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#### Text: The President of the United States should establish a national security drone court as per our Katyal evidence.

**CP solves better than the drone court – avoids *terrorism* and *collapse of deference* while preserving oversight and accountability**

**Katyal 13** – former acting solicitor general, professor of national security law at Georgetown and a partner at the law firm Hogan Lovells (Neal K, Who Will Mind the Drones?”, Feb 20, http://www.nytimes.com/2013/02/21/opinion/an-executive-branch-drone-court.html, CMR)

IN the wake of revelations about the Obama administration’s drone program, politicians from both parties have taken up the idea of creating a “drone court” within the federal judiciary, which would review executive decisions to target and kill individuals.¶ But the drone court idea is a mistake. It is hard to think of something less suitable for a federal judge to rule on than the fast-moving and protean nature of targeting decisions.¶ Fortunately, a better solution exists: a “national security court” housed within the executive branch itself. Experts, not generalists, would rule; pressing concerns about classified information would be minimized; and speedy decisions would be easier to reach.¶ There is, of course, a role for federal courts in national security. In 2006, I argued and won Hamdan v. Rumsfeld, a Supreme Court case that struck down President George W. Bush’s use of military tribunals at Guantánamo Bay. But military trials are a far cry from wartime targeting decisions.¶ And the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Court, which reviews administration requests to collect intelligence involving foreign agents inside the country and which some have advocated as a model for the drone court, is likewise appropriately housed within the judicial system — it rules on surveillance operations that raise questions much like those in Fourth Amendment “search and seizure” cases, a subject federal judges know well.¶ But there is no true precedent for interposing courts into military decisions about who, what and when to strike militarily. Putting aside the serious constitutional implications of such a proposal, courts are simply not institutionally equipped to play such a role.¶ There are many reasons a drone court composed of generalist federal judges will not work. They lack national security expertise, they are not accustomed to ruling on lightning-fast timetables, they are used to being in absolute control, their primary work is on domestic matters and they usually rule on matters after the fact, not beforehand.¶ Even the questions placed before the FISA Court aren’t comparable to what a drone court would face; they involve more traditional constitutional issues — not rapidly developing questions about whether to target an individual for assassination by a drone strike.¶ Imagine instead that the president had an internal court, staffed by expert lawyers to represent both sides. Those lawyers, like the Judge Advocate General’s Corps in the military, would switch sides every few years, to develop both expertise as repeat players and the ability to understand the other point of view.¶ The adjudicator would be a panel of the president’s most senior national security advisers, who would issue decisions in writing if at all possible. Those decisions would later be given to the Congressional intelligence committees for review. Crucially, the president would be able to overrule this court, and take whatever action he thought appropriate, but would have to explain himself afterward to Congress.¶ Such a court would embed accountability and expertise into the drone program. With a federal drone court, it would simply be too easy for a president or other executive-branch official to point his finger at a federal judge for the failure to act. With an internal court, it would be impossible to avoid blame.¶ It’s true that a court housed within the executive branch might sound nefarious in today’s “Homeland” culture — if Alexander Hamilton celebrated the executive, in Federalist No. 70, for its “decision, activity, secrecy and dispatch,” some now look at those same qualities with skepticism, if not fear.¶ In contrast, advocates of a drone court say it would bring independent, constitutional values of reasoned decision making to a process that is inherently murky.¶ But simply placing a drone court in the judicial branch is not a guaranteed check. The FISA Court’s record is instructive: between 1979 and 2011 it rejected only 11 out of more than 32,000 requests — making the odds of getting a request rejected, around 1 in 3,000, approximately the same as those of being struck by lightning in one’s lifetime. What reason does the FISA Court give us to think that judges are better than specialists at keeping executive power in check?¶ The written decisions of an internal national security court, in contrast, would be products of an adversarial system (unlike the FISA Court), and later reviewed by Congressional intelligence committees. If members of Congress saw troublesome trends developing, it could push legislation to constrain the executive. That is something a federal judge cannot do.¶ One of our Constitution’s greatest virtues is that it looks to judges as a source of reasoned, practical, rights-minded decision making. But judges should be left to what they know. A national security court inside the executive branch may not be a perfect solution, but it is a better way to balance the demands of secrecy and speed with those of liberty and justice.

#### The impact is military effectiveness

Hudson 99 Walter Hudson, Major, US Army, Military Law Review, March 1999 (159 Mil. L. Rev. 1)

By granting the elected branches plenary and command power over the military, the Constitution links military control to the democratic will and the democratic process. Because the people will feel the burden of war, the elected branches can best respond to that will. n223 Furthermore, in granting power to the elected branches to control the military, the Constitution acknowledges that the elected branches grant a degree of legitimacy to military policy that courts cannot. These elected branches can best reflect and respond to the societal consensus, a particularly relevant and important concern when dealing with national security. n224 Of the three branches, the judiciary has the least competence to evaluate the military's formation, training, or command. It has, as one court stated, "no Armed Services Committee, Foreign Relations Committee, Department of Defense, or Department of State" nor does it have the same access to intelligence and testimony on military readiness as does Congress or the President. n225 The Supreme Court has thus repeatedly cited its own lack of competence to evaluate military affairs. n226

#### Global war

Jack Spencer, Policy Analyst for Defense and National Security @ the Institute for International Studies, Heritage Foundation, 2k (The Facts About Military Readiness -- Heritage Foundation) http://www.heritage.org/Research/ MissileDefense/BG1394.cfm)

Military readiness is vital because declines in America's military readiness signal to the rest of the world that the United States is not prepared to defend its interests. Therefore, potentially hostile nations will be more likely to lash out against American allies and interests, inevitably leading to U.S. involvement in combat. A high state of military readiness is more likely to deter potentially hostile nations from acting aggressively in regions of vital national interest, thereby preserving peace.

### 2

#### CIR will pass now

David Nakamura, “For House Republicans, New Momentum on Immigration Reform,” WASHINGTON POST, 1—24—14, <http://www.washingtonpost.com/politics/for-house-republicans-new-momentum-on-immigration-reform/2014/01/24/1c48e25e-8509-11e3-bbe5-6a2a3141e3a9_story.html>

Recent signals from House Republican leaders that they will pursue their own vision of immigration reform have presented the White House with an opening to achieve a major legislative deal this year that has eluded lawmakers for decades. Speaker John A. Boehner (R-Ohio) is expected to release a brief outline of immigration principles to his caucus as soon as its annual retreat next week. The goals would include strengthening border security and creating new visas for foreign workers, while providing a path toward legalizing the status of the nation’s 11 million to 12 million undocumented immigrants, according to people briefed on the deliberations. Obama administration officials and congressional Democrats expressed optimism that new momentum in the House could yield results after months in which the issue languished in the lower chamber. But they cautioned that it is far too early to determine whether a compromise could be reached between the House and Senate, which approved a bipartisan plan to overhaul border-control laws last June. “It’s a very big deal, and there’s a path here that could get it done,” Cecilia Munoz, the White House’s director of domestic policy, said of the potential for an immigration agreement. White House officials view immigration as the best chance President Obama has to pass a major piece of domestic legislation in his final three years in office, largely because some GOP leaders believe their party must broaden its appeal to Latinos and Asian Americans. Obama won reelection in 2012 with the support of more than 70 percent of those voters.

#### Drone courts cause massive fights

Carlos Munoz, “Turf Battle Builds Quietly in Congress over Control of Armed Drone Program,” THE HILL, 4—9—13,

<http://thehill.com/homenews/administration/292501-turf-battle-builds-quietly-over-control-of-armed-drone-program>

A turf war is quietly building between congressional defense and intelligence committees over who will oversee the Obama administration’s controversial armed drone program. Lawmakers are scrambling to make their case for or against a White House proposal that would hand control of the drones to the Pentagon. Gordon Adams, a senior defense analyst at the Stimson Center, called the looming battle a “turf fight in the [disguise] of a policy debate.” The Pentagon and CIA operate their own armed drone programs, which are both geared toward eliminating senior al Qaeda leaders and other high-level terror targets around the world. Under the Obama administration’s proposal, the CIA would continue to supply intelligence on possible targets, but actual control over the drone strikes would fall to the Pentagon. Senate Intelligence Committee Chairwoman Dianne Feinstein (D-Calif.) publicly questioned whether the Defense Department (DOD) would be able to shoulder the program alone. “We’ve watched the intelligence aspect of the drone program, how they function, the quality of the intelligence, watching the agency exercise patience and discretion,” Feinstein told reporters in March. “The military [armed drone] program has not done that nearly as well.” Sen. John McCain and other defense lawmakers say the drone program would be better off being run by the Pentagon. “It’s not the job of the Central Intelligence Agency. ... It’s the military’s job,” the Arizona Republican said in March. The fight is a typical battle over who on Capitol Hill will retain power over the program, according to several analysts, who described it as predictable. “There is always going to be a turf battle” when dealing with congressional oversight, said Lawrence Korb, a former DOD official and defense analyst at the liberal-leaning Center for American Progress. But that battle could become particularly heated, given the high-profile nature of the drone program, which since the Sept. 11, 2001, attacks has become a huge factor in shaping counterterrorism policy, given its success, Korb said. For congressional panels, the fight over who will control the drone program will have a say in the relevancy of the two committees. Korb, for example, noted that national security spending on unmanned aircraft and special operations forces will likely increase, even as the budget for defense spending overall is expected to trend downward. Ironically, Pentagon officials pushed back against using armed drones in the late 1990s, fearing they would replace fighter jets as the weapon of choice in future wars, Korb said. That decision essentially handed control of the armed drone program to the CIA, he said. Early versions of the unmanned aircraft flown during the 2001 invasion of Afghanistan belonged to the agency, not the Defense Department, according to Korb. Taking that influence away from Langley and intelligence lawmakers was bound to spark a fight, he said.

#### Political capital is key

Orlando Sentinel 11-1-13 "What we think: It'll take both parties to clear immigration logjam" articles.orlandosentinel.com/2013-11-01/news/os-ed-immigration-reform-congress-20131031\_1\_immigration-reform-comprehensive-reform-house-republicans

For those who thought the end of the government shutdown would provide a break from the partisan bickering in Washington, think again. The battle over comprehensive immigration reform could be every bit as contentious. Polls show the popular momentum is there for comprehensive reform, which would include a path to citizenship for many of the nation's 11 million undocumented immigrants. But it'll take plenty of political capital from President Obama and leaders in both parties on Capitol Hill to make it happen. Immigration-reform activists, who have been pushing for reform for years, are understandably impatient. This week police arrested 15 who blocked traffic at a demonstration in Orlando. There are plenty of selling points for comprehensive immigration reform. An opportunity for millions of immigrants to get on the right side of the law. Stronger border security. The chance for law enforcement to focus limited resources on real threats to public safety, instead of nannies and fruit pickers. A more reliable work force to meet the needs of key industries. Reforms to let top talent from around the world stay here after studying in U.S. universities. The Senate passed its version of comprehensive immigration in June. It includes all of the benefits above. Its path to citizenship requires undocumented immigrants to pay fines, learn English, pass a criminal background check and wait more than a decade. So far, House Republicans have balked, taking a piecemeal rather than comprehensive approach. Many members fear being challenged from the right for supporting "amnesty." Yet polls show the public supports comprehensive reform. In June, a Gallup poll found 87 percent of Americans — including 86 percent of Republicans — support a pathway to citizenship like the one outlined in the Senate bill. Florida Republican Sen. Marco Rubio took flak from tea-party supporters for spearheading the comprehensive bill. Now, apparently aiming to mend fences, he says immigration should be handled piecemeal. He's politically savvy enough to know that's a dead end. But comprehensive reform won't have a chance without President Obama making full use of his bully pulpit to promote it, emphasizing in particular all that undocumented immigrants would need to do to earn citizenship. House Democratic leaders will have to underscore the president's message.

#### That solves competitiveness and terrorism

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

Immigration reform is a secret weapon that can help unleash the full power of the U.S. economy. Except that it’s not really much of a secret. Study after study has shown what revamping our outdated immigration system can do. The CATO Institute estimates that comprehensive immigration reform would increase U.S. gross domestic product by $1.5 trillion over 10 years. The nonpartisan Congressional Budget Office believes that it would trim the federal deficit by $135 billion over the same time period. Analysis published by the U.S. Chamber of Commerce indicates that a pathway to citizenship for undocumented workers — which would unleash their full contribution to our economy — would create 123,000 new jobs for U.S. citizens in 2014, increasing to 594,000 jobs by 2018. Additionally, it would increase GDP by more than $10 billion the first year, and by almost $50 billion four years later. In Michigan, one study found that the pathway to citizenship would increase the gross state product by more than $800 million in 2020, while adding almost 10,000 new jobsfor Michiganders. Just expanding the availability of H1B visas for high-skilled immigrants would create 5,600 new jobs in the first year, and increase the Michigan GSP by more than $500 million. That is the potential. Here is what we have today. Our broken immigration policies deny businesses — from farms to contractors to cutting edge high-tech companies — the employees they need to compete, expand and create more jobs for all American workers. Current immigration statutes do not give law enforcement agencies a realistic method of dealing with the 11 million undocumented workers living among us. The years of ineffective security strategies perpetuated by present day immigration laws have created a porous border that not only disrupts legitimate commerce and legal immigration, but also puts us at risk of increased criminal activity and possible acts of terrorism. Visa policies also fail to welcome entrepreneurial immigrants who are eager to start new companies in the U.S. and force many would-be business founders to stay in jobs that constrain their ambitions for fear of losing the work visas they presently hold. In short, the status quo is a mess, and failing to fix it will virtually guarantee limited economic progress, fewer jobs and gloomier prospects, not only for ourselves, but also for our children and grandchildren. Immigration reform is not a political issue. It can be approached as one — as people at the extreme edges of both parties have proved — but doing so is a tragic error that ignores the basic problems and opportunities at stake. More than anything, immigration reform is an economic issue. Failure to enact immigration reform will also leave in place a system that has completely failed to stem the tide of illegal immigration to the U.S., and that will mean millions more undocumented individuals entering the country in coming years. The Senate was able to overcome its political differences and approve a comprehensive immigration reform package that addresses major issues, such as border security, bringing illegal immigrants back into the system and more realistic visa allocations. The U.S. House must make whatever effort is necessary to devise and pass its own constructive plan. Putting off the important task of immigration reform is no longer a viable option.

