, **it would hit zero around 2035** – though it probably won’t. The United Nations estimates that poverty was reduced more in the last fifty years than in the previous 500.

**Patriarchy doesn’t cause war—their evidence can’t explain variations in the outbreak of conflict.**

Jack S. **Levy**, Governors' Professor of Political Science at Rutgers University, **1998** (“The Causes Of War And The Conditions Of Peace,” *Annual Review of Political Science*, Volume 1, June, Available Online to Subscribing Institutions via Annual Reviews Full Text)

Another exception to the focus on variations in war and peace can be found in some feminist theorizing about the outbreak of war, although **most feminist work on war focuses on the consequences of war**, particularly for women, **rather than on the outbreak of war** (Elshtain 1987, Enloe 1990, Peterson 1992, Tickner 1992, Sylvester 1994). The argument is that the gendered nature of states, cultures, and the world system contributes to the persistence of war in world politics. This might provide an alternative (or supplement) to anarchy as an answer to the first question of why violence and war repeatedly occur in international politics, although **the fact that peace is more common than war makes it difficult to argue that patriarchy** (or anarchy) **causes war. Theories of patriarchy might** also **help answer the** second **question of variations in war and peace**, **if they identified differences in the patriarchal structures and gender relations in different international and domestic political systems in different historical contexts**, **and if they incorporated these differences into empirically testable hypotheses about the outbreak of war**. This is a promising research agenda, and one that has engaged some anthropologists. **Most current feminist thinking in political science about the outbreak of war, however, treats gendered systems and patriarchal structures** in the same way that neorealists treat anarchy—**as a constant**—**and consequently it cannot explain variations in war and peace**.

**Events of war preclude solutions to structural violence – No alt without our action**

**Rabie 94** (Mohamed, professor of International political economy, Georgetown University, Praeger, “Conflict Resolution and Ethnicity”, 1994, <http://www.questiaschool.com/read/14788166?title=Conflict%20Resolution%20and%20Ethnicity>)

**In countries where democracy does not exist** and where the control of authoritarian states over peoples' lives and fortunes is real, **the nonviolent resolution and prosecution of political conflict is an impossibility because violence is the major tool of the oppressor rather than the oppressed. Democratization** as the first order of concern, which the proponents of a limited definition of peace further advocate, **cannot be effected without freedom and liberty**, two conditions for access to cherished values. Therefore, **a realistic definition of peace ought to take both arguments into consideration.** This is particularly important since the proponents of positive peace tend to view it more as a process and less as a stationary state of political affairs, while the others see it generally in opposite terms. In fact, **human experience seems to indicate that the absence of war and violence cannot be maintained without social justice, and social justice cannot be achieved under conditions of war and violence.** Consequently, an operational definition of realistic peace would probably describe it as the absence of violence under conditions and relationships that provide for the nonviolent resolution of political conflict and the freedom to pursue legitimate individual and group goals without threat or coercion. Peace, to be real and human, must be understood and employed as a continuous process to lessen social tension, resolve political conflict, and create conditions to pursue freedom and justice through a gradual evolution of human perceptions and socio-political institutions. Thus, **a strategy for universal peace must deal not only with war but also with the very forces and conditions that cause the eruption of war and induce the spread of violence in the first place. It must also strive to change a people's perceptions of the other** in order to humanize the adversary, acknowledge his grievances, and legitimize his basic concerns. Above all, **it must lay the foundation for transforming existing group relationships and state and civil society institutions,** with a view to creating new more dynamic ones committed to promoting compatible visions and values with developing shared interests.

## 2NC

### T

#### Violation –treaties don’t legally grant executive authority

STATEMENT OF LOUIS FISHER, SENIOR SPECIALIST IN SEPARATION OF ¶ POWERS, CONGRESSIONAL RESEARCH SERVICE, LIBRARY OF CONGRESS, ¶ WASHINGTON, D.C.¶ [Senate Hearing 107-892]¶ [From the U.S. Government Printing Office]¶ APRIL 17, 2002¶ Serial No. J-107-74¶ APPLYING THE WAR POWERS RESOLUTION TO THE WAR ON TERRORISM¶ HEARING¶ before the¶ SUBCOMMITTEE ON THE CONSTITUTION, FEDERALISM, AND PROPERTY RIGHTS¶ of the¶ COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY¶ UNITED STATES SENATE¶ ONE HUNDRED SEVENTH CONGRESS¶ SECOND SESSION¶ http://www.gpo.gov/fdsys/pkg/CHRG-107shrg85888/html/CHRG-107shrg85888.htm

In addition to citing the U.N. Charter and Security Council ¶ resolutions as grounds for using American troops in military ¶ operations, Presidents regard mutual security treaties as another ¶source of authority. Treaties such as NATO and SEATO stipulate that ¶ provisions shall be ``carried out by the Parties in accordance with ¶ their respective constitutional processes.'' Nothing in the legislative ¶ histories of these treaties suggests that the President has unilateral ¶ authority to act in the event of an attack. Military action by the ¶ United States would have to be consistent with ``constitutional ¶ processes.''¶ To argue that NATO and other mutual security treaties confer upon ¶ the President the authority to use military force without congressional ¶ approval would allow the President and the Senate, through the treaty ¶ process, to amend the Constitution by stripping the House of ¶ Representatives of its prerogatives over the use of military force. ¶ Scholars who examined NATO after its adoption concluded that the ¶ language about constitutional processes was ``intended to ensure that ¶ the executive branch of the Government should come back to the Congress ¶ when decisions were required in which the Congress has a constitutional ¶ responsibility.'' The NATO treaty ``does not transfer to the President the Congressional power to make war.'' \15\¶ Senator Walter George said this about SEATO: ``The treaty does not ¶ call for automatic action; it calls for consultation. If any course of ¶ action shall be agreed upon or decided upon, then that course of action ¶ must have the approval of Congress, because the constitutional process ¶ is provided for.'' 101 Cong. Rec. 1051 (1955). Nevertheless, the Lyndon ¶ Johnson Administration cited SEATO as one legal justification for the ¶ Vietnam War.\16\¶ The War Powers Resolution attempted to limit the effect of mutual ¶ security treaties. Authority to introduce U.S. forces into hostilities shall not be inferred ``from any treaty heretofore or hereafter ¶ ratified unless such treaty is implemented by legislation specifically ¶ authorizing'' the introduction of American troops. 87 Stat. 558, ¶ Sec. 8(a) (1973). The Senate Foreign Relations Committee explained that ¶ this provision ensured that both Houses of Congress ``must be affirmatively involved in any decision of the United States to engage in hostilities pursuant to a treaty.'' S. Rept. No. 93-220, at 26 ¶ (1973). These understandings had zero impact on requiring congressional ¶ approval for the use of U.S. forces operating in conjunction with NATO ¶ in Bosnia and Kosovo.

#### Restrictions on war power are prohibitive

David J. Barron & Martin S. Lederman, Harvard Law Review, February 2008. “THE COMMANDER IN CHIEF AT THE LOWEST EBB — A CONSTITUTIONAL HISTORY,” http://www.harvardlawreview.org/media/pdf/barron\_lederman2.pdf

251–52. Senator Edward Gurney asked what would happen if Congress had imposed such a restriction but then the President had learned of missiles in the Eastern Hemisphere that ¶ were to be fired at the U.S. Capitol within two weeks. Rehnquist’s response was revealing: he ¶ replied not that there would be a Commander in Chief override in such a case, but that the President would be “perfectly right in concluding that Congress had not intended [the prohibition] to ¶ apply to this situation.” Id. at 252. That is to say, he was prepared to read an implicit emergency exception into such a statutory limitation.

