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### Heg: A2 “Alt Cause—Topshelf”

**Russia deal helped Obama dodge the Silver Syria Bullet – saved legitimacy**

**American Thinker** “Lavrov Helped Obama Dodge the Syrian Bullet” **9/10**/13

<http://www.americanthinker.com/blog/2013/09/lavrov_helped_obama_dodge_the_syrian_bullet.html>

Any diplomatic initiative on Syria coming from Russia, whose UN votes have perpetuated Assad's killing machine for over two years, should be viewed with extreme suspicion. Nevertheless, **the latest Russian proposal merits serious consideration**. Russian Foreign Minister Sergey **Lavrov's proposal, which exploited an offhand remark by U.S. Secretary of State John Kerry, calls for the destruction of Syria's chemical weapons arsenal in exchange for a cancellation of the U.S. military action against Syria being debated by Congress. Syria has "accepted" the proposal** with alacrity. Russian national interests underlie this proposal: helping Russia's last Mideast client state to survive, reinforcing the image of Russia as a Mideast power broker, and diminishing the perception that Russia supports chemical weapons use. But **these interests intersect with US interests insofar as a diplomatic solution decreases the odds of an Islamist takeover of Syria** (should U.S. strikes actually alter the balance of power between the Syrian regime and the opposition) **while possibly removing the need for potentially risky and costly U.S. military action -- without further undermining U.S. credibility**. **The humanitarian justification for intervention --** with over two million Syrian refugees and 110,000 dead -- **grows stronger by the day. The geo-strategic reasons for U.S. action are also manifest**: Syria's chemical weapons could be used unpredictably by the Assad regime, its terrorist ally Hezb'allah, or Islamist rebels; **rogue regimes like North Korea and Iran will view U.S. inaction as a green light to oppose U.S. interests where they see fit** (particularly with respect to their nuclear plans); and the toppling of Assad's regime -- Iran's closest ally -- would weaken the Iranian regime while signaling that it is next unless diplomacy quickly resolves the Iranian nuclear standoff. But opinion polls have consistently revealed that the U.S. public opposes involvement in the Syrian conflict. Had Obama shown more active and forceful leadership on the Syrian conflict back when the opposition was comprised mostly of secular rebels, it's unlikely that the tragedy -- and related U.S. policy options -- would have deteriorated into what they are today. Had Obama not drawn a "red line" to show that the U.S. still cares about international norms (particularly when their enforcement makes the U.S. safer), the potential damage to U.S. credibility caused by inaction might not have been so great. Finally, had Obama strongly backed the Syrian rebels from the outset, Russia might not have opposed U.S. interests as aggressively, U.S. allies might have been more forthcoming with their support for any eventual military action, and Americans might not have reflected the ambivalence and confusion of their president when it comes to Syria. Given these policy blunders and the unfortunate circumstances they produced, **Obama's best move now is to explore the Russian proposal for the remote chance that it can improve the Syrian situation at little cost.** **Success would mean that Russia effectively enabled Obama to dodge the Syrian bullet.** Failure would force Obama to return to the three bad options available before the Russian proposal: 1) stay out of the conflict (despite the damage to U.S. credibility and the risk of an even bigger crisis requiring intervention later), 2) enter with the necessary strategy and commitment for victory, or, worst of all, 3) launch "symbolic strikes" that only boost Assad's standing (for successfully withstanding the "mighty" U.S. before continuing with his murderous military campaign) and possibly draw the U.S. into a much greater conflict on terms dictated by Assad, Hezbollah, and/or Iran.

**China Heg**

**U.S. engagement is key to global stability, peacefully managing China's rise**

Jim Lacey, Professor, Strategic Studies, Marine Corps War College, "America Does Not Pivot," NATIONAL REVIEW, 11--23--11, www.nationalreview.com/articles/283676/america-does-not-pivot-jim-lacey, accessed 6-4-13.

One should keep in mind that **a transfer of power in the Pacific from America to China is not likely to have the same exceptional results as the earlier global transfer of power to us from Great Britain**. When Britain decided not to hamper America’s growth and later turned over its global responsibilities to us, this was done with a certain awareness that the two nations shared similar political philosophies and world views. **Few in Britain worried that a world dominated by America would have radically different norms from what the British would have created if they possessed the power to do so**. In fact, Churchill was so sure of our shared traditions and common outlook that he bequeathed some valuable advice to his successors: “Stay close to the Americans.” No one says anything similar about China. **Unlike the leadership handoff from Britain to America**, which resulted in a huge amount of geostrategic continuity, a **handoff of power from America to China**, either globally or just in the Pacific, **would transform the world. There is a quantum difference between a world policed by a brutal dictatorship and one where a free and democratic state plays the dominant role**. No American president is ever going to say, “Stay close to the Chinese.” **Making room for China’s rise, therefore, does not mean the United States should retreat from the world and hand over the mantle of global leadership to China**’s dictators. The nations of the Pacific have recently seen the true nature of China’s Communist regime. That is why so many of them are eager to embrace a larger American military presence in the region, and why they are signing on to new American-led regional pacts. Still, there are concerns. America would not have to “pivot” back to Asia if we had not first pivoted away. Moreover, **the very notion that the world’s global superpower should ever “pivot” is a false one**. America cannot afford to pivot. **Pivoting by its very definition means that you are focusing on one area while neglecting another**. **The problems in Europe, the Persian Gulf, the Middle East more generally, and the rest of the world will not disappear because we pivoted away**. In fact, **our neglect just assures they will all worsen**. We can’t fix everything or even most things, but we can often keep everything from going to hell in a handbasket. **America remains the indispensable nation**. The world’s, as well as our own, **peace and prosperity rest on the United States’ remaining engaged throughout the world**. America does not pivot. Being a global superpower, and usually a force for good in the world, means staying fully engaged everywhere. When we have failed to do that in the past, the result has always cost us dearly in blood and treasure.