#### Nuclear war

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

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

**Burke 2007**(Anthony Burke, Int'l Studies @ U of New South Wales,“Ontologies of War,” in Theory & Event, Vol. 10, Iss. 2)

This tells us much about the enduring power of crude instrumental versions of strategic thought, which relate not merely to the actual use of force but to broader geopolitical strategies that see, as limited war theorists like Robert Osgood did, force as an 'instrument of policy short of war'. It was from within this strategic ontology that figures like the Nobel prize-winning economist Thomas Schelling theorised the strategic role of threats and coercive diplomacy, and spoke of strategy as 'the power to hurt'.[79](http://muse.jhu.edu.floyd.lib.umn.edu/journals/theory_and_event/v010/10.2burke.html#_edn79) In the 2006 Lebanon war we can see such thinking in the remark of a U.S. analyst, a former Ambassador to Israel and Syria, who speculated that by targeting civilians and infrastructure Israel aimed 'to create enough pain on the ground so there would be a local political reaction to Hezbollah's adventurism'.[80](http://muse.jhu.edu.floyd.lib.umn.edu/journals/theory_and_event/v010/10.2burke.html#_edn80) Similarly a retired Israeli army colonel told the Washington Post that 'Israel is attempting to create a rift between the Lebanese population and Hezbollah supporters by exacting a heavy price from the elite in Beirut. The message is: If you want your air conditioning to work and if you want to be able to fly to Paris for shopping, you must pull your head out of the sand and take action toward shutting down Hezbollah-land.'[81](http://muse.jhu.edu.floyd.lib.umn.edu/journals/theory_and_event/v010/10.2burke.html#_edn81) Conclusion: Violent Ontologies or Peaceful Choices?      I was motivated to begin the larger project from which this essay derives by a number of concerns. I felt that the available critical, interpretive or performative languages of war -- realist and liberal international relations theories, just war theories, and various Clausewitzian derivations of strategy -- failed us, because they either perform or refuse to place under suspicion the underlying political ontologies that I have sought to unmask and question here. Many realists have quite nuanced and critical attitudes to the use of force, but ultimately affirm strategic thought and remain embedded within  the existential framework of the nation-state. Both liberal internationalist and just war doctrines seek mainly to improve the accountability of decision-making in security affairs and to limit some of the worst moral enormities of war, but (apart from the more radical versions of cosmopolitanism) they fail to question the ontological claims of political community or strategic theory.[82](http://muse.jhu.edu.floyd.lib.umn.edu/journals/theory_and_event/v010/10.2burke.html#_edn82)      In the case of a theorist like Jean Bethke Elshtain, just war doctrine is in fact allied to a softer, liberalised form of the Hegelian-Schmittian ontology. She dismisses Kant'sPerpetual Peace as 'a fantasy of at-oneness...a world in which differences have all been rubbed off' and in which 'politics, which is the way human beings have devised for dealing with their differences, gets eliminated.'[83](http://muse.jhu.edu.floyd.lib.umn.edu/journals/theory_and_event/v010/10.2burke.html#_edn83) She remains a committed liberal democrat and espouses a moral community that stretches beyond the nation-state, which strongly contrasts with Schmitt's hostility to liberalism and his claustrophobic distinction between friend and enemy. However her image of politics -- which at its limits, she implies, requires the resort to war as the only existentially satisfying way of resolving deep-seated conflicts -- reflects much of Schmitt's idea of the political and Hegel's ontology of a fundamentally alienated world of nation-states, in which war is a performance of being. She categorically states that any effort to dismantle security dilemmas 'also requires the dismantling of human beings as we know them'.[84](http://muse.jhu.edu.floyd.lib.umn.edu/journals/theory_and_event/v010/10.2burke.html#_edn84) Whilst this would not be true of all just war advocates, I suspect that even as they are so concerned with the ought, moral theories of violence grant too much unquestioned power to the is. The problem here lies with the confidence in being -- of 'human beings as we know them' -- which ultimately fails to escape a Schmittian architecture and thus eternally exacerbates (indeed reifies) antagonisms. Yet we know from the work of Deleuze and especially William Connolly that exchanging an ontology of being for one ofbecoming, where the boundaries and nature of the self contain new possibilities through agonistic relation to others, provides a less destructive and violent way of acknowledging and dealing with conflict and difference.[85](http://muse.jhu.edu.floyd.lib.umn.edu/journals/theory_and_event/v010/10.2burke.html#_edn85)      My argument here, whilst normatively sympathetic to Kant's moral demand for the eventual abolition of war, militates against excessive optimism.[86](http://muse.jhu.edu.floyd.lib.umn.edu/journals/theory_and_event/v010/10.2burke.html#_edn86) Even as I am arguing that war is not an enduring historical or anthropological feature, or a neutral and rational instrument of policy -- that it is rather the product of hegemonic forms of knowledge about political action and community -- my analysis does suggest some sobering conclusions about its power as an idea and formation. Neither the progressive flow of history nor the pacific tendencies of an international society of republican states will save us. The violent ontologies I have described here in fact dominate the conceptual and policy frameworks of modern republican states and have come, against everything Kant hoped for, to stand in for progress, modernity and reason. Indeed what Heidegger argues, I think with some credibility, is that the enframing world view has come to stand in for being itself. Enframing, argues Heidegger, 'does not simply endanger man in his relationship to himself and to everything that is...it drives out every other possibility of revealing...the rule of Enframing threatens man with the possibility that it could be denied to him to enter into a more original revealing and hence to experience the call of a more primal truth.'[87](http://muse.jhu.edu.floyd.lib.umn.edu/journals/theory_and_event/v010/10.2burke.html#_edn87)      What I take from Heidegger's argument -- one that I have sought to extend by analysing the militaristic power of modern ontologies of political existence and security -- is a view that the challenge is posed not merely by a few varieties of weapon, government, technology or policy, but by an overarching system of thinking and understanding that lays claim to our entire space of truth and existence. Many of the most destructive features of contemporary modernity -- militarism, repression, coercive diplomacy, covert intervention, geopolitics, economic exploitation and ecological destruction -- derive not merely from particular choices by policymakers based on their particular interests, but from calculative, 'empirical' discourses of scientific and political truth rooted in powerful enlightenment images of being. Confined within such an epistemological and cultural universe, policymakers' choices become necessities, their actions become inevitabilities, and humans suffer and die. Viewed in this light, 'rationality' is the name we give the chain of reasoning which builds one structure of truth on another until a course of action, however violent or dangerous, becomes preordained through that reasoning's very operation and existence. It creates both discursive constraints -- available choices may simply not be seen as credible or legitimate -- and material constraints that derive from the mutually reinforcing cascade of discourses and events which then preordain militarism and violence as necessary policy responses, however ineffective, dysfunctional or chaotic.

##### root cause of conflict--Insecurity is inevitable

**Burke 2007**(Anthony Burke, Int'l Studies @ U of New South Wales,“Ontologies of War,” in Theory & Event, Vol. 10, Iss. 2)

And what would be mankind's 'bread', the rewards of its new 'empire over creation'? If the new method and invention brought modern medicine, social welfare, sanitation, communications, education and comfort, it also enabled theArmenian genocide, the Holocaust and two world wars; napalm, the B52, the hydrogen bomb, the Kalashnikov rifle and military strategy. Indeed some of the 20th Century's most far-reaching inventions -- radar, television, rocketry, computing, communications, jet aircraft, the Internet -- would be the product of drives for national security and militarisation. Even the inventions Bacon thought so marvellous and transformative -- printing, gunpowder and the compass -- brought in their wake upheaval and tragedy: printing, dogma and bureaucracy; gunpowder, the rifle and the artillery battery; navigation, slavery and the genocide of indigenous peoples. In short, the legacy of the new empirical science would be ambivalence as much as certainty; degradation as much as enlightenment; the destruction of nature as much as its utilisation.Doubts and Fears: Technology as Ontology    If Bacon could not reasonably be expected to foresee many of these developments, the idea that scientific and technological progress could be destructive did occur to him. However it was an anxiety he summarily dismissed:...let none be alarmed at the objection of the arts and sciences becoming depraved to malevolent or luxurious purposes and the like, for the same can be said of every worldly good; talent, courage, strength, beauty, riches, light itself...Only let mankind regain their rights over nature, assigned to them by the gift of God, and obtain that power, whose exercise will be governed by right reason and true religion.[71](http://muse.jhu.edu.floyd.lib.umn.edu/journals/theory_and_event/v010/10.2burke.html#_edn71)    By the mid-Twentieth Century, after the destruction of Hiroshima and Nagasaki, such fears could no longer be so easily wished away, as the physicist and scientific director of the Manhattan Project, J. Robert Oppenheimer recognised. He said in a 1947 lecture:We felt a particularly intimate responsibility for suggesting, for supporting and in the end in large measure achieving the realization of atomic weapons...In some sort of crude sense which no vulgarity, no humor, no over-statement can quite extinguish, the physicists have known sin, and this is a knowledge they cannot lose.[72](http://muse.jhu.edu.floyd.lib.umn.edu/journals/theory_and_event/v010/10.2burke.html#_edn72)    Adam had fallen once more, but into a world which refused to acknowledge its renewed intimacy with contingency and evil. Man's empire over creation-- his discovery of the innermost secrets of matter and energy, of the fires that fuelled the stars -- had not 'enhanced human power and dignity' as Bacon claimed, but instead brought destruction and horror. Scientific powers that had been consciously applied in the defence of life and in the hope of its betterment now threatened its total and absolute destruction. This would not prevent a legion of scientists, soldiers and national security policymakers later attempting to apply Bacon's faith in invention and Descartes' faith in mathematics to make of the Bomb a rational weapon.      Oppenheimer -- who resolutely opposed the development of the hydrogen bomb -- understood what the strategists could not: that the weapons resisted control, resisted utility, that 'with the release of atomic energy quite revolutionary changes had occurred in the techniques of warfare'.[73](http://muse.jhu.edu.floyd.lib.umn.edu/journals/theory_and_event/v010/10.2burke.html#_edn73) Yet Bacon's legacy, one deeply imprinted on the strategists, was his view that truth and utility are 'perfectly identical'.[74](http://muse.jhu.edu.floyd.lib.umn.edu/journals/theory_and_event/v010/10.2burke.html#_edn74) In 1947 Oppenheimer had clung to the hope that 'knowledge is good...it seems hard to live any other way than thinking it was better to know something than not to know it; and the more you know, the better'; by 1960 he felt that 'terror attaches to new knowledge. It has an unmooring quality; it finds men unprepared to deal with it.'[75](http://muse.jhu.edu.floyd.lib.umn.edu/journals/theory_and_event/v010/10.2burke.html#_edn75)    Martin Heidegger questioned this mapping of natural science onto the social world in his essays on technology -- which, as 'machine', has been so crucial to modern strategic and geopolitical thought as an image of perfect function and order and a powerful tool of intervention. He commented that, given that modern technology 'employs exact physical science...the deceptive illusion arises that modern technology is applied physical science'.[76](http://muse.jhu.edu.floyd.lib.umn.edu/journals/theory_and_event/v010/10.2burke.html#_edn76) Yet as the essays and speeches of Oppenheimer attest, technology and its relation to science, society and war cannot be reduced to a noiseless series of translations of science for politics, knowledge for force, or force for good.    Instead, Oppenheimer saw a process frustrated by roadblocks and ruptured by irony; in his view there was no smooth, unproblematic translation of scientific truth into social truth, and technology was not its vehicle. Rather his comments raise profound and painful ethical questions that resonate with terror and uncertainty. Yet this has not prevented technology becoming a potent object of desire, not merely as an instrument of power but as a promise and conduit of certainty itself. In the minds of too many rational soldiers, strategists and policymakers, technology brings with it the truth of its enabling science and spreads it over the world. It turns epistemological certainty into political certainty; it turns control over 'facts' into control over the earth.    Heidegger's insights into this phenomena I find especially telling and disturbing -- because they underline the ontological force of the instrumental view of politics. In The Question Concerning Technology, Heidegger's striking argument was that in the modernising West technology is not merely a tool, a 'means to an end'. Rather technology has become a governing image of the modern universe, one that has come to order, limit and define human existence as a 'calculable coherence of forces' and a 'standing reserve' of energy. Heidegger wrote: 'the threat to man does not come in the first instance from the potentially lethal machines and apparatus of technology. The actual threat has already affectedmanin his essence.'[77](http://muse.jhu.edu.floyd.lib.umn.edu/journals/theory_and_event/v010/10.2burke.html#_edn77)      This process Heidegger calls 'Enframing' and through it the scientific mind demands that 'nature reports itself in some way or other that is identifiable through calculation and remains orderable as a system of information'. Man is not a being who makes and uses machines as means, choosing and limiting their impact on the world for his ends; rather man has imagined the world as a machine and humanity everywhere becomes trapped within its logic. Man, he writes, 'comes to the very brink of a precipitous fall...where he himself will have to be taken as standing-reserve. Meanwhile Man, precisely as the one so threatened, exalts himself to the posture of lord of the earth.'[78](http://muse.jhu.edu.floyd.lib.umn.edu/journals/theory_and_event/v010/10.2burke.html#_edn78) Technological man not only becomes the name for a project of lordship and mastery over the earth, but incorporates humanity within this project as a calculable resource. In strategy, warfare and geopolitics human bodies, actions and aspirations are caught, transformed and perverted by such calculating, enframing reason: human lives are reduced to tools, obstacles, useful or obstinate matter.

##### Reject the aff as an instance of the violent logic of security

**Burke**, School of Political Science and International Studies, University of Queensland**2002**[Anthony, Aporias of Security, Alternatives 27]

It is perhaps easy to become despondent, but as countless struggles for freedom, justice, and social transformation have proved, a sense of seriousness can be tempered with the knowledge that many tools are already available—and where they are not, the ef­fort to create a productive new critical sensibility is well advanced. There is also a crucial political opening within the liberal problematic itself, in the sense that it assumes that power is most effec­tive when it is absorbed as truth, consented to and desired—which creates an important space for refusal. As Colin Gordon argues, Foucault thought that the very possibility of governing was condi­tional on it being credible to the governed as well as the govern­ing. This throws weight onto the question of how security works as a technology of subjectivity. It is to take up Foucault's challenge,framed as a reversal of the liberal progressive movement of being we have seen in Hegel, not to discover who or what we are so much as to refuse what we are. Just as security rules subjectivity as both a totalizing and individualizing blackmail and promise, it is at these levels that we can intervene. We can critique the machinic frame­works of possibility represented by law, policy, economic regulation, and diplomacy, while challenging the way these institutions deploy language to draw individual subjects into their consensual web.This suggests, at least provisionally, a dual strategy. The first as­serts the space for agency, both in challenging available possibilities for being and their largersocioeconomic implications. Roland Bleiker formulates an idea of agency that shifts away from the lone(male) hero overthrowing the social order in a decisive act of re­bellion to one that understands both the thickness of social power and its "fissures," "fragmentation," and "thinness." We must, he says, "observe how an individual may be able to escape the discur­sive order and influence its shifting boundaries. ... By doing so, discursive terrains of dissent all of a sudden appear where forces of domination previously seemed invincible."Pushing beyond security requires tactics that can work at many-levels—that empower individuals to recognize the larger social, cul­tural, and economic implications of the everyday forms of desire, subjection, and discipline they encounter, to challenge and rewrite them, and that in turn contribute to collective efforts to transform the larger structures of being, exchange, and power that sustain (and have been sustained by) these forms. As Derrida suggests, this is to open up aporetic possibilities that transgress and call into question the boundaries ofthe self, society, and the international that security seeks to imagine and police.The second seeks new ethical principles based on a critique of the rigid and repressive forms of identity that security has heretofore offered. Thus writers such as Rosalyn Diprose, William Con­nolly, and Moira Gatens have sought to imagine a new ethical rela­tionship that thinks difference not on the basis of the same but on the basis of a dialogue with the other that might, allow space for the unknown and unfamiliar, for a "debate and engagement with the other's law and the other's ethics"—an encounter that involves a transformation of the self rather than the other. Thus while the sweep and power of securitymust be acknowledged, it must also be refused: at the simultaneous levels of individual identity, social order, and macroeconomic possibility, it would entail another kind of work on "ourselves"—a political refusal of the One, the imagination of an other that never returns to the same. It would be to ask if there is a world after security, and what its shimmering possibilities might be.