#### That includes only outright prohibitions on war powers, not mere consequences

**Caiaccio 94** (Kevin T., “Are Noncompetition Covenants Among Law Partners Against Public Policy?”, Georgia Law Review, Spring, 28 Ga. L. Rev. 807, Lexis)

The Howard court began its analysis by examining the California Business and Professions Code, which expressly permits reasonable restrictive covenants among business partners. [139](http://www.lexis.com/research/retrieve?y=&dom1=&dom2=&dom3=&dom4=&dom5=&crnPrh=&crnSah=&crnSch=&crnLgh=&crnSumm=&crnCt=&cc=&crnCh=&crnGc=&shepSummary=&crnFmt=&shepStateKey=&pushme=1&tmpFBSel=all&totaldocs=&taggedDocs=&toggleValue=&numDocsChked=0&prefFBSel=0&delformat=XCITE&fpDocs=&fpNodeId=&fpCiteReq=&fpSetup=0&_m=2f902ef509c60febb5baa821f74f591c&docnum=69&_fmtstr=FULL&_startdoc=51&wchp=dGLzVzz-zSkAb&_md5=13c4fa4ea4799356b6831f265d253078&focBudTerms=the+word+restrict+or+the+term+restrict+or+the+phrase+restrict+&focBudSel=all" \l "n139" \t "_self) The court noted that this provision had long applied to doctors and accountants and concluded that the general language of the statute provided no indication of an exception for lawyers. [140](http://www.lexis.com/research/retrieve?y=&dom1=&dom2=&dom3=&dom4=&dom5=&crnPrh=&crnSah=&crnSch=&crnLgh=&crnSumm=&crnCt=&cc=&crnCh=&crnGc=&shepSummary=&crnFmt=&shepStateKey=&pushme=1&tmpFBSel=all&totaldocs=&taggedDocs=&toggleValue=&numDocsChked=0&prefFBSel=0&delformat=XCITE&fpDocs=&fpNodeId=&fpCiteReq=&fpSetup=0&_m=2f902ef509c60febb5baa821f74f591c&docnum=69&_fmtstr=FULL&_startdoc=51&wchp=dGLzVzz-zSkAb&_md5=13c4fa4ea4799356b6831f265d253078&focBudTerms=the+word+restrict+or+the+term+restrict+or+the+phrase+restrict+&focBudSel=all" \l "n140" \t "_self) After reaching this conclusion, however, the court noted that, since it had the authority to promulgate a higher standard for lawyers, the statute alone did not necessarily control, [141](http://www.lexis.com/research/retrieve?y=&dom1=&dom2=&dom3=&dom4=&dom5=&crnPrh=&crnSah=&crnSch=&crnLgh=&crnSumm=&crnCt=&cc=&crnCh=&crnGc=&shepSummary=&crnFmt=&shepStateKey=&pushme=1&tmpFBSel=all&totaldocs=&taggedDocs=&toggleValue=&numDocsChked=0&prefFBSel=0&delformat=XCITE&fpDocs=&fpNodeId=&fpCiteReq=&fpSetup=0&_m=2f902ef509c60febb5baa821f74f591c&docnum=69&_fmtstr=FULL&_startdoc=51&wchp=dGLzVzz-zSkAb&_md5=13c4fa4ea4799356b6831f265d253078&focBudTerms=the+word+restrict+or+the+term+restrict+or+the+phrase+restrict+&focBudSel=all" \l "n141" \t "_self) and the court therefore proceeded to examine the California Rules of Professional Conduct. [142](http://www.lexis.com/research/retrieve?y=&dom1=&dom2=&dom3=&dom4=&dom5=&crnPrh=&crnSah=&crnSch=&crnLgh=&crnSumm=&crnCt=&cc=&crnCh=&crnGc=&shepSummary=&crnFmt=&shepStateKey=&pushme=1&tmpFBSel=all&totaldocs=&taggedDocs=&toggleValue=&numDocsChked=0&prefFBSel=0&delformat=XCITE&fpDocs=&fpNodeId=&fpCiteReq=&fpSetup=0&_m=2f902ef509c60febb5baa821f74f591c&docnum=69&_fmtstr=FULL&_startdoc=51&wchp=dGLzVzz-zSkAb&_md5=13c4fa4ea4799356b6831f265d253078&focBudTerms=the+word+restrict+or+the+term+restrict+or+the+phrase+restrict+&focBudSel=all" \l "n142" \t "_self) The court avoided the apparent conflict between the business statute and the ethics rule by undertaking a strained reading of the rule. In essence, the court held that the word "restrict" referred only to outright prohibitions, and that a mere "economic consequence" does not equal a prohibition. [143](http://www.lexis.com/research/retrieve?y=&dom1=&dom2=&dom3=&dom4=&dom5=&crnPrh=&crnSah=&crnSch=&crnLgh=&crnSumm=&crnCt=&cc=&crnCh=&crnGc=&shepSummary=&crnFmt=&shepStateKey=&pushme=1&tmpFBSel=all&totaldocs=&taggedDocs=&toggleValue=&numDocsChked=0&prefFBSel=0&delformat=XCITE&fpDocs=&fpNodeId=&fpCiteReq=&fpSetup=0&_m=2f902ef509c60febb5baa821f74f591c&docnum=69&_fmtstr=FULL&_startdoc=51&wchp=dGLzVzz-zSkAb&_md5=13c4fa4ea4799356b6831f265d253078&focBudTerms=the+word+restrict+or+the+term+restrict+or+the+phrase+restrict+&focBudSel=all" \l "n143" \t "_self)

#### Violate War powers=Power to make war

**Merriam-Webster, 2013**, p. <http://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/war%20power>

the power to make war; specifically : an extraordinary power exercised usually by the executive branch of a government in the prosecution of a war

### A2 “Bernstein” 1AR

**Two-thousand years of history prove**

William **Wohlforth 8** Daniel Webster Professor of Government, Dartmouth. BA in IR, MA in IR and MPhil and PhD in pol sci, Yale, Unipolarity, Status Competition, and Great Power War, October 2008, World Politics Vol. 61, Iss. 1; pg. 28, 31 pgs, Proquest

Despite increasingly compelling findings concerning the importance of status seeking in human behavior, research on its connection to war waned some three decades ago.38 Yet **empirical studies of the relationship between** both systemic and dyadic **capabilities distributions and war have continued to cumulate. If the relationships implied by the status theory run afoul** of well-established patterns or general historical findings, **then there is little reason to continue investigating them. The clearest empirical implication** of the theory **is that** status **competition is unlikely to cause great power military conflict in unipolar systems. If status competition is an important contributory cause of great power war, then,** ceteris paribus, **unipolar systems should be markedly less war-prone** than bipolar or multipolar systems. And this appears to be the case. As Daniel Geller notes **in a review of the empirical literature: "The only polar structure that appears to influence conflict probability is unipolarity."**39 In addition, a larger number of studies at the dyadic level support the related expectation that narrow capabilities gaps and ambiguous or unstable capabilities hierarchies increase the probability of war.40 These studies are based entirely on post-sixteenth-century European history, and most are limited to the post-1815 period covered by the standard data sets. Though the systems coded as unipolar, near-unipolar, and hegemonic are all marked by a high concentration of capabilities in a single state, these studies operationalize unipolarity in a variety of ways, often very differently from the definition adopted here. **An ongoing collaborative project looking at ancient interstate systems over** the course of **two thousand years suggests** **that** **historical systems** **that come closest to** the definition of unipolarity used here **exhibit precisely the** **behavioral** **properties implied by the theory**. 41 As David C. Kang's research shows, the **East Asian system between 1300 and 1900 was** an unusually stratified **unipolar** structure, **with** an economic and militarily dominant **China interacting with** a small number of geographically proximate, clearly weaker East Asian **states**.42 Status politics existed, but actors were channeled by elaborate cultural understandings and interstate practices into clearly recognized ranks. **Warfare was exceedingly rare, and the major outbreaks occurred precisely when the theory would predict: when China's capabilities waned**, reducing the clarity of the underlying material hierarchy and increasing status dissonance for lesser powers. Much more research is needed, but initial exploration of other arguably unipolar systems-for example, Rome, Assyria, the Amarna system-appears consistent with the hypothesis.43 Status Competition and Causal Mechanisms **Both theory and evidence demonstrate convincingly that competition for status is a driver of human behavior, and social** identity **theory** and related literatures **suggest** the **conditions under which it might come to the fore in great power relations.** Both the systemic and dyadic findings presented in large-N studies are broadly consistent with the theory, but they are also consistent with power transition and other rationalist theories of hegemonic war.

