### 2AC T USAF--- LONG VERSION

#### We meet: plan says “nuclear armed forces”--- that’s T

Quester 2006 (George H. Quester, Visiting Professor of International Affairs at the George Washington University's Elliott School of Government, “Nuclear First Strike: Consequences of a Broken Taboo,” gbooks)

Weapons systems of various sorts are proliferating worldwide, and much may depend on what kinds of systems, offensive or defensive, have already been deployed by the time nuclear weapons have been used. A great number of relevant possibilities have to be introduced here. By the time of a such a nuclear escalation, the United States may already have effective missile defenses and resuscitated air defenses, or it may not, despite vast expenditures on such systems; and there may or may not have been a widespread proliferation of chemical and biological weapons in the world.¶ As in all the wars and war plans of the past, much will depend on what kinds of targets are hit. Nuclear weapons are most often thought of as a “countervalue” weapon ¶ , capable of destroying entire cities, as at Hiroshima and Nagasaki; but contingencies have existed, ever since the onset of the Cold War, for much more strictly countermilitary or counterforce uses of nuclear weapons. Again, there may be a great variation in the results achieved such a more specific attack. If important military goals were achieved in the escalation, very different responses might emerge than if the nuclear escalation proved relatively fruitless. Who the actor is would play a critical role in the perception of the event. The next power to use a nuclear weapon in combat could be a state hostile to the United States; to the extent that Americans have been thinking about this problem at all, this is the scenario that naturally captures most attention. But the user could instead be a power which is neither hostile nor friendly to the United States, the use being part of a conflict in which it would be difficult for Americans to identify with either side. The nuclear escalator might even be an ally of the United States. Finally, as noted, the scenarios for the next use of nuclear weapons must also include those involving such action by United States armed forces.

#### Counter interp: USAF are the four branches

DOD Dictionary No Date http://www.dtic.mil/doctrine/dod\_dictionary/data/a/2554.html

United States Armed Forces

 (DOD) Used to denote collectively the Army, Marine Corps, Navy, Air Force, and Coast Guard. See also Armed Forces of the United States.

#### We’re the Air Force

OV 2010 (Opposing Viewpoints, “The U.S. Armed Forces,” Gale Group)

The United States Armed Forces are the military forces that serve the United States of America. The U.S. Armed Forces include five service branches: the Air Force, the Army, the Navy, the Marine Corps, and the Coast Guard. On 14 June 1775, the Continental Congress created the Continental Army, and also authorized riflemen from Virginia, Pennsylvania, and Maryland. By 13 October of that year, Congress had established a Naval Committee and authorized two armed ships to capture British vessels traveling to North America. On 10 November 1775, the Continental Congress authorized the creation of the Continental Marines. For these reasons, today's U.S. Armed Forces consider 1775 to be the year the U.S. military was formed.¶ While the United States has had a military since the 1700s, the National Security Act of 1947 established the modern U.S. Armed Forces. The National Security Act of 1947 created the United States Air Force and the current structure of the U.S. Armed Forces. The act also created the Department of Defense out of what had previously been the War Department. Since the 1940s, the U.S. Armed Forces have grown rapidly. As of 31 July 2010, there were 1,478,160 personnel on active duty in the U.S. Armed Forces.¶ Structure and Function¶ The function of the U.S. Armed Forces is to help protect and defend the United States, its people, and its interests. In order to complete these functions, the U.S. Armed Forces operate on a strict chain of command, which allows for discipline, order, and the effective discharge of duties. The president of the United States is the official commander in chief of the U.S. Armed Forces. However, carrying out the policies of the Air Force, the Marine Corps, and the Navy is overseen by the Department of Defense, a federal department. The Department of Homeland Security oversees the Coast Guard during peacetime, while the Coast Guard reports to the Department of Defense through the Navy in times of war.¶ The highest ranking members of the service branches include: the Army Chief of Staff, a four-star general; the Air Force Chief of Staff, a four-star general; the Chief of Naval Operations, an admiral; and the Commandant of the Marine Corps, a four-star general. These officers are members of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, a group of military leaders whose job it is to advise the president. The Coast Guard Commandant commands the Coast Guard, and is not a member of the Joint Chiefs of Staff.¶ In addition to active-duty members of the five service branches, the U.S. military has reserve military service members who serve in the National Guard or the Army, Navy, Air Force, or Marine reserves. These reserves undergo military training and must agree to a certain time commitment to the reserves. They may be called into active duty during times of war. The National Guard is a joint component of the Air Force and the Army. National Guard units are attached to each of the fifty states. The total number of U.S. military reservists is about 1.5 million.¶ U.S. Armed Forces Service Branches¶ While the overall aim of the U.S. Armed Forces is to protect the United States and its people, each of the service branches has a specific role. The role of the U.S. Army, for example, is to defend and protect the United States as well as its interests through use of ground troops, tactical nuclear weapons, tanks, artillery, and helicopters. As of 31 July 2010, there were 567,167 personnel in the U.S. Army.¶ The Air Force defends and protects the United States and any U.S. interests in space and air, often using tanker aircraft, bomber aircraft, transport aircraft, and helicopters. The U.S. Air Force is in charge of the nuclear ballistic missiles and military satellites, as well. As of 31 July 2010, there were 336,031 personnel in the U.S. Air Force.