### Norms

#### US action irrelevant to international norms on drones – other tech proves

**Etzioni 13** – professor of IR @ George Washington (Amitai, “The Great Drone Debate”, March/April, <http://usacac.army.mil/CAC2/MilitaryReview/Archives/English/MilitaryReview_20130430_art004.pdf>, CMR)

Other critics contend that by the United States ¶ using drones, it leads other countries into making and ¶using them. For example, Medea Benjamin, the cofounder of the anti-war activist group CODEPINK ¶ and author of a book about drones argues that, “The ¶ proliferation of drones should evoke reﬂection on the ¶ precedent that the United States is setting by killing ¶ anyone it wants, anywhere it wants, on the basis of ¶ secret information. Other nations and non-state entities are watching—and are bound to start acting in ¶ a similar fashion.”60 Indeed scores of countries are ¶ now manufacturing or purchasing drones. There can ¶ be little doubt that the fact that drones have served ¶ the United States well has helped to popularize them. ¶ However, it does not follow that United States ¶ should not have employed drones in the hope that ¶such a show of restraint would deter others. First ¶ of all, this would have meant that either the United ¶ States would have had to allow terrorists in hardto-reach places, say North Waziristan, to either ¶ roam and rest freely—or it would have had to use ¶ bombs that would have caused much greater collateral damage. ¶ Further, the record shows that even when the ¶United States did not develop a particular weapon, ¶others did. Thus, China has taken the lead in the ¶ development of anti-ship missiles and seemingly ¶ cyber weapons as well. One must keep in mind ¶ that the international environment is a hostile ¶ one. Countries—and especially non-state actors—¶ most of the time do not play by some set of selfconstraining rules. Rather, they tend to employ ¶whatever weapons they can obtain that will further ¶their interests. The United States correctly does ¶ not assume that it can rely on some non-existent ¶ implicit gentleman’s agreements that call for the ¶ avoidance of new military technology by nation X ¶ or terrorist group Y—if the United States refrains ¶ from employing that technology¶ I am not arguing that there are no natural norms ¶ that restrain behavior. There are certainly some ¶ that exist, particularly in situations where all parties beneﬁt from the norms (e.g., the granting of ¶ diplomatic immunity) or where particularly horrifying weapons are involved (e.g., weapons of ¶ mass destruction). However drones are but one ¶step—following bombers and missiles—in the ¶development of distant battleﬁeld technologies. ¶ (Robotic soldiers—or future ﬁghting machines—¶ are next in line). In such circumstances, the role ¶ of norms is much more limited.

#### No drones arms race – multiple checks

- narrow application – diplomatic and political costs – state defenses

**Singh 12** – researcher at the Center for a New American Security (Joseph, “Betting Against a Drone Arms Race”, 8/13, <http://nation.time.com/2012/08/13/betting-against-a-drone-arms-race/#ixzz2TxEkUI37>, CMR)

Bold predictions of a coming drones arms race are all the rage since the uptake in their deployment under the Obama Administration. Noel Sharkey, for example, argues in an August 3 op-ed for the Guardian that rapidly developing drone technology — coupled with minimal military risk — portends an era in which states will become increasingly aggressive in their use of drones.¶ As drones develop the ability to fly completely autonomously, Sharkey predicts a proliferation of their use that will set dangerous precedents, seemingly inviting hostile nations to use drones against one another. Yet, the narrow applications of current drone technology coupled with what we know about state behavior in the international system lend no credence to these ominous warnings.¶ Indeed, critics seem overly-focused on the domestic implications of drone use.¶ In a June piece for the Financial Times, Michael Ignatieff writes that “virtual technologies make it easier for democracies to wage war because they eliminate the risk of blood sacrifice that once forced democratic peoples to be prudent.”¶ Significant public support for the Obama Administration’s increasing deployment of drones would also seem to legitimate this claim. Yet, there remain equally serious diplomatic and political costs that emanate from beyond a fickle electorate, which will prevent the likes of the increased drone aggression predicted by both Ignatieff and Sharkey.¶ Most recently, the serious diplomatic scuffle instigated by Syria’s downing a Turkish reconnaissance plane in June illustrated the very serious risks of operating any aircraft in foreign territory.¶ States launching drones must still weigh the diplomatic and political costs of their actions, which make the calculation surrounding their use no fundamentally different to any other aerial engagement.¶ This recent bout also illustrated a salient point regarding drone technology: most states maintain at least minimal air defenses that can quickly detect and take down drones, as the U.S. discovered when it employed drones at the onset of the Iraq invasion, while Saddam Hussein’s surface-to-air missiles were still active.¶ What the U.S. also learned, however, was that drones constitute an effective military tool in an extremely narrow strategic context. They are well-suited either in direct support of a broader military campaign, or to conduct targeted killing operations against a technologically unsophisticated enemy.¶ In a nutshell, then, the very contexts in which we have seen drones deployed. Northern Pakistan, along with a few other regions in the world, remain conducive to drone usage given a lack of air defenses, poor media coverage, and difficulties in accessing the region.

#### Realist theory disproves the advantage

JM Greico- professor of political science at Duke University, 1993 “Neorealism and Neoliberalism: The Contemporary Debate”¶ edited by David Allen Baldwin, chapter entitled “Anarchy and the Limits of Cooperation: A Realist Critique of the Newest Liberal Institutionalism” p. 116-118

Realism has dominated international relations theory at least since World War II.' For realists, international anarchy fosters competition and conflict among states and inhibits their willingness to cooperate even when they share common interests. Realist theory also argues that international institutions are unable to mitigate anarchy's constraining effects on interstate cooperation. Realism, then, presents a pessimistic analysis of the prospects for international cooperation and of the capabilities of international institutions.2¶ The major challenger to realism has been what I shall call liberal institutionalism. Prior to the current decade, it appeared in three successive presentations—functionalist integration theory in the 1940s and early 1950s, neofunctionalist regional integration theory in the 1950s and 1960s, and interdependence theory in the 1970s.3 All three versions rejected realism's propositions about states and its gloomy understanding of world politics. Most significantly, they argued that international institutions can help states cooperate. Thus, compared to realism, these earlier versions of liberal institutionalism offered a more hopeful prognosis for international cooperation and a more optimistic assessment of the capacity of institutions to help states achieve it.¶ International tensions and conflicts during the 1970s undermined liberal institutionalism and reconfirmed realism in large measure. Yet that difficult decade did not witness a collapse of the international system, and in the light of continuing modest levels of interstate cooperation, a new liberal institutionalist challenge to realism came forward during the early 1980s (Stein 1983:115-40; Axelrod 1984; Keohane 1984; Lipson 1984; Axelrod and Keohane 1985). What is distinctive about this newest liberal institutionalism is its claim that it accepts a number of core realist propositions, including, apparently, the realist argument that anarchy impedes the achievement of international cooperation. However, the core liberal arguments—that realism overemphasizes conflict and underestimates the capacities of international institutions to promote cooperation—remain firmly intact. The new liberal institutionalists basically argue that even if the realists are correct in believing that anarchy constrains the willingness of states to cooperate, states nevertheless can work together and can do so especially with the assistance of international institutions.¶ This point is crucial for students of international relations. If neo-liberal institutionalists are correct, then they have dealt realism a major blow while providing ine intellectual justification for treating their own approach, and the tradition from which it emerges, as the most effective for understanding world politics.¶ This essay's principal argument is that, in fact, neoliberal institutionalism misconstrues the realist analysis of international anarchy and therefore it misunderstands the realist analysis of the impact of anarchy on the preferences and actions of states. Indeed, the new liberal institutionalism fails to address a major constraint on the willingness of states to cooperate which is generated by international anarchy and which is identified by realism. As a result, the new theory's optimism about international cooperation is likely to be proven wrong.¶ Neoliberalism's claims about cooperation are based on its belief that states are atomistic actors. It argues that states seek to maximize their individual absolute gains and are indifferent to the gains achieved by others. Cheating, the new theory suggests, is the greatest impediment to cooperation among rationally egoistic states, but international institutions, the new theory also suggests, can help states overcome this barrier to joint action. Realists understand that states seek absolute gains and worry about compliance. However, realists¶ find that states are positional, not atomistic, in character, and therefore realists argue that, in addition to concerns about cheating, states in cooperative arrangements also worry that their partners might gain more from cooperation that they do. For realists, a state will focus both on its absolute and relative gains from cooperation, and a state that is satisfied with a partner's compliance in a joint arrangement might nevertheless exit from it because the partner is achieving relatively greater gains. Realism, then, finds that there are at least two major barriers to international cooperation: state concerns about cheating and state concerns about relative achievements of gains. Neoliberal institutionalism pays attention exclusively to the former and is unable to identify, analyze, or account for the latter.¶ Realism's identification of the relative gains problem for cooperation is based on its insight that states in anarchy fear for their survival as independent actors. According to realists, states worry that today's friend may be tomorrow's enemy in war, and fear that achievements of joint gains that advantage a friend in the present might produce a more dangerous potential foe in the future. As a result, states must give serious attention to the gains of partners. Neoliber-als fail to consider the threat of war arising from international anarchy, and this allows them to ignore the matter of relative gains and to assume that states only desire absolute gains. Yet in doing so, they fail to identify a major source of state inhibitions about international cooperation.¶ In sum, I suggest that realism, its emphasis on conflict and competition notwithstanding, offers a more complete understanding of the problem of international cooperation than does its latest liberal challenger. If that is true, then realism is still the most powerful theory of international politics.

#### drones make conflict less likely

Goure, 12

[Daniel, vice president of the Lexington Institute, Drones and the Changing Nature of Warfare: Hold the Presses!, CATO Unbound, January 13, 2012, <http://www.cato-unbound.org/2012/01/13/daniel-goure/drones-changing-nature-warfare-hold-presses>, CMR] gender edited

Has the accelerated use of drones opened a new chapter in the history of warfare, as David Cortright asserts? If so, what is the title of that chapter? It certainly is not “Drones Make War More Likely, Indiscriminate or Bloodier.” As recent landmark studies by Goldstein and Pinker clearly document, societal violence in general and armed conflict in particular are on the decline.[1] The fact that we live in the historical shadow of the air raids on Dresden and Tokyo but are focused on a few hundred strikes by unmanned aerial systems in Pakistan underscores this dramatic change in the way air power is employed today. Drones are not new. The V-1 was a drone, but lacked a man-in-the-loop and precision guidance capabilities. Modern drones emerged from the overall revolution in precision navigation and networked communications which began more than two decades ago. This revolution centered on improvements in technologies for position location, remote sensing, automated flight controls, computer-based target designation, high bandwidth communications, high capacity computing and smart fusing. These technologies were combined to provide a capability for long-range precision strikes, as demonstrated in the first Gulf War. Most often this capability required both a platform/launcher and a “smart” weapon such as a laser-guided bomb or Joint Direct Attack Munition that would be flown to a release point, then fly to a specific target based either on laser illumination or pre-programmed GPS coordinates. Cruise missiles, which have been widely proliferated, are essentially drones. Modern drones provide many of the best features of both cruise missiles and manned aircraft. Most significantly, they provide the tactical and operational flexibility of manned platforms with the reduced risk to personnel associated with cruise missiles. Unlike the former, they allow for man-in-the-loop control and vehicle recovery. Unlike the latter, they can operate at altitudes and in environments unsuited to manned systems and, in some cases, for extended periods of time. Despite the proliferation of drones, particularly by the United States, at best it can be argued that the proliferation of unmanned aerial systems (UASs) is changing tactics, particularly with respect to operations on land. The predominant mission of drones today is to collect information, primarily electro-optical data in the form of pictures and full motion video. The overwhelming majority of drone flying hours are conducted by systems such as Aerovironment’s Wasp, Puma, and Raven; Insitu’s ScanEagle; and Textron’s Shadow for the purpose of providing overwatch for maneuvering Army and Marine Corps units. Even the vaunted Predator, a variant of which, the MQ-9 Reaper, is the platform employed for armed strikes, is predominantly employed for intelligence, surveillance, and reconnaissance missions. The larger systems such as Northrop Grumman’s Global Hawk and Lockheed Martin’s stealthy RQ-170 Sentinel are intended solely to gather intelligence. Armed drones serve a niche function. They are useful in situations where real-time tactical intelligence is required in order to launch a weapon and the operating environment is extremely benign. Because they can loiter in the area of a suspected target, waiting for positive identification and the proper time to strike with the least possibility of inflicting collateral damage, they are far less lethal than any other aerial weapons system. Attempts to connect an increased tendency to use force are supported neither by the evidence nor by logic. The frequency and intensity of conflicts has declined even as the ability to conduct remote combat has increased exponentially. There were only a handful of drones available to the U.S. military when Operations Enduring Freedom and Iraqi Freedom began. The lack of unmanned systems appears to have posed no obstacle to the decision to initiate either operation. It is difficult to accord any serious influence over the conduct of air operations in past or current conflicts to the presence of armed drones. In the era before drones, the U.S. imposed ten year long no-fly zones over northern and southern Iraq. In addition, the number of drone sorties in total is but a tiny fraction of all aerial sorties. Armed drone sorties constitute only a small fraction of total drone missions. Cortright notes that since 2009 there have been 239 drone strikes into Pakistan. However, for the month of January 2011, Coalition forces in Afghanistan flew 387 sorties in which guns were fired or munitions expended.[2] These statistics suggest a clear preference on the part of the military for manned aerial systems and not drones in the conduct of tactical air operations. Cortright also reports that 145 drone strikes were conducted during Operation Odyssey Dawn—the liberation of Libya. Actually this is an incorrect statement. While drones were used over Libya these were not armed flights, hence they were sorties and not strikes. But this is good example of the breathless quality of much of the analysis today of the implications of drones for warfare. Look at the numbers. The U.S. alone conducted some 3,500 sorties during Operation Odyssey Dawn. So drones amounted to 4% of the total. By the way, the United States and United Kingdom also launched 228 Tomahawk cruise missiles during this operation, 112 on the first night of the conflict. If we are to accord to weapon systems influence over the decision to use force then in the case of Libya, precedence must be given based simply on the number of sorties conducted to cruise missiles, aerial refueling tankers, tactical fighters, and even cargo planes before we come to the little-used drone. The availability of un[staffed]manned aerial systems in no way makes conflict more likely or more brutal. Quite the opposite, in fact, seems to be the case. The presumption that were it not for the availability of drones, the U.S. would refrain from conducting military operations against terrorists based in Pakistan is highly dubious. We have an example of an alternative military option: Operation Enduring Freedom. As Joshua Goldstein pointed out in a recent article, the use of armed drones in Pakistan may have prevented the use of far bloodier means. “Armed drones now attack targets that in the past would have required an invasion with thousands of heavily armed troops, displacing huge numbers of civilians and destroying valuable property along the way.”[3] According to Robert Woodward’s reporting on President Obama’s decision to deploy additional forces to Afghanistan in 2009, a number of senior advisors proposed a lower-cost, smaller deployment based on increased use of special operations forces and unmanned aerial vehicles. I might go even farther than Goldstein and argue that Cortright should advocate the greater use of drones, armed and otherwise, precisely due to his interest in reducing the frequency, intensity, and costs of conflicts. Just as dash cameras in police cars and cell phone cameras have led to a decrease in police brutality and the ability to bring those who violate procedures to account, the electro-optical sensors on drones can be used to increase oversight over military forces in the field. In fact, cameras can reduce what Cortright calls “the psychological distance that separates the launching of a strike from its bloody impact.” It can also help reduce the alleged isolation of the American people from the use of force in their name. Unfortunately in view of its title, the primary focus of Cortright’s article is not on drones and warfare. Rather, it centers on the subset of the role of drones in current counterterrorism operations. A number of the issues he raises are frankly much more relevant to the rather murky legal and operational circumstances surrounding the global campaign against al Qaeda. Cortright is closer to the mark when, as the title of his article suggests, he connects the nature of drones, notably the lack of a person in the cockpit, to the sense that both the George W. Bush and, most particularly, the Obama Administration saw such systems as supporting if not promoting a “license to kill.” Critics of the use of drones against unlawful combatants in Pakistan and elsewhere would be on firmer ground by connecting the disembodied features of “Nintendo warfare” to our seeming tolerance for the weakening of legal safeguards for criminal terrorists. In conclusion, I would suggest that there is nothing in the current employment of drones or in plans for future unmanned aerial systems that poses the kinds of dangers suggested by Mr. Cortright. They will not make war easier or cheaper. There is no evidence that armed drones have reduced the political inhibitions against the use of deadly force. The use of drones in no way threatens to weaken the moral presumption against the inappropriate or excessive use of force that is at the heart of the just war doctrine—the emphasis is mine, but the qualifiers have always belonged to just war theory. Mr. Cortright’s problem is not with drones but the policies of those who employ them. I almost hate to say it, but we should remember that drones don’t kill terrorists, governments do.

