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#### Restrictions impose limits on action- regulations merely manage practices associated

Schackleford 17 J. is a justice of the Supreme Court of Florida. “Atlantic Coast Line Railroad Company, a corporation, et al., Plaintiff in Error, v. The State of Florida, Defendant in Error,” 73 Fla. 609; 74 So. 595; 1917 Fla., Lexis

There would seem to be no occasion to discuss whether or not the Railroad Commissioners had the power and authority to make the order, requiring the three specified railroads running into the City of Tampa to erect a union passenger station in such city, which is set out in the declaration in the instant case and which we have copied above. [\*\*\*29] It is sufficient to say that under the reasoning and the authorities cited in State v. Atlantic Coast Line R. Co., 67 Fla. 441, 458, 63 South. Rep. 729, 65 South. Rep. 654, and State v. Jacksonville Terminal [\*631] Co., supra, it would seem that HN14the Commissioners had power and authority. The point which we are required to determine is whether or not the Commissioners were given the authority to impose the fine or penalty upon the three railroads for the recovery of which this action is brought. In order to decide this question we must examine Section 2908 of the General Statutes of 1906, which we have copied above, in the light of the authorities which we have cited and from some of which we have quoted. It will be observed that the declaration alleges that the penalty imposed upon the three railroads was for the violation of what is designated as "Order No. 282," which is set out and which required such railroads to erect and complete a union depot at Tampa within a certain specified time. If the Commissioners had the authority to make such order, it necessarily follows that they could enforce a compliance with the same by appropriate proceedings in the courts, but [\*\*\*30] it does not necessarily follow that they had the power and authority to penalize the roads for a failure to comply therewith. That is a different matter. HN15Section 2908 of the General Statutes of 1906, which originally formed Section 12 of Chapter 4700 of the Laws of Florida, (Acts of 1899, p. 86), expressly authorizes the imposition of a penalty by the Commissioners upon "any railroad, railroad company or other common carrier doing business in this State," for "a violation or disregard of any rate, schedule, rule or regulation, provided or prescribed by said commission," or for failure "to make any report required to be made under the provisions of this Chapter," or for the violation of "any provision of this Chapter." It will be observed that the word "Order" is not mentioned in such section. Are the other words used therein sufficiently comprehensive to embrace an order made by the Commissioners, such as the one now under consideration? [\*632] It could not successfully be contended, nor is such contention attempted, that this order is covered by or embraced within the words "rate," "schedule" or "any report,' therefore we may dismiss these terms from our consideration and [\*\*\*31] direct our attention to the words "rule or regulation." As is frankly stated in the brief filed by the defendant in error: "It is admitted that an order for the erection of a depot is not a 'rate' or 'schedule' and if it is not a 'rule' or 'regulation' then there is no power in the Commissioners to enforce it by the imposition of a penalty." It is earnestly insisted that the words "rule or regulation" are sufficiently comprehensive to embrace such an order and to authorize the penalty imposed, and in support of this contention the following authorities are cited: Black's Law Dictionary, defining regulation and order; Rapalje & Lawrence's Law Dictionary, defining rule; Abbott's Law Dictionary, defining rule; Bouvier's Law Dictionary, defining order and rule [\*\*602] of court; Webster's New International Dictionary, defining regulation; Curry v. Marvin, 2 Fla. 411, text 515; In re Leasing of State Lands, 18 Colo. 359, 32 Pac. Rep. 986; Betts v. Commissioners of the Land Office, 27 Okl. 64, 110 Pac. Rep. 766; Carter V. Louisiana Purchase Exposition Co., 124 Mo. App. 530, 102 S.W. Rep. 6, text 9; 34 Cyc. 1031. We have examined all of these authorities, as well as those cited by the [\*\*\*32] plaintiffs in error and a number of others, but shall not undertake an analysis and discussion of all of them. While it is undoubtedly true that the words, rule, regulation and order are frequently used as synonyms, as the dictionaries, both English and law, and the dictionaries of synonyms, such as Soule's show, it does not follow that these words always mean the same thing or are interchangeable at will. It is well known that the same word used in different contexts may mean a different thing by virtue of the coloring which the word [\*633] takes on both from what precedes it in the context and what follows after. Thus in discussing the proper constructions to be placed upon the words "restrictions and regulations" as used in the Constitution of this State, then in force, Chap. 4, Sec. 2, No. 1, of Thompson's Digest, page 50, this court in Curry v. Marvin, 2 Fla. 411, text 415, which case is cited to us and relied upon by both the parties litigant, makes the following statement: "The word restriction is defined by the best lexicographers to mean limitation, confinement within bounds, and would seem, as used in the constitution, to apply to the amount and to the time [\*\*\*33] within which an appeal might to be taken, or a writ of error sued out. The word regulation has a different signification -- it means method, and is defined by Webster in his Dictionary, folio 31, page 929, to be 'a rule or order prescribed by a superior for the management of some business, or for the government of a company or society.' This more properly perhaps applies to the mode and form of proceeding in taking and prosecuting appeals and writs of error. By the use of both of those terms, we think that something more was intended than merely regulating the mode and form of proceedings in such cases." Thus, in Carter v. Louisiana Purchase Exposition Co., 124 Mo. App. 530, text 538, 102 S.W. Rep. 6, text 9, it is said, "The definition of a rule or order, which are synonymous terms, include commands to lower courts or court officials to do ministerial acts." In support of this proposition is cited 24 Amer. & Eng. Ency. of Law 1016, which is evidently an erroneous citation, whether the first or second edition is meant. See the definition of regulate and rule, 24 amer. & Eng. Ency. of Law (2nd Ed.) pages 243 to 246 and 1010, and it will be seen that the two words are not always [\*\*\*34] synonymous, much necessarily depending upon the context and the sense in which the words are used. Also see the discussion [\*634] of the word regulation in 34 Cyc. 1031. We would call especial attention to Morris v. Board of Pilot Commissioners, 7 Del. chan. 136, 30 Atl. Rep. 667, text 669, wherein the following statement is made by the court: "These words 'rule' and the 'order,' when used in a statute, have a definite signification. They are different in their nature and extent. A rule, to be valid, must be general in its scope, and undiscriminating in its application; an order is specific and not limited in its application. The function of an order relates more particularly to the execution or enforcement of a rule previously made." Also see 7 Words & Phrases 6271 and 6272, and 4 Words & Phrases (2nd Ser.) 419, 420. As we held in City of Los Angeles v. Gager, 10 Cal. App. 378, 102 Pac. Rep. 17, "The meaning of the word 'rules' is of wide and varied significance, depending upon the context; in a legal sense it is synonymous with 'laws.'" If Section 2908 had contained the word order, or had authorized the Commissioners to impose a penalty for the violation of any order [\*\*\*35] made by them, there would be no room for construction. The Georgia statute, Acts of 1905, p. 120, generally known as the "Steed Bill," entitled "An act to further extend the powers of the Railroad Commission of this State, and to confer upon the commission the power to regulate the time and manner within which the several railroads in this State shall receive, receipt for, forward and deliver to its destination all freight of every character, which may be tendered or received by them for transportation; to provide a penalty for non-compliance with any and all reasonable rules, regulations and orders prescribed by the said commission in the execution of these powers, and for other purposes," expressly authorized the Railroad Commissioners "to provide a penalty for non-compliance with any and all reasonable rules, regulations and orders prescribed by the said Commision." [\*635] See Pennington v. Douglas, A. & G. Ry. Co., 3 Ga. App. 665, 60 S.E. Rep. 485, which we cited with approval in State v. Atlantic Coast Line R. Co., 56 fla. 617, text 651, 47 South. Rep. 969, 32 L.R.A. (N.S.) 639. Under the reasoning in the cited authorities, especially State v. Atlantic Coast Line R. Co., [\*\*\*36] supra, and Morris v. Board of Pilot Commissioners, we are constrained to hold that the fourth and eighth grounds of the demurrer are well founded and that HN16the Railroad Commissioners were not empowered or authorized to impose a penalty upon the three railroads for failure to comply with the order for the erection of a union depot.