#### Counter-interp: “Hostilities” are full-scale armed conflict

Chesney 2011 (Robert Chesney, Brookings, June 22, 2011, “Web Chat: Libya and the War Powers Resolution,” http://www.brookings.edu/blogs/up-front/posts/2011/06/22-war-powers-resolution-chat)

12:37 Robert Chesney: The argument is that the word "hostilities" in the WPR has a particular, and relatively narrow, meaning in this setting (i.e., "hostilities" is a term of art requiring reference, just in this setting, to a particular definition). The WPR does not actually define the word, of course. The administration's view appears to be that not just any circumstances of U.S. involvement in fighting will count. Rather, "hostilities" occur for WPR purposes only where something akin to a full-scale armed conflict with sustained, relatively high-intensity kinetic operations by U.S. forces occur. In the present circumstance, we have only limited direct involvement in kinetic operations (periodic drone strikes, and apparently periodic manned aircraft strikes), while the rest of our involvement is in the nature of (important) support for the kinetic operations of our NATO allies.

#### That’s us

Cox 1989 (H. Bartholomew Cox, M.A. 1962, Ph.D. 1967, George Washington University; J.D. 1976, George Washington University National Law Center, August 1989, George Washington Law Review, Lexis)

The foregoing points considered, let us return to the questions posed above, in order to see if, because of its awesome potential, first use of nuclear weapons should be made a specific exception to the general rules concerning congressional delegation of discretionary powers to the Executive. There seems little question that under the formal Constitution Congress must participate in some way in the decision to employ nuclear weapons. Under Article I, section 8, Congress has the power "to provide for the common defense and general welfare of the United States" and "to declare war." It cannot be denied that first -- or any -- use of nuclear weapons is tantamount to a declaration of war and that the resultant nuclear winter will fundamentally affect the general welfare of the United States. The 1946 delegation, insofar as it involves first use, is not valid -- without regard to whether or not anyone would be accorded the requisite standing under Article III's "case or controversy" requirement to challenge it. The original delegation has by 1989 so altered the formal constitutional system that it should not be sustained. Surely Congress did not contemplate well over forty years ago an evolution to the grimness of civilizational suicide. This is not to argue that Congress should retrieve complete control over nuclear weapons, but to say that it has a constitutional duty to create an institutional means of properly curbing use of those weapons.

#### Prefer our interp---

#### Best limit--- infinite small “troops” affs--- peacekeeping, SEAL teams, Jason Bourne affs--- only NUCLEAR weapons require special AUTHORITY to use--- no link to the limits DA

#### DOD definitions key to precision and predictable limits

DOD Dictionary 2010 (http://ra.defense.gov/documents/rtm/jp1\_02.pdf)

1. Scope ¶ The Joint Publication 1-02, Department of Defense Dictionary of Military and Associated ¶ Terms sets forth standard US military and associated terminology to encompass the joint activity of ¶ the Armed Forces of the United States. These military and associated terms, together with their ¶ definitions, constitute approved Department of Defense (DOD) terminology for general use by all ¶ DOD components. ¶ 2. Purpose ¶ This publication supplements standard English-language dictionaries and standardizes military ¶ and associated terminology to improve communication and mutual understanding within DOD, with ¶ other federal agencies, and among the United States and its allies. ¶ 3. Application ¶ This publication applies to the Office of the Secretary of Defense, the Services, the Joint Staff, ¶ combatant commands, DOD agencies, and all other DOD components. It is the primary terminology source when preparing correspondence, to include policy, strategy, doctrine, and planning documents. Criteria for inclusion of terminology in JP 1-02 is enumerated in Department ¶ of Defense Instruction (DODI) 5025.12, Standardization of Military and Associated Terminology, ¶ and Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff Instruction (CJCSI) 5705.01, Standardization of Military ¶ and Associated Terminology.

#### They overlimit--- Neg definition is obsolete--- Modern war is about weapons not troops--- we’re not gonna invade Russia

#### Predictability--- We’re what the WPR meant

Fisher 2011 (Louis Fisher, Scholar in Residence at the Constitution Project, previously he worked for four decades at the Library of Congress as Senior Specialist in Separation of Powers, June 28, 2011, Statement by Louis Fisher, ¶ The Constitution Project, ¶ Before the ¶ Senate Committee on Foreign Relations, ¶ “Libya and War Powers,” http://www.foreign.senate.gov/imo/media/doc/Fisher\_Testimony.pdf)

In response to a House resolution passed on June 3, the Obama administration on June 15 ¶ submitted a report to Congress. A section on legal analysis (p. 25) determined that the word ¶ “hostilities” in the War Powers Resolution should be interpreted to mean that hostilities do not ¶ exist with the U.S. military effort in Libya: “U.S. operations do not involve sustained fighting or ¶ active exchanges of fire with hostile forces, nor do they involve the presence of U.S. ground troops, U.S. casualties or a serious threat thereof, or any significant chance of escalation into a ¶ conflict characterized by those factors.” ¶ This interpretation ignores the political context for the War Powers Resolution. Part of ¶ the momentum behind passage of the statute concerned the decision by the Nixon administration ¶ to bomb Cambodia.17 The massive air campaign did not involve “sustained fighting or active ¶ exchanges of fire with hostile forces,” the presence of U.S. ground troops, or substantial U.S. ¶ casualties. However, it was understood that the bombing constituted hostilities.