**T-Restrict**

**Restriction means a limit and includes conditions on action**

**CAA 8**,COURT OF APPEALS OF ARIZONA, DIVISION ONE, DEPARTMENT A, STATE OF ARIZONA, Appellee, v. JEREMY RAY WAGNER, Appellant., 2008 Ariz. App. Unpub. LEXIS 613

P10 The term "restriction" is not defined by the Legislature for the purposes of the DUI statutes. See generally A.R.S. § 28-1301 (2004) (providing the "[d]efinitions" section of the DUI statutes). In the absence of a statutory definition of a term, we look to ordinary dictionary definitions and do not construe the word as being a term of art. Lee v. State, 215 Ariz. 540, 544, ¶ 15, 161 P.3d 583, 587 (App. 2007) ("**When a statutory term is not explicitly defined, we assume**, unless otherwise stated, **that the Legislature intended to accord the word its natural and obvious meaning**, which may be discerned from its dictionary definition."). P11 **The dictionary definition of "restriction" is "[a] limitation or qualification**." Black's Law Dictionary 1341 (8th ed. 1999). In fact, "**limited" and "restricted" are considered synonyms.** See Webster's II New Collegiate Dictionary 946 (2001). **Under these** **commonly accepted definitions**, **Wagner's driving privileges were "restrict[ed]" when they were "limited" by the ignition interlock requirement.** **Wagner was not only** [\*7] **statutorily required** **to install an ignition** **interlock device on all of the vehicles he operated,** A.R.S. § 28-1461(A)(1)(b), **but he** was also **prohibited from driving any vehicle that was not equipped with such a device**, regardless whether he owned the vehicle or was under the influence of intoxicants, A.R.S. § 28-1464(H). **These limitations constituted a restriction** on Wagner's privilege to drive, **for he was unable to drive in circumstances which were otherwise available** to the general driving population. Thus, the rules of statutory construction dictate that the term "restriction" includes the ignition interlock device limitation.

**EU Soft Power DA: 2AC**

**US military power and leadership is key to solve climate change.**

**Maybee 08** **(Sean C, US Navy commander, p. 98, http://www.ndu.edu/inss/Press/jfq\_pages/i49.htm)**

For the purpose of this essay, national security is defined as the need to maintain the safety, prosperity, and survival of the nation-state through the use of instruments of national power: **diplomatic, military, economic, and informational power will be the drivers of GCC responses as they provide the needed resources ideas and technology. It will be through invoking military and diplomatic power that resources are used and new ideas are implemented to overcome any GCC challenges**. In addition to fighting and winning the nation’s wars, **the US military has a long history of humanitarian assistance and disaster relief**, but the potential impacts of GCC should lead national security policymakers to consider how environmental security will play a role in the future.

#### EU soft power fails

Dirk Messner 07 [“EU as Protagonist of Multilateralism,” March, www.fes.de/ipg/arc\_07\_d/01\_07\_d/pdf/03\_A\_Messner\_GB.pdf]

Four Weaknesses on the Way to Becoming a Cooperative World Power However, a number of weak points must be set against these assets in terms of the eu setting itself up as a cooperative world power. First, Europe’s only limited economic, technological, and scientific attractive- ness in comparison with the usa (and in future possibly also China and India) implies a loss of »soft power«which should not be underestimated. The capacity to act globally is based not only, perhaps not even principally, on military power, but on top of that on political, economic, and cultural attractiveness. Europe can therefore in future only become a relevant »co- operative world power« if it at the same time overcomes its economic weaknesses and becomes a motor of innovation in the world economy. Secondly, despite the »European Security Strategy« of 2003 the eu has still not managed to develop pan-European interests – which can even be opposed to individual national interests – and, on that basis, common strategies for helping to shape the international system, which can also withstand »heavy storms and a bumpy journey.« The crisis of the eu in the run-up to the Iraq war showed that in difficult international crises it is still the nation states and their capital cities, not the eu, Brussels, or the European Council of Foreign Ministers which ultimately are the relevant actors. The dispute between some European member states con-cerning the reform of the Security Council last year only strengthened this impression. The eu is the most developed regional cooperation project in the world, but still »work in progress«: no longer merely the sum of nation states, more than an association of states, but still clearly not a federal state of Europe. Moreover with the crisis of the European constitution the project of a more effective common eu foreign policy remains blocked for the time being. If this blockade and the loose co- operation between the foreign policies of the member states, as well as of the Commission, remains in place the eu’s global influence will ulti- mately remain very limited. Only a common European foreign policy would provide the opportunity to play a major role in global politics. Thirdly, although the eu is regarded worldwide as a »benevolent player« on the international stage, at the same time it is considered a po- litical actor which, in the context of the troubled further development of the European cooperation and integration project, is preoccupied above all with itself, its complicated decision-making processes and its confused institutional structures. The breath-taking political and economic dy- namics in parts of Asia contrast with the often finickyand stolid machinery of the European Union. And while the usa is reproached with exhibiting the hubris of power the eu must often give the appearance of being in- volved internationally »with the handbrake on.« Over against Europe’s good international reputation overall must be set the not unjustified observation that the eu is still not a truly globally thinking and capable »cooperative world power.« Fourthly, the eu’s efforts to develop its global capacity to act continue to be undermined by the internationally widespread image of »Fortress Europe«. Two things in particular which contribute to this image of the walled-in fortress are, on the one hand, the disputed immigration and migration policy of the Union which in the context of rising refugee move- ments from Africa have gained in importance in recent months; and, on the other hand, above all European agricultural policy is a symbol of the protectionism which inflicts great damage on the image of a cosmopolitan actor with a far-sighted interest in global issues. For example, Europe’s intransigence on agricultural questions in the negotiations with Mercosur on a free trade zone have harmed Europe’s standing in South America. This sketch of the eu’s strengths and weaknesses shows that it has a good starting position from which to gain significance as a global power without giving rise to international worries about an aggressive Europe, or one solely orientated towards its own, narrow interests. On the other hand, the economic, political and institutional construction work is vis- ible on which the eu must build in order to translate its global-gover-nance potential into an effective capacity to act.

### Defer Add-On: Chemical Soldiers 2AC

#### Military is developing chemical soldiers

Parasidis 12 (Efthimios, Assistant Professor of Law, Center for Health Law Studies, Saint Louis University School of Law, 2012, "Justice and Beneficence in Military Medicine and Research" Ohio State Law School, Lexis)

The United States military has a long and checkered history of experimental research involving human subjects. It has sponsored clandestine projects that examined if race influences one's susceptibility to mustard gas, n1 the extent to which radiation affects combat effectiveness, n2 and whether psychotropic drugs could be used to facilitate interrogations or develop chemical weapons. n3 In each of these experiments, the government deliberately violated legal requirements and ethical norms that govern human-subjects research and failed to provide adequate follow-up medical care or compensation for those who suffered adverse health effects. In defending its decisions, the government argued that the studies and research methods were necessary to further the strategic advantage of the United States. n4 The military's contemporary research program is motivated by the same rationale. As the U.S. Defense Advanced Research Projects Agency (DARPA) explains, its goal is to "create strategic surprise for U.S. adversaries by maintaining the technological superiority of the U.S. military." n5 Current research sponsored by DARPA and the U.S. Department of Defense (DoD) [\*725] aims to ensure that soldiers have "no physical, physiological, or cognitive limitations." n6 The research includes drugs that keep soldiers awake for seventy-two hours or more, a nutraceutical that fulfills a soldier's dietary needs for up to five days, a vaccine that eliminates intense pain within seconds, and sophisticated brain-to-computer interfaces. n7 The military's emphasis on neuroscience is particularly noteworthy, with recent annual appropriations of over $ 350 million for cognitive science research. n8 Projects include novel methods of scanning a soldier's brain to ascertain physical, intellectual, and emotional states, as well as the creation of electrodes that can be implanted into a soldier's brain for purposes of neuroanalysis and neurostimulation. n9 One of the goals of the research is to create a means by which a soldier's subjective experience can be relayed to a central command center, and, in turn, the command center can respond to the soldier's experience by stimulating brain function for both therapeutic and enhancement purposes. n10 For example, the electrodes can be used to activate brain function that can help heal an injury or keep a soldier alert during difficult moments. n11 Another goal is to create a "connected consciousness" whereby a soldier can interact with machines, access information from the Internet, or communicate with other humans via thought alone. n12