### Struct violence

**Heg decreases structural violence---any alt dooms humanity to deprivation**

Thomas P.M. **Barnett 11,** Former Senior Strategic Researcher and Professor in the Warfare Analysis & Research Department, Center for Naval Warfare Studies, U.S. Naval War College American military geostrategist and Chief Analyst at Wikistrat, worked as the Assistant for Strategic Futures in the Office of Force Transformation in the Department of Defense, September 12, 2011, “The New Rules: The Rise of the Rest Spells U.S. Strategic Victory,” World Politics Review, online: <http://www.worldpoliticsreview.com/articles/9973/the-new-rules-the-rise-of-the-rest-spells-u-s-strategic-victory>

First the absurdity: A few of the most **over-the-top Bush-Cheney neocons did** indeed **promote a vision of U.S. primacy by which America shouldn't be afraid to wage war to keep other rising powers at bay. It was a nutty concept then, and it remains a nutty concept today.** But since it feeds a lot of major military weapons system purchases, especially for the China-centric Air Force and Navy, don't expect it to disappear so long as the Pentagon's internal budget fights are growing in intensity. ¶ **Meanwhile**, the Chinese do their stupid best to fuel this outdated logic by building a force designed to keep America out of East Asia just as their nation's dependency on resources flowing from unstable developing regions skyrockets. **With America's fiscal constraints now abundantly clear, the world's primary policing force is pulling back, while that force's implied successor is nowhere close to being able to field a similar power-projection capacity -- and never will be.** So with NATO clearly stretched to its limits by the combination of Afghanistan and Libya, **a lot of future fires in developing regions will likely be left to burn on their own**. We'll just have to wait and see how much foreign commentators delight in that G-Zero dynamic in the years ahead. ¶ That gets us to the original "insult": **the U.S. did not lord it over the world in the 1990s. Yes, it did argue for and promote the most rapid spread of globalization possible. But the "evil" of the Washington Consensus only yielded the most rapid growth of a truly global middle class that the world has ever seen**. Yes, we can, in our current economic funk, somehow cast that development as the "loss of U.S. hegemony," in that the American consumer is no longer the demand-center of globalization's universe. But this is without a doubt the most amazing achievement of U.S. foreign policy, surpassing even our role in World War II. ¶ **Numerous world powers served as global or regional hegemons before we came along, and their record on economic development was painfully transparent: Elites got richer, and the masses got poorer. Then America showed up after World War II and engineered an international liberal trade order**, one that was at first admittedly limited to the West. But **within four decades it went virally global, and now for the first time in history, more than half of our planet's population lives in conditions of modest-to-mounting abundance -- after millennia of mere sustenance**. ¶ You may choose to interpret this as some sort of cosmic coincidence, but **the historical sequence is undeniable: With its unrivaled power, America made the world a far better place**. ¶ That § Marked 11:57 § spreading wave of global abundance has reformatted all sorts of traditional societies that lay in its path. Some, like the Chinese, have adapted to it magnificently in an economic and social sense, with the political adaptation sure to follow eventually. Others, being already democracies, have done far better across the board, like Turkey, Indonesia and India. But there are also numerous traditional societies where that reformatting impulse from below has been met by both harsh repression from above and violent attempts by religious extremists to effect a "counterreformation" that firewalls the "faithful" from an "evil" outside world.¶ Does this violent blowback constitute the great threat of our age? Not really. As I've long argued, this "friction" from globalization's tectonic advance is merely what's left over now that great-power war has gone dormant for 66 years and counting, with interstate wars now so infrequent and so less lethal as to be dwarfed by the civil strife that plagues those developing regions still suffering weak connectivity to the global economy. ¶ **Let's remember what the U.S. actually did across the 1990s** after the Soviet threat disappeared. **It went out of its way to police the world's poorly governed spaces, battling rogue regimes and answering the 9-1-1 call repeatedly when disaster and/or civil strife struck vulnerable societies. Yes, playing globalization's bodyguard made America public enemy No. 1 in the eyes of its most violent rejectionist movements**, including al-Qaida, **but we made the effort because**, in our heart of hearts, **we knew that this is what blessed powers are supposed to do**. ¶ Some, like the Bush-Cheney neocons, were driven by more than that sense of moral responsibility. They saw a chance to remake the world so as to assure U.S. primacy deep into the future. The timing of their dream was cruelly ironic, for it blossomed just as America's decades-in-the-making grand strategy reached its apogee in the peaceful rise of so many great powers at once. Had Sept. 11 not intervened, the neocons would likely have eventually targeted rising China for strategic demonization. Instead, they locked in on Osama bin Laden. The rest, as they say, is history. ¶ The follow-on irony of **the War on Terror** is that its operational requirements **actually revolutionized a major portion of the U.S. military -- specifically the Army, Marines and Special Forces -- in such a way as to redirect their strategic ethos from big wars to small ones**. It also forged a new operational bond between the military's irregular elements and that portion of the Central Intelligence Agency that pursues direct action against transnational bad actors. The up-front costs of this transformation were far too high, largely because the Bush White House stubbornly refused to embrace counterinsurgency tactics until after the popular repudiation signaled by the 2006 midterm election. But **the end result is clear: We now have the force we actually need to manage this global era.¶ But,** of course, **that can all be tossed into the dumpster if we convince ourselves that our "loss" of hegemony was somehow the result of our own misdeed, instead of being our most profound gift to world history. Again, we grabbed the reins of global leadership and patiently engineered not only the greatest redistribution -- and expansion -- of global wealth ever seen, but also the greatest consolidation of global peace ever seen. ¶ Now, if we can sensibly realign our strategic relationship with the one rising great power, China,** whose growing strength upsets us so much, **then in combination with the rest of the world's rising great powers we can collectively wield enough global policing power to manage what's yet to come.** ¶ As always, **the choice is ours.**

**The world is getting better now because heg is peaceful**

Josh **Busby 12**, Assistant Professor of Public Affairs and a fellow in the RGK Center for Philanthropy and Community Service as well as a Crook Distinguished Scholar at the Robert S. Strauss Center for International Security and Law, <http://duckofminerva.blogspot.com/2012/01/get-real-chicago-ir-guys-out-in-force.html>

**Is Unipolarity Peaceful?** As evidence, **Monteiro provides metrics of the number of years during which great powers have been at war.** For the unipolar era since the end of the Cold War, the United States has been at war 13 of those 22 years or 59% (see his Table 2 below). Now, **I've been following** some of **the discussion by** and about Steven **Pinker** and Joshua Goldstein's [work](http://www.nytimes.com/2011/12/18/opinion/sunday/war-really-is-going-out-of-style.html?pagewanted=all) **that suggests the world is becoming more peaceful** **with** interstate wars and intrastate **wars becoming more rare**. I was struck by the graphic that Pinker used in a Wall Street Journal [piece](http://online.wsj.com/article/SB10001424053111904106704576583203589408180.html) back in September that drew on the Uppsala Conflict Data, which shows a steep decline in the number of deaths per 100,000 people. **How do we square this account by Monteiro of a unipolar world that is not peaceful** (**with the U.S. at war during this period in Iraq twice, Afghanistan, Kosovo**) **and** **Pinker's account which suggests declining violence in the contemporary period**? **Where Pinker is focused on systemic outcomes, Monteiro's measure merely reflect years during which the great powers are at war**. Under unipolarity, there is only one great power so the measure is partial and not systemic. However, Monteiro's theory aims to be systemic rather than partial. In critiquing Wohlforth's early work on unipolarity stability, Monteiro notes: Wohlforth’s argument does not exclude all kinds of war. Although power preponderance allows the unipole to manage conflicts globally, this argument is not meant to apply to relations between major and minor powers, or among the latter (17). So presumably, **a more adequate test of the peacefulness or not of unipolarity** (at least for Monteiro) **is not the number of years the great power has been at** **war but whether the system as a whole is becoming more peaceful under unipolarity compared** to previous eras, including wars between major and minor powers or wars between minor powers and whether the wars that do happen are as violent as the ones that came before. Now, as Ross Douthat pointed [out](http://douthat.blogs.nytimes.com/2011/10/17/steven-pinkers-history-of-violence/), Pinker's argument isn't based on a logic of benign hegemony. It could be that even if the present era is more peaceful, unipolarity has nothing to do with it. Moreover, **Pinker may be wrong**. Maybe the world isn't all that peaceful. I keep thinking about the places I don't want to go to anymore because they are violent (Mexico, Honduras, El Salvador, Nigeria, Pakistan, etc.) As Tyler Cowen [noted](http://marginalrevolution.com/marginalrevolution/2011/10/steven-pinker-on-violence.html), the measure Pinker uses to suggest violence is a per capita one, which doesn't get at the absolute level of violence perpetrated in an era of a greater world population. **But, if my read of other** [**reports**](http://www.hsrgroup.org/human-security-reports/20092010/graphs-and-tables.aspx) **based on Uppsala data is right, war is becoming more rare and less deadly** (though later [data](http://www.pcr.uu.se/research/ucdp/charts_and_graphs/) suggests lower level armed conflict may be increasing again since the mid-2000s). The apparent violence of the contemporary era may be something of a presentist bias and reflect our own lived experience and the ubiquity of news media **.Even if the U.S. has been at war for the better part of unipolarity, the deadliness is declining, even compared with Vietnam, let alone World War II.** Does Unipolarity Drive Conflict? So**, I** kind of took **issue with the Monteiro's premise that unipolarity is not peaceful**. What about his argument that unipolarity drives conflict? Monteiro suggests that the unipole has three available strategies - defensive dominance, offensive dominance and disengagement - though is less likely to use the third. Like Rosato and Schuessler, Monteiro suggests because other states cannot trust the intentions of other states, namely the unipole, that minor states won't merely bandwagon with the unipole. Some "recalcitrant" minor powers will attempt to see what they can get away with and try to build up their capabilities. As an aside, in Rosato and Schuessler world, unless these are located in strategically important areas (i.e. places where there is oil), then the unipole (the United States) should disengage. **In Monteiro's world**, **disengagement would inexorably lead to instability and draw in the U.S. again** (though I'm not sure this necessarily follows), but neither defensive or offensive dominance offer much possibility for peace either since it is U.S. power in and of itself that makes other states insecure, even though they can't balance against it.