#### Nukes topic education outweighs--- 1AC Willis ev says “bomb power” is the root of ALL OTHER executive war powers--- prerequisite to learning about the other areas of the topic

#### Prefer reasonability--- competing interps causes race to the bottom--- AND it’s written into the rez

CC 12 (October 26, 2012, “Special Programs - Centenary College Wiki,” wiki.centenarycollege.edu/index.php/Special\_Programs‎)

An “area of study” is defined as a field of study or a related cluster within one of the College's academic departments.

### K

#### Role of the ballot is to evaluate effects of the plan- other interps arbitrarily exclude 9 min of aff offense--- Judge should choose reps that best test plan desirability, must evaluate the effects of the plan to determine the desirability of our language/reps/knowledge

#### The aff is an acknowledgment of the tempory nature of ableness--- the Wilbur evidence doesn’t say that the president shouldn’t be allowed to launch nukes because they’re “disabled” it’s because everyone is fallible and susceptible to illness, physical and mental--- this means that NO ONE should have SOLE AUTHORITY to launch nukes because NO ONE PERSON is “able” to do so wisely

#### Their link claims are a targeting strategy which constructs coalitions in ways that undermine solvency

James L. Cherney 2011 Wayne State University

The Rhetoric of Ableism Vol 31, No 3 (2011) Disability Studies Quarterly

Similar work has been done to establish the concept of "sexism." Until the word came into being and use, what it described operated in the open as acceptable patterns of thought. Oppressed women certainly might find such thinking objectionable, but without the word their critique lacks a specific target. In such a situation they may target another related concept, such as the institutions generated and protected by the attitude, as a way of expressing their dissatisfaction with the hegemonic oppressive orientation. The target may be chosen because it is closely linked with the attitude, because it is deemed a particularly heinous practice, or because it lies close to the border of acceptable behavior and is thus easily accessible. Once chosen, the target becomes the receptacle for dissatisfaction with the unnamed orientation, and efforts to remove the practice become closely aligned with repudiating the offensive perspective. Because attacking the target requires forging coalitions with those who may oppose the target for other reasons, this strategically important move can actually help protect the underlying oppressive orientation from discovery, and eliminating the target can be confused with eliminating the oppressive view. Continued dissatisfaction with the still unnamed premises of the oppressive system can lead to the acquisition of new targets, and the cycle begins anew. Yet naming and calling into question the view itself raises the possibility of altering the very strands out of which the oppressive institutions are spun. Identifying the view as problematic adds a critical dimension to the struggle by denying the simplistic perspective that sees altering a few target structures as a solution to the problem. Naming the view exposes its pervasiveness, assumptions, and implications to criticism.

#### Their link claim is overbroad

Barker & Murray, English Professors University of Birmingham, University of Leeds 10

[Clare Barker, Stuart Murray, Journal of Literary & Cultural Disability Studies Volume 4, Number 3, 2010 “Disabling Postcolonialism: Global Disability Cultures and Democratic Criticism,” accessed 7-13-12 BC]

Given that the history of colonialism (and its post/neocolonial aftermath) is indeed a history of mass disablement, and that the acquisition of disability may be tied into wider patterns of dispossession—the loss of family, home, land, community, employment—there is a pressing need, as we see it, to resist the too-easy censure of narratives that construct disability as loss. We would caution especially against the blanket rejection and/or critique of medical discourse and medicalized terminology, which may be strategically important when campaigning for resources and raising awareness of (neo)colonial abuses. What individuals in such circumstances experience as loss should not be rendered an invalid response by arguments that fail to recognize the wider contexts and material environments in which disablement occurs.

#### Their critique’s essentialism link turns any productive response to their impact claims –

Humphrey, Faculty of Applied Social Sciences, The Open University UK, 2000

(Jill C., Disability & Society, Vol. IS, No. I, “Researching Disability Politics, Or, Some Problems with the Social Model in Practice”, Proquest, p. 64-65)

In academic texts, the social model begins with an appreciation of the individual and collective experiences of disabled people (e.g. Swain a al, 1993). It goes on to elaborate the nature of a disabling society in terms of the physical environment, the political economy, the welfare state and sedimented stereotypes (e.g. Barnes et ah, 1999). Finally, it endorses a critical or emancipatory paradigm of research (e.g. Barnes & Mercer 1997a). This analysis lends itself to a recognition of the array of diverse experiences of disabling barriers; a realistic appraisal of the need for broader political coalitions to combat entrenched structural inequalities and cultural oppressions; and an openness about the potential for non-disabled people to contribute to critical theory and research. In activist discourses, the emphasis is upon the fact that it is non-disabled people who have engineered the physical environment, dominated the political economy, managed welfare services, controlled research agendas, recycled pejorative labels and images, and translated these into eugenics policies. This analysis lends itself to a dichotomy between non-disabled and disabled people which becomes coterminous with the dichotomy between oppressors and oppressed; and this tightens the boundaries around the disabled identity, the disabled people's movement and disability research. Whilst this hermeneutic closure is designed to ward off incursions and, therefore, oppressions from non-disabled people, it may also have some unfortunate consequences.