#### Drone prolif solve Asia war – deterrence – and no solvency for surveillance drones

Gettinger, 11/8/ 13 [Dan, Bard College, “An Act of War”: Drones Are Testing China-Japan Relations,http://dronecenter.bard.edu/act-war-drones-testing-china-japan-relations/]

The proliferation of unmanned surveillance aircraft and an agreement similar to President Eisenhower’s 1955 “Open Skies” proposal could help deter conflict by giving each side better knowledge of movements by the other. However, these measures would do little to calm the flaring nationalistic feeling in both countries or solve the question of ownership of undersea resources. The region is seeing a significant escalation in military preparedness in reaction to the tensions over the Senkaku Islands. The investments in drones by both sides could result in one of these aircraft acting as a catalyst for broader conventional military action. This possibility was made clear by China’s reaction to Japan’s revised rules of engagement concerning intrusive drones. The Senkaku Islands dispute is becoming the first case study of the role that drones play in escalating geopolitical tensions to the point of war.

#### Unfettered drone prolif key to stable china rise

Basu, 13 [China: The Dawn of the Drones [Narayani Basu] Narayani Basu Research Intern, CRP, IPCS http://www.ipcs.org/article/military/china-the-dawn-of-the-drones-3948.html]

An Aerial Geo-Strategy The primary role of China’s growing drone programme is to help Beijing control and monitor disputed territories in the Asia-Pacific region. Put simply, drones help China deter countries from intervening in the area by helping to detect and target potential violators of the areas they are trying to deny. Indeed, Beijing’s deployment of drones near the disputed Senkaku/Diaoyu Islands impacted Sino-Japanese relations recently, prompting Tokyo to place its own defence programme under review, with the aim of introducing its own drones to patrol the disputed waters by 2015. For China then, drones could act as the ideal surveillance tool in the event of a crisis - a proxy weapon to deter assertive behaviour over territories China considers its own - such as the South China Sea and the Senkaku Islands. China’s move into large-scale drone deployment is a significant indication of its military’s growing sophistication. It could not only challenge American dominance in the Asia-Pacific, but could also elevate the threat to any neighbours with which China has territorial disputes, such as Vietnam, Japan, India or the Philippines. Within China, drones are already patrolling the borders, and a navy drone was deployed to the western province of Sichuan to provide aerial surveillance, in the aftermath of last month’s deadly earthquake. However, on a wider geopolitical canvas, Chinese drones could be the tipping point for giving the Chinese an edge in possible future disputes in Asia with the US, as American foreign policy continues its rebalancing trends within the Asia-Pacific. Indeed, China has already made it clear that the drones are capable of carrying bombs and missiles as well as conducting reconnaissance missions, potentially turning them into offensive weapons in the event of a border conflict. The thought of armed UAVs patrolling the skies over disputed territories like the Paracel and the Spratly Islands is enough to cause anxiety among ASEAN members, besides greatly enhancing China’s ocean surveillance. On the other hand, it is equally important to remember that Chinese drones are not yet as sophisticated as their US counterparts in terms of range, hardware, and engines. Official makers COSIC admit that progress is needed in half a dozen major areas, from airframe designs to digital linkups. Secondly, the Chinese drones on display at the Zhuhai Airshow are prototypes and not finished products. Nor have Chinese drones ever been put to military use.

#### The impact is overpopulation, Indian economic growth and global war

Hutchison, 13 [Martin Hutchinson is the author of Great Conservatives (Academica Press, 2005) - details can be found on the website www.greatconservatives.com - and co-author with Professor Kevin Dowd of Alchemists of Loss (Wiley, 2010). Both are now available on Amazon.com, Great Conservatives only in a Kindle edition, Alchemists of Loss in both Kindle and print editions. <http://www.atimes.com/atimes/Global_Economy/GECON-01-250613.html>]

U economic, military and foreign policy blunders make China's global dominance appear entirely realistic, and for many observers inevitable. Last week, the Nicaraguan congress approved a US$40 billion project for a Chinese company to build an Isthmian canal parallel to Panama's. For those of us prone to peering anxiously into the future, this gave a disquieting advance picture of the new world of Chinese hegemony into which we are probably entering, whether we like it or not. As president Ronald Reagan famously remarked, Nicaragua is only two days' drive from Harlingen, Texas. And presumably we can rely on China to cut that down a bit by improving the road! Historically we must remember that the natural position of China is hegemony, though for several hundred years it only achieved that position by being deliberately geographically obtuse. Nevertheless, like ancient Egypt, for all but about 200 years of her history China has been militarily dominant over all powers it felt it had to deal with. We should also remember that the high point of Chinese civilization was not the early Ming period of exploration by Admiral Zheng He under the Yongle emperor, but the apogee of the Song dynasty some three centuries earlier. The Zheng He voyages, while gigantic in scale, were strategically very unambitious - they followed an entirely coastal route, not striking out away from the known world as Columbus was to do. Moreover, they were diplomatic efforts, rather than attempts to establish permanent trading routes, as the Portuguese were to do in the East Indies, or colonize new areas, as the Spanish were to do in Mexico. If Zheng He had discovered California, it's likely he would have done little with it; if he'd stretched his voyage to almost twice its length and sailed into Lisbon harbor, he would have been a spectacular sight for the Portuguese. However, his arrival would not have been psychologically daunting for the contemporaneous exploration efforts of Portugal's Henry the Navigator, who knew of China's existence and nature through the travels of Marco Polo a century earlier. Song dynasty civilization, on the other hand, was in terms of technology and lifestyle superior to anything that had preceded it, or anything that followed it until the Western Enlightenment 500 years later. Confucianism also is a very benign religion/philosophy compared with its Christian, Moslem, Hindu or even Buddhist approximate contemporaries. We should not judge China solely by the current regime, the remnants of a dictatorship of unparalleled brutality, but instead by its overall record, the peaks of which were very enlightened indeed. There is no question that China's enormous economic success in the last 40 years has brought forth a desire, both among the regime and among China's people as a whole, to resume the position of global dominance it enjoyed for two millennia. Ten years ago, this ambition would have seemed quixotic, except over the time-frame of half a century or more. Today, both because of China's economic successes and because of US economic, military and foreign policy blunders, it appears entirely realistic, and for many observers inevitable. Whether China's advance is something to be welcomed depends entirely on what kind of regime China has as a hegemon. Two possibilities exist. First, China may continue its current growth on its current trajectory with its current regime, with its GDP per capita increasing from about 15% of the US figure to about 50%. At that point, the inefficiencies and corruption of China's current government system would prevent further progress towards the "frontier" affluence of the United States and the better-run European and Asian free-market economies. However, to a Chinese regime concerned about its power position rather than the welfare of its citizens, this wouldn't matter. With a gross domestic product per capita half that of the United States, China would have a GDP in absolute terms about twice that of the US, since its population is four times that of the US. Indeed, China's GDP would be as great as that of the US and the EU combined, although smaller free-market countries like Canada, Australia and the free-market East Asian economies of Japan, South Korea and the 10-member Association of Southeast Asian Nations would still give the West a modest preponderance (and no, Vladimir Vladimirovich, by allying with China you would not bring the position back into balance; with only 130 million people by then and a GDP per capita constrained like China's by corruption and inefficiency you would still not be a serious economic competitor, however impressive your missile count). In this case, you can imagine the Chinese playing the game of international power politics rather like the old Soviet Union, at least in its less malign days after Stalin's death. The Nicaraguan canal, a $40 billion investment that is hopelessly economically unviable (as Panama's adjacent canal has annual revenues of only $2.4 billion) would be followed by a naval base. China would enjoy the enthusiastic cooperation of the anti-American Ortega government, which would have been propped up by Chinese money and when necessary information about its opponents. Daniel Ortega, in spite of having been around seemingly almost as long as Fidel Castro, is only 67 and in good health. Another 20 years of his rule would cement China's position in the Western Hemisphere. China's economic extreme helpfulness to anti-Western regimes like Rafael Correa's Ecuador would also cement itself into long-lasting dictatorships under Chinese dominance. Countries like Venezuela and Argentina, with anti-Western regimes that got into economic trouble, would find China very helpful, although not all of these interventions would be successful. Africa would also be dotted with Chinese satrapies, not all of them entirely under its control, any more than all the Comecon bloc countries were entirely under the control of the Soviet Union. Economically, free markets would dominate only in trade between the Western powers themselves and those few wealthy nations in East Asia who feared Chinese domination. Natural resources would be locked up by China in long-term contracts, backed by the threat of force. Of course, this world would be thoroughly economically suboptimal, especially in terms of innovation, which would take place only in the Western economies. In particular, the peoples of countries dominated by China would find their existence a miserable one. Nevertheless, China itself would benefit from its advantageous resources and cheap-labor manufacturing operations overseas. Since China would remain semi-capitalist and generally more efficient than the old Soviet Union, the Chinese hegemony would not run into the contradictions faced by the Soviet empire in the 1970s and 1980s. Certainly its wealth would prove ample to fund a massive military machine, which would engage in few overt acts of aggression but would exert Chinese dominance whenever the opportunity arose. If this sounds like a resumption of the 1945-91 Cold War, it is. China would not be economically communist (whatever its theoretical pretensions), and it's unlikely it to be ruled by an irrational monster like Stalin. Nevertheless, its economic autarky would impoverish much of the world, and its military might would be used to seize advantages from those Western countries foolish enough to elect a Jimmy Carter, Willy Brandt or Harold Wilson. And because of its size and relative economic efficiency, it would be a far more dangerous strategic opponent than the Soviet Union ever was. There is however an alternative. The continuation of China's current government is not inevitable, and nor is the gradual progress of its economy to a hegemonic level. There are already signs of severe funds shortage in the Chinese banking system - the domestic interbank rate is up to 8%, a T-bill auction recently was only two-thirds subscribed and the People's Bank is trying to rein back credit hard, since bank loan volumes are already 23% above last year. Since in 2006 there was reckoned to be $910 billion of bad debts in the Chinese banking system, and the anecdotes of entirely empty luxury office buildings are legion, there must be a chance that the country's financial system will collapse, revealing "malinvestment" - to use the Austrian economic term - not seen since the Tower of Babel proved the folly of over-investing in ziggurats. In that event, the Chinese economy will enter a deep recession, with unemployment, bankruptcies and the other attributes of misery. That won't end the Chinese prospects for growth, but it will very likely destabilize the Chinese political system, causing unrest similar to that of Tiananmen Square in 1989, but with a much larger middle class and infinitely better communications. There is no certainty whatever that such an event will produce a benign outcome; in general, street unrest doesn't, as was demonstrated two years ago in Cairo. However, if it produces a reshuffled authoritarian regime, we are simply back to Option 1 after a few extra years, while if it produces a socialist outcome Chinese economic emergence will be aborted and hegemony will be unaffordable, as it was for Mao Zedong. If on the other hand, China reaches back into the mists of its history and produces a Confucian democracy, a kind of Song dynasty with elected emperors, then Chinese economic and political emergence will take a very different form. Like the Song dynasty itself, which relied on barbarians for its military muscle and pursued a generally defensive international strategy (before being overwhelmed by the infinitely more aggressive but less agreeable Mongols), a neo-Song regime would regard the Nicaragua canal as simply a canal, abandoning it as hopelessly uneconomic or finishing it if it had by then become economic to do so. Unlike the current Chinese regime, it would be a thoroughly benign and cooperative member of the global order, like Germany or Singapore. A neo-Song China would allow the free market to flourish, but without the crony capitalism and protectionism of the current regime. Thereby it would raise the incomes of its people far beyond the 50% of US incomes that would be the maximum for the current China, but towards and even beyond the "frontier" of the highest incomes possible with the current technological capability. It would be a pioneer in several areas of research, notably biotech, in which its Confucian heritage would allow it to experiment in areas taboo to Judeo-Christians. A world with such a China would be close to its optimum. It would have lower military spending than today, because rogue states would be unable to destabilize a world dominated by the immensely wealthy neo-Song China and its equally wealthy but smaller friends in the US, Europe and East Asia. India would develop rapidly, with a wealthy free-trading China as its neighbor, and the poor countries of Africa and Latin America would also be brought up towards "frontier" levels. Global population would peak and begin to decline as the world became wealthier, with neo-Song China representing about 20% of the world's population, but a rather larger percentage of its wealth, intellectual capability and civilizational potential. Just as modern Germany is a highly prosperous and civilized member of the world community and a force for much good, so too a neo-Song China could play a huge role in making this a happier and richer planet. But whether we arrive at such a Nirvana, or whether we descend into a Manichean Cold War with the existing Chinese regime grown rich and arrogant is entirely in the lap of the gods, to be driven by political and economic developments that are currently unknowable.