#### Vote negative-

#### Limits- there are infinite ways the Congress could implement oversight policies over the areas of the topic- under their interpretation anything that condemns an action after the fact constitutes a restriction

#### Bidirectionality- allowing oversight affs allows actual increases in executive action in topical areas- all of the affs that say they make drones more legitimate by reviewing them ex post- ex post review also can result in legitimation of current practice and flexibility
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#### Immigration reform will pass --- political capital is key

Matthews, 10/16 (Laura, 10/16/2013, “2013 Immigration Reform Bill: 'I'm Going To Push To Call A Vote,' Says Obama,” <http://www.ibtimes.com/2013-immigration-reform-bill-im-going-push-call-vote-says-obama-1429220)>)

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

#### Having to defend authority derails the current agenda

Kriner 10 Douglas L. Kriner (assistant professor of political science at Boston University) “After the Rubicon: Congress, Presidents, and the Politics of Waging War”, University of Chicago Press, Dec 1, 2010, page 68-69.

While congressional support leaves the president’s reserve of political capital intact, congressional criticism saps energy from other initiatives on the home front by forcing the president to expend energy and effort defending his international agenda. Political capital spent shoring up support for a president’s foreign policies is capital that is unavailable for his future policy initiatives. Moreover, any weakening in the president’s political clout may have immediate ramifications for his reelection prospects, as well as indirect consequences for congressional races.59 Indeed, Democratic efforts to tie congressional Republican incumbents to President George W. Bush and his war policies paid immediate political dividends in the 2006 midterms, particularly in states, districts, and counties that had suffered the highest casualty rates in the Iraq War. 60 In addition to boding ill for the president’s perceived political capital and reputation, such partisan losses in Congress only further imperil his programmatic agenda, both international and domestic. Scholars have long noted that President Lyndon Johnson’s dream of a Great Society also perished in the rice paddies of Vietnam. Lacking the requisite funds in a war-depleted treasury and the political capital needed to sustain his legislative vision, Johnson gradually let his domestic goals slip away as he hunkered down in an effort first to win and then to end the Vietnam War. In the same way, many of President Bush’s highest second-term domestic proprieties, such as Social Security and immigration reform, failed perhaps in large part because the administration had to expend so much energy and effort waging a rear-guard action against congressional critics of the war in Iraq.61 When making their cost-benefit calculations, presidents surely consider these wider political costs of congressional opposition to their military policies. If congressional opposition in the military arena stands to derail other elements of his agenda, all else being equal, the president will be more likely to judge the benefits of military action insufficient to its costs than if Congress stood behind him in the international arena.