#### Chemical soldiers cause extinction and destroy value to life

Deubel 13 (Paula, Professor Gabriel has held positions at the Brookings Institution, the Army Intelligence School, the Center for the Study of Intelligence at the CIA, and at the Walter Reed Army Institute of Research, Department of Combat Psychiatry, in Washington. 3-25-13, "The Psychopath Wars: Soldiers of the Future?" Suite 101) suite101.com/article/the-psychopath-wars-soldiers-of-the-future-a366977 \*\*evidence is gender modified\*\*

According to Dr. Richard A. Gabriel in his fascinating book, No More Heroes, the sociopathic personality can keep his or her psyche intact even under extremely pathological conditions, while the sane will eventually break down under guilt, fear, or normal human repulsion. Chemical Soldiers Richard A. Gabriel (military historian, retired U.S. army officer and former professor at the U.S. Army War College) describes socio/psychopaths as people without conscience, intellectually aware of what harm they might do to another living being, but unable to experience corresponding emotions. This realization, Gabriel claims, has led the military establishments of the world to discover a drug banishing fear and emotion in the soldier by controlling ~~his~~ [their] brain chemistry. In order for soldiers to ideally function in modern war ~~he~~ [they] should first be reconstructed to become what could be defined as mentally ill. “We may be rushing headlong into a long, dark chemical night from which there will be no return,” warns Gabriel. If these efforts succeed (as it appears they can) a chemically induced zombie would be born, a psychopathic-type being who would function (at least temporarily) without any human compassion and whose moral conscience would not exist to take responsibility for his actions. “Man’s [Humankind’s] nature would be altered forever,” he adds, “and it would cost him his [us our] soul.” As incredible and futuristic as that sounds, the creation of such a drug is apparently already well underway in the world’s military research labs; Gabriel reports such research centers already exist in the United States, Russia, and Israel. Since all emotions are based in anxiety, it appears the eradication of it (perhaps through a variant of the anti-anxiety medication Busbirone) may create soldiers who become more efficient killing machines. Futuristic Warfare Gabriel writes further about the possible nightmarish future of modern warfare: “The standards of normal sane men will be eroded, and soldiers will no longer die for anything understandable or meaningful in human terms. They will simply die, and even their own comrades will be incapable of mourning their deaths […] The battlefields of the future will witness a clash of truly ignorant armies, armies ignorant of their own emotions and even of the reasons for which they fight.” (Operation Enduring Valor, Richard A. Gabriel) This would strip a person of his core identity and all of his humanity. Whether or not the soldier would knowingly take part in this experience is unknown, but during the 1991 Persian Gulf War, one could almost easily imagine that this conscience-killing pill had already been swallowed. Psychopathic Behavior During War During the 1991 Iraq war a pilot interviewed on European television callously remarked ambushing Iraqis was “like waiting for the cockroaches to come out so we could kill them." Other U.S. pilots compared killing human beings to “shooting turkey” or like “attacking a farm after someone had opened a sheep stall.” This same lack of empathy can be seen in Iraq’s Abu Graib prison scandal (2004) where U.S. soldiers were shown seemingly to enjoy torture, as well as more recent photos of military men posing with dead Afghans (first published in Germany's Der Spiegel magazine); more gruesome photos were later published in Rolling Stone before the U.S. Army censored all the remaining damning material from public view. No More Heroes warns that modern warfare will become increasingly difficult for sane men to endure. The combat punch of man’s weapons has increased over 600% since World War II. These weapons are highly technical. High Explosive Plastic Tracers (HEP-T) send fragments of metal through enemy tanks and into humans at speeds faster than the speed of sound. The Starlight Scope is able to differentiate between males and females by computing differences in body heat given off by pelvic areas. The Beehive artillery ammunition (filled with three-inch long nail-like steel needles) is capable of pinning victims to trees. The world has a nightmare arsenal of terrible weapons advanced beyond the evolution of our morality.

**Drone Shift DA: 2AC**

**Drone shift now, but plan still solves legitimacy**

David **Ignatius 10**, Washington Post, "Our default is killing terrorists by drone attack. Do you care?", December 2, www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/content/article/2010/12/01/AR2010120104458.html

Every war brings its own deformations, but consider this disturbing fact about America's war against al-Qaeda: **It has become easier, politically and legally, for the United States to kill suspected terrorists than to capture** and interrogate **them**.¶ **Predator and Reaper drones**, armed with Hellfire missiles, **have become the weapons of choice against al-Qaeda** operatives in the tribal areas of Pakistan. They have also been used in Yemen, and the demand for these efficient tools of war, which target enemies from 10,000 feet, is likely to grow.¶ **The pace of drone attacks on the tribal areas has increased sharply** during the Obama presidency, with more assaults in September and October of this year than in all of 2008. **At the same time, efforts to capture al-Qaeda suspects have virtually stopped.** Indeed, if CIA operatives were to snatch a terrorist tomorrow, the agency wouldn't be sure where it could detain him for interrogation.¶ Michael **Hayden, a former director of the CIA, frames the puzzle** this way: "Have **we made detention** and interrogation **so legally difficult and politically risky that our default option is to kill our adversaries rather than capture** and interrogate **them**?"¶ It's curious why the American public seems so comfortable with a tactic that arguably is a form of long-range assassination, after the furor about the CIA's use of nonlethal methods known as "enhanced interrogation." When Israel adopted an approach of "targeted killing" against Hamas and other terrorist adversaries, it provoked an extensive debate there and abroad.¶ "**For reasons that defy logic, people are more comfortable with drone attacks"** than with killings at close range, says Robert Grenier, a former top CIA counterterrorism officer who now is a consultant with ERG Partners. "**It's something that seems so clean and antiseptic, but the moral issues are the same."**