I would like to illustrate these consequences by drawing upon a research project involving the four self-organised groups (SOGs) for women, black people, disabled members, and lesbian and gay members in UNISON (see Humphrey, 1998, 1999). Material drawn directly from conversations and observations in the disabled members' group is supplemented by interview transcripts with members of the lesbian and gay group, my own personal experiences of and reflections upon disability and discrimination, and recent developments in various social movements and critical research texts. The rest of the article depicts three problematic consequences of the social model in practice and redirects them back to the social model as critical questions which need to be addressed by its proponents. First, there are questions of disability identity where a kind of 'purism' has been cultivated from the inside of the disability community. Here, it can be demonstrated that some people with certain types of impairments have not been welcomed into the disabled members1 group in UNISON, which means that the disability community is not yet inclusive, and that its membership has been skewed in a particular direction. Second, there are questions of disability politics where a kind of 'separatism' has been instituted. Whilst the UNISON constitution allows for separatism to be supplemented by both coalitions and transformations, these have been slow to materialise in practice, and the dearth of such checks and balances in the wider disabled peoples\* movement implies that the danger of developing a specific kind of disability ghetto is more acute. Third, there are questions of disability research where a kind of 'provisional-ism1 is suspended over the role of researchers. The most obvious dilemmas arise for the non-disabled researcher as would-be ally, but it is becoming clear that disabled academics can also be placed in a dilemmatic position, and it is doubtful whether any researcher can practise their craft to their own standards of excellence when operating under the provisos placed upon them by political campaigners.

#### Their rejection is grounded in acceptance of difference, which eradicate the subaltern

Roberts, Baylor University, Masters thesis in Communication, 7

(Jeff, *The Rhetorical Structure of Disability: Bridging the Gap Between What is ‘Spoken’ and What is ‘Said’ with Song - Over-Signifying with Personhood Against the Backdrop of Disease-Centric Discourse,* [http://www.google.com/url?sa=t&rct=j&q=&esrc=s&source=web&cd=37&ved=0CGkQFjAGOB4&url=http%3A%2F%2Fbeardocs.baylor.edu%2Fxmlui%2Fbitstream%2Fhandle%2F2104%2F5086%2FJeff\_Roberts\_Masters.pdf%3Fsequence%3D1&ei=hUL3T52RN4SlrQH1j6iLCQ&usg=AFQjCNHd4PB3kECHEjVxxEx07R2Oqb2EBg](http://www.google.com/url?sa=t&rct=j&q=&esrc=s&source=web&cd=37&ved=0CGkQFjAGOB4&url=http%3A%2F%2Fbeardocs.baylor.edu%2Fxmlui%2Fbitstream%2Fhandle%2F2104%2F5086%2FJeff_Roberts_Masters.pdf%3Fsequence%3D1&ei=hUL3T52RN4SlrQH1j6iLCQ&usg=AFQjCNHd4PB3kECHEjVxxEx) , Pg.7-8, FFF)

Founding action towards people with disabilities upon notions of difference, placing a primacy on difference particularly in the context of incorporation, domestication, and acceptance of such difference, dooms the struggle for equality to failure. “Over recent centuries all forms of violent otherness have been incorporated, willingly or under threat of force, into a discourse of difference which simultaneously implies inclusion and exclusion, recognition and discrimination (Baudrillard, 1993, p. 129).” Once the Native American “savage” became “accepted” under U.S. law as “human,” or rather a different type of human, it was not long until viral hatred forced new boundaries of difference to be erected, and segregation of such difference to be enacted in the form of the reservation. Where the “savage” or “monster” is never understood, or assimilated, remaining radically exotic to the oppressive guise of society, when “accepted” by society on the basis of “difference” viral racism allows only two options for the future: assimilation or extermination (Baudrillard, 1993). Similarly, modern medicine has facilitated society with an understanding of disability, allowing it to accept the “different” or “disabled” person under law as “human,” more specifically a “disabled human” in which is different from “normal” individuals, but none the less similar. “Madness, once its exclusionary status had been revoked, was caught up in the far subtler toils of psychology (Baudrillard, 1993, p. 129).” As soon as society began to understand and consequently attempt to “accept” the “monster” other, the other traded its quality of foreign “monsterness” for qualities of “feebleness,” with the social acceptance of the others difference, the “monster” soon became the “mongoloid.” “Difference” annihilated the subaltern subject by making all that was foreign and radically exotic within easy reach of societal understanding. With a compassion rooted in pity, and fear founded upon difference, society became locked into a mode of interaction with disability, and the individuals’ disability located itself within, which mandated oppression in the spirit of viral hatred.

#### Language is reversible – The introduction of injurious language simultaneously introduces the prospect of contestation

**Butler 97** Judith Butler, 1997, EXCITABLE SPEECH- politics of speech, ,KL

One is not simply fixed by the name that one is called. In being called an injurious name, one is derogated and demeaned. But the name holds out another possibility as well: by being called a name, one is also, paradaoxically, given a certain possibility for social existence, initiated into a temporal life of language that exceeds the prior purposes that animate that call. Thus the injurious address may appear to fix or paralyze the one it hails, but it may also produce an unexpected and enabling response. If to be addressed is to be interpellated, then the offensive call runs the risk of inaugurating a subject in speech who comes to use language to counter the offensive call. When the address is injurious, it works its force upon the one in injures.