#### Court action triggers the link

Calabresi 2008(Massimo Calabresi, June 26, 2008, “Obama's Supreme Move to the Center Washington” TIME Magazine, http://www.time.com/time/politics/article/0,8599,1818334,00.html)

When the Supreme Court issues rulings on hot-button issues like gun control and the death penalty in the middle of a presidential campaign, Republicans could be excused for thinking they'll have the perfect opportunity to paint their Democratic opponent as an out-of-touch social liberal. But while Barack Obama may be ranked as one of the Senate's most liberal members, his reactions to this week's controversial court decisions showed yet again how he is carefully moving to the center ahead of the fall campaign. On Wednesday, after the Supreme Court ruled that the death penalty was unconstitutional in cases of child rape, Obama surprised some observers by siding with the hardline minority of Justices Scalia, Thomas, Roberts and Alito. At a press conference after the decision, Obama said, "I think that the rape of a small child, six or eight years old, is a heinous crime and if a state makes a decision that under narrow, limited, well-defined circumstances the death penalty is at least potentially applicable, that that does not violate our Constitution." Then Thursday, after Justice Scalia released his majority opinion knocking down the city of Washington's ban on handguns, Obama said in a statement, "I have always believed that the Second Amendment protects the right of individuals to bear arms, but I also identify with the need for crime-ravaged communities to save their children from the violence that plagues our streets through common-sense, effective safety measures. The Supreme Court has now endorsed that view." John McCain's camp wasted no time in attacking, with one surrogate, conservative Senator Sam Brownback of Kansas, calling Obama's gun control statement "incredible flip-flopping." McCain advisor Randy Scheunemann was even tougher in a conference call Thursday. "What's becoming clear in this campaign," Scheunemann said, is "that for Senator Obama the most important issue in the election is the political fortunes of Senator Obama. He has demonstrated that there really is no position he holds that isn't negotiable or isn't subject to change depending on how he calculates it will affect his political fortunes." Politicians are always happy to get a chance to accuse opponents of flip-flopping, but McCain's team may be more afraid of Obama's shift to the center than their words betray. Obama has some centrist positions to highlight in the general election campaign on foreign policy and national security, social issues and economics. His position on the child rape death penalty case, for example, is in line with his record in Illinois of supporting the death penalty. He is on less solid ground on the gun ban as his campaign said during the primary that he believed the D.C. law was constitutional. A top legal adviser to Obama says both cases are consistent with his previous positions. "I don't see him as moving in his statements on the death penalty or the gun case," says Cass Sunstein, a former colleague of Obama's at the University of Chicago. Sunstein says Obama is "not easily characterized" on social issues, and says the Senator's support for allowing government use of the Ten Commandments in public, in some cases, is another example of his unpredictability on such issues. On the issue of gun control, he says Obama has always expressed a belief that the Second Amendment guarantees a private right to bear arms, as the court found Thursday. But Obama's sudden social centrism would sound more convincing in a different context. Since he wrapped up the primary earlier this month and began to concentrate on the independent and moderate swing voters so key in a general election, Obama has consistently moved to the middle. He hired centrist economist Jason Furman, known for defending the benefits of globalization and private Social Security accounts, to the displeasure of liberal economists. On Father's Day, Obama gave a speech about the problem of absentee fathers and the negative effects it has on society, in particular scolding some fathers for failing to "realize that what makes you a man is not the ability to have a child — it's the courage to raise one." Last week, after the House passed a compromise bill on domestic spying that enraged liberals and civil libertarians, Obama announced that though he was against other eavesdropping compromises in the past, this time he was going to vote for it. Whether Obama's new centrist sheen is the result of flip-flopping or reemphasizing moderate positions, the Supreme Court decisions have focused attention again on the role of the court in the campaign season. McCain himself is vulnerable to charges of using the Supreme Court for political purposes. Earlier this month, when the court granted habeas corpus rights to accused terrorist prisoners at Guantanamo Bay, McCain attacked the opinion in particularly harsh language, though advisers say closing the prison there is high on his list of actions to rehabilitate America's image around the world. Liberals are hoping that despite Obama's moderate response to the Supreme Court decisions, the issues alone will rally supporters to him. "What both of these decisions say to me is that the Supreme Court really is an election-year issue," says Kathryn Kolbert, president of People For the American Way. "We're still only one justice away from a range of really negative decisions that would take away rights that most Americans take for granted," she says. And Obama's run to the center surely won't stop conservatives from using the specter of a Democratic-appointed Supreme Court to try to rally support. "Its pretty clear that if he's elected and Justice Scalia or Kennedy retires that he's going to appoint someone who's very likely to reverse [the gun control decision]," says Eugene Volokh, a professor at the UCLA School of Law. Given how Obama has been responding to the recent Supreme Court decisions, however, you're not likely to hear him talking about appointing liberal justices much between now and November.

#### Reform key to the economy – immigrants are key to several critical sectors

West, ‘09 – Director of Governance Studies at the Brookings Institution (7/22/09, Darrell M., “The Path to a New Immigration Reform,” http://www.brookings.edu/opinions/2009/0721\_immigration\_reform\_west.aspx)

Skeptics need to understand how important a new immigration policy is to American competitiveness and long-term economic development. High-skill businesses require a sufficient number of scientists and engineers. Many industries such as construction, landscaping, health care and hospitality services are reliant on immigrant labor. Farmers need seasonal workers for agricultural productivity. Critics who worry about resource drains must understand that immigrants spend money on goods and services, pay taxes and perform jobs and start businesses vital to our economy. Beyond the economy, immigration reform prospects improve considerably across a fresh political landscape that features a popular Democratic president armed with substantial Democratic majorities in the House and Senate, many who appear receptive to comprehensive reform. Obama has called repeatedly for big ideas and bold policy actions. The country needs new policies that emphasize the importance of immigrant workers \_ across the skills spectrum \_ to our country's long-term financial future. Our universities invest millions in training foreign students but then send them home without any U.S. job opportunities that would take advantage of their new skills. And investing in the children of middle- and lower-skilled immigrants is wise as we recognize their majority role in our workforce as the next generation rises.