**There’s no tradeoff**

Robert **Chesney 11**, Charles I. Francis Professor in Law at the UT School of Law as well as a non-resident Senior Fellow at Brookings, "Examining the Evidence of a Detention-Drone Strike Tradeoff", October 17, www.lawfareblog.com/2011/10/examining-the-evidence-of-a-detention-drone-strike-tradeoff/

Yesterday Jack linked to this piece by Noah **Feldman**, which among other things **advances the argument that** the **Obama** administration has **resorted to** drone **strikes** at least in part **in order to avoid having to grapple with** the **legal and political problems associated with** military **detention**:¶ Guantanamo is still open, in part because Congress put obstacles in the way. Instead of detaining new terror suspects there, however, Obama vastly expanded the tactic of targeting them, with eight times more drone strikes in his first year than in all of Bush’s time in office.¶ **Is there truly a detention-drone strike tradeoff, such that** the **Obama** administration **favors killing** rather than capturing? As an initial matter, **the numbers quoted above aren’t correct** according to the New America Foundation database of drone strikes in Pakistan, **2008 saw a total of 33 strikes, while in 2009 there were 53** (51 subsequent to President Obama’s inauguration). Of course, you can recapture something close to the same point conveyed in the quote by looking instead to the full number of strikes conducted under Bush and Obama, respectively. There were relatively few drone strikes prior to 2008, after all, while the numbers jump to 118 for 2010 and at least 60 this year (plus an emerging Yemen drone strike campaign). But **what does all this really prove?**¶ **Not much**, I think. Most if not all of **the difference in drone strike rates can be accounted for by specific policy decisions relating to the quantity of drones available** for these missions, **the locations in Pakistan** where drones have been permitted to operate, **and** most notably **whether drone strikes were conditioned on** obtaining **Pakistani permission**. Here is how I summarize the matter in my forthcoming article on the legal consequences of the convergence of military and intelligence activities:¶ According to an analysis published by the New America Foundation, two more drone strikes in Pakistan’s FATA region followed in 2005, with at least two more in 2006, four more in 2007, and four more in the first half of 2008.[1] The pattern was halting at best. Yet that soon changed. U.S. policy up to that point had been to obtain Pakistan’s consent for strikes,[2] and toward that end to provide the Pakistani government with advance notification of them.[3] But intelligence suggested that on some occasions “the Pakistanis would delay planned strikes in order to warn al Qaeda and the Afghan Taliban, whose fighters would then disperse.”[4] A former official explained that in this environment, it was rare to get permission and not have the target slip away: “If you had to ask for permission, you got one of three answers: either ‘No,’ or ‘We’re thinking about it,’ or ‘Oops, where did the target go?”[5]¶ Declaring that he’d “had enough,” Bush in the summer of 2008 “ordered stepped-up Predator drone strikes on al Qaeda leaders and specific camps,” and specified that Pakistani officials going forward should receive only “‘concurrent notification’…meaning they learned of a strike as it was underway or, just to be sure, a few minutes after.”[6] **Pakistani permission no longer was required**.[7] ¶ **The results were dramatic. The CIA conducted dozens of strikes in Pakistan over the remainder of 2008, vastly exceeding the number of strikes over the prior four years combined**.[8] **That pace continued in 2009**, which eventually saw a total of 53 strikes.[9] **And then, in 2010, the rate more than doubled**, with 188 attacks (followed by 56 more as of late August 2011).[10] The further acceleration in 2010 appears to stem at least in part from a meeting in October 2009 during which President Obama granted a CIA request both for more drones and for permission to extend drone operations into areas of Pakistan’s FATA that previously had been off limits or at least discouraged.[11] ¶ **There is an additional reason to doubt that the number of drone strikes tells us much about a potential detention/targeting tradeoff: most of these strikes involved circumstances in which there was no feasible option for capturing the target. These strikes are concentrated in the FATA region**, after all. ¶ Having said all that: it does not follow that there is no detention-targeting tradeoff at work. I’m just saying that drone strikes in the FATA typically should not be understood in that way (though there might be limited exceptions where a capture raid could have been feasible). Where else to look, then, for evidence of a detention/targeting tradeoff?¶ Bear in mind that it is not as if we can simply assume that the same number of targets emerge in the same locations and circumstances each year, enabling an apples-to-apples comparison. But set that aside.¶ First, consider locations that (i) are outside Afghanistan (since we obviously still do conduct detention ops for new captures there) and (ii) entail host-state government control over the relevant territory plus a willingness either to enable us to conduct our own ops on their territory or to simply effectuate captures themselves and then turn the person(s) over to us. This is how most GTMO detainees captured outside Afghanistan ended up at GTMO. Think Bosnia with respect to the Boumediene petitioners, Pakistan’s non-FATA regions, and a variety of African and Asian states where such conditions obtained in years past. **In** such **locations, we seem to be using neither drones nor detention. Rather, we** either **are relying on host-state intervention or we are limiting ourselves to surveillance**. Very hard to know how much of each might be going on, of course. **If it is occurring often**, moreover, **it might reflect a decline in host-state willingness to cooperate with us** (in light of increased domestic and diplomatic pressure from being seen to be responsible for funneling someone into our hands, and the backdrop understanding that, in the age of wikileaks, we simply can’t promise credibly that such cooperation will be kept secret). **In any event, this tradeoff is not about detention versus targeting, but something much more complex and difficult to measure**.

**Prosecuting terrorists solves drone shift**

Craig **Whitlock 13**, Washington Post, "Renditions continue under Obama, despite due-process concerns", January 1, articles.washingtonpost.com/2013-01-01/world/36323571\_1\_obama-administration-interrogation-drone-strikes

The three European men with Somali roots were arrested on a murky pretext in August as they passed through the small African country of Djibouti. But the reason soon became clear when they were visited in their jail cells by a succession of American interrogators.¶ U.S. agents accused the men — two of them Swedes, the other a longtime resident of Britain — of supporting al-Shabab, an Islamist militia in Somalia that Washington considers a terrorist group. Two months after their arrest, the prisoners were secretly indicted by a federal grand jury in New York, then clandestinely taken into custody by the FBI and flown to the United States to face trial.¶ The secret arrests and detentions came to light Dec. 21 when the suspects made a brief appearance in a Brooklyn courtroom.¶ The men are the latest example of how the Obama administration has embraced rendition — the practice of holding and interrogating terrorism suspects in other countries without due process — despite widespread condemnation of the tactic in the years after the Sept. 11, 2001, attacks.¶ Renditions are taking on renewed significance because the administration and **Congress have not reached agreement on a consistent legal pathway for apprehending terrorism suspects** overseas **and bringing them to justice**.¶ Congress has thwarted President Obama’s pledge to close the military prison at Guantanamo Bay, Cuba, and has created barriers against trying al-Qaeda suspects in civilian courts, including new restrictions in a defense authorization bill passed last month. The White House, meanwhile, has resisted lawmakers’ efforts to hold suspects in military custody and try them before military commissions.¶ **The** impasse and **lack of detention options**, critics say, **have led to a de facto policy** under which the administration finds it easier **to kill terrorism suspects**, **a key reason for the surge of U.S. drone strikes in Pakistan, Yemen and Somalia**. Renditions, though controversial and complex, represent one of the few alternatives.