**US pursuit of hegemony inevitable**

**Kagan**, 1/24/20**11**, (Robert Kagan, [American](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/United_States)historian, author and foreign policy commentator at the[Brookings Institution](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Brookings_Institution)) ‘The Price of Power: The benefits of U.S. defense spending far outweigh the costs’, VOL. 16, NO. 18, <http://www.weeklystandard.com/articles/price-power_533696.html?page=3>

In theory, the United States could refrain from intervening abroad. But, in practice, will it? Many assume today that the American public has had it with interventions, and Alice Rivlin certainly reflects a strong current of opinion when she says that “much of the public does not believe that we need to go in and take over other people’s countries.” That sentiment has often been heard after interventions, especially those with mixed or dubious results. It was heard after the four-year-long war in the Philippines, which cost 4,000 American lives and untold Filipino casualties. It was heard after Korea and after Vietnam. It was heard after Somalia. Yet **the reality has been that after each intervention, the sentiment against foreign involvement has faded, and the United States has intervened again. Depending on how one chooses to count, the United States has undertaken roughly 25 overseas interventions since 1898**:Cuba, 1898The Philippines, 1898-1902China, 1900Cuba, 1906Nicaragua, 1910 & 1912Mexico, 1914Haiti, 1915Dominican Republic, 1916Mexico, 1917World War I, 1917-1918Nicaragua, 1927World War II, 1941-1945Korea, 1950-1953Lebanon, 1958Vietnam, 1963-1973Dominican Republic, 1965Grenada, 1983Panama, 1989First Persian Gulf war, 1991Somalia, 1992Haiti, 1994Bosnia, 1995Kosovo, 1999Afghanistan, 2001-presentIraq, 2003-presentThat is one intervention every 4.5 years on average. Overall, **the United States has intervened or been engaged in combat somewhere in 52 out of the last 112 years, or roughly 47 percent of the time. Since the end of the Cold War**, it is true, **the rate of U.S. interventions has increased, with an intervention roughly once every 2.5 years and American troops intervening or engaged in combat in 16 out of 22 years, or over 70 percent of the time**, since the fall of the Berlin Wall.The argument for returning to “normal” begs the question: What is normal for the United States? The historical record of the last century suggests that it is not a policy of nonintervention. This record ought to raise doubts about the theory that American behavior these past two decades is the product of certain unique ideological or doctrinal movements, whether “liberal imperialism” or “neoconservatism.” **Allegedly “realist” presidents in this era have been just as likely to order interventions as their more idealistic colleagues**. George H.W. Bush was as profligate an intervener as Bill Clinton. He invaded Panama in 1989, intervened in Somalia in 1992—both on primarily idealistic and humanitarian grounds—which along with the first Persian Gulf war in 1991 made for three interventions in a single four-year term. Since 1898 the list of presidents who ordered armed interventions abroad has included William McKinley, Theodore Roose-velt, William Howard Taft, Woodrow Wilson, Franklin Roosevelt, Harry Truman, Dwight Eisenhower, John F. Kennedy, Ronald Reagan, George H.W. Bush, Bill Clinton, and George W. Bush. **One would be hard-pressed to find a common ideological or doctrinal thread among them—unless it is the doctrine and ideology of a mainstream American foreign policy that leans more toward intervention than many imagine or would care to admit**.Many don’t want to admit it, and **the only thing as consistent as this pattern of American behavior has been the claim by contemporary critics that it is abnormal and a departure from American traditions.** The anti-imperialists of the late 1890s, the isolationists of the 1920s and 1930s, the critics of Korea and Vietnam, and the critics of the first Persian Gulf war, the interventions in the Balkans, and the more recent wars of the Bush years have all insisted that the nation had in those instances behaved unusually or irrationally. And yet the behavior has continued.To note this consistency is not the same as justifying it. The United States may have been wrong for much of the past 112 years. Some critics would endorse the sentiment expressed by the historian Howard K. Beale in the 1950s, that “the men of 1900” had steered the United States onto a disastrous course of world power which for the subsequent half-century had done the United States and the world no end of harm. But **whether one lauds or condemns this past century of American foreign policy—and one can find reasons to do both—the fact of this consistency remains.It would require not just a modest reshaping of American foreign policy priorities but a sharp departure from this tradition to bring about the kinds of changes that would allow the United States to make do with a substantially smaller force structure.**Is such a sharp departure in the offing? It is no doubt true that many Americans are unhappy with the on-going warfare in Afghanistan and to a lesser extent in Iraq, and that, if asked, a majority would say the United States should intervene less frequently in foreign nations, or perhaps not at **all. It may also be true that the effect of long military involvements in Iraq and Afghanistan may cause Americans and their leaders to shun further interventions at least for a few years—as they did for nine years after World War I, five years after World War II, and a decade after Vietnam. This may be further reinforced by the difficult economic times in which Americans are currently suffering. The longest period of nonintervention in the past century was during the 1930s, when unhappy memories of World War I combined with the economic catastrophe of the Great Depression to constrain American interventionism to an unusual degree and produce the first and perhaps only genuinely isolationist period in American history**.So are we back to the mentality of the 1930s? It wouldn’t appear so. There is no great wave of isolationism sweeping the country. There is not even the equivalent of a Patrick Buchanan, who received 3 million votes in the 1992 Republican primaries. Any isolationist tendencies that might exist are severely tempered by continuing fears of terrorist attacks that might be launched from overseas. Nor are the vast majority of Americans suffering from economic calamity to nearly the degree that they did in the Great Depression.Even if we were to repeat the policies of the 1930s, however, **it is worth recalling that the unusual restraint of those years was not sufficient to keep the United States out of war. On the contrary, the United States took actions which ultimately led to the greatest and most costly foreign intervention in its history. Even the most determined and in those years powerful isolationists could not prevent it**.Today there are a number of obvious possible contingencies that might lead the United States to substantial interventions overseas, notwithstanding the preference of the public and its political leaders to avoid them. **Few Americans want a war with Iran, for instance. But it is not implausible that a president—indeed, this president—might find himself in a situation where military conflict at some level is hard to avoid.** The continued success of the international sanctions regime that the Obama administration has so skillfully put into place, for instance, might eventually cause the Iranian government to lash out in some way—perhaps by attempting to close the Strait of Hormuz. Recall that Japan launched its attack on Pearl Harbor in no small part as a response to oil sanctions imposed by a Roosevelt administration that had not the slightest interest or intention of fighting a war against Japan but was merely expressing moral outrage at Japanese behavior on the Chinese mainland. Perhaps in an Iranian contingency, the military actions would stay limited. But perhaps, too, they would escalate. One could well imagine an American public, now so eager to avoid intervention, suddenly demanding that their president retaliate. Then there is the possibility that a military exchange between Israel and Iran, initiated by Israel, could drag the United States into conflict with Iran. Are such scenarios so farfetched that they can be ruled out by Pentagon planners?Other possible contingencies include a war on the Korean Peninsula, where the United States is bound by treaty to come to the aid of its South Korean ally; and possible interventions in Yemen or Somalia, should those states fail even more than they already have and become even more fertile ground for al Qaeda and other terrorist groups. And what about those “humanitarian” interventions that are first on everyone’s list to be avoided? Should another earthquake or some other natural or man-made catastrophe strike, say, Haiti and present the looming prospect of mass starvation and disease and political anarchy just a few hundred miles off U.S. shores, with the possibility of thousands if not hundreds of thousands of refugees, can anyone be confident that an American president will not feel compelled to send an intervention force to help?Some may hope that a smaller U.S. military, compelled by the necessity of budget constraints, would prevent a president from intervening. More likely, however, it would simply prevent a president from intervening effectively. This, after all, was the experience of the Bush administration in Iraq and Afghanistan. Both because of constraints and as a conscious strategic choice, the Bush administration sent too few troops to both countries. The results were lengthy, unsuccessful conflicts, burgeoning counterinsurgencies, and loss of confidence in American will and capacity, as well as large annual expenditures. Would it not have been better, and also cheaper, to have sent larger numbers of forces initially to both places and brought about a more rapid conclusion to the fighting? The point is, it may prove cheaper in the long run to have larger forces that can fight wars quickly and conclusively, as Colin Powell long ago suggested, than to have smaller forces that can’t. Would a defense planner trying to anticipate future American actions be wise to base planned force structure on the assumption that the United States is out of the intervention business? Or would that be the kind of penny-wise, pound-foolish calculation that, in matters of national security, can prove so unfortunate?The debates over whether and how the United States should respond to the world’s strategic challenges will and should continue. Armed interventions overseas should be weighed carefully, as always, with an eye to whether the risk of inaction is greater than the risks of action. And as always, these judgments will be merely that: judgments, made with inadequate information and intelligence and no certainty about the outcomes. No foreign policy doctrine can avoid errors of omission and commission. But **history has provided some lessons, and for the United States the lesson has been fairly clear: The world is better off, and the United States is better off, in the kind of international system that American power has built and defended.**