#### Extinction

Harris and Burrows, ‘09 [Mathew, PhD European History at Cambridge, counselor in the National Intelligence Council (NIC) and Jennifer, member of the NIC’s Long Range Analysis Unit “Revisiting the Future: Geopolitical Effects of the Financial Crisis” <http://www.ciaonet.org/journals/twq/v32i2/f_0016178_13952.pdf>]

Increased Potential for Global Conflict Of course, the report encompasses more than economics and indeed believes the future is likely to be the result of a number of intersecting and interlocking forces. With so many possible permutations of outcomes, each with ample Revisiting the Future opportunity for unintended consequences, there is a growing sense of insecurity. Even so, history may be more instructive than ever. While we continue to believe that the Great Depression is not likely to be repeated, the lessons to be drawn from that period include the harmful effects on fledgling democracies and multiethnic societies (think Central Europe in 1920s and 1930s) and on the sustainability of multilateral institutions (think League of Nations in the same period). There is no reason to think that this would not be true in the twenty-first as much as in the twentieth century. For that reason, the ways in which the potential for greater conflict could grow would seem to be even more apt in a constantly volatile economic environment as they would be if change would be steadier. In surveying those risks, the report stressed the likelihood that terrorism and nonproliferation will remain priorities even as resource issues move up on the international agenda. Terrorism’s appeal will decline if economic growth continues in the Middle East and youth unemployment is reduced. For those terrorist groups that remain active in 2025, however, the diffusion of technologies and scientific knowledge will place some of the world’s most dangerous capabilities within their reach. Terrorist groups in 2025 will likely be a combination of descendants of long established groups\_inheriting organizational structures, command and control processes, and training procedures necessary to conduct sophisticated attacks\_and newly emergent collections of the angry and disenfranchised that become self-radicalized, particularly in the absence of economic outlets that would become narrower in an economic downturn. The most dangerous casualty of any economically-induced drawdown of U.S. military presence would almost certainly be the Middle East. Although Iran’s acquisition of nuclear weapons is not inevitable, worries about a nuclear-armed Iran could lead states in the region to develop new security arrangements with external powers, acquire additional weapons, and consider pursuing their own nuclear ambitions. It is not clear that the type of stable deterrent relationship that existed between the great powers for most of the Cold War would emerge naturally in the Middle East with a nuclear Iran. Episodes of low intensity conflict and terrorism taking place under a nuclear umbrella could lead to an unintended escalation and broader conflict if clear red lines between those states involved are not well established. The close proximity of potential nuclear rivals combined with underdeveloped surveillance capabilities and mobile dual-capable Iranian missile systems also will produce inherent difficulties in achieving reliable indications and warning of an impending nuclear attack. The lack of strategic depth in neighboring states like Israel, short warning and missile flight times, and uncertainty of Iranian intentions may place more focus on preemption rather than defense, potentially leading to escalating crises. 36 Types of conflict that the world continues to experience, such as over resources, could reemerge, particularly if protectionism grows and there is a resort to neo-mercantilist practices. Perceptions of renewed energy scarcity will drive countries to take actions to assure their future access to energy supplies. In the worst case, this could result in interstate conflicts if government leaders deem assured access to energy resources, for example, to be essential for maintaining domestic stability and the survival of their regime. Even actions short of war, however, will have important geopolitical implications. Maritime security concerns are providing a rationale for naval buildups and modernization efforts, such as China’s and India’s development of blue water naval capabilities. If the fiscal stimulus focus for these countries indeed turns inward, one of the most obvious funding targets may be military. Buildup of regional naval capabilities could lead to increased tensions, rivalries, and counterbalancing moves, but it also will create opportunities for multinational cooperation in protecting critical sea lanes. With water also becoming scarcer in Asia and the Middle East, cooperation to manage changing water resources is likely to be increasingly difficult both within and between states in a more dog-eat-dog world.
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#### Text: The president of the United States should sign a directive that consolidates lead executive authority for planning and conducting targeted killings under the Department of Defense.

#### An executive directive transferring authority from the CIA to the DOD is key to targeted killing reform

Zenko 13 Micah Zenko, Douglas Dillon fellow in the Center for Preventive Action (CPA) at the Council on Foreign Relations, worked for five years at Harvard University’s Kennedy School of Government, and in Washington, DC, at the Brookings Institution, Congressional Research Service, and State Department's Office of Policy Planning, “Clip the Agency's Wings, Why Obama needs to take the drones away from the CIA.”, Foreign Policy, April 16th, 2013, http://www.foreignpolicy.com/articles/2013/04/16/clip\_the\_agencys\_wings\_cia\_drones

Implementing the 9/11 Commission recommendation has been proposed repeatedly over the last nine years, but neither the Bush nor Obama administrations seriously considered it. Subsequently, the lead executive authority for targeted killings became divided between the CIA and Joint Special Operations Command (JSOC) -- a subunified command of Special Operations Command. Since 9/11, with a few exceptions, non-battlefield targeted killings have been carried out in Pakistan by the CIA, in Somalia by JSOC, and in Yemen by both. (The CIA also conducted one drone strike in the Philippines in 2006.) Of the approximately 420 targeted killing attempts, the lead executive authority for over 90 percent has been the CIA.¶ Last month, Daniel Klaidman reported that three senior officials had told him that President Obama would gradually transfer targeted killings to the Pentagon during his second term. Other journalists report that this is not a certainty or that "it would most likely leave drone operations in Pakistan under the CIA," making any transition meaningless since over 80 percent of all U.S. targeted killings have occurred in Pakistan. But if Obama is serious about reforming targeted killing policies, as he has stated, then he needs to sign an executive order transferring lead executive authority for non-battlefield targeted killings from the CIA to the Defense Department. Doing this has three significant benefits for U.S. foreign policy.