**End to strikes inevitable—backlash**

**Benjamin 13** (Medea, Co-Founder, CODEPINK: Women for Peace, 3-25-13, "Finally, the Backlash Against Drones Takes Flight" Huffington Post) www.huffingtonpost.com/medea-benjamin/finally-the-backlash-against-drones\_b\_2950601.html

Rand Paul's marathon 13-hour filibuster was not the end of the conversation on drones. Suddenly, drones are everywhere, and so is the backlash. **Efforts to counter drones at home and abroad are growing** in the courts, at places of worship, outside air force bases, inside the UN, at state legislatures, inside Congress -- **and having an effect on policy.** 1. April marks the national month of uprising against drone warfare. **Activists in** upstate **New York are converging on the Hancock Air National Guard Base where Predator drones are operated**. In San Diego, they will take on Predator-maker General Atomics at both its headquarters and the home of the CEO. In D.C., a coalition of national and local organizations are coming together to say no to drones at the White House. And **all across the nation** -- including New York City, New Paltz, Chicago, Tucson and Dayton -- **activists are planning picket lines, workshops and sit-ins to protest the covert wars. The word has even spread to** Islamabad, **Pakistan, where activists are planning a vigil to honor victims.** 2. **There has been an unprecedented surge of activity in cities, counties and state legislatures** across the country **aimed at regulating domestic surveillance drones**. After a raucous city council hearing in Seattle in February, the mayor agreed to terminate its drones program and return the city's two drones to the manufacturer. Also in February, the city of Charlottesville, Va., passed a two-year moratorium and other restrictions on drone use, and other local bills are pending in cities from Buffalo to Ft. Wayne. Simultaneously, bills have been proliferating on the state level. In Florida, a pending bill will require the police to get a warrant to use drones in an investigation; a Virginia statewide moratorium on drones passed both houses and awaits the governor's signature, and similar legislation in pending in at least 13 other state legislatures. 3. Responding to the international outcry against drone warfare, **the United Nations' special rapporteur on counterterrorism and human rights,** Ben Emmerson, **is conducting an in-depth investigation of 25 drone attacks** and will release his report in the spring. Meanwhile, on March 15, having returned from a visit to Pakistan to meet drone victims and government officials, **Emmerson condemned the U.S. drone program in Pakistan**, as "it involves the use of force on the territory of another State without its consent and is therefore a violation of Pakistan's sovereignty." 4. **Leaders in the faith-based community** broke their silence and **began mobilizing** against the nomination of John Brennan, with more than 100 leaders urging the Senate to reject Brennan. And in an astounding development, **The National Black Church Initiative** (NBCI), a faith-based coalition of 34,000 churches comprised of 15 denominations and 15.7 million African Americans, **issued a scathing statement about Obama's drone policy, calling it "evil," "monstrous" and "immoral."** The group's president, Rev. Anthony Evans, exhorted other black leaders to speak out, saying, "If the church does not speak against this immoral policy we will lose our moral voice, our soul, and our right to represent and preach the gospel of Jesus Christ." 5. In the past four years the congressional committees that are supposed to exercise oversight over the drones have been mum. Finally, in February and March, the House Judiciary Committee and the Senate Judiciary Committee held their first public hearings, and the Constitution Subcommittee will hold a hearing on April 16 on the "constitutional and statutory authority for targeted killings, the scope of the battlefield and who can be targeted as a combatant." Too little, too late, but at least **Congress is feeling** some **pressure** to exercise its authority. 6. The specter of tens of thousands of **drones** here at home when the FAA opens up U.S. airspace to drones by 2015 **has spurred new left/right alliances.** Liberal Democratic Senator Ron Wyden joined the tea party's Rand Paul during his filibuster. The first bipartisan national legislation was introduced by Rep. Ted Poe, R-Texas, and Rep. Zoe Lofgren, D-Calif., saying drones used by law enforcement must be focused exclusively on criminal wrongdoing and subject to judicial approval, and prohibiting the arming of drones. Similar left-right coalitions have formed at the local level. And speaking of strange bedfellows, NRA president David Keene joined The Nation's legal affairs correspondent David Cole in an op-ed lambasting the administration for the cloak of secrecy that undermines the system of checks and balances. 7. While trying to get redress in the courts for the killing of American citizens by drones in Yemen, the ACLU has been stymied by the Orwellian U.S. government refusal to even acknowledge that the drone program exists. But on March 15, in an important victory for transparency, **the D.C. Court of Appeals rejected the CIA's absurd claims that it "cannot confirm or deny" possessing information about the government's use of drones for targeted killing, and sent the case back to a federal judge.** 8. Most Democrats have been all too willing to let President Obama carry on with his lethal drones, but on March 11, **Congresswoman Barbara Lee and seven colleagues issued a letter to President Obama calling on him to publicly disclose the legal basis for drone killings,** echoing a call that emerged in the Senate during the John Brennan hearing. The letter also requested a report to Congress with details about limiting civilian casualties by signature drone strikes, compensating innocent victims, and restructuring the drone program "within the framework of international law." 9. **There have even been signs of discontent within the military**. Former Defense Secretary Leon Panetta had approved a ludicrous high-level military medal that honored military personnel far from the battlefield, like drone pilots, due to their "extraordinary direct impacts on combat operations." Moreover, it ranked above the Bronze Star, a medal awarded to troops for heroic acts performed in combat. **Following intense backlash from the military and veteran community**, as well as a push from a group of bipartisan senators, new Defense Secretary Senator Chuck **Hagel decided to review the criteria for this new "Distinguished Warfare" medal.** 10. Remote-control warfare is bad enough, but what is being developed is warfare by "killer robots" that don't even have a human in the loop. A campaign against fully autonomous warfare will be launched this April at the UK's House of Commons by human rights organizations, Nobel laureates and academics, many of whom were involved in the successful campaign to ban landmines. The goal of the campaign is to ban killer robots before they are used in battle. **Throughout the U.S. -- and the world -- people are beginning to wake up to the danger of spy and killer drones. Their actions are already having an impact in forcing the administration to share memos with Congress, reduce the number of strikes and begin a process of taking drones out of the hands of the CIA.**

**Fem IR K: 2AC**

**Method doesn’t come first**

Friedrich **Kratochwil**, Professor of International Relations, European University Institute, “Ten points to ponder about pragmatism: some critical reflections to knowledge generation in the social sciences,” PRAGMATISM IN INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS, eds. Harry Bauer and Elisabetta Brighi, 200**9**, p. 12-13.