#### Extinction

**Brown 2006** – professor of physiology at West Virginia University (Paul, Notes from a Dying Planet, p. 3-4)

The threats we face stem from overpopulation and environmental degradation. The resulting climate change and mass extinctions are leading to ecological collapse, in which the once-robust tapestry of interrelationships among living creatures, climate, and our physical environment has been weakened and is starting to unravel. Clinical indicators of our planet’s serious illness are illustrated in the graph. I’ve adjusted the vertical scales for population, carbon dioxide (CO2), methane, temperature, and extinction of species per year so they all have a common minimum and maximum.   All the minima occurred tens of thousands of years BC, and all the maxima are now.  The state of the Earth today is unique. We’re consuming the world’s resources faster than they can be restored. The world’s population is now doubling in less than fifty years. Around mid-century the world’s population is expected to level off at eight to twelve billion people. The lower number is far too high: population must start to decline before 2050 if we are to survive. The upper limit, to put it simply, will never be reached because we would all die first**.** Because of population growth and increasing consumption, concentrations of greenhouse gases such as carbon dioxide and methane in our atmosphere are the highest in human history, as are global temperatures. This is not normal climatic fluctuation, as fossil-fuel industry shills would have you believe. The rate of species extinctions is comparable to mass extinctions that have occurred only five times before, and is likely to exceed those. The total decline of species since the Industrial Revolution will soon be worse than the mass extinction caused by the asteroid impact sixty-five million years ago off the Yucatan peninsula, which wiped out 83% of species including the dinosaurs.  Before we came along, species evolved and went extinct for billions of years, creating and filling a diversity of ecological niches. Organisms used energy from the sun to grow and reproduce, recycling the materials needed for life through an interdependent worldwide ecosystem. Mechanisms existed to maintain ecological stability, ensuring that the environment didn’t change too fast for evolution to keep up. Our biosphere recovered from calamitous events like asteroid collisions, even though only a minority of species made it through some of those catastrophes. Today’s ongoing catastrophe may eliminate all but the smallest and simplest of life forms.  Our species has flourished, but without realizing it we’ve changed our environment too fast for other species to adapt. A system’s stability can only be eroded so far, after which it becomes unstable. We’re approaching a point where the world’s ecosystem will change too fast even for us to adapt. We will become extinct.  It’s already too late for us to return to the world as we found it or even as it was ten years ago. We’ve wiped out too many species. But we can protect the remaining fragile stability. In a word, we must seek sustainability, which means consuming resources only as fast as they’re replenished. All the trends on our graph have to be reversed, until they’re all back to pre-industrial levels or lower. This doesn’t mean returning to a pre-industrial quality of life – in fact, we should all be able to live much better once there are fewer of us. But we have to take effective action very soon, before it’s too late.

#### Indian economic growth solves asia war

**Garten 95** (Jeffrey, Under Secretary of Commerce for International Trade, FDCH, 3-7, Lexis)

Paramount among those interests are the commercial opportunities that are increasingly at the heart of the Clinton Administration's foreign policy. But it is impossible to separate those commercial interests from our broader interests. Economic reforms enable our companies to take advantage of the opportunities within the Indian market and enable Indian companies to better enter the global marketplace. Economic growth in India is a **powerful stabilizing force** in a region of the world where stability is of Supreme importance. Stability and growth in India are of enormous importance through southern Asia, from the Middle East to Indochina. Peace and prosperity in that part of the world are **essential** to the peace and prosperity of the world.

#### Plan’s modeling restricts Chinese strikes on Uighur separatists

**Bergen and Rowland 12** (Peter Bergen, CNN National Security Analyst, Jennifer Rowland, Special to CNN, “A Dangerous New World of Drones,” CNN News, October 8, 2012, http://www.cnn.com/2012/10/01/opinion/bergen-world-of-drones)

But without an international framework governing the use of drone attacks, the United States is **setting a** dangerous **precedent** for other nations with its aggressive and secretive drone programs in Pakistan and Yemen, which are aimed at suspected members of al Qaeda and their allies.

Just as the U.S. government justifies its drone strikes with the argument that it is at war with al Qaeda and its affiliates, one could imagine that India in the not too distant future might launch such attacks against suspected terrorists in Kashmir, or **China might strike Uighur separatists** in western China, or Iran might attack Baluchi nationalists along its border with Pakistan.

#### Drone strikes are key --- suppresses Xinjiang separatist violence and instability

**Erickson and Strange 13** (Andrew Erickson, associate professor at the Naval War College, Associate in Research at Harvard University's Fairbank Centre, Austin Strange, researcher at the Naval War College's China Maritime Studies Institute, graduate student at Zhejiang University, “China Has Drones. Now How Will it Use Them?” Foreign Affairs, May 29, 2013, http://www.nationmultimedia.com/opinion/China-has-drones-Now-how-will-it-use-them-30207095.html)

Yet there is a reason why the United States has employed drones extensively despite domestic and international criticism: it is much easier and cheaper to kill terrorists from above than to try to root them out through long and expensive counterinsurgency campaigns. Some similar challenges loom on China's horizon. Within China, Beijing often considers protests and **violence** **in** the restive border regions, such as **Xinjiang** and Tibet, to constitute terrorism. It would presumably consider ordering precision strikes to **suppress** any **future violenc**e there. Even if such strikes are operationally prudent, China's leaders understand that they would damage the country's image abroad, but they prioritise internal stability above all else. Domestic surveillance by drones is a different issue; there should be few barriers to its application in what is already one of the world's most heavily policed societies. China might also be willing to use stealth drones in foreign airspace without authorisation if the risk of detection were low enough; it already deploys intelligence-gathering ships in the exclusive economic zones of Japan and the United States, as well as in the Indian Ocean.

#### The impact is Chinese nuclear terrorism

Ferguson and Potter, 4 — president of the Federation of American Scientists, former project director of the Independent Task Force on U.S. Nuclear Weapons Policy at the Council on Foreign Relations, adjunct professor in the security studies program at Georgetown University, former scientist-in-residence at the Monterey Institute’s Center for Nonproliferation Studies, winner of the 2003 Robert S. Landauer Lecture Award from the Health Physics Society, consultant for Oak Ridge National Laboratory, Sandia National Laboratories, and the National Nuclear Security Administration, former physical scientist in the Office of the Senior Coordinator for Nuclear Safety at the U.S. Department of State, co-chairman of the U.S.-Japan Nuclear Working Group, M.A. and Ph.D. in physics from Boston University, AND, Sam Nunn and Richard Lugar Professor of Nonproliferation Studies and Founding Director of the James Martin Center for Nonproliferation Studies at the Monterey Institute of International Studies, member of the Council on Foreign Relations, member of the International Advisory Board of the Center for Policy Studies in Russia (Charles D. and William C., “The Four Faces of Nuclear Terrorism”, Nuclear Threat Initiative, Monterey Institute, Center for Nonproliferation Studies, 2004, http://jeffreyfields.net/427/Site/Blog/30F67A03-182C-4FC7-9EFD-A7C321F6DC8D\_files/analysis\_4faces.pdf)

China has been gradually modernizing its nuclear arsenal. However, at this time, it is unclear whether this modernization program will in- crease or decrease security risks that terrorists might exploit. While more Chinese nuclear weapons might mean more opportunities for theft, a modernized force might incorporate more up-to-date security proce- dures. Isolated storage and transportation links could pose increased risks for any nation’s nuclear weapons security program. China is be- lieved to assemble nuclear warheads at a number of nuclear facilities, and the Lop Nur test site may contain a storage facility for Chinese nuclear weapons (although it is probably unused, since China has not tested a nuclear weapon since 1996).56 Lop Nur is remotely located in northwest Xinjiang province, where nationalist/separatist organizations have been campaigning for autonomy from Beijing. Although Xinjiang separatist groups have not openly expressed interest in acquiring nuclear weapons, some reports have alleged that Uighur separatists may have stolen radioactive sources from Lop Nur in 1993.57 It is difficult to offer an overall assessment of the security of China’s nuclear arms against terrorists because Beijing has a long-standing prac- tice of not publishing sensitive information. In addition, China shows little concern (at least openly) that nuclear terrorism can occur on Chinese soil. While this lack of concern may be justified, the Chinese government still has to factor in security threats posed by Xinjiang separatists and other groups that may engage in terrorism in China. Nonetheless, the dominant role of the Chinese Communist Party and its security ap- paratus in Chinese society, and the limited presence of terrorist groups in China, appear to reduce substantially the danger that a terrorist or- ganization might gain control of an intact nuclear weapon in that country.

### Accountability

#### Drone campaign effective and sustainable – has allied support

Mansbachin 7/22/13 Shana, “Only 3 Out Of 39 Countries Approve Of U.S. Drone Strikes”, <http://www.policymic.com/articles/56027/only-3-out-of-39-countries-approve-of-u-s-drone-strikes>, CMR

However, these concerns overshadow the reality that drones are extraordinarily effective. In a decade, drone strikes have killed 3,300 jihadist operatives in Pakistan and Yemen, including 50 senior Al-Qaeda and Taliban officials. These strikes have also severely limited terrorist groups' ability to contact and recruit new members, driving cells underground. What's more, drone strikes result in far less civilian casualties than the alternatives, primarily because attacks from F-16s or Tomahawk missiles have a limited ability to discriminate against non-combatants. Finally, it is important to note that many countries, despite their public protestations against drones, covertly support U.S. drone operations.¶ Indeed, Pakistan cooperated with drone strikes during the Bush and Obama administrations, even hosting drone facilities on its soil up until 2011. Similarly, Yemeni officials have traditionally complied with U.S. drone strikes, going so far as to occasionally tell their citizens that they were conducted by the Yemeni air force.

#### no drone blowback – alt causes inevitable, alternatives worse

**Etizoni 13** 4/30 – director of the Institute for Communitarian Policy Studies and a professor of International Affairs at the George Washington University (Amitai, “Drones: Say it with figures”, 2013, <http://www.upi.com/Top_News/Analysis/Outside-View/2013/04/30/Outside-View-Drones-Say-it-with-figures/UPI-25571367294880/>, CMR)

Attacking drones, the most effective counter-terrorism tool the United States has found thus far, is a new cause celebre among progressive public intellectuals and major segments of the media.¶ Their arguments would deserve more of a hearing if, instead of declaring their contentions as fact, they instead coughed up some evidence to support their claims.¶ One argument that is repeated again and again is that killing terrorists with drones generates resentment from Pakistan to Yemen, thereby breeding many more terrorists than are killed. For example, Akbar Ahmed, a distinguished professor at American University, told the BBC on April 9 that, for "every terrorist drones kill, perhaps 100 rise as a result."¶ The key word is "perhaps"; Ahmed cites no data to support his contention.¶ Similarly, in The New York Times, Jo Becker and Scott Shane write that "Drones have replaced Guantanamo as the recruiting tool of choice for militants," citing as their evidence one line Faisal Shahzad, who had tried to set off a car bomb in Times Square, used in his 2010 trial seeking to justify targeting civilians.¶ At the same time, when HBO interviewed children who carry suicide vests, they justified their acts by the presence of foreign troops in their country and burning of Korans.¶ No such self-serving statements can be taken as evidence in themselves.¶ And Peter Bergen, a responsible and serious student of drones, quotes approvingly in The Washington Post a new book by Mark Mazzetti, who claims that the use of drone strikes "creates enemies just as it has obliterated them." Again, however, Mazzetti presents no evidence.¶ One may at first consider it obvious that, when American drones kill terrorists who are members of a tribe or family, other members will resent the United States. And hence if the United States would stop targeting people from the skies, that resentment would abet and ultimately vanish.¶ In reality, ample evidence shows that large parts of the population of several Muslim countries resent the United States for numerous and profound reasons, unrelated to drone attacks.¶ These Muslims consider the United States to be the "Great Satan" because it violates core religious values they hold dear; it promotes secular democratic liberal regimes; it supports women's rights; and it exports a lifestyle that devout Muslims consider hedonistic and materialistic to their countries.¶ These feelings, data show, are rampant in countries in which no drones attacks have occurred, were common in those countries in which the drones have been employed well before any attacks took place, and continue unabated, even when drone attacks are greatly scaled back.¶ As Marc Lynch notes in Foreign Affairs:¶ "A decade ago, anti-Americanism seemed like an urgent problem. Overseas opinion surveys showed dramatic spikes in hostility toward the United States, especially in the Arab world ... It is now clear that even major changes, such as Bush's departure, Obama's support for some of the Arab revolts of 2011, the death of Osama bin Laden, and the U.S. withdrawal from Iraq, have had surprisingly little effect on Arab attitudes towards the United States. Anti-Americanism might have ebbed momentarily, but it is once again flowing freely."¶ The Pew Global Attitudes Project says anti-American sentiments were high and on the rise in countries where drone strikes weren't employed. In Jordan, for example, U.S. unfavorability rose from 78 percent in 2007 to 86 percent in 2012 while Egypt saw a rise from 78 percent to 79 percent over the same period.¶ Notably, the percentage of respondents reporting an "unfavorable" view of the United States in these countries is as high, or higher, than in drone-targeted Pakistan.¶ In Pakistan, a country that has been subjected to a barrage of strikes over the last five years, the United States' unfavorability held steady at 68 percent from 2007-10 (dropping briefly to 63 percent in 2008), but then began to increase, rising to 73 percent in 2011 and 80 percent in 2012 -- a two-year period in which the number of drone strikes was actually dropping significantly.¶ It is also worth noting that these critics attribute resentment to drones rather than military strikes.¶ Do they really think that resentment would be lower if the United States were using cruise missiles? Or bombers? Or Special Forces?