#### Bipartisian support for the CP – congress and the military think our strategy solves reform better

Zenko 13 Micah Zenko, Douglas Dillon Fellowat the Council on Foreign Relations, “Transferring CIA Drone Strikes to the Pentagon”, Council on Foreign Relations, April 2013, http://www.cfr.org/wars-and-warfare/reforming-us-drone-strike-policies/p29736

In 2004, the 9/11 Commission recommended that the "lead responsibility for directing and executing paramilitary operations, whether clandestine or covert, should shift to the Defense Department" to avoid the "creation of redundant, overlapping capabilities and authorities in such sensitive work." The recommendation was never seriously considered because the CIA wanted to retain its covert action authorities and, more important, it was generally believed such operations would remain a rarity. (At the time, there had been only one nonbattlefield targeted killing.) Nearly a decade later, there is increasing bipartisan consensus that consolidating lead executive authority for drone strikes would pave the way for broader strategic reforms, including declassifying the relevant legal memoranda, explicitly stating which international legal principles apply, and providing information to the public on existing procedures that prevent harm to civilians. During his February 2013 nomination hearing, CIA director John O. Brennan welcomed the transfer of targeted killings to the DOD: "The CIA should not be doing traditional military activities and operations."
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#### Counterterrorism is effective now

Anderson 2013 [Kenneth Anderson Professor of Law, Washington College of Law, American University, and Research Fellow, The Hoover Institution, Stanford University and Member of its Task Force on National Security and the Law May 24, 2013 “The Case for Drones” Real Clear Politics http://www.realclearpolitics.com/articles/2013/05/24/the\_case\_for\_drones\_118548-full.html]

Barack Obama campaigned for his first presidential term on the platform of ending America’s wars. Obama voters and much of the rest of the world figured this promise referred not only to the conventional conflicts in Iraq and Afghanistan, but also to what liberals considered the long and unnecessary national nightmare of the war on terror. It now seems clear he was misunderstood—though we don’t know yet whether the misunderstanding was by Obama’s design or due to changes that took place after he assumed office. Obama’s policy proved not to be “peace breaks out.” It was, rather, that America would wind down its two counterinsurgency, boots-on-the-ground wars and undertake a refocused effort against the terrorists who had set this all in motion. He framed it this way during the 2008 race. “If Pakistan cannot or will not take out al-Qaeda leadership when we have actionable intelligence about their whereabouts,” he said on the campaign trail, “we will act to protect the American people. There can be no safe haven for al-Qaeda terrorists.” No safe havens—that has been Barack Obama’s strategic lodestar in the war on terror.¶ It is this proposition, more than any other, that gets us to drone warfare.¶ Even as Obama publicly disdained the institutions and methodologies of Bush’s war on terror, he was issuing a new call to arms in that war. Taking the fight directly to the enemy required a means of combat other than counterinsurgency warfare on the ground, and the United States turned to a technology the Israelis had used effectively in their war against Palestinian terrorists: unmanned surveillance drones, now weaponized.¶ This tool had been used during the Bush administration, but sparingly-—largely due to geopolitical fears, but also because it was only by the second Bush term that the CIA had established ground-level human-intelligence networks in Afghanistan and Pakistan sufficient for making independent targeting decisions without having to rely on the questionable and self-interested information coming from Pakistan’s intelligence services.¶ The strategy has worked far better than anyone expected. It is effective, and has rightfully assumed an indispensable place on the list of strategic elements of U.S. counterterrorism-on-offense.

#### Legal restrictions are the key issue for drones usefulness for counterterror

Anderson 2009 [Kenneth Anderson Professor of Law, Washington College of Law, American University, and Research Fellow, The Hoover Institution, Stanford University and Member of its Task Force on National Security and the Law May 11, 2009 “Targeted Killing in U.S. Counterterrorism Strategy and Law” A Working Paper of the Series on Counterterrorism and American Statutory Law, a joint project of the Brookings Institution, the Georgetown University Law Center, and the Hoover Institution]

American domestic law—the law codifying the existence of the CIA and defining its functions—has long accepted implicitly at least some uses of force, including targeted killing, as self-defense toward ends of vital national security that do not necessarily fall within the strict terms of armed conflict in the sense meant by the Geneva Conventions and other international treaties on the conduct of armed conflict. Categories of the use of force short of armed conflict or war in a juridical sense—by intelligence services such as the CIA, for example—or by military agents in furtherance of national self defense and vital security interests, yet outside of the legal condition of armed conflict, date back in codified law to the founding of the CIA and, in state practice by the United States and other sovereigns, far further still. Yet as a matter of legal justification, successive administrations have already begun to cede this ground. Even the Bush Administration, with its unrivaled enthusiasm for executive power, always sought to cast its killing targets as the killing of combatants in what it legally characterized as armed conflicts, governed by the laws of war on the conduct of hostilities, known as “international humanitarian law” (IHL). This concession, however, if followed by the Obama Administration and beyond, will likely reduce the practical utility of a policy and security tool of both long- standing provenance and proven current value. It will likely reduce the flexibility of the United States to respond to emerging threats before they ripen into yet another war with non-state terrorists, and it will reduce the ability of the United Sates to address terrorist threats in the most discriminating fashion advancing technology permits.