To that extent, the argument for a pluralism of methods and approaches follows from the fact that all knowledge is always part of a certain perspective, and that direct tests against 'reality' are not available. Consequently, the orthodox notion that scientific 'progress\* consists in coming nearer and nearer to the truth shows its ideological character. For one, it is on all fours with the empirical evidence of how the scientific enterprise developed. Thus the notion of a simple accumulation was not only debunked by Kuhn and the general criticisms developed by the history of science (Kuhn 1970) but, more importantly, involves us in a logically untenable contradiction. **Without knowing 'reality' independently of our specific theoretical inquiries, we can never know whether we are 'nearer\* to the "truth\* (rather than** being simply **'somewhere else'**). Otherwise we would need to argue that we can determine that we are nearer to the 'goal', even if we have no goal line against which we can make that assessment.2 **This recognition puts a premium on 'dialogue\* among practitioners utilizing competing theories rather than on the idea of 'demonstration\* that speaks for itself. Analytical and methodological eclecticism recommends itself precisely because in practical contexts we cannot wait until we know 'the truth**', whatever it might be. To that extent, **insisting on methodological purity seems a problematic regulative idea**. Instead, what **we need** is **a self-conscious 'trespassing'**, a la Hirschman, of various research traditions, **and a flexible utilization of their contribution to the problem at hand** (Hirschman 1981). Trusting 'paradigms' might hinder rather than help with diagnosing the problem. Similarly, a blind reliance on methods in the sense "one size fits all' is unlikely to deliver the desired 'data\* (King el al. 1994). What is needed is a careful combination of methods and approaches that understands and respects the strengths and limitations of different research traditions and methods, and that combines and adapts (through 'translation' and other techniques) the different parts, while being fully attentive lo their moorings in different descriptions of the world.

**No gender bias in international relations actually exists—feminist criticism is based upon exaggerated mischaracterizations of realism and is riddled with contradictions**

**Murray,** professor of politics at the University of Wales, 19**97** (Alistair, Reconstructing Realism: Between Power Politics and Cosmopolitan Ethics, netlibrary)

Consequently, Tickner claims that feminist perspectives on national security take us beyond realism’s statist representations. Whilst Tickner’s **feminism** presents an interesting revisioning of international relations, it **ultimately suffers from the problem that, in order to sustain any of its claims**, most of all the notion that a distinctively feminist epistemology is actually necessary, **it must establish the existence of a gender bias in international relations theory which simply does not exist, and the existence of an alternative feminist position on international affairs which is simply a fiction.** Consequently, in order to salvage her very raison d^etre, Tickner is forced to engage in some imaginative rewriting of international relations theory. First **in order to lay the basis for the claim that an alternative perspective is actually necessary, conventional theory is stripped of its positive elements, and an easily discredited caricature, centered on realism, erected in its place. Second, in order to conjure up a reason for this alternative perspective to be a feminist one, the positive elements which have been removed from conventional theory are then claimed as the exclusive preserve of such perspectives.** Yet, however imaginative this “revisioning” of international relations theory, **its inevitable result is a critique which is so riddled with contradictions that is proves unsustainable, and an alternative epistemology which, based on this flawed critique, collapses in the face of the revelation of its inadequacy.**

**IR feminism isn’t needed to address “the root cause” of global problems—realism achieves the same goals**

Alastair J. H. **Murray**, Professor of Politics @ U of Wales, 19**97** (Reconstructing Realism: Between Power Politics and Cosmopolitan Ethics) p. 192-193

Consequently, it is not surprising that the third strut of this new feminist epistemology, a broader notion of national security, seems simply unnecessary. **Acknowledging the interdependence of human security in an age of nuclear holo­caust and environmental degeneration would hardly seem to be a preserve of feminism.** What of everything that George Kennan has said on this subject over the last forty years**? Nor can we accept the notion that we need to redefine conflict resolution to focus more on mutually beneficial outcomes, when realism is deeply concerned with the amelioration of difference by diplomacy.** What of the nine points with which Morgenthau concludes Politics among Nations? **Nor can we accept the notion that `maternal thinking' and a female, contextual morality are required to attempt to confine conflict to non-violent means. A persistent theme of realism is that humility of self and toleration of others are the foremost moral imperatives, that conflict should not be permitted to become an ideological war of absolutes in which all enemies are monsters, all actions are legitimate, and all peaces are but punitive armistices. One ultimately has to question the need for a specifically feminist theory of international relations. We currently do not have two radically opposed standpoints, masculine and feminine, but a unified human standpoint which, with modifications, serves us reasonably well.**

**Turn—equating militarism and patriarchy assumes traditional gender roles and reinforces domination**

**Hooks 95** (Bell, English professor and senior lecturer in Ethnic Studies at the University of Southern California “Feminism and Militarism: A Comment” *Women's Studies Quarterly*, Vol. 23, No. 3/4, Rethinking Women's Peace Studies (Fall - Winter, 1995), pp. 58-64)

**By equaling militarism and patriarchy**, these **feminists** often **structure their arguments in** such **a way as to suggest that to be male is synonymous with strength, aggression, and the will to dominate** and do violence to others **and that to be female is synonymous with weakness, passivity, and the will to nourish** and affirm the lives of others. While these may be stereotypical norms that many people live out, **such dualistic thinking is dangerous; it is a basic ideological component of the logic that informs and promotes domination in Western society. Even when inverted and employed for a meaningful purpose**, like nuclear disarmament**, it is nevertheless risky, for it reinforces the cultural basis of sexism and other forms of group oppression**, suggesting as it does that women and men are inherently different in some fixed and absolute way. It implies that women by virtue of our sex have played no crucial role in supporting and upholding imperialism (and the militarism that serves to maintain imperialist rule) or other systems of domination. Often the women who make such assertions arc white. Black women are very likely to feel strongly that white women have been quite violent and militaristic in their support and maintenance of racism.