#### Targeting low-level militants is key to all aspects of counter-terror---in-depth network analysis means the people we target don’t seem important to observers, but they’re actually vital to the effectiveness of terror groups

Gregory McNeal 13, Associate Professor of Law, Pepperdine University, 3/5/13, “Targeted Killing and Accountability,” <http://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract_id=1819583>

This becomes obvious when one considers that national security bureaucrats will look beyond criticality and vulnerability, and also engage in network-based analysis. Network-based analysis looks at terrorist groups as nodes connected by links, and assesses how components of that terrorist network operate together and independently of one another.143 Contrary to popular critiques of the targeting process that liken it to a “haphazardly prosecuted assassination program,” in reality modern targeting involves applying pressure to various nodes and links within networks to disrupt and degrade their functionality.144

To effectively pursue a network-based approach, bureaucrats rely in part on what is known as “pattern of life analysis” which involves “connecting the relationships between places and people by tracking their patterns of life.” This analysis draws on the interrelationships among groups “to determine the degree and points of their interdependence,” it assesses how activities are linked and looks to “determine the most effective way to influence or affect the enemy system.”145 While the enemy moves from point to point, reconnaissance or surveillance tracks and notes every location and person visited. Connections between the target, the sites they visit, and the persons they interact with are documented, built into a network diagram, and further analyzed.146 Through this process links and nodes in the enemy's network emerge.147 The analysis charts the “social, economic and political networks that underpin and support clandestine networks,”148 identifying key decision-makers and those who support or influence them indirectly.149 This may mean that analysts will track logistics and money trails, they may identify key facilitators and non-leadership persons of interests, and they will exploit human and signals intelligence combined with computerized knowledge integration that generates and cross-references thousands of data points to construct a comprehensive picture of the enemy network.150 “This analysis has the effect of taking a shadowy foe and revealing his physical infrastructure . . . as a result, the network becomes more visible and vulnerable, thus negating the enemy’s asymmetric advantage of denying a target.”151

Viewing targeting in this way demonstrates how seemingly low-level individuals such as couriers and other “middle-men” in decentralized networks such as al Qaeda are oftentimes critical to the successful functioning of the enemy organization.152 Targeting these individuals can “destabilize clandestine networks by compromising large sections of the organization, distancing operatives from direct guidance, and impeding organizational communication and function.”153 Moreover, because clandestine networks rely on social relationships to manage the trade-off between maintaining secrecy and security, attacking key nodes can have a detrimental impact on the enemy’s ability to conduct their operations.154 Thus, while some individuals may seem insignificant to the outside observer, when considered by a bureaucrat relying on network based analytical techniques, the elimination of a seemingly low level individual might have an important impact on an enemy organization. Moreover, because terrorist networks rely on secrecy in communication, individuals within those networks may forge strong ties that remain dormant for the purposes of operational security.155 This means that social ties that appear inactive or weak to a casual observer such as an NGO, human rights worker, journalist, or even a target’s family members may in fact be strong ties within the network.156 Furthermore, because terrorist networks oftentimes rely on social connections between charismatic leaders to function, disrupting those lines of communication can significantly impact those networks.157

#### Constraining targeted killing’s role in the war on terror causes extinction

Louis Rene Beres 11, Professor of Political Science and International Law at Purdue, 2011, “After Osama bin Laden: Assassination, Terrorism, War, and International Law,” Case Western Reserve Journal of International Law, 44 Case W. Res. J. Int'l L. 93

Even after the U.S. assassination of Osama bin Laden, we are still left with the problem of demonstrating that assassination can be construed, at least under certain very limited circumstances, as an appropriate instance of anticipatory self-defense. Arguably, the enhanced permissibility of anticipatory self-defense that follows generally from the growing destructiveness of current weapons technologies in rogue hands may be paralleled by the enhanced permissibility of assassination as a particular strategy of preemption. Indeed, where assassination as anticipatory self-defense may actually prevent a nuclear or other highly destructive form of warfare, reasonableness dictates that it could represent distinctly, even especially, law-enforcing behavior.

For this to be the case, a number of particular conditions would need to be satisfied. First, the assassination itself would have to be limited to the greatest extent possible to those authoritative persons in the prospective attacking state. Second, the assassination would have to conform to all of the settled rules of warfare as they concern discrimination, proportionality, and military necessity. Third, the assassination would need to follow intelligence assessments that point, beyond a reasonable doubt, to preparations for unconventional or other forms of highly destructive warfare within the intended victim's state. Fourth, the assassination would need to be founded upon carefully calculated judgments that it would, in fact, prevent the intended aggression, and that it would do so with substantially less harm [\*114] to civilian populations than would all of the alternative forms of anticipatory self-defense.

Such an argument may appear manipulative and dangerous; permitting states to engage in what is normally illegal behavior under the convenient pretext of anticipatory self-defense. Yet, any blanket prohibition of assassination under international law could produce even greater harm, compelling threatened states to resort to large-scale warfare that could otherwise be avoided. Although it would surely be the best of all possible worlds if international legal norms could always be upheld without resort to assassination as anticipatory self-defense, the persisting dynamics of a decentralized system of international law may sometimes still require extraordinary methods of law-enforcement. n71

Let us suppose, for example, that a particular state determines that another state is planning a nuclear or chemical surprise attack upon its population centers. We may suppose, also, that carefully constructed intelligence assessments reveal that the assassination of selected key figures (or, perhaps, just one leadership figure) could prevent such an attack altogether. Balancing the expected harms of the principal alternative courses of action (assassination/no surprise attack v. no assassination/surprise attack), the selection of preemptive assassination could prove reasonable, life-saving, and cost-effective.

What of another, more common form of anticipatory self-defense? Might a conventional military strike against the prospective attacker's nuclear, biological or chemical weapons launchers and/or storage sites prove even more reasonable and cost-effective? A persuasive answer inevitably depends upon the particular tactical and strategic circumstances of the moment, and on the precise way in which these particular circumstances are configured.

But it is entirely conceivable that conventional military forms of preemption would generate tangibly greater harms than assassination, and possibly with no greater defensive benefit. This suggests that assassination should not be dismissed out of hand in all circumstances as a permissible form of anticipatory self-defense under international law. [\*115]

What of those circumstances in which the threat to particular states would not involve higher-order (WMD) n72 military attacks? Could assassination also represent a permissible form of anticipatory self-defense under these circumstances? Subject to the above-stated conditions, the answer might still be "yes." The threat of chemical, biological or nuclear attack may surely enhance the legality of assassination as preemption, but it is by no means an essential precondition. A conventional military attack might still, after all, be enormously, even existentially, destructive. n73 Moreover, it could be followed, in certain circumstances, by unconventional attacks.

#### No impact to Pakistan instability- their ev is hype

**Hundley ’12** (Before joining the Pulitzer Center, Tom Hundley was a newspaper journalist for 36 years, including nearly two decades as a foreign correspondent for the Chicago Tribune. During that time he served as the Tribune’s bureau chief in Jerusalem, Warsaw, Rome and London, reporting from more than 60 countries. He has covered three wars in the Persian Gulf, the Arab-Israeli conflict and the rise of Iran’s post-revolutionary theocracy. His work has won numerous journalism awards. He has taught at the American University in Dubai and at Dominican University in River Forest, Illinois. He has also been a Middle East correspondent for GlobalPost and a contributing writer for the Chicago News Cooperative. Tom graduated from Georgetown University and holds a master’s degree in international relations from the University of Pennsylvania. He was also National Endowment for the Humanities journalism fellow at the University of Michigan. Published September 5, 2012

With both sides armed to the teeth, **it is easy to exaggerate the fears** and much harder to pinpoint where the real dangers lie. For the United States, the nightmare scenario is that some of Pakistan's warheads or its fissile material falls into the hands of the Taliban or al Qaeda -- or, worse, that the whole country falls into the hands of the Taliban. For example, Rolf Mowatt-Larssen, a former CIA officer now at Harvard University's Belfer Center for Science and International Affairs, has warned of the "lethal proximity between terrorists, extremists, and nuclear weapons insiders" in Pakistan. This is a reality, but on the whole, Pakistan's nuclear arsenal appears to be reasonably secure against internal threats, according to those who know the country best. To **outsiders**, Pakistan **appears** to be permanently teetering on the **brink** of collapse. The fact that large swaths of the country are literally beyond the control of the central government is not reassuring. But a weak state **does not mean** a **weak society**, and **powerful internal dynamics based** largely on kinship and tribe **make it highly unlikely** that Pakistan would **ever fall** under the control of an outfit like the Taliban. During the country's intermittent bouts of democracy, its civilian leaders have been consistently incompetent and corrupt, but **even in the worst of times,** the military has maintained a high standard of professionalism. And there is **nothing** that **matters more** to the Pakistani military than keeping the nuclear arsenal -- **its crown jewels** -- out of the hands of India, the United States, and homegrown extremists. "Pakistan struggled to acquire these weapons against the wishes of the world. Our nuclear capability comes as a result of great sacrifice. It is our most precious and powerful weapon -- for our defense, our security, and our political prestige," Talat Masood, a retired Pakistani lieutenant general, told me. "We keep them safe." Pakistan's nuclear security is in the responsibility of the Strategic Plans Division**,** which appears to function pretty much as **a separate branch** of the military. It has its **own training facility and an elaborate set of controls** and screening proceduresto keep track of **all warheads and fissile material** and to monitor **any blips** in the behavior patterns of its personnel. The 15 or so sites where weapons are stored **are the mostly heavily guarded** in the country. **Even if** some group managed to steal or commandeer a weapon, **it is highly unlikely the group would be able to use it**. The greater danger is the theft of fissile material, which could be used to make a crude bomb. "With 70 to 80 kilos of highly enriched uranium, it would be fairly easy to make one in the basement of a building in the city of your choice," said Pervez Hoodbhoy, a distinguished nuclear physicist at Islamabad's Quaid-i-Azam University. At the moment, Pakistan has a stockpile of about 2.75 tons -- or some 30 bombs' worth -- of highly enriched uranium. It does not tell Americans where it is stored. "All nuclear countries are conscious of the risks, nuclear weapons states especially so," said Gen. Ehsan ul-Haq, who speaks with the been-there-done-that authority of a man who has served as both chairman of Pakistan's Joint Chiefs of Staff Committee and head of the ISI, its controversial spy agency. "Of course there are concerns. Some are genuine, butmuch of what you read in the U.S. media is **irrational and reflective of paranoia**. Rising radicalism in Pakistan? Yes, this is true, and the military is very conscious of this." Perhaps **the most credible endorsement** of Pakistan's nuclear security regime comes from its **most steadfast enemy.** The **consensus among India's top generals and defense experts** is that Pakistan's nukes are pretty secure. "No one can be 100 percent secure, but I think they are **more than 99 percent secure**," said Shashindra Tyagi, a former chief of staff of the Indian Air Force. "They keep a very close watch on personnel. All of the steps that could be taken have been taken. This business of the Taliban taking over -- it can't be ruled out, but I think **it's unlikely**. **The** Pakistani **military understands the threats** they face better than anyone, **and** they **are smart enough to take care it."** Yogesh Joshi, an analyst at the Institute for Defense Studies and Analyses in New Delhi, agrees: "Different states have different perceptions of risk. The U.S. has contingency plans [to secure Pakistan's nukes] because its nightmare scenario is that Pakistan's weapons fall into terrorist hands. The view from India over the years is that **Pakistan,** probably **more than any other nuclear** weapons **state, has taken measures to secure its weapons.** At the political level here, there's a lot of confidence that Pakistan's nuclear weapons are secure."

#### Stability high

Deford 13 (Mac, GlobalPost, "Sharif’s election gives US an opening to help stabilize Pakistan," http://www.globalpost.com/dispatches/globalpost-blogs/commentary/sharif-s-election-gives-us-opening-help-stabilize-pakistan)

OWL’S HEAD, Maine — There's not much good news coming out of the broader Middle East these days and so the successful election this past weekend in Pakistan is cause for at least muted elation. It is, after all, the first time in Pakistan's beleaguered 65-year history that a democratically elected government has been replaced by a democratically elected government.¶ So that's the good news. Toss in the fact that the voter turnout, the highest for parliamentary elections in nearly two generations, was spurred upward by women and younger voters, and was not deterred by Taliban attacks, then add that Pakistan does have a remarkably free press and a quite independent judiciary and, obviously, a military that now is willing to let democracy play out — and things don't look so bad.¶ Pakistan's support of extremist groups like the Taliban, and its high-level decision to keep Osama bin Laden hidden in plain sight, are the clearest evidence of Pakistan perversity.¶ Pakistan-US relations were so low last year that an article in the establishment journal Foreign Affairs suggested that the US should treat Pakistan the same way it treats other "hostile powers," such as Iran and North Korea.¶ As has been well documented, Dick Holbrooke, handpicked by Secretary of State Hillary Clinton to oversee the Afghan-Pakistan theatre, got no support from the president for the two years he was in the role, until his death at the end of 2010.¶ A key part of the problem has been Obama's apparent belief — or at least the belief of his advisors — that Pakistan is a client state, that it needs us more than we need them.¶ A failed Pakistan or one infiltrated by the Taliban or other extremists could cause dangerous problems for the US. At the end of next year, we'll be pulling our last fighting forces out of Afghanistan. But it's never really been about Afghanistan. Pakistan is the key. Has the White House finally learned that?¶ The Arab Middle East faces decades of collapsing regimes, civil wars and even re-drawn borders. Obama's hands-off reaction to the most dangerous current aspect of the failed Arab Spring, Syria's bloody civil war, illustrates not just our relative retreat from our role as the world's night-watchman but as well a realistic assessment of the diminishing importance of the Middle East. And while Israel's concerns about a nuclear-armed Iran — and indeed Saudi Arabia's and its Gulf neighbors as well — may yet explode the area, the most dangerous region in today's world is Pakistan and its environs.¶ For starters, Pakistan has a couple hundred nuclear weapons. It has the Taliban, an insurgency movement that it mid-wifed and returned to haunt it. Strategically, Pakistan is the center of a complex web of relationships that entangle half the world's population.¶ The US sees China as a down-the-road threat to our primacy in Asia. India and China, the world's two most populous countries, have long been rivals, not so much because of their border clashes in the high Himalayas as their regional strategic ambitions.¶ As it moved out of its non-aligned leadership role, India aligned itself more closely with the US. China has long courted close relations with Pakistan, which has been reciprocated as an obvious way for both to counter India's pre-eminent position in the sub-continent.¶ Afghanistan only came into US purview through al-Qaeda and 9/11. But Pakistan has long exercised influence in Afghanistan, where the populous Punjab was arbitrarily split between the two by the Durand Line drawn up by the British colonial enterprise. India, naturally, has numerous consulates throughout Afghanistan for the primary purpose of offsetting Pakistan's influence.¶ The Taliban and nuclear weapons have created a potentially high stakes situation. A failed state, or just a couple of nuclear bombs in the wrong hands, would prompt a somewhat different response from the Obama administration than the understandable waffling on how to deal with Syria's chemical weapons.¶ So, as Nawaz Sharif takes control of Pakistan for the third time, what can the US hope for? And, more importantly, how can the US work with Sharif to reinforce Pakistan's stability? What must Obama do to keep Pakistan out of the "lost" column?¶ The good news is that Sharif, although a religious conservative and a two-time recipient of a military overthrow, is a sophisticated businessman who understands capitalism. He wants to improve relations with India; he wants to help the US negotiate a deal with the Afghan Taliban that would facilitate a peaceful US departure.¶ Pakistan has enormous economic problems: its infrastructure has been unable to keep pace with its rapid population growth; in the larger cities, electricity is cut 12 hours or more each day. Its education system is so weak that millions of Pakistani children end up at religious madrasas, often being taught extremist Islamism.¶ Sharif understands the economic problems that were as much as anything responsible for the overwhelming defeat of current Prime Minister Zardari's party. Sharif knows that for his party to remain in power, economic growth is essential.¶ He's realistic when it comes to India, hoping, as he did the last time he was prime minister, to improve relations. Indeed, he's invited his Indian counterpart to his inauguration. Better relations with India not only lower the overall military decibels but enhanced trade could provide a big boost to that economic bounce Sharif needs.