### Human k2 heg 1nr

#### Humanitarian intervention is essential to maintaining hegemony- war fighting capacity on these grounds is critical to pursuit of global order. Numerous Studies confirm.

Eric Bonds, University of Mary Washington, “Hegemony and Humanitarian Norms: The US Legitimation of Toxic Violence,” American Sociological Association, Volume XIX, Number 1, 2013, p. 84-85

Certainly, the United States could not shrug off or ignore the emergence of humanitarian norms in its pursuit of hegemony during the twentieth century. Hegemony requires, after all, that a dominant nation exercise the global “moral leadership” necessary to garner the consent of a¶ critical mass of domestic and international political factions (Arrighi 2010). Likely for this reason, the United States became the “world spokesman for liberalism” during its era of hegemony, promoting the idea of the “rights of the people,” including the notion that they should not be deprived of their most basic rights to life during times of war (Wallerstein 1995: 156). Furthermore, several scholars have argued that powerful nations work to establish global humanitarian norms as a means of controlling or diminishing the military capacities of weaker nations or insurgent non-state groups, as in the case of chemical weapons (Price 1997), landmines (Beier 2011), or the small arms trade (Stavrianakis 2011). Hegemony, however, requires more than an economically dominant nation’s ability to exert global cultural leadership; it also requires the use of violent coercion (Arrighi 2010; see also Gramsci 1971).¶ There are several reasons why military force is particularly important to the U.S. during its era of hegemony. First and foremost, the United States was called upon to secure “international order,” including the maintenance of inequitable relationships between nations first forged through colonialism (Wallerstein 2004). Securing “international order” has often meant that the United States has used its military power to open and preserve access to foreign markets and to protect its own military and economic supremacy. It has also used its substantial military power as a threat or through actual belligerence in order to maintain access to valuable natural resources that are necessary for the continuous accumulation of capitalism (Klare 2004; Downey, Bonds, and Clark 2010). In sum, the period of U.S. hegemony has been one in which the U.S. military was continuously poised to use coercive violence to defend the established world order, and one in which it was often embroiled in one conflict or another somewhere around the globe.

### Pat-war 2NC

#### Patriarchy doesn’t cause war—*war* causes *patriarchy*.

Joshua S. Goldstein, Professor of International Relations at American University, 2001 (“Reflections: The Mutuality of Gender and War," *War and Gender*, Published by Cambridge University Press, ISBN 0521001803, p. 411-412)

First, peace activists face a dilemma in thinking about causes of war and working for peace. Many peace scholars and activists support the approach, "if you want peace, work for justice." Then, if one believes that sexism contributes to war, one can work for gender justice specifically (perhaps among others) in order to pursue peace. This approach brings strategic allies to the peace movement (women, labor, minorities), but rests on the assumption that injustices cause war. The evidence in this book suggests that causality runs at least as strongly the other way. War is not a product of capitalism, imperialism, gender, innate aggression, or any other single cause, although all of these influence wars' outbreaks and outcomes. Rather, war has in part fueled and sustained these and other injustices. 9 So, "if you want peace, work for peace." Indeed, if you want justice (gender and others), work for peace. Causality does not run just upward through the levels of analysis, from types of individuals, societies, and governments up to war. It runs downward too. Enloe suggests that changes in attitudes towards war and the military may be the most important way to "reverse women's oppression." The dilemma is that peace work focused on justice brings to the peace movement energy, allies, and moral grounding, yet, in light of this book's evidence, the emphasis on injustice as the main cause of war seems to be empirically inadequate. 10

### 2NC- war causes struct vio

#### War causes structural violence

Schnabel 7 (Albrecht, Senior Research Fellow at Swiss peace and a Lecturer in International Organizations and Conflict Management at the University of Bern Institute of Political Science, “The human security approach to direct and structural violence” <http://www.sipri.org/yearbook/2008/files/SIPRIYB0802C.pdf>)

Among the causes of insecurity, armed violence is a factor of unique significance because it: (a) causes human insecurity and prevents the adequate provision of human security through its debilitating direct and indirect effects; (b) acts as an accelerator of human insecurity, with knock-on effects that increase the negative impact of existing levels of violence and harm; and (c) is often the articulation of underlying, protracted and unresolved structural violence and thus an indicator of societal and political instability. Armed violence is a highly visible pointer to the long overdue necessity of addressing structural violence and its manifestations.

### Heg solves women

#### Hegemony prevents violence against women—Kurdistan proves

Mojo, 11/29/2009 “Violence Against Women In Iraq” M. Iraqi. (Iraqi American who http://iraqimojo.blogspot.com/2010/11/violence-against-women-in-iraq.html

Stop FGM in Kurdistan. It's good to see that UNICEF has been part of the effort to stop FGM in Kurdistan. In March I asked "Why aren't more countries in the middle east (especially the oil rich nations) contributing to UNICEF?"

I'm glad that Kurdistan's government is allowing open discussion of these issues and is attempting to combat gender-based violence against women.

As Kurdistan is fast progressing, becoming democratized and westernized, it faces serious difficulties with its conservative culture that has subjected women to painful and deadly rituals including honor killing. Barham Salih, prime minister of Kurdistan, promised on Thursday to put the issue of women first in his government’s policies and eliminate violence against women, who constitute more than half of the Kurdish society.

Perhaps these changes in Kurdistan have been made possible by American influence. If so, I hope the positive influence continues, and not just in Kurdistan. With American help and encouragement, Iraq can become a better country.