#### Alt fails - disrupting the inequitable social constructions of people with disabilities is insufficient and leaves the disabled people excluded

Dewsbury et al 2k4

(Guy, Lancaster Univ, Karen Clarke, Lancaster Univ, Dave Randalll, Manchester Metropolitan Univ, Mark Rouncefield Lancaster, Ian Sommerville, Lancaster, The anti-social model of disability, Disability & Society, 19.2 March)

We do not share all **these concerns** as they **apply to the social model of disability**, for we are not menaced by constructionism, nor do we wish to promote one variety of truth claim over another. We are concerned specifically with how this helps. The constructionist focus, we feel, has altered our perspective on expertise such that **where we had previously unquestioningly accepted the professional expertise of medical practitioners, we now equally unquestioningly accept the expertise of the sociologist who wishes to undermine it.** **The social constructionist**, that is, **provides professional explanation by revealing the hidden nature of the social world in and through a number of typical steps.** These include: 1. **Showing that definitions** of a given concept **are shifting**, especially historically. Many social constructionist studies draw attention to the ways in which explanations that were accepted as matters of fact were embedded in the ideologies or discourses of the time and can now be clearly seen as absurd or wrong. 2. **Deriving from this that ‘things could be otherwise’** insofar as new and ‘constructionist’ models can be used contrastively with models that have preceded them, including models that still have a currency. 3. **Arguing that in some way this challenges the ‘social reality’** of the concept in question. 4. **Suggesting that this challenge to the social reality of any given social fact has important political consequences** and that the social constructionist is pivotal in the realization of these consequences. We think **there may be problems here**, mainly with steps 3 and 4. As Hacking (1999) has convincingly shown the validity and importance of challenges to social reality depend very much on what kind of challenge they are. Equally, we will suggest that **the apparent political importance of the constructionist position is largely rhetorical**. This is not to understate its importance, for rhetoric is a powerful force, but **it does not assist us with our ‘what to do next’ problem**. In explicating the various ways in which disability is a social construct the Social Model highlights the social features of what, on first consideration, might appear as a purely physical problem. As Humphrey argues: ‘… the social model harbours a number of virtues in redefining disability in terms of a disabling environment, repositioning disabled people as citizens with rights, and reconfiguring the responsibilities for creating, sustaining and overcoming disablism’ (Humphrey, 2000, p. 63). Again, there are self-evident, political, advantages in adopting this position. As Hacking suggests, ‘it **can still be liberating suddenly to realize that something is constructed and is not part of the nature of things**, of people, or human society’ (Hacking, 1999, p. 35). **However, the metaphor has grown tired, if not tiresome, and in the matter of what we call ‘practical politics’**, **that is the quite ordinary business of making-do, managing, coping** (and obviously everyone ‘makes do’, not just disabled people) **that might inform the design-related questions we want to ask, it is for the most part empty.** In order to pursue this theme, **we need to examine the sense in which the ‘social model’ can be seen as ‘radical’**, **for as with so many similar avowals there is less to this than meets the eye**. **Despite the supposedly ‘radical’ nature and claims of the social model of disability it clearly engages in the ordinary business of sociology** and, as Button (1991) suggests, **any radical claims are readily absorbed into everyday sociological debate.** **That is, radical political commitments are not radical sociologies**—**they are,** from within a sociological perspective**, unremarkable**. Radical causes are the very stuff of conventional sociology, conducted along conventional lines. Even, for example, **the argument that some current sociological approaches propagate a ‘disablist’ view of society that legitimates the treatment of disabled people, whilst simultaneously obscuring their real position within society is but a pale imitation of earlier, similar, Feminist and Marxist arguments. The application of the idea may be new but the idea itself, and the argument presented, is not.**

#### No alt solvency- exposing disability oppression does not lead to change in perception or attitude

**Donoghue, 2k3**

(Christopher, Fordham University, Challenging the authority of the medical definition of disability: an analysis of the resistance to the social constructionist paradigm, Disability & Society 18.2)

**In an effort to debunk the entrenched authority of the medical model, a social constructionist paradigm has been adopted** by many disability theorists and activists. They have suggested that society normally creates a negative social identity for people with disabilities (Gergen, 1985; Fine & Asch, 1988; Scotch, 1988; Brzuzy, 1997). **Through the construction of this identity, which is typically characterised by deviant or abnormal behaviour, the non-disabled majority is granted a legitimate means to exclude and isolate people with disabilities**. As removed members of society, their contributions are often discredited and their successes are treated as aberrations. Likewise, the expectations of people with disabilities are chronically low, and there is an ever-present suggestion that their lives are not necessarily worth living. This identity has been argued to derive from the medical model, which defines a disability as a deficiency that restricts one’s ability to perform normal life activities. By adopting the social constructionist viewpoint, theorists and activists have contended that society has created disability by choosing not to remove structural constraints that would enable more people to participate and gain access to social resources. **The social constructionist approach was an effective ideological rejoinder to the established medical model**. Yet the question of how to convince the non-disabled majority that society has disabled certain individuals has not been adequately resolved. The **activists** attempted to adopt the social constructionist theory as a basis for a minority group model of disability. They would **use this model to support a plea for action to people with disabilities as a mechanism to overcome the oppression being inflicted upon them by the non-disabled majority**. While it is clear that such a transformation of the definition of disability among academics and disability activists has clearly taken hold, **the disability movement appears to have achieved only limited success in changing the views of the non-disabled majority**. By accepting the reward of civil rights protection without insisting that the medical model be publicly dismantled, the hopes of the disability activists to change the views of the broader public may have been sacrificed. The willingness to make this concession may have stemmed from **the belief among social constructionist theorists that society will change its perception of disability if it is merely demonstrated that the prior notion has been made unjustly**. From a structural point of view, **it would seem to take much more to convince a dominant group in society that it needs to redistribute power and access to its treasured resources.** **The more desirable arrangement to the non-disabled majority is one that maintains the superiority of people with ‘normal’ abilities**. **As a result, the disabled are typically described as dysfunctional and are often perceived to be incapable of understanding the world in the same way that ‘normal’ people do.** Although **social constructionists** argue that such judgements regarding how people should be able to think or act are subjective notions that stem from dominant social ideologies, they may be said to **underestimate the extent to which those ideologies are created and legitimated by the non-disabled majority because they best serve their interests.**