#### There is a linear increase in risk every time the Aff prevents action

Metz 2013 [Steven Metz is a defense analyst and the author of "Iraq and the Evolution of American Strategy." His weekly WPR column, Strategic Horizons, appears every Wednesday 27 Feb 2013 World Politics Review “Strategic Horizons: The Strategy Behind U.S. Drone Strikes” http://www.worldpoliticsreview.com/articles/12747/strategic-horizons-the-strategy-behind-u-s-drone-strikes]

The current strategy of containing al-Qaida-style extremism may repeat this pattern. Its strategic logic is the same, even if its methods differ. Yet, as during the Cold War, remaining steadfast until the strategy works will not be easy. Many parts of it are difficult, even repellent. Drone strikes are an example. But there is no other sustainable method of offensive actions that can effectively hinder the ability of the terrorists to organize and execute attacks. Even though this conflict does not look like the sort of traditional wars that Americans are used to, it cannot be handled like a law enforcement issue. And those who support a strictly defensive version of containment may be right that al-Qaida's flame will eventually burn out on its own. But without an offensive element to U.S. strategy, this day will be postponed, increasing the chances that a terrorist will get through America's defenses. And extending the conflict also brings even greater suffering to the people al-Qaida and its ilk hide behind.¶ Nearly all Americans would embrace a strategy that counters and defeats al-Qaida-style extremists without using drone strikes. So far, though, critics of the drones have not provided a viable alternative or made the case that the strategic costs of drones outweigh the benefits. At this point, drones remain the only effective offensive tool in a strategy that requires them.

#### Nuclear terrorism breaks the taboo- causes escalation

Bin ‘9 (5-22-09 About the Authors Prof. Li Bin is a leading Chinese expert on arms control and is currently the director of Arms Control Program at the Institute of International Studies, Tsinghua University. He received his Bachelor and Master Degrees in Physics from Peking University before joining China Academy of Engineering Physics (CAEP) to pursue a doctorate in the technical aspects of arms control. He served as a part-time assistant on arms control for the Committee of Science, Technology and Industry for National Defense (COSTIND).Upon graduation Dr. Li entered the Institute of Applied Physics and Computational Mathematics (IAPCM) as a research fellow and joined the COSTIND technical group supporting Chinese negotiation team on Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty (CTBT). He attended the final round of CTBT negotiations as a technical advisor to the Chinese negotiating team. Nie Hongyi is an officer in the People’s Liberation Army with an MA from China’s National Defense University and a Ph.D. in International Studies from Tsinghua University, which he completed in 2009 under Prof. Li Bin. )

**The nuclear taboo is a** kind **of international norm and this type of norm is supported by the promotion of the norm through international social exchange.** **But at present the increased threat of nuclear terrorism has lowered people’s confidence that nuclear weapons will not be used**. **China and the United States have a broad common interest in combating nuclear terrorism.** **Using technical and institutional measures to break the foundation of nuclear terrorism and lessen the possibility of a nuclear terrorist attack can not only weaken the danger of nuclear terrorism itself but also** strengthen people’s confidence in the nuclear taboo**, and in this way preserve an international environment beneficial to both China and the United States.** **In this way even if there is crisis in China-U.S. relations caused by conflict, the nuclear taboo can also help both countries reduce suspicions about the nuclear weapons problem, avoid miscalculation and thereby reduce the** danger of a nuclear war**.**

### Acctblty

#### Drones don’t hurt relations with the Yemeni people- they hate AQAP more

Swift 2012 [Christopher Swift is a fellow at the University of Virginia’s Center for National Security Law and author of the forthcoming “The Fighting Vanguard: Local Insurgencies in the Global Jihad July 1, 2012 Foreign Affairs “The Drone Blowback Fallacy¶ Strikes in Yemen Aren't Pushing People to Al Qaeda” http://www.foreignaffairs.com/articles/137760/christopher-swift/the-drone-blowback-fallacy]

Despite Yemenis’ antipathy toward drones, my conversations also revealed a surprising degree of pragmatism. Those living in active conflict zones drew clear distinctions between earlier U.S. operations, such as the Majala bombing, and more recent strikes on senior al Qaeda figures. “Things were very bad in 2009,” a tribal militia commander from Abyan province told me, “but now the drones are seen as helping us.” He explained that Yemenis could “accept [drones] as long as there are no more civilian casualties.” An Islamist member of the separatist al-Harak movement offered a similar assessment. “Ordinary people have become very practical about drones,” he said. “If the United States focuses on the leaders and civilians aren’t killed, then drone strikes will hurt al Qaeda more than they help them.”¶ Some of the men I interviewed admitted that they had changed their minds about drone strikes. Separatists in Aden who openly derided AQAP as a proxy of Yemen’s recently deposed president, Ali Abdullah Saleh, privately acknowledged the utility of the U.S. drone campaign. “Saleh created this crisis in order to steal from America and stay in power,” a former official from the now-defunct People’s Democratic Republic of Yemen told me. “Now it is our crisis, and we need every tool to solve it.”¶ Yemeni journalists, particularly those with firsthand exposure to AQAP, shared this view: “I opposed the drone campaign until I saw what al Qaeda was doing in Jaar and Zinjibar,” an independent reporter in Aden said. “Al Qaeda hates the drones, they’re absolutely terrified of the drones … and that is why we need them.”