## 1NR

### A2 “Hendricks”

**Applying complexity theory to policy causes paralysis and numerous other failures**

**Hendrick9** (Diane; Department of Peace Studies – University of Bradford, “Complexity Theory and Conflict Transformation: An Exploration of Potential and Implications,” June,http://143.53.238.22/acad/confres/papers/pdfs/CCR17.pdf)

**It is still relatively early days in the application of complexity theory to social sciences and there are doubts and criticisms, either about the applicability of the ideas or about the expectations generated for them**. It is true that the translation of terms from natural science to social science is sometimes contested due to the significant differences in these domains, and that there are concerns that **the meanings of terms may be distorted, thus making their use arbitrary or even misleading**. Developing new, relevant definitions for the new domain applications, where the terms indicate a new idea or a new synthesis that takes our understanding forward, are required. In some cases, **particular aspects of complexity theory are** seen as **of only limited applicability**, for example, self-organisation (see Rosenau‘s argument above that it is only relevant in systems in which authority does not play a role). There are those who argue that **much that is being touted as new is actually already known, whether from systems theory or from experience**, and **so complexity theory cannot be seen as adding value in that way**. There are also concerns that the **theory has not been worked out in sufficient detail, or with sufficient rigour, to make itself useful** yet. Even that **it encourages woolly thinking and imprecision**. **In terms of application in the field**, it could be argued that **it may lead to paralysis, in fear of all the unexpected things that could happen, and all the unintended consequences that could result, from a particular intervention**. The proposed adaptability and sensitivity to emerging new situations may lead to difficulties in planning or, better expressed, must lead to a different conception of what constitutes planning, which is, in itself, challenging (or even threatening) for many fields. **The criteria for funding projects or research may not fit comfortably with a complexity approach, and evaluation, already difficult especially in the field of conflict transformation**, would require a re-conceptualisation. Pressure for results could act as a disincentive to change project design in the light of emergent processes. There may be the desire to maintain the illusion of control in order to retain the confidence of funders. **On the other hand**, there are fears that **complexity may be used as an excuse for poor planning, and implementation**, which is a valid concern for funders. **In addition**, there may be scepticism that **the co-operation and co-ordination between different researchers or interveners**, (let alone transdisciplinary undertakings) **appropriate to working on complex problem domains, will not work due to differing mental models, competing interests and aims, competition for funding, prestige, etc**. **Such attempts appear, therefore, unrealistic or unfeasible.**

**The disad isn’t a string of linear causes: it is scenario planning: solves 100% of their imapcts to the ‘complexity’ of international politics and is key to adjudicating claims about the future**

Steven **Bernstein** et al., “God Gave Physics the Easy Problems: Adapting Social Science to an Unpredictable World,” EJIR, 6, 43, **2000**, p. 53-55

**One useful alternative approach is the development of scenarios**, or narratives with plot lines **that map a set of causes and trends in future time.** **This** forward reasoning **strategy is based on a notion of contingent causal mechanisms, in opposition to** the standard, neo-positivist focus on **efficient causes**, but with no clear parallel in evolutionary biology. It should not be confused with efforts by some to develop social scientific concepts directly analogous to evolutionary mechanisms (such as variation or selection) in biology to explain, for example, transformations in the international system or institutions, or conditions for optimum performance in the international political economy. **Scenarios are not predictions;** rather, **they start with the assumption that the future is unpredictable** and tell alternative stories of how the future may unfold. **Scenarios** **are generally constructed by distinguishing what we believe is relatively certain from what we think is uncertain.** The most important ‘’certainties’ are common to all scenarios that address the problem or trend, while the most important perceived uncertainties differentiate one scenario from another. The approach differs significantly from a forecasting tournament or competition, where advocates of different theoretical perspectives generate differential perspectives on a single outcome in the hope of subsequently identifying the ‘best’ or most accurate performer. Rather, **by constructing scenarios**, or plausible stories of paths to the future**, we can identify the different driving forces** (a term we prefer to independent variable, since it implies a force pushing in a certain direction rather than what is known on one side of an ‘equals’ sign) and then attempt to combine these forces **in logical chains that generate a range of outcomes**, rather than single futures. **Scenarios make contingent claims rather than point predictions**. They reinsert a sensible notion of contingency into theoretical arguments that would otherwise tend toward determinism. **Scholars in i**nternational **r**elations **tend to privilege arguments** **that reach back into the past** and parse out one or two causal variables that are then posited to be the major driving forces of past and future outcomes. The field also favors variables that are structural or otherwise parametric, thus downplaying the role of both agency and accident**. Forward reasoning undercuts structural determinism by raising the possibility and plausibility of multiple futures**. **Scenarios** are impressionistic pictures **that build on different combinations of causal variables that may also take on different values in different scenarios**. Thus **it is possible to construct scenarios without pre-existing firm proof of theoretical claims that meet strict positivist standards**. **The foundation** for scenarios **is** made up of **provisional** assumptions and causal claims. These become the subject of revision and updating more than testing. A set of scenarios often contains competing or at least contrasting assumptions. It is less important where people start, than it is where they end up through frequent revisions, and how they got there**. A good scenario is an internally consistent hypothesis about how the future might unfold; it is a chain of logic that connects ‘drivers’ to outcomes** (Rosell, 1999:126). Consider as an example one plausible scenario at the level of a ‘global future’ where power continues to shift away from the state and towards international institutions, transnational actors and local communities. The state lose its monopoly on the provision of security and basic characteristics of the Westphalian system as we have known it are fundamentally altered. In this setting, key decisions about security, economics and culture will be made by non-state actors. Security may become a commodity that can be bought like other commodities in the global marketplace**. A detailed scenario** about this transformation would **specify the range of changes that are expected to occur** and how they are connected to one another. **It would** also **identify what kinds of evidence might support the scenario** as these or other processes unfold over the next decade, and what kind of evidence would count against the scenario. This is simply a form of process tracing, or **increasing the number of observable implications of an argument**, in future rather than past time. **Eventually**, as in the heuristics of evolutionary biology, **future history becomes data**. Bu**t instead of thinking of data as something that can falsify** any particular **hypothesis, one should think of it as something capable of distinguishing or selecting the story that was from the stories that might have been**.

**There is zero empirical basis for extending complexity to social systems- they have their epistemology backwards- complexity needs to be meaningfully capable of describing an empirical example of emergence otherwise it is a buzzword- the standard of complexity science should be prescriptive- this is the d-rule for adjudicating complexity in physics and biology**

Terrence W. **Deacon**, Professor of Anthropology and Human Evolutionary Biology at University of California Berkeley- he is the foremost expert on different orders of emergence in thermodynamic, biology, and neurological systems, “Emergence: The Hole at the Wheel’s Hub,” **2006**