#### Disability rhetoric doesn’t reinforce ableism and rejecting it doesn’t solve- their linguistic gymnastics just papers over oppression- turns the K

Pierce 2012 (Samantha Pierce, founder and Executive Director of NeuroDiversity Consulting, a firm dedicated to special needs families and educating parents and the community at large about neurodiversity, March 17, 2012, http://www.neurodiversityconsulting.org/1/post/2012/03/person-first-language-the-r-word-and-other-linguistic-gymnastics.html)

In sociology there is a theory, called the Sapir-Whorf thesis (also known as linguistic relativity) , which claims “people see and understand the world through the cultural lens of language.” (Macionis, 2011)\* To put it another way, language creates reality. Since Edward Sapir and Benjamin Whorf first put forth their theories on the relationship between language and reality in the first half of the last century sociologists have come to the conclusion that language doesn’t determine reality in any strict sense. For my part I think our language reflects our reality rather than genuinely creates it. But we still act as if we believe that language creates reality.¶ Consider the terms used to describe people with developmental disabilities. First we had imbeciles, morons, idiots. All originated as clinical terms to describe the developmentally disabled. We now know them as throw away insults used by young and old alike. In the span of a few decades we have seen the term “retarded”, once a clinical descriptor for those with developmental delays, degenerate into an insult so grave that there is a movement to stamp out the use of the word. It’s called the euphemism treadmill where new terms are developed to replace old terms that have come to be seen as derogatory. Even the term “special needs” seems to be taking its turn on the euphemism treadmill for some. ¶ All of this brings to me to the person, or people, first language movement. “People-first language is a form of linguistic prescriptivism in English, aiming to avoid perceived and subconscious dehumanization when discussing people with disabilities, as such forming an aspect of disability etiquette.” The idea is basically to name the person first and the descriptor of their condition second. In English we usually do things the other way round. Such tinkering with English sentence structure is seen by some as a good thing for the disabled. It is an effort to create a reality where the personhood of the disabled is valued and respected. In essence it is an attempt to apply the Sapir-Whorf thesis in its language creates reality form.¶ Advocates of person first language claim that we should embrace person first language “To ensure inclusion, freedom, and respect for all.” I agree with some of the sentiments expressed in the above linked article, such as,¶ “The real problem is never a person’s disability, but the attitudes of others! A change in our attitudes leads to changes in our actions. Attitudes drive actions.”¶ But I am more than a bit skeptical that acts of linguistic gymnastics will make any forward movement towards better treatment of and greater respect for the disabled. Unless we work to change attitudes about the disabled within our culture and within our society it’s not going to matter what clumsy, politically correct term is dreamed up next to gloss over the fact that the disabled are greatly devalued in our culture.¶ Person, or people, first language hinges on the idea that a person is a person first and their disability is secondary to their personhood. Now the problem with this kind of thinking is why anyone would think that identifying someone with their disability somehow denies their personhood. Another problem with person first language is that despite the fact that many of the disabled themselves reject the use of person first language and the reasoning behind it other, often nondisabled people, keep pushing for its use. In researching this article I found very few references among supporters of person first language to the opinions of the disabled about person first language (the two references were from Wikipedia and About.com.¶ One can find any number of articles, papers, and blog posts (add this one to that number), some written by the disabled and some not, pointing out the fatal flaws and clumsiness of person first language. Dr. C Edwin Vaughan wrote in his article People-First Language: An Unholy Crusade, ¶ I wonder if the proponents of people-first language believe that putting disabled people first on the printed page accomplishes anything in the real world? Does it alter attitudes, professional or otherwise, about disabilities? What is their evidence? The awkwardness of the preferred language calls attention to a person as having some type of "marred identity" (Goffman, 1963). But the misconceptions that diminish the lives of disabled people must still be countered directly.¶ In 1993 Kenneth Jernigan wrote, The Pitfalls of Political Correctness: Euphemisms Excoriated, which was published, and republished, in the Braille Monitor, a journal published by the Nation Federation of the blind. In his article he states,¶ As civilizations decline, they become increasingly concerned with form over substance, particularly with respect to language.¶ Euphemisms and the politically correct language which they exemplify are sometimes only prissy, sometimes ridiculous, and sometimes tiresome. Often, however, they are more than that. At their worst they obscure clear thinking and damage the very people and causes they claim to benefit.¶ The blind have had trouble with euphemisms for as long as anybody can remember, and late twentieth-century America is no exception. The form has changed (in fact, everything is very "politically correct"), but the old notions of inferiority and second-class status still remain. The euphemisms and the political correctness don't help. If anything, they make matters worse since they claim modern thought and new enlightenment.¶ Jernigan further went on to write in a resolution adopted by the National Federation of the Blind,¶ We believe that it is respectable to be blind, and although we have no particular pride in the fact of our blindness, neither do we have any shame in it. To the extent that euphemisms are used to convey any other concept or image, we deplore such use. We can make our own way in the world on equal terms with others, and we intend to do it.¶ In 1999 Joy Johnston wrote of the National Federation of the Blind’s response to person first language,¶ “That one sentiment alone provides the blind community with more empowerment than a thousand politically correct slogans could ever provide.”¶ In the same article we find,¶ What PC [political correctness] proponents fail to understand in their good-hearted mission is that changing the words a person speaks does not change the thoughts in their minds or the feelings in their heart. It's merely a surface solution that does not change the reality of what it is to be a female, a black man, or a disabled person in this society one iota.¶ Stop and consider the following: person with femaleness; person with maleness; person with blackness; person with deafness; person with blindness. All of these characteristics are an intrinsic part of an individual, you can’t separate them from the person. Person first language implies that personhood cannot coexist with disability. It stems from the erroneous assumption that acknowledging the important role that a disability plays in an individual’s life diminishes one’s personhood. What it communicates is the impression that one doesn’t really believe in the disabled individual’s personhood. The proliferation of person first language despite strong opposition to it from the disabled themselves certainly points to the devaluation of the disabled. Clearly “we” think “we” know what is better for “them” than they do never mind what they actually have to say for themselves.