**The feminist alternative inevitably results in the same practices it hopes to prevent, and fails to secure knowledge claims which could cause real change.**

Aria **Stern**, researcher, department of peace and development research @ Gotberg University **and** Marysia **Zalewski**, director of centre for gender studies @ University of Aberdeen, 200**9**, “Feminist fatigue(s): Reflections on feminism and familiar fables of militarization”

n this section we clarify what we mean by the problem of sex/gender and how it transpires in the context of feminist narratives within IR – which we will exemplify below with a recounting of a familiar feminist reading of militarisation. To re-iterate, the primary reason for investigating this is that we **suspect part of the reason for the aura of disillusionment around feminism – especially as a critical theoretical resource – is connected to the sense that feminist stories repeat the very grammars that initially incited them as narratives in resistance.** To explain; one might argue that **there has been a normative feminist failure to adequately construct secure foundations for legitimate and authoritative knowledge claims upon which to garner effective and permanent gender change**, particularly in regard to women. But for poststructural scholars this failure is not surprising as **the emancipatory visions of feminism inevitably emerged as illusory given the attachments to foundationalist and positivistic understandings of subjects, power and agency**. If, as poststructuralism has shown us, we cannot – through language – decide the meaning of woman, or of femininity, or of feminism, or produce foundational information about it or her;42 that subjects are ‘effects’ rather than ‘origins of institutional practices and discourses’;43 that power ‘produces subjects in effects’;44 or that authentic and authoritative agency are illusory – then the sure foundations for the knowledge that feminist scholars are conventionally required to produce – even hope to produce – are unattainable. Moreover, **post-colonial feminisms have vividly shown how representations of ‘woman’ or ‘women’ which masquerade as ‘universal’ are, instead, universalising and inevitably produced through hierarchical and intersecting power relations.**45 In sum; the poststructural suggestion is that feminist representations of women do not correspond to some underlying truth of what woman is or can be; **rather feminism produces the subject of woman which it then subsequently comes to represent.46 The implications of this familiar conundrum are far-reaching as the demands of feminism in the context of the knowledge/political project of the gender industry are exposed as implicated in the re-production of the very power from which escape is sought**. In short, feminism **emerges as complicit in violent reproductions of subjects and knowledges/ practices**. How does this recognisable puzzle (recognisable within feminist theory) play out in relation to the issues we are investigating in this article? As noted above, the broad example we choose to focus on to explain our claims is **militarisation**; partly chosen as both authors have participated in pedagogic, policy and published work in this generic area, and partly because this **is an area in which the demand for operationalisable gender knowledge is ever-increasing.** Our suggestion is **that the increasing requirement47 for knowledge for the gender industry about gender and militarisation re-animates the sexgender paradox which persistently haunts attempts to translate what we know into useful knowledge for redressing (and preventing) conflict**, or simply into hopeful scenarios for our students.

**Alt doesn’t solve – can’t destabilize existing hierarchies**

**Saloom** JD UGA, **6**Rachel, JD Univ of Georgia School of Law and M.A. in Middle Eastern Studies from U of Chicago, Fall 2006, A Feminist Inquiry into International Law and International Relations, 12 Roger Williams U. L. Rev. 159, Lexis

Because patriarchy is embedded within society, it is no surprise that the theory and practice of both international law and international relations is also patriarchal. [98](http://web.lexis-nexis.com/scholastic/document?_m=a2ac53a45e1fe17371cdbaa2cf370390&_docnum=3&wchp=dGLbVzW-zSkVk&_md5=2c8e9aab339ea5ca4d4f4fae4578bb53#n98#n98)**Total critique,** however, **presents no method by which to challenge current hegemonic practices. Feminist scholars have yet to provide a coherent way in which total critique can be applied to change the nature of international law and international relations.** Some  [\*178]  feminist scholars are optimistic for the possibility of changing the way the current system is structured. For example, Whitworth believes that "sites of resistance are always available to those who oppose the status quo." [99](http://web.lexis-nexis.com/scholastic/document?_m=a2ac53a45e1fe17371cdbaa2cf370390&_docnum=3&wchp=dGLbVzW-zSkVk&_md5=2c8e9aab339ea5ca4d4f4fae4578bb53#n99#n99) Enloe suggests that since the world of international politics has been made it can also be remade. [100](http://web.lexis-nexis.com/scholastic/document?_m=a2ac53a45e1fe17371cdbaa2cf370390&_docnum=3&wchp=dGLbVzW-zSkVk&_md5=2c8e9aab339ea5ca4d4f4fae4578bb53#n100#n100) She posits that every time a woman speaks out about how the government controls her, new theories are being made. [101](http://web.lexis-nexis.com/scholastic/document?_m=a2ac53a45e1fe17371cdbaa2cf370390&_docnum=3&wchp=dGLbVzW-zSkVk&_md5=2c8e9aab339ea5ca4d4f4fae4578bb53#n101#n101)**All of these theorists highlight the manner in which gender criticisms can destabilize traditional theories. They provide no mechanism**, however, **for the actual implementation of their theories into practice.** While in the abstract, resistance to hegemonic paradigms seems like a promising concept, gender theorists have made no attempt to make their resistance culminate in meaningful change. **The notion of rethinking traditional approaches to** international law and **international relations does not go far enough in prescribing an alternative theoretical basis for understanding the international arena. Enloe's plea for women to speak out about international politics does not go nearly far enough in explaining how those acts could have the potential to actually change the practice of international relations. Either women are already speaking out now, and their voices alone are not an effective mechanism to challenge the system,** or women are not even speaking out about world politics currently. Obviously it is absurd to assume that women remain silent about world politics. If that is the case, then one must question women's ability to speak up, challenge, and change the system.

# 1ar

## Solvency

### Courts Solve: A2 “Congress Blocks Transfer”

#### Court order trumps Congress

Rosenberg 12 (Carol, 1-9-12, "Congress, rules keep Obama from closing Guantanamo Bay" The Miami Herald) www.mcclatchydc.com/2012/01/09/135179/congress-rule-keep-obama-from.html#.UjXQNcasiSo

But Congress has made it nearly impossible to transfer captives anywhere. Legislation passed since Obama took office has created a series of roadblocks that mean that only a federal court order or a national security waiver issued by Secretary of Defense Leon Panetta could trump Congress and permit the release of a detainee to another country.

Court decisions are enforced

### Heg

#### Hegemony prevents US-Russia war.

Robert **Kagan**, senior associate, Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, "End of Dreams, Return of History," POLICY REVIEW, 7--17--**07**, www.hoover.org/publications/policyreview/8552512.html

In Europe, too, the departure of the United States from the scene — even if it remained the world’s most powerful nation — could be destabilizing. It could tempt Russia to an even more overbearing and potentially forceful approach to unruly nations on its periphery. Although some realist theorists seem to imagine that the disappearance of the Soviet Union put an end to the possibility of confrontation between Russia and the West, and therefore  to the need for a permanent American role in Europe, history suggests that conflicts in Europe involving Russia are possible even without Soviet communism. If the United States withdrew from Europe — if it adopted what some call a strategy of **“**offshore balancing” — this could in time increase the likelihood of conflict involving Russia and its near neighbors, which could in turn draw the United States back inunder unfavorable circumstances.