Over the past few decades, this compositional usage has become more and more prominent as scientists in different fields have encountered similar transitional patterns in systems as diverse as liquid convection patterns and the appearance of unprecedented social dynamics. In non-technical discussions the phrase **'the whole is more than the sum of the parts' is often quoted** to convey this sense of novelty generated via ascent in scale. This phrase originates with Aristotle and captures two aspects of the **emergence** concept: the distinction between a merely quantitative difference and a qualitative one, and effects involving the combination of elements whose patterns of interaction contribute to global properties that are not evident in the components themselves. **There is something a bit misleading about this way of phrasing the relationship that harkens back to a something-from-nothing conception. Exactly what 'more' is being appealed to, if not the parts and their relationships, is seldom made explicit.** This additive conception has often led to the expectation that new classes of physical laws come into existence with increases in scale and the interaction effects that result. This conception of emergence is often described as 'strong emergence' because it implies a dissociation from the physics relevant to the parts and their relationships. It is contrasted with 'weak emergence' that does not entail introduction of any new physical principles. The latter is often seen merely as a redescriptive variant of standard reductionistic causality, and thus as emergence only with respect to human observers and their limited analytic tools. In this essay I will argue that we can still understand the emergence of novel forms of causality without attributing it to the introduction of unprecedented physical laws. Indeed, I will argue that only to the extent that an unbroken chain of causal principles links such higher-order phenomena as consciousness to more basic physical processes will we have an adequate theory of emergence. **In the last decades of the twentieth century the concept of emergence has taken on a merely descriptive function in many fields. It is applied to any case of the spontaneous production of complex dynamical patterns from uncorrelated interactions of component parts. This shift from a largely philosophical to this more descriptive usage of the term emergence** has been strongly influenced by the increasing use of computational simulations to study complex systems. Some of the more elaborate examples of these phenomena have been the topics of **so-called** chaos and **complexity theories**, and have become commonplace in computational models of dynamical systems, cellular automata, and simulations of non-equilibrium thermodynamic processes. **This more general conception of emergence** **has been adopted** by many other fields where complex interaction effects may be relevant, such as **in the social sciences**. **Evolutionary and mental processes are also treated as producing emergent effects, though the complexity of evolution, not to mention cognition compared with dynamical systems, suggests that more subtle distinction between kinds of emergence may be necessary** (see below). **Because of this terminological promiscuity there is likely to be no common underlying causal principle that ties all these uses togethe**r. Nevertheless**, I think that with care a technical usage tied to a well-characterized class of empirical exemplars can be articulated for which a clear theory of emergent processes can be formulated**. The exemplars of emergent phenomena that serve as guides for this analysis occupy a middle position in the taxonomy of different emergent dynamics that I describe below. They represent a well-understood set of physical and computational systems that all share a form-amplifying, form-propagating, form-replicating feature. This feature is exhibited irrespective of whether they are physical or computational phenomena. These phenomena are often called self-organizing, because their regularities are not externally imposed but generated by iterative interaction processes occurring in the media that comprise them. They serve as a useful starting point because they allow us to extrapolate both upward to more complex living phenomena and downward to simpler, merely mechanistic phenomena. **I decry using emergence as an anti-reductionistic code word in holistic criticisms of standard explanations. In this use, the concept of emergence is a place holder, indicating points where standard reductionistic accounts seem to be incomplete in explaining apparent discontinuities. In this negative usage, emergence serves only as a philosophically motivated promissory note for a missing explanation that, critics argue, is needed to flll in a gap.** **In contrast**, the purpose of the present essay is to outline **a technical sense of emergence** that **explicitly describes a specifc class of causal topologies** (i.e. self-constituting causal structures**) and then attempts to show how this may help to explain many of the attributes that have motivated the emergence concept. This approach avoids engaging the pointless semantic debates about the completeness of reductionism or dealing with metaphysical questions about the ontological status of emergence**. The term will only be applied to well-understood empirical processes, and yet I will argue that it does indeed mark the transition to unprecedented and indecomposable causal architectures. It may be wondered, then, what more besides a taxonomic exercise is provided by identifying the emergent architectural features of known physical processes? **By providing an explicit account of how apparent reversals of causal logic come about, how variant forms of these processes are related to one another, and what aspects of their dynamic organization are most critical to the development of these attributes, we can gain critical perspective on the apparent discontinuities between simple mechanistic and teleological models of causality.**

**Complexity can’t explain human interactions—it doesn’t account for cooperation**

**Snooks 07** (Graeme D., Foundation Timothy Coghlan Research Professor  Institute of Advanced Studies  Australian National University, 1989-2010, Executive Director  Institute of Global Dynamics Systems  Canberra, Australia, since 2010 “SELF-ORGANISATION OR SELFCREATION? FROM SOCIAL PHYSICS TO REALIST DYNAMICS” *Social Evolution and History, 6.1,* March, online: http://www.sociostudies.org/journal/articles/140541/)

Cooperation is a vital but problematical concept in social physics. Cooperation is vital because the idea of order on the edge of chaos – self-organised criticality – is a frightening one for physicists who have little understanding of the self-sustaining nature of human society. Cooperation is seen as a way of avoiding the descent into chaos. One commentator writes: ‘If we know that cooperation is possible, even in a world that lacks altruism, we have no reason to despair’ (Ball 2004: 563). And **cooperation is problematical for social physicists because complexity theory cannot explain it persuasively.** Self-organisation theory is all about physical interaction – or primitive competition – not about working together on a joint life pursuit. Indeed, **no supply-side theory** – whether it beneo-Darwinist or game theoretic – **can deal successfully with cooperation as it appears in the real world** (Snooks 2003). It is for the above reasons that some physical and social scientists, convinced of the importance of self-organisation theory, are concerned about the implications of the Snooks-Panov algorithm. This algorithm is a mathematical formulation showing that the process of biological/technological transformation over the past 4,000 myrs has occurred exponentially (Snooks 1996: 79–82, 92–95, 402–405; Snooks 2005a: 229–231; Panov 2005). These scholars are concerned, unnecessarily, that the checks and balances required to prevent the order of human society from descending into chaos are not sufficiently robust (Nazaretyan 2005a-c; Panov 2005). Their unwarranted concern is primarily the result of the limitations of a supply-side complexity theory. As my demand-side dynamic-strategy theory shows, **robust checks and balances do in fact exist,** with the result that the exponential growth of life and human society has occurred over the past 4,000 myrs, and will continue to occur, at a constant, not an increasing,compound rate of growth (Snooks 2005b; 2005c). **Human society is not about to launch itself into the chasm of chaos, because strategic agents are past masters at managing feedback**. How do social physicists attempt to resolve this dilemma – of cooperation or chaos – which is of their own making. The role of governments in compelling cooperation and punishing transgressors is usually considered but finally rejected by all except those with authoritarian tendencies. So, in hope rather than conviction, it is suggested that game theory – another supply-side approach – might provide the answer all concerned social physicists are looking for. This would be a happy outcome indeed, because game theory was the joint product of the statistical physicist John Von Neumann and the economist Oskar Morgenstern, which resulted in the celebrated Theory of Games and Economic Behavior in 1944. The often-expressed hope of social physicists is that ‘cooperation can evolve’. It is believed that through repeated interactions, players in the game of life will learn from past errors and develop ‘mutual trust’. One problem with this line of argument is that the results of organised games are not encouraging. In the late 1970s, Robert Axelrod (1984) organised a series of internet tournaments to discover how interactive games could be most effectively played. He found that there is no ‘best’ way to play these games, as it all depends on who the participants are and what tactics (‘strategies’ in this context is a misnomer) they are convinced in advance will win – which merely demonstrates that the physical interaction model makes little sense. What did emerge clearly from these games is that even when convinced cooperators made initial gains, they were always ultimately vulnerable to rogue defectors. Even a small band of defectors could totally destroy a cooperative culture. Some have concluded that only a strong and harsh central government could prevent this, which is hardly a solution for liberal democracies. And, of course, this brings us back to the very reason that game theory was resorted to by social physicists in the first place! It is also clear from any realist stance that game theory is not well founded. First, games like ‘prisoners’ dilemma’ and ‘tit-for-tat’ (in its various forms) are highly artificial and unrealistic. They are merely the result of arbitrary rules that can be changed to obtain the outcomes one desires. In reality, **the rules of engagement are set by strategic demand in any life system**. Second, the implications of this approach for our understanding of reality are metaphysical. It suggests that life resembles a supply-side computer world in which the rules of interaction are determined and arbitrarily changed by an all-powerful being from outside the system. Game theory, as in ACE ‘artificial’ societies, requires ‘God’ to make it work – to generate order and prevent chaos. **The only solution to this problem is a robust general dynamic theory that is capable of generating all the necessary rules of engagement endogenously.** This brings us to the third and most fundamental problem. Social physicists have failed to recognise the existence, let alone the role, of ‘strategic exchange’, which is the central feature of a demand-dominated general dynamic theory. Social physics is, as I have mentioned before, like one hand clapping, as it focuses solely on the supply-side interaction between agents. In doing so, **it fails to appreciate the existence of a dominant demand side that shapes the social order as well as the rules of engagement**. It is, as we have seen, **the demand side that provides the ‘directionality’ lacking in self-organisation theory. Strategic demand,** which changes as the dominant dynamic strategy unfolds, **calls forth a joint response from all active agents in any society. This is the process of strategic exchange.** And in this process, trust is invested by individuals in the successful strategic pursuit – reflected in an increasing material prosperity – and not in each other. **Cooperation is the outcome**. **When the success of the strategic pursuit wanes, both trust and cooperation decline and, under conditions of extreme crisis, evaporate completely. Competition**, or interaction, between agents **is** a phenomenon that is **secondary to ‘strategic cooperation’. Order, therefore, is the outcome of a successfully unfolding dominant dynamic strategy. The anxiety expressed by social physicists about sustaining order on the edge of chaos is the outcome of a fundamentally flawed theory – a science fiction.** There can be no social physics, only ‘social stratology’ – a new study of the dynamics of the strategic pursuit.