### CP

#### Perm do the CP--- plan doesn’t preclude second strike, just requires congressional approval--- also, CP also restricts:

#### “Restrict” is just limit

Google Dictionary

re·strict

riˈstrikt/Submit

verb

1.

put a limit on; keep under control.

"some roads may have to be closed at peak times to restrict the number of visitors"

#### “Restrict” doesn’t preclude choice

Dictionary.com

re·strict [ri-strikt]

verb (used with object)

to confine or keep within limits, as of space, action, choice, intensity, or quantity.

#### There’d be three nuclear footballs

Forrester 1989 (Ray Forrester, Professor, Hastings College of the Law, University of California, former dean of the law schools at Vanderbilt, Tulane, and Cornell August 1989, “Presidential Wars in the Nuclear Age: An Unresolved Problem,” The George Washington Law Review, Lexis)

Obviously, it is not feasible to convene Congress for a decision as to whether the circumstances justify a declaration of war and the immediate launching of the missile. But perhaps it is not too bizarre to consider the use of three "nuclear footballs." Since the President is now able to have the "black bag" by his side at all times, it would seem feasible to require that a bag also be constantly available to a representative of the House and a representative of the Senate. Inconvenient, yes, but if the President can live with it, representatives of the Congress should also be able to do so. In this age of miracles in instant communication, the messages going to the President could be transmitted to all three at the same time, thereby prompting immediate consultation. The three, of course, would receive constant protection as the President is protected now. If one should not be available due to incapacity, the others would consult alone. My own inclination would be to require the President to receive the concurrence of at least one of the two in the President's plan of action. But for those more willing to trust the judgment of one person, the President's decision could control subject only to the safeguard of prior consultation.

#### Congress is as available as the NSC

Miller 1987 (William G. Miller, former Staff Director, Senate Select Committee on Intelligence.“A Congressional Committee on National Security: The Perspective from the Hill,” from First Use of Nuclear Weapons: Under the Constitution, Who Decides?, Questia)

The problem of congressional availability for time-urgent decisions was addressed in the Vietnam period. Senator Mike Mansfield first decided that, as a technical matter, Congress would never be out of session. When not formally in session it would be in recess, subject to recall of the chair. In addition, he established an informal duty roster of the leadership. Further, he ordered the Secretary of the Senate to maintain a list of telephone numbers for each member so that they could be contacted at any time and brought back to Washington within twenty-four hours, no matter where they were. As a practical matter, moreover, the leadership, by the nature of its role, is "always around" and would be available for consultation as readily as Cabinet officers or members of the NSC.¶ Another example illustrates the availability of Congress for crisis consultation. The Senate Intelligence Committee's first chairman, Daniel K. Inouye, made sure that he could be contacted by telephone, even when in Hawaii, within minutes. His successors have followed his example.¶ It is clear, therefore, that the Congress can organize itself to meet, discuss, advise, or decide on urgent issues. It is not much more difficult to assemble congressional leadership than it is the membership of the NSC. Secure telephones, teleprinters, available aircraft and other forms of transport all serve to make it possible for a responsible congressional committee to assemble quickly and confer on urgent national security issues.

#### Congress can suspend all other business

Miller 1987 (William G. Miller, former Staff Director, Senate Select Committee on Intelligence.“A Congressional Committee on National Security: The Perspective from the Hill,” from First Use of Nuclear Weapons: Under the Constitution, Who Decides?, Questia)

Finally, Congress has the means, through its own rule making process, to clear the decks at any time and set aside all other business to attend to urgent matters. Although changes in the rules are generally very difficult to make and usually are the result of long debate and deliberation, specific changes can relatively easily be incorporated into legislation. 14 A good case in point is Section 8 of Senate Resolution 400, 15 which created the Senate Intelligence Committee. It provides for votes within stated time frames on vital intelligence matters, such as the disclosure of classified material. The War Powers Resolution, 16 which was passed by the Congress over President Nixon's veto, restricts the time allowed for debate and also prescribes time frames for votes. 17¶ The simplest way to assure expedited procedure in national security decision making is to incorporate the desired procedure in the enabling resolution creating a congressional national security committee. Clearly, if the leadership of both parties is involved in pressing a particular issue to debate or vote, the Congress will have little difficulty in adapting its agenda to meet a crisis.