### Solvency

#### it would rubber stamp policies

By Gabor **Rona**, Human Rights First - 02/27/**13** 09:00 AM ET The pro-rule of law argument against a 'drone court' http://thehill.com/blogs/congress-blog/judicial/285041-the-pro-rule-of-law-argument-against-a-drone-court

While doing much harm, a “drone court” would do little, if any, good. Supporters like the idea because it appears to provide some check on the President’s secretive exercise of this lethal unilateral power. But what judge would risk preventing the interception of a terrorist? What’s more likely is that the drone court would be a rubber stamp, creating only the appearance, not the reality, of justice.

#### The plan destroys legitimacy

Jaffer 13 (Jameel Jaffer, Director of the ACLU's Center for Democracy, presents his reaction to the recent calls to establish a "drone court" to provide ex ante review of targeted killings.

“Judicial Review of Targeted Killings,” http://www.harvardlawreview.org/issues/126/april13/forum\_1002.php)

But to recognize that judicial review is indispensible in this context is not to say that Congress should establish a specialized court, still less that it should establish such a court to review contemplated killings before they are carried out. First, the establishment of such a court would almost certainly entrench the notion that the government has authority, even far away from conflict zones, to use lethal force against individuals who do not present imminent threats. When a threat is truly imminent, after all, the government will not have time to apply to a court for permission to carry out a strike. Exigency will make prior judicial review infeasible. To propose that a court should review contemplated strikes before they are carried out is to accept that the government should be contemplating strikes against people who do not present imminent threats. This is why the establishment of a specialized court would more likely institutionalize the existing program, with its elision of the imminence requirement, than narrow it.

## 1NR

### CIR Will Pass: 2NC Wall

#### Will pass—leadership push, Tallent, state action, DREAMers

Jennifer Rubin, “Positive Signs for Immigration Reform,” WASHINGTON POST, 1—22—14, <http://www.washingtonpost.com/blogs/right-turn/wp/2014/01/22/positive-signs-for-immigration-reform/>

Plenty of signs suggest immigration reform will move front and center in the next few weeks. House Speaker John Boehner of Ohio meets with reporters on Capitol Hill in Washington, Thursday, Jan. 16, 2014. On Wednesday, the Republican-run House passed an immense $1.1 trillion spending package, a bipartisan compromise that all but banishes the likelihood of an election-year government shutdown. Majority Whip Kevin McCarthy (Calif.), as The Hill reported, is sounding a positive note, saying he would supporting legalizing the 11 million or so illegal immigrants but not carving a special pathway to citizenship. He joins a number of conservative Republicans including Rep. Bob Goodlatte (R-Va.) in suggesting that formula. (The devil is in the details: Does this mean they could eventually get citizenship?) This still will be too generous to satisfy immigration opponents, for whom the goalposts constantly change. If earned citizenship was equated in 2013 with “amnesty,” the same will be true in 2014 of “no special pathway.” At bottom, there are some on the right who want no impediment to deporting 11 million people. Suggesting that this will never happen and that they therefore are eroding the “rule of law” they claim to support doesn’t seem to register. The next critical step may come at the House GOP confab next week. Leadership can take the pulse of the conference and then see if there is a real chance for progress. Another indication of potential success is the staff brought on to try to bridge the gaps between Democrats and the Republicans who are at least open to the possibility of comprehensive reform. The speaker’s decision to hire Rebecca Tallent, a veteran of immigration reform battles, suggests his public comments are more than window dressing. If he really wants to find a bill that can pass, Tallent is the person to craft it. Politico today also suggests that states are creating impetus for federal immigration reform. (“The National Conference of State Legislatures report, released Tuesday, documents a 64 percent increase in state-level immigration legislation; in all, 2013 saw a total of 437 laws and resolutions passed on immigration, compared to 267 in 2012.”) I wouldn’t overestimate the importance of these efforts, but it does give some Republicans cover to say federal action is needed for purposes of uniformity. But perhaps the biggest breakthrough is the grudging realization that aside from DREAMers, all that is possible at this point is legalization (removing the fear of deportation). Democrats will grumble. Sen. Chuck Schumer (D-N.Y.) will race to the media to make sure they carry the spin that this spells the end of real immigration reform. But in the end there could be a half-a loaf deal that, for example, does something on boarder security, makes citizenship available for DREAMers, makes legalization attainable for millions more and looks at the need for loosening the strings on high-skill immigrants who are needed and provide a shot in the arm to the economy.

#### Will pass—House leadership supports

IRISH CENTRAL, “Breakthrough as Key Republican Concedes on Need for Immigration Reform,” 1—23—14, [www.irishcentral.com/news/politics/Breakthrough-as-key-Republican-concedes-on-need-for-immigration-reform.html](http://www.irishcentral.com/news/politics/Breakthrough-as-key-Republican-concedes-on-need-for-immigration-reform.html)

A key figure on the Republican side has agreed to back immigration reform with legal status for the undocumented. Chief Deputy Whip of the U.S. House of Representatives, Kevin McCarthy, spoke to his local news station, of Bakersfield, CA on the drafting of the party’s principles of immigration reform. His move now means that the entire GOP House leadership, Speaker Boehner, his number two Eric Cantor, McCarthy, and Congressman Paul Ryan all support an immigration reform bill. This could mean that a bill will be on the floor in the Republican-controlled House by April, say experts. A bill has already passed the Senate and both bills would have to be reconciled. McCarthy, a longtime target of immigration advocates, told Eyewitness News, “People understand that the immigration system today doesn’t work. That you have 42 percent of the people that are here illegally came here legally on a visa. You have to reform the visa program.” While against a “pathway to citizenship,” predominantly supported by the Democrats, McCarthy said that he does support principles of a legal status being afforded to those who have become undocumented. According to a Fox poll carried out this week, nearly seven in ten voters support a pathway to citizenship for the undocumented in the US. McCarthy said that although these Republican principles of immigration reform are not yet written out he believes they will go with legal status. “It will allow you to work, pay your taxes, and other, but if you want to apply for citizenship you have to go through the path, there won’t be amnesty.” This legal status would allow the 11 million undocumented – around 50,000 of which are Irish – to travel, pay taxes and most importantly live without fear of deportation. Until now the Republican leadership has not provided any details on what immigration plan they might propose. Last year the US Senate passed an immigration reform bill calling for a pathway to citizenship, but this bill was never taken up by the House of Representatives. Republicans have now said that they will introduce immigration bills on a smaller basis, piece by piece. McCarthy said “We're going to take it section by section. The president said he's agreed to this.” House Speaker John Boehner said these Republican principles of immigration reform could be released before President Obama's State of the Union address on Jan. 28. However, Boehner first has to sell the plan to his own party. Republicans are expected to debate the set of principles at their annual retreat later this month.

#### Will pass – Obama cred, elections, latino vote

Kaplan 12/26 “Can Immigration reform pass in 2014?” <http://www.cbsnews.com/news/can-immigration-reform-pass-in-2014/> [Edymit]

If House Republicans were to offer up legislation that legalized, but did not give citizenship, to a large portion of the undocumented community, that could put pressure on the president to compromise. Although he doesn’t have another election to worry about, his approval rating among Latinos has plunged 23 points in the last year, according to Gallup, from 75 percent in December 2012 to 52 percent in November 2013. That could spell bad news for Democrats running next fall.¶ The Pew survey found that 43 percent of Hispanic adults would place more blame with Republicans in Congress if immigration reform fails to pass, but 34 percent said they would hold Democrats and the president responsible. ¶ Though the conventional wisdom holds that passing any major legislation in an election year is a heavy lift, there are signs that may not hold true in 2014 because the growing population of Latino voters will exert greater influence in the coming elections.¶ “The chances of congressional passage of immigration reform are good because each party has political reasons for wanting to deliver for Latinos and the business community,” said Darrel West, an immigration policy expert at the Brookings Institution. “The biggest challenge is the pathway to citizenship, where the parties remain far apart. A possible compromise could involve creating a pathway that is longer and has more conditions that were in the Senate bill. That will displease reformers but provide cover for Boehner to move the legislation.”

#### Obama’s push secures CIR

Lopez 1 -1 (Oscar, Brooklyn-based writer, Graduating from the University of Melbourne in 2011 with a BA (Honors) Oscar was awarded the Keith Macartney Scholarship for the Arts, the Louise Homfrey Award and the Hannah Barry Memorial Award, “New Year 2014: 4 Reasons Immigration Reform Will Pass In 2014,” <http://www.latintimes.com/new-year-2014-4-reasons-immigration-reform-will-pass-2014-141778>)

Immigration reform is set to be the key issue of 2014. Following Mitt Romney's dismal performance among Latino voters in the 2012 election, both sides of the Government woke up to the necessity for comprehensive reform on immigration. Indeed, in his State of the Union address in February, President Obama declared that “the time has come to pass comprehensive immigration reform.” Yet with the House divided over Obamacare and the budget crisis, the Government Shutdown let immigration reform die. 2014 will change that: and here are 4 Reasons Why. 1. Republican Support: A fundamental lack of support from the GOP has always been one of the major obstacles for passing comprehensive reform legislation, and indeed this seemed to be the case this year after the Bill passed by the Senate was struck down by Congress. However, more and more GOP members are realizing the significance of the Latino vote and understanding that passing comprehensive immigration reform is the most significant way of securing support from Latino voters. A July poll from Latino Decisions found that immigration reform was the most important issue facing the Latino community for 60 percent of those surveyed. The poll also found that 70 percent of those questioned were dissatisfied with the job Republicans were doing on the issue. The survey also found the 39 percent would be more likely to support a Republican congressional candidate if immigration reform was passed with Republican leadership. Republican candidates have become aware of the significance of immigration reform for the party. Even in traditionally conservative Republican strongholds like Texas, candidates are turning towards immigration reform. According to Republican strategist and CNN en Español commentator Juan Hernandez, "it also wouldn’t surprise me if after the primary, the candidates move to the center and support reform. For Republicans to stay in leadership in Texas, we must properly address immigration.” The March 2014 primaries will be a key moment in determining how reform progresses: Republican Strategist John Feehery suggests, “The timing on this is very important. What was stupid to do becomes smart to do a little bit later in the year.” Once the primaries are over, GOP members will have the chance to implement reform legislation without fear of challenges from the right. 2. Legalization Over Citizenship: While the Senate’s 2013 immigration reform bill was struck down by Congress, GOP party members have indicated that they will support legislation which favors legalization of undocumented immigrants over a path to citizenship. Meanwhile, a recent survey from Pew Research Hispanic Trends Project demonstrated that 55 percent of Hispanic adults believe that legalizing immigrants and removing the fear of deportation is more important than a pathway to citizenship (although citizenship is still important to 89 percent of Latinos surveyed.) As CBS suggests, “Numbers like these could give leverage to lawmakers who are interested in making some reforms to the legal immigration system, but not necessarily offering any kind of citizenship.” If House Republicans offered legalization legislation for the undocumented community, this could put pressure on the President to compromise. And while this kind of reform would not be as comprehensive as the Senate’s bill, a bipartisan agreement would be a significant achievement towards accomplishing reform. 3. Activism Steps Up: 2013 saw one of the biggest surges in grassroots activism from immigration supporters, and political leaders started to listen. The hunger strike outside the White House was a particularly significant demonstration and drew visits of solidarity from a number of leaders from both sides of Congress, including the President and First Lady. Immigration reform activists have promised "we will be back in 2014." Indeed, 2014 promises to be a year of even greater activism. Activist Eliseo Medina has pledged that immigrant advocacy groups would visit “as many congressional districts as possible” in 2014 to ensure further support. Protests, rallies and marchers are likely to increase in 2014, putting greater pressure on Congress to pass legislation. Such visual, vocal protests will be key in ensuring comprehensive reform. 4. Leadership: As immigration reform comes to the fore, party leaders will step up in 2014 to ensure change is achieved. While President Obama has made clear his support for comprehensive reform, House Speaker John Boehner previously stated that he had “no intention” of negotiating with the Senate on their comprehensive immigration bill. However, towards the end of 2013, it seemed that Representative Boehner was changing his tune. In November, President Obama revealed that “the good news is, just this past week Speaker Boehner said that he is “hopeful we can make progress” on immigration reform.” As if to prove the point, Boehner has recently hired top aide Rebecca Tallent to work on immigration reform. With bipartisan leadership firmly focused on immigration reform and party members on both sides realizing the political importance of the issue, comprehensive legislation is one thing we can be sure of in 2014.

#### Deal now—both sides want compromise, Boehner will deal

Orange County Register 1/6/14 [Roxana Kopetman, “Immigration forces brace for a renewed battle”, <http://www.ocregister.com/articles/immigration-596102-citizenship-percent.html>]

It was to be the year for an immigration overhaul. In some ways, 2013 came close, but – to the relief of opponents and the disappointment of advocates – not close enough.¶ The new year is expected to bring more pressure on legislators and President Barack Obama not only to make big changes to immigration law, but to reconsider deportations, an issue that gained increasing attention from activists as the year progressed.¶ In 2014, proponents of an overhaul expect to see new legislation. What that will look like is unclear.¶ “We're reaching a compromise point,” predicted Alex Nowrasteh, immigration policy analyst for the Washington-based CATO Institute, a libertarian think tank.¶ “There are about 30 (House) Republicans who support citizenship and about 85 who support legalization of some kind. I think they're going to find a compromise around legalizing, but not citizenship,” he said.¶ For Roy Beck, executive director of NumbersUSA, that's no compromise. His group seeks to curtail population increases created by immigrants.¶ “Citizenship is not what we object to. It's the work permits,” Beck said. “We're planning to fight like crazy again to make sure something bad won't happen.”¶ Michelle Mittelstadt, spokeswoman for the Migration Policy Institute, a nonpartisan think tank in Washington, said the status granted to the country's undocumented immigrants “will be the major policy question that congressional leaders in both parties will have to resolve if they hope to pass immigration reform.”¶ The high point for advocates of an overhaul came in June, when the Senate passed a broad plan, one that included border security, visas for high-tech and agricultural workers and a 13-year process to become citizens for the 11 million people living in the U.S. illegally.¶ Then came some unexpected issues.¶ Congressional attention turned to a conflict in Syria, budget battles that resulted in a shutdown of the federal government and the Obama administration's rollout of its health care program.¶ In the fall, House Democrats introduced their own version of the Senate immigration bill and gained a handful of GOP co-sponsors. But House Republican leaders said they preferred tackling the issue in pieces, with separate smaller bills.¶ Meanwhile, House Speaker John Boehner, R-Ohio, refused to bring the matter to a vote and said he supports changes made in a step-by-step “common sense approach.” And a month ago, he hired as an adviser an advocate for legalizing undocumented immigrants. The hiring of Rebecca Tallent, who worked on previous immigration campaigns, suggested to political observers that the House leadership is looking to bring some form of change to a vote in 2014, Mittelstadt said.¶ Nowrasteh said of Boehner's new hire: “It's an excellent sign that he's really committed to bringing that forward.”