#### the SQ is the best possible pace for stability

Danya Greenfield Thursday, October 24, 2013 deputy director of the Rafik Hariri Center for the Middle East at the Atlantic Council.

<http://mideast.foreignpolicy.com/posts/2013/10/24/yemen_s_final_stretch> Yemen’s final stretch

Rushing the process could potentially undermine the positive gains that have been made by setting in motion a situation in which the majority of Southerners reject the outcome or refuse to participate. At the same time, there is a delicate balance between not rushing the process and giving license to continual delays and postponement. Yemenis almost take pride in their reputation of endless delaying and then last minute negotiations at the 11th hour before a deadline. Finding the right balance is not an easy task, but that is why clearly defining a new framework and timeline -- sooner rather than later -- is so essential. These discussions are now underway among the Yemeni powers-that-be, but mostly behind closed doors, and this is what generates fear and distrust among other political actors outside this process and the public. Again, this is where the international community can play a useful role by formalizing the process and demonstrating the willingness to rethink the wisdom of the initial GCC-mandated plan. Ultimately, international players are motivated primarily by an interest in preserving Yemen's security and stability, but rushing to the finish line does not achieve this in any sustainable way, and doing so may undermine the delicate gains made to date.

#### Middle East won’t escalate

#### No military capacity – internal capacity to de-escalate overwhelms your links

Steven A. Cook (fellow at the Council on Foreign Relations) Ray Takeyh (fellows at the Council on Foreign Relations) and Suzanne Maloney (senior fellow at Saban Center) June 28 2007 “Why the Iraq war won't engulf the Mideast”, International Herald Tribune

Yet, the Saudis, Iranians, Jordanians, Syrians, and others are very unlikely to go to war either to protect their own sect or ethnic group or to prevent one country from gaining the upper hand in Iraq. The reasons are fairly straightforward. First, Middle Eastern leaders, like politicians everywhere, are primarily interested in one thing: self-preservation. Committing forces to Iraq is an inherently risky proposition, which, if the conflict went badly, could threaten domestic political stability. Moreover, most Arab armies are geared toward regime protection rather than projecting power and thus have little capability for sending troops to Iraq. Second, there is cause for concern about the so-called blowback scenario in which jihadis returning from Iraq destabilize their home countries, plunging the region into conflict. Middle Eastern leaders are preparing for this possibility. Unlike in the 1990s, when Arab fighters in the Afghan jihad against the Soviet Union returned to Algeria, Egypt and Saudi Arabia and became a source of instability, Arab security services are being vigilant about who is coming in and going from their countries. In the last month, the Saudi government has arrested approximately 200 people suspected of ties with militants. Riyadh is also building a 700 kilometer wall along part of its frontier with Iraq in order to keep militants out of the kingdom. Finally, there is no precedent for Arab leaders to commit forces to conflicts in which they are not directly involved. The Iraqis and the Saudis did send small contingents to fight the Israelis in 1948 and 1967, but they were either ineffective or never made it. In the 1970s and 1980s, Arab countries other than Syria, which had a compelling interest in establishing its hegemony over Lebanon, never committed forces either to protect the Lebanese from the Israelis or from other Lebanese. The civil war in Lebanon was regarded as someone else’s fight. Indeed, this is the way many leaders view the current situation in Iraq. To Cairo, Amman and Riyadh, the situation in Iraq is worrisome, but in the end it is an Iraqi and American fight. As far as Iranian mullahs are concerned, they have long preferred to press their interests through proxies as opposed to direct engagement. At a time when Tehran has access and influence over powerful Shiite militias, a massive cross-border incursion is both unlikely and unnecessary. So Iraqis will remain locked in a sectarian and ethnic struggle that outside powers may abet, but will remain within the borders of Iraq. The Middle East is a region both prone and accustomed to civil wars. But given its experience with ambiguous conflicts, the region has also developed an intuitive ability to contain its civil strife and prevent local conflicts from enveloping the entire Middle East.

#### They have no empirical data – history disproves escalation – squo coping mechanisms solve

Paul Cochrane (Middle East correspondent for International News Services) January 31, 2011 “The Middle East: On the edge of the abyss?”

Countless times I've read analysis and the blurb on the back of books that the Middle East is ‘on the brink’, a ‘tinderbox’ ready to explode due to the nepotistic nature of governments and the dire economic conditions of much of the region. Now more than ever, these predictions look like they may be coming true - a dictatorial regime has fallen in Tunisia and another is tottering in Egypt. Some of these analyses have predicted the imminent fall of the Middle East's regimes and monarchies for the past four decades. A Middle East ‘spring’ was just around the corner, the people would rise up and the region's overwhelmingly authoritarian regimes would no longer have their days in the sun. Democracy would prevail. There have certainly been many coups, the overthrow of kings and dictators, and - of course - wars since the region was cookie-cut into separate countries through the fall of the Ottoman Empire, before and after World War One. But that tinder box never exploded. It didn't happen after the 1967 or 1973 wars between Arab states and Israel; it didn't happen after the 1979 Islamic revolution in Iran; it didn't happen following the 1990-91 Second Gulf war or the 2003 US-led invasion of Iraq; and it didn't happen after the July 2006 war between Israel and Lebanon's Hezbollah. The sparks that could have ignited the tinderbox were diffused, snuffed out by the internal security forces and outside meddling, and the malaise continued. But it would seem that these analyses forecasting the Middle East's imminent explosion were premature. It has taken until now for the people to stand up en masse and say ‘kifaya’, ‘enough’ in Arabic - enough of high unemployment, corruption, cronyism, repression, phony elections, lousy education and low standards of living.