## Drone da

### China

#### Drones increasing – China

Wong 9/20 (Edward, 9/20/13, “Hacking U.S. Secrets, China Pushes for Drones”, http://www.nytimes.com/2013/09/21/world/asia/hacking-us-secrets-china-pushes-for-drones.html?pagewanted=all#h[], zzx)

“I believe this is the largest campaign we’ve seen that has been focused on drone technology,” said Darien Kindlund, manager of threat intelligence at the company, FireEye, based in California. “It seems to align pretty well with the focus of the Chinese government to build up their own drone technology capabilities.” The hacking operation, conducted by a group called “Comment Crew,” was one of the most recent signs of the ambitions of China’s drone development program. The government and military are striving to put China at the forefront of drone manufacturing, for their own use and for export, and have made an all-out push to gather domestic and international technology to support the program. Foreign Ministry officials have said China does not sanction hacking, and is itself a victim, but another American cybersecurity company has tracked members of Comment Crew to a building of the People’s Liberation Army outside Shanghai. China is now dispatching its own drones into potential combat arenas. Every major arms manufacturer in China has a research center devoted to drones, according to Chinese and foreign military analysts. Those companies have shown off dozens of models to potential foreign buyers at international air shows. Chinese officials this month sent a drone near disputed islands administered by Japan; debated using a weaponized drone last year to kill a criminal suspect in Myanmar; and sold homemade drones resembling the Predator, an American model, to other countries for less than a million dollars each. Meanwhile, online photographs reveal a stealth combat drone, the Lijian, or Stealth Sword, in a runway test in May. Military analysts say China has long tried to replicate foreign drone designs. Some Chinese drones appearing at recent air shows have closely resembled foreign ones. Ian M. Easton, a military analyst at the Project 2049 Institute in Virginia, said cyberespionage was one tool in an extensive effort over years to purchase or develop drones domestically using all available technology, foreign and domestic. Chinese engineers and officials have done reverse engineering, studied open source material and debriefed American drone experts who attend conferences and other meetings in China. “This can save them years of design work and mistakes,” Mr. Easton said. The Chinese military has not released statistics on the size of its drone fleet, but a Taiwan Defense Ministry report said that as of mid-2011, the Chinese Air Force alone had more than 280 drone units, and analysts say the other branches have thousands, which means China’s fleet count is second only to the 7,000 or so of the United States. “The military significance of China’s move into unmanned systems is alarming,” said a 2012 report by the Defense Science Board, a Pentagon advisory committee.

### Drones increasing

#### Drones increasing and inevitable

Chow 10/3 (Eugene, Former Executive Editor, Homeland Security NewsWire, 10/3/13, “The Next Generation of Drone Warfare Is Here”, http://www.huffingtonpost.com/eugene-k-chow/the-next-generation-of-dr\_b\_4030384.html, zzx)

While the Air Force may insist that it has no plans to use these drones in combat, the calculus continues to shift towards just that. "There is every reason to believe that these so-called 'targets' could become a test bed for drone warfare, moving us closer and closer to automated killing," said Professor Noel Sharkey, a spokesman for the Campaign to Stop Killer Robots. Transforming existing fighter jets into drones is becoming an increasingly economical option in light of dwindling military budgets and the fact that the troubled next generation F-35 Joint Strike Fighter is running hundreds of billions of dollars over budget and nearly a decade behind schedule. Furthermore, the MQ-9 Reaper drone, the current weapon of choice against insurgents, costs roughly $20 million each, and the Air Force spends more than $6 million to train a single fighter pilot and is struggling to retain them. In contrast, under an initial contract of $70 million, Boeing has already modified six F-16s, re-designated the QF-16, and is scheduled to begin low-rate production with an expected delivery date in 2015. While the QF-16 isn't the first unmanned fighter jet to soar through the skies -- since the mid-70s, the Air Force has used unmanned F-4s, or QF-4s for target practice -- the QF-16 is the first modern jet to fly without a pilot and is a stark reminder of the growing use of unmanned drones by the Pentagon. Earlier this year, the Navy's autonomous X-47B drone made history when it successfully landed by itself on the moving flight deck of an aircraft carrier at sea, one of the most challenging feats in modern aviation. Beyond just taking off and landing without a pilot, unmanned fighter jets are also capable of firing missiles. Since 2008, the military has used unmanned F-4 Phantoms to test fire experimental missiles, and rumors continue to swirl that the next generation long-range stealth bomber, capable of delivering nuclear weapons, could be unmanned. Skeptics have long dismissed drones as incapable of landing on carriers and some commanders continue to question their efficacy against an opponent with strong air defenses, but long-term trends continue to push for their use -- shrinking budgets, the zero-cost to American lives, and the powerful Congressional Drone Caucus. With these trends in place and the technological capabilities largely developed, it seems only a matter of time before these advanced fighter jet drones dominate the skies.

#### Drones increasing – shutdown didn’t stop

Mackey 10/1 (Robert, NYT, 10/1/13, “Drones Are Flying, Despite U.S. Shutdown”, http://thelede.blogs.nytimes.com/2013/10/01/drones-are-flying-despite-u-s-shutdown/, zzx)

As the United States government ground to a halt on Tuesday, there were plenty of sardonic comments from bloggers and journalists in parts of the world where the American military footprint is large. Writing on Twitter, the Pakistani columnist Cyril Almeida suggested that the top question for militants in the country’s North Waziristan Agency would be, “Are drones still operating?” While the Central Intelligence Agency’s campaign of drone strikes in Pakistan’s tribal belt is covert — and there have been hints that some attacks there attributed to the Americans might have been carried out by Pakistan’s own military — there is no doubt that drones operated by the Air Force, at least, will continue to fly. As my colleagues Michael Schmidt, Thom Shanker and Andrew Siddons reported, while about 400,000 civilian employees of the Defense Department face unpaid leave, Pentagon contingency plans will keep more than 1.3 million active military personnel on duty, although they will probably not receive their paychecks until the shutdown ends. “Those of you in uniform will remain on your normal duty status,” President Obama confirmed in a prerecorded video message to members of the armed forces, released as the shutdown took effect. “The threats to our national security have not changed, and we need you to be ready for any contingency,” Mr. Obama explained. “Ongoing military operations — like our efforts in Afghanistan — will continue.”