#### GOP on board – budget clears the way

Stiles 12 – 31 (Andrew, “To take on Big Business, the GOP needs more than rhetoric,” <http://www.nationalreview.com/node/367266/print>, CMR)

The budget deal may clear a path for the House to move on immigration reform, an issue some conservatives have argued is a perfect opportunity for the GOP to buck Big Business and K Street, which overwhelmingly support the Gang of Eight legislation that passed the Senate earlier this year. The Republican National Committee’s own post-2012 autopsy report suggested that the GOP embrace “comprehensive immigration reform” in an effort to appeal to Hispanic voters.

### CIR Thumper Ans: Topshelf

#### Obama shook up his staff and it got him momentum – budget deal proves

Lesley Clark and Anita Kumar, “After Inaugural High, Obama Limps Out of 2013,” MCCLATCHY WASHINGTON BUREAU, 12—23—13, LN.

Still, there was an upside to the wrangling: Congress last week sent Obama a rare bipartisan budget deal, breaking two years of near-constant budget brinksmanship.¶ In recent weeks, Obama has begun to shuffle staff in hopes of regaining momentum for his sixth year in office, which is historically a tough year for presidents to secure legislative accomplishments, given looming midterm elections.¶ The shakeup includes bringing aboard as a top adviser John Podesta, former President Bill Clinton's last chief of staff and an advocate of using executive actions to circumvent Congress. There's also the return of former adviser Phil Schiliro, who will oversee health care, and a new legislative director, Katie Beirne Fallon, who has strong ties to Capitol Hill.

#### Immigration top priority

Fox 12 – 27 (“President Obama Eyes Immigration Reform As A Top Priority For 2014,” <http://latino.foxnews.com/latino/politics/2013/12/27/president-obama-eyes-immigration-reform-as-top-priority-for-2014/>, CMR)

The last vestiges of 2013's political wrangling officially behind him, President Barack Obama is setting his sights on the coming year, when a number of unfinished tasks will increasingly compete for attention with the 2014 midterm elections. High on the agenda for the start of the year is a renewed push on immigration. Bipartisan consensus about the need for action on immigration in the wake of the 2012 presidential election gave way in 2013 to opposition from conservative House Republicans. U.S. House Speaker John Boehner, R-Ohio, has started offering subtle signs he'll put more weight behind the issue despite continued resistance from the tea party.

#### One thing that passes

Boyer 12-31 (Dave, “Obama’s liberal wish list for Congress likely to stall in election year,” <http://www.washingtontimes.com/news/2013/dec/31/obamas-wish-list-likely-to-stall-in-election-year/#ixzz2pAw27Mo8>, CMR)

Meeting of the minds? One of the few prospects for bipartisan achievement in 2014 could be immigration reform. Although Speaker John A. Boehner, Ohio Republican, has said the House won’t pass the Senate’s comprehensive plan, some Republicans believe the House will approve at least some portions of the Senate bill. “Anything that gets done on the legislative front will get done because Republicans want it, and I would put immigration in that category,” Mr. Feehery said.

#### Still has limited PC, will need it for immigration

Juliet Eilperin and Karen Tumulty, “Podesta, Schiliro to Return to White House,” WASHINGTON POST, 12—11—13, p. A17.

President Obama is embarking on his biggest organizational overhaul of the White House since 2010, bringing in Washington veterans and rethinking the way he approaches some of the most pressing policy decisions he will make during the remainder of his second term.¶ The decision to enlist influential Democratic strategist John D. Podesta, just days after bringing back his former legislative affairs chief Phil Schiliro, signals a larger shift in how the White House will operate in coming months. Eager to salvage his landmark health-care law and advance climate-change policy before he leaves office, Obama and his aides are open to empowering a handful of advisers with broader policy portfolios to ensure the administration achieves its goals.¶ The president and his aides have been discussing a possible reorganization with some trusted outside advisers for at least a month, according to a senior White House official, who spoke on the condition of anonymity because of the topic's sensitive nature. The staff changes will continue in the coming weeks, the official said.¶ The moves mark a recognition by the White House that it needed to change its operations in light of the botched Oct. 1 rollout of the health-care law, particularly given that Pete Rouse, the president's longest-serving aide, will be leaving by the end of the year.¶ Obama has been hesitant to replace many within his small inner circle operating in the West Wing, in part because his limited time in Washington before the presidency left him with relatively few trusted advisers. While he replaced several key members of his Cabinet after his 2012 reelection - including his secretaries of state, Treasury and defense - it is a measure of how static White House staff has been that the recruitment of two former advisers, on a temporary basis, amounts to a staff shake-up.¶ "Obama still has an opportunity to get one or two major initiatives through Congress, possibly immigration reform, but he doesn't have much gas left in the tank," New York University public affairs professor Paul C. Light wrote in an e-mail. "Podesta and Schiliro may be able to ration Obama's declining political capital, and hold the line on House Republican attacks. The door is closing on Obama's presidency - these two advisers know how to do it as well as it can be done."

### CIR IL: PC Key—2NC

#### Capital key

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

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

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

#### FOCUS – plan prevents Obama from maintaining a consistent message on immigration and means he’ll lose the ability to ask for favors

Moore 9/10/13 - Guardian's US finance and economics editor. (Heidi, “Syria: the great distraction” The Guardian, <http://www.theguardian.com/commentisfree/2013/sep/10/obama-syria-what-about-sequester>)

Political capital – the ability to horse-trade and win political favors from a receptive audience – is a finite resource in Washington. Pursuing misguided policies takes up time, but it also eats up credibility in asking for the next favor. It's fair to say that congressional Republicans, particularly in the House, have no love for Obama and are likely to oppose anything he supports. That's exactly the reason the White House should stop proposing policies as if it is scattering buckshot and focus with intensity on the domestic tasks it wants to accomplish, one at a time.

#### More reasons PC is key

#### Complexity – PC forges a final compromise

Kuhnhenn 10-19 Jim Kuhnhenn - Associated Press 10-19-2013 http://hutchnews.com/Todaystop/BC-US--Obama-Shrinking-Agenda-2nd-Ld-Write-20131019-17-04-58

Regrouping after a feud with Congress stalled his agenda, President Barack Obama is laying down a three-item to-do list for Congress that seems meager when compared with the bold, progressive agenda he envisioned at the start of his second term. But given the capital's partisanship, the complexities of the issues and the limited time left, even those items - immigration, farm legislation and a budget - amount to ambitious goals that will take political muscle, skill and ever-elusive compromise to execute. "Those are three specific things that would make a huge difference in our economy right now," Obama said. "And we could get them done by the end of the year if our focus is on what's good for the American people."

#### Momentum

Reid Epstein 10/17/13, writer at Politico, “Obama’s latest push features a familiar strategy,” http://www.politico.com/story/2013/10/barack-obama-latest-push-features-familiar-strategy-98512.html

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

#### GOP moderates

Richard Andrew, 10-25-2013, “Will the GOP Accept Obama’s Peace Offering?” Ring of Fire, http://www.ringoffireradio.com/2013/10/will-gop-accept-obamas-peace-offering/

President Obama is pushing for immigration reform now while the GOP has been knocked on their heels from the government shutdown. Obama is trying to give them a way out by moving a bill that a majority in both congressional chambers can agree to. The operative word here is compromise. Frank Sharry, executive director of America’s Voice, an immigration advocacy group, told NPR “If they want to take advantage of the get-out-of-jail card Democrats have offered them, this would be the perfect opportunity to do it.” There have been huge rallies around immigration since way before the last presidential election. Groups like America’s Voice are going to step up their rallies regardless of what Congress does. Sharry continues with a determined outcry, “We’re going to throw down until they either say ‘yes’ or they make it clear they’re not going to get to yes and then we’ll pivot to try to un-elect them.” That sounds like a determined group. These advocacy groups believe that, after the shutdown debacle , the GOP is ready to show the country that they can govern. NPR reported that after successfully staring down congressional Republicans in the shutdown-debt ceiling fight, President Obama has pivoted to immigration in a move with almost no downside. I have found the enemy and it is us. If President Obama is trying to push for immigration reform, the Tea Partiers will find a way to turn it against him. Sen. Rubio (R-FL), has already begun to turn the blame towards Obama. Rubio said that “The president has undermined this effort, absolutely, because of the way he has behaved over the last three weeks.” Like Rubio, Rep. Raul Labrador (R-ID), also has immigrant parents. The American Prospect reported him as saying, “After the way the president acted over the last two or three weeks where he would refuse to talk to the Speaker of the House … they’re not going to get immigration reform. That’s done.” The President will have to show some strong leadership skills that can drive a wedge between the Tea Party caucus in both Houses and the more moderate Republicans. What would happen if we have a debate about immigration? That would bring the GOP out of the darkness and into the public light and hold the Tea Party’s feet to the fire. That should be the first thing Congress should do to bring about change on the subject of immigration. The president has already alluded to the second point of attack. In a comment he made on Univision last week, he said, “We had a very strong Democratic and Republican vote in the Senate. The only thing right now that’s holding it back is, again, Speaker Boehner not willing to call the bill on the floor of the House of Representatives.”

#### Citizenship

Las Cruces Sun-News 1 -2 (“Editorial: Still hope for immigration bill this year,” <http://www.lcsun-news.com/las_cruces-opinion/ci_24825449/imm>, CMR)

The Republican-controlled House almost certainly won't pass anything along the lines of the Senate bill from 2013. But there might be opportunities for important incremental steps. "The challenge for the GOP will be to pass a package of bills out of the House," Jacoby said. "The challenge for Democrats, in Congress and the White House, will be coming together for a deal on legal status rather than citizenship for most unauthorized immigrants." The immigration reform options in 2014 are narrow, but not impossible.

#### Corrals Democrats

Hohmann 1 – 1 (James, “As D.C. turns: 14 dates to watch in 2014,” <http://www.politico.com/story/2014/01/2014-14-dates-to-watch-101627.html#ixzz2pGFE5U9W>, CMR)

The president said in his most recent news conference that “2014 needs to be a year of action.” He will flesh out what that means during his State of the Union speech. Obama becomes more of a lame duck with each annual update to Congress, and, faced with strong Republican opposition, it’s likely many of the priorities he outlines will go nowhere. Still, the State of the Union is an important platform for any president, and this is a chance for Obama to convey how much of his diminishing political capital he will invest in pursuing immigration reform, making the health care law work and other priorities. Whatever he says will be the Democratic rallying cry for the months ahead.

### Heg Good: Quickhitter (Barnett)—1NC

#### 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](http://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 delivered. 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.

### Heg Good: Quickhitter (Zhang 11)—1NC

#### Alt to heg is massive great power wars

Yuhan Zhang, Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, and Lin Shi, Columbia University, “America’s Decline: A Harbinger of Conflcit and Rivalry,” EAST ASIA FORUM, 1—22—11, <http://www.eastasiaforum.org/2011/01/22/americas-decline-a-harbinger-of-conflict-and-rivalry/>

This does not necessarily mean that the US is in systemic decline, but it encompasses a trend that appears to be negative and perhaps alarming. Although the US still possesses incomparable military prowess and its economy remains the world’s largest, the once seemingly indomitable chasm that separated America from anyone else is narrowing. Thus, the global distribution of power is shifting, and the inevitable result will be a world that is less peaceful, liberal and prosperous, burdened by a dearth of effective conflict regulation. Over the past two decades, no other state has had the ability to seriously challenge the US military. Under these circumstances, motivated by both opportunity and fear, many actors have bandwagoned with US hegemony and accepted a subordinate role. Canada, most of Western Europe, India, Japan, South Korea, Australia, Singapore and the Philippines have all joined the US, creating a status quo that has tended to mute great power conflicts. However, as the hegemony that drew these powers together withers, so will the pulling power behind the US alliance. The result will be an international order where power is more diffuse, American interests and influence can be more readily challenged, and conflicts or wars may be harder to avoid. As history attests, power decline and redistribution result in military confrontation. For example, in the late 19th century America’s emergence as a regional power saw it launch its first overseas war of conquest towards Spain. By the turn of the 20th century, accompanying the increase in US power and waning of British power, the American Navy had begun to challenge the notion that Britain ‘rules the waves.’ Such a notion would eventually see the US attain the status of sole guardians of the Western Hemisphere’s security to become the order-creating Leviathan shaping the international system with democracy and rule of law. Defining this US-centred system are three key characteristics: enforcement of property rights, constraints on the actions of powerful individuals and groups and some degree of equal opportunities for broad segments of society. As a result of such political stability, free markets, liberal trade and flexible financial mechanisms have appeared. And, with this, many countries have sought opportunities to enter this system, proliferating stable and cooperative relations. However, what will happen to these advances as America’s influence declines? Given that America’s authority, although sullied at times, has benefited people across much of Latin America, Central and Eastern Europe, the Balkans, as well as parts of Africa and, quite extensively, Asia, the answer to this question could affect global society in a profoundly detrimental way. Public imagination and academia have anticipated that a post-hegemonic world would return to the problems of the 1930s: regional blocs, trade conflicts and strategic rivalry. Furthermore, multilateral institutions such as the IMF, the World Bank or the WTO might give way to regional organisations. For example, Europe and East Asia would each step forward to fill the vacuum left by Washington’s withering leadership to pursue their own visions of regional political and economic orders. Free markets would become more politicised — and, well, less free — and major powers would compete for supremacy. Additionally, such power plays have historically possessed a zero-sum element. In the late 1960s and 1970s, US economic power declined relative to the rise of the Japanese and Western European economies, with the US dollar also becoming less attractive. And, as American power eroded, so did international regimes (such as the Bretton Woods System in 1973). A world without American hegemony is one where great power wars re-emerge, the liberal international system is supplanted by an authoritarian one, and trade protectionism devolves into restrictive, anti-globalisation barriers. This, at least, is one possibility we can forecast in a future that will inevitably be devoid of unrivalled US primacy.