#### Drone removal causes legitimacy problems for Pakistan’s government- they can’t pass the buck the US anymore

Walsh 2013 [Declan Walsh May 25, 2013 New York Times “U.S. Shift Poses Risk to Pakistan” http://www.nytimes.com/2013/05/26/world/asia/us-shift-poses-risk-to-pakistan.html?pagewanted=1&\_r=0&ref=asia]

The American presence also created a giant blind spot in Pakistan’s political psyche: with so much focus on American operations, Pakistani leaders used the United States as a scapegoat to avoid tackling some homegrown problems. Lurid tales of American espionage and other skulduggery abounded in the news media, promoted by politicians and mullahs but also fanned by real-life controversies like the shooting of two Pakistanis by the C.I.A. contractor Raymond Davis in January 2011. Now that calculus is shifting for Pakistani policy makers. From now on, they will be less able to rely on the cloak-and-dagger workings of the drone program to have it both ways. Indeed, many fear a replay of the early 1990s when, after the departure of Soviet troops from Afghanistan, the United States withdrew abruptly, leaving behind a cadre of fired-up Islamist fighters, and then imposed sanctions on Pakistan for its nuclear weapons program.

#### They need us- especially the generals

Walsh 2013 [Declan Walsh May 25, 2013 New York Times “U.S. Shift Poses Risk to Pakistan” http://www.nytimes.com/2013/05/26/world/asia/us-shift-poses-risk-to-pakistan.html?pagewanted=1&\_r=0&ref=asia]

Behind the bellicose speech, there is a complex dependency on both sides. While Pakistan’s powerful generals have grown to resent the United States, they also lean on American military aid as a steady source of income in an economy so shaky it may soon require a bailout from the International Monetary Fund. The generals also rely on transfers of American military hardware to keep their fleet of F-16 fighters in the air.

#### Drones don’t cause blowback in Pakistan- we all forget how much they hated the Taliban

Anderson 2013 [Kenneth Anderson Professor of Law, Washington College of Law, American University, and Research Fellow, The Hoover Institution, Stanford University and Member of its Task Force on National Security and the Law May 24, 2013 “The Case for Drones” Real Clear Politics http://www.realclearpolitics.com/articles/2013/05/24/the\_case\_for\_drones\_118548-full.html]

It is sharply contested, to say the least, whether and to what extent drone strikes are creating blowback among villagers, or whether and to what extent, as a former British soldier recently returned from Afghanistan remarked to me, villagers are sad to see the Taliban commander who just insisted on marrying someone’s young daughter blown up in an airstrike. There is also debate about the degree to which villagers are aware that the American drones are undertaking strikes that the Pakistani government might otherwise undertake. Critics often neglect to focus on the Pakistani government’s regular and brutal assaults in the tribal zones. Despite a general perception that all of Pakistan is united against drone strikes, voices in the Pakistani newspapers have often made note that the tribal areas fear the Pakistani army far more than they fear U.S. drones, because, despite mistakes and inevitable civilian casualties, they see them as smaller and more precise. But the blunt reality is that as the counterinsurgency era ends for U.S. forces, narrow blowback concerns about whether villages might be sufficiently provoked against American infantry are subsiding.

#### Deterrence prevents India/Pakistan conflict

Tepperman 2009 (Jonathan Tepperman, Deputy Editor at Newsweek Magazine and former Deputy Managing Editor of Foreign Affairs, September 14, 2009, Newsweek, September 14, 2009, Lexis Academic)

The record since then shows the same pattern repeating: nuclear-armed enemies slide toward war, then pull back, always for the same reasons. The best recent example is India and Pakistan, which fought three bloody wars after independence before acquiring their own nukes in 1998. Getting their hands on weapons of mass destruction didn't do anything to lessen their animosity. But it did dramatically mellow their behavior. Since acquiring atomic weapons, the two sides have never fought another war, despite severe provocations (like Pakistani-based terrorist attacks on India in 2001 and 2008). They have skirmished once. But during that flare-up, in Kashmir in 1999, both countries were careful to keep the fighting limited and to avoid threatening the other's vital interests. Sumit Ganguly, an Indiana University professor and coauthor of the forthcoming India, Pakistan, and the Bomb, has found that on both sides, officials' thinking was strikingly similar to that of the Russians and Americans in 1962. The prospect of war brought Delhi and Islamabad face to face with a nuclear holocaust, and leaders in each country did what they had to do to avoid it.

#### Pakistan stable – governments are politically stable, militancy is decreasing

Omar Khan Saturday, October 26, 2013 Good news from Pakistan

<http://www.thenews.com.pk/Todays-News-2-210329-Good-news-from-Pakistan>

Pakistan today is proud to complete its first full democratic cycle and peaceful handover of power to the next elected government. Prime Minister Nawaz Sharif is a third time seasoned prime minister and people have shown their confidence by electing him during this critical phase in our national history. All the provincial and federal governments are politically stable and co-existing with each other focusing on development of the poor people while the military stands firmly behind the democratically elected government. The people of Pakistan have shown their resolve against extremism by rejecting any such forces again and again during elections and world ought to respect this resilience on the part of the people. The people of Pakistan are united