#### Nothing is ever that urgent, seriously

Miller 1987 (William G. Miller, former Staff Director, Senate Select Committee on Intelligence.“A Congressional Committee on National Security: The Perspective from the Hill,” from First Use of Nuclear Weapons: Under the Constitution, Who Decides?, Questia)

B. The Need for Expeditious Action¶ Another argument against congressional participation is that the time-urgency of national security decision making prevents consultation with Congress. This urgency allegedly makes the congressional deliberative process impossible; indeed the attendant delay could endanger the security of the nation.¶ Although this argument is plausible, it is not supported by the historical record. Even in sudden emergencies like the seizure of the Mayaguez, the shooting down of KAL 007, or the rescue of Americans in Grenada, there was sufficient time available for extensive consultation with Congress before decisions were made. In fact, the Mayaguez rescue might have been accomplished without loss of life if there had been more deliberation using the better information which later became available. In the case of Grenada, the political crisis on that small island had been brewing for several years, the Carter administration had consulted with Congress, and consultation by the Reagan administration would clearly have been desirable. In the KAL 007 incident, it was several days before the facts were available even to the executive.¶ It is clear, however, that the President could within his constitutional authority act without consultation if he reasonably believed that any delay would seriously endanger the security of the United States or certainly result in the death of Americans. The constitutionality of his actions would in these cases be measured by the results. But few, if any, issues that come before the President in the NSC or its informal variants for consideration, deliberation, or decision are of this immediacy. The case usually cited as an example of an urgent matter--the Cuban Missile Crisis--in fact extended over seven days, and the roots of the crisis went back months and years before the event.

### DA

#### Aff doesn’t take Nuke option off the table--- “nukes topic 101” I was in high school in 2009 and I know sole authority isn’t a mission

#### No evidence that Obama would use the PGS

#### \*Obama weak on nukes now

Gertz 2013 (Bill Gertz, June 20, 2013, “Obama Directs New Limits on Pentagon Nuclear Weapons Use,” Washington Free Beacon, http://freebeacon.com/obama-directs-new-limits-on-pentagon-nuclear-weapons-use/)

President Barack Obama this week ordered new limits on the use of U.S. nuclear weapons and called for sharp warhead cuts in a speech in Berlin aimed at what he called achieving “peace with justice.”¶ “Peace with justice means pursuing the security of a world without nuclear weapons, no matter how distant that dream may be,” Obama said on the eastern Berlin side of the Brandenburg Gate.¶ “And so as president, I’ve strengthened our efforts to stop the spread of nuclear weapons and reduce the number and role of America’s nuclear weapons.”¶ Obama announced that, after reviewing U.S. nuclear doctrine, “I’ve determined that we can ensure the security of America and our allies and maintain a strong and credible strategic deterrent while reducing our deployed strategic nuclear weapons by up to one-third.”¶ It was not clear from the speech whether the president planned to cut the deployed warhead arsenal from the 2010 New START arms treaty level of 1,550 to around 1,000 unilaterally or with another arms pact with Moscow.¶ Obama said he intended to seek “negotiated cuts” with Russia but appeared to leave open a unilateral one-third warhead arsenal reduction by the United States.

#### That’s eliminating 500 nukes

McLeary 2013 (Paul McLeary, June 19, 2013, “Obama sparks new fight in seeking huge nuke reductions,” Navy Times, http://www.navytimes.com/article/20130619/NEWS05/306190033/Obama-sparks-new-fight-seeking-huge-nuke-reductions)

President Barack Obama upped the ante in a growing political debate, announcing to a crowd in Berlin that he is set to propose slashing the U.S. nuclear arsenal by one-third, or about 500 warheads, in the coming years.¶ Speaking at the famous Brandenburg Gate, where U.S. presidents from John Kennedy to Ronald Reagan have made dramatic policy speeches, the president said that while “we may no longer live in fear of global annihilation, but so long as nuclear weapons exist, we are not truly safe.”

#### Obama just announced nuke reductions

Beauchamp 2013 (Zack Beauchamp, June 19, 2013, “Obama Announces New Plans To Reduce Global Nuclear Weapons Stockpile,” Think Progress, http://thinkprogress.org/security/2013/06/19/2179481/obama-announces-new-plans-to-reduce-global-nuclear-weapons-stockpile/)

In a speech at the Brandenburg Gate in Berlin, a historic symbol of the end of the Cold War, President Obama announced new plans to move towards reducing the American and global nuclear weapons stockpiles in order to reduce the risks these dangerous weapons pose to humanity as a whole.¶ Limiting the spread of nuclear weapons has long been a priority for Obama, dating at least back to his time as a Senator, when he introduced and authored several bills on the topic. In April 2009, the president declared moving towards “a world without nuclear weapons” to be a key American foreign policy objective.¶ The Administration has principally pursued this goal through treaty negotiations with Russia, which produced the “New START” treaty in 2010. Under New START, each former Cold War adversary agreed to cut their deployed nuclear weapons to 1,550, a 30 percent reduction from the previous 2002 bilateral agreement between the two states. Notably, however, New START placed no limits on non-deployed warheads.¶ The initiative Obama announced on Wednesday at Brandenburg would build on New START by cutting US and Russian deployed warhead levels by (ideally) another third, though the final reductions would likely be determined in negotiations between the two states. “After a comprehensive review,” Obama said, “I’ve determined that we can ensure the security of America and our allies, and maintain a strong and credible strategic deterrent, while reducing our deployed strategic nuclear weapons by up to one-third. And I intend to seek negotiated cuts with Russia to move beyond Cold War nuclear postures.”