### A2 Low Risk

**The impact to extinction is infinite potential lives – Even a miniscule risk outweighs everything else**

**Bostrum 03** (Nick, Professor of philosophy at Oxford, Winner of the Eugene R. Gannon Award for the Continued Pursuit of Human Advancement, “Astronomical Waste: The Opportunity Cost of Delayed Technological Development” <http://www.nickbostrom.com/astronomical/waste.html>)

The effect on total value, then, seems greater for actions that accelerate technological development than for practically any other possible action. Advancing technology (or its enabling factors, such as economic productivity) even by such a tiny amount that it leads to **colonization of the local supercluster just one second earlier** than would otherwise have happened **amounts to bringing about more than 10^31 human lives** (or 10^14 human lives if we use the most conservative lower bound) that would not otherwise have existed. Few other philanthropic causes could hope to mach that level of utilitarian payoff. Utilitarians are not the only ones who should strongly oppose astronomical waste. There are many views about what has value that would concur with the assessment that the current rate of wastage constitutes an enormous loss of potential value. For example, we can take a thicker conception of human welfare than commonly supposed by utilitarians (whether of a hedonistic, experientialist, or desire-satisfactionist bent), such as a conception that locates value also in human flourishing, meaningful relationships, noble character, individual expression, aesthetic appreciation, and so forth. So long as the evaluation function is aggregative (does not count one person’s welfare for less just because there are many other persons in existence who also enjoy happy lives) and is not relativized to a particular point in time (no time-discounting), the conclusion will hold. These conditions can be relaxed further. Even if the welfare function is not perfectly aggregative (perhaps because one component of the good is diversity, the marginal rate of production of which might decline with increasing population size), it can still yield a similar bottom line provided only that at least some significant component of the good is sufficiently aggregative. Similarly, some degree of time-discounting future goods could be accommodated without changing the conclusion.[7] III. THE CHIEF GOAL FOR UTILITARIANS SHOULD BE TO REDUCE EXISTENTIAL RISK In light of the above discussion, **it may seem as if a utilitarian ought** to **focus** her efforts **on accelerating technological development**. The payoff from even a very slight success in this endeavor is so enormous that it dwarfs that of almost any other activity. We appear to have a utilitarian argument for the greatest possible urgency of technological development. **However, the true lesson is a different one. If** what **we are concerned with** is (something like) **maximizing the expected number of worthwhile lives** that we will create, then in addition to the opportunity cost of delayed colonization, **we have to take into account the risk of failure to colonize at all. We might fall victim to an existential risk**, one where

an adverse outcome would either annihilate Earth-originating intelligent life or permanently and drastically curtail its potential.[8] **Because the lifespan of galaxies is measured in billions of years, whereas the time-scale of any delays** that we could realistically affect **would** rather **be measured in years or decades, the consideration of risk trumps the consideration of opportunity cost**. For example, **a single percentage point of reduction of existential risks would be worth** (from a utilitarian expected utility point-of-view) **a delay of over 10 million years**. Therefore, if our actions have even the slightest effect on the probability of eventual colonization, this will outweigh their effect on when colonization takes place. For standard utilitarians, **priority number one**, two, three and four **should** consequently **be to reduce existential risk**. The utilitarian imperative “Maximize expected aggregate utility!” can be simplified to the maxim “Minimize existential risk!”.

**3. Low probabilities must be considered—the alternative is russian roulette with the planet**

William **Ophuls** (political scientist) 19**77** Ecology and the Politics of Scarcity, p. 124-125

**It is sometimes said that the probability of any one of these disasterous events happening is so low as to be not worth worrying about**. Of course, some risk must be run in order to reap the fruits of technology, but **dismissing the problem in this fashion shows a potentially fatal misunderstanding of the laws of probability,** for an apparently low probability of accident may be illusory. First, as explained in the discussion of reactor safety in Box 3-2, whether a risk is large or small depends greatly on how many sources of risk there are. That is, if the chances of some kind of reactor accident are one in a thousand per reactor year, then one accident a year is a certainty (on average) if there are a thousand reactors in operation. Since we already do so many things that have some potential, however small, of altering the climate or unleashing other disasters, we should not be complacent about the apparently highly improbable. Second, **some risks are essentially incalculable. There is no way, for example, to estimate the degree of danger to nuclear installations from** fanatical political **terrorists** with sufficient cunning to outwit all the safety devices and security procedures. Third, **even when the probabilities are truly small we cannot afford to relax, for the million-to-one shot may occur at the first event**, at the millionth **or well beyond the millionth with equal probability; if the result of failure is potentially catastrophic, then we are simply engaged in playing** a highly recondite version of **Russian roulette**. As game theorists have shown, a course of action that risks very serious loss is unlikely to be sound, no matter how attractive the potential gain; a prudent strategist limits his risks even if this also limits his gains.

### Extinction Outweighs: F/L

#### Extinction outweighs everything else—there is no recovering from it (includes climate change)

Anders **Sandberg** et al., James Martin Research Fellow, Future of Humanity Institute, Oxford University, "How Can We Reduce the Risk of Human Extinction?" BULLETIN OF THE ATOMIC SCIENTISTS, 9-9-**08**, http://www.thebulletin.org/web-edition/features/how-can-we-reduce-the-risk-of-human-extinction, accessed 5-2-10.

Such remote risks may seem academic in a world plagued by immediate problems, such as global poverty, HIV, and climate change. But as intimidating as these problems are, they do not threaten human existence. In discussing the risk of nuclear winter, Carl Sagan emphasized the astronomical toll of human extinction: A nuclear war imperils all of our descendants, for as long as there will be humans. Even if the population remains static, with an average lifetime of the order of 100 years, over a typical time period for the biological evolution of a successful species (roughly ten million years), we are talking about some 500 trillion people yet to come. By this criterion, the stakes are one million times greater for extinction than for the more modest nuclear wars that kill "only" hundreds of millions of people. There are many other possible measures of the potential loss--including culture and science, the evolutionary history of the planet, and the significance of the lives of all of our ancestors who contributed to the future of their descendants. Extinction is the undoing of the human enterprise. There is a discontinuity between risks that threaten 10 percent or even 99 percent of humanity and those that threaten 100 percent. For disasters killing less than all humanity, there is a good chance that the species could recover. If we value future human generations, then reducing extinction risks should dominate our considerations. Fortunately, most measures to reduce these risks also improve global security against a range of lesser catastrophes, and thus deserve support regardless of how much one worries about extinction.

#### And, Extinction destroys all human aspiration – Claims to outweigh it destroy value to life

Schell 82 (Jonathan, Visiting professor of liberal studies at Harvard University, “Fate of the Earth”)

For the generations that now have to decide whether or not to risk the future of the species, the implication of our species’ unique place in the order of things is that while things in the life of [hu]mankind have worth, we must never raise that worth above the life of [hu]mankind and above our respect for that life’s existence. To do this would be to make of our highest ideals so many swords with which to destroy ourselves. To sum up the worth of our species by reference to some particular standard, goal, or ideology, no matter how elevated or noble it might be, would be to prepare the way for extinction by closing down in thought and feeling the open-ended possibilities for human development which extinction would close down in fact. There is only one circumstance in which it might be possible to sum up the life and achievement of the species, and that circumstance would be that it had already died; but then, of course, there would be no one left to do the summing up. Only a generation that believed itself to be in possession of final, absolute truth could ever conclude that it had reason to put an end to human life, and only generations that recognized the limits to their own wisdom and virtue would be likely to subordinate their interests and dreams to the as yet unformed interests and undreamed dreams of the future generations, and let human life go on.

**Our predictions of the Middle East are accurate.**

**Doran 11—Prof @ NYU**

Michael, Doran Replies, Foreign Affairs, Jul/Aug2011, Vol. 90, Issue 4

Kaye and Wehrey exhibit what might be called **the academic fallacy, in which the necessary simplicity of strategic concepts is mistaken for simple-mindedness** (hence **the diagnosis of "a two-dimensional reading of the strategic map"**). **The Middle East is inherently complex and presents policymakers in Washington with a multiplicity of actors that operate from a large variety of motives. It is important, however,** *not to let a fascination with complexity**make one blind* **to enduring and consequential concentrations of power**. The United States must train itself to see a large dune as something more formidable than just endless grains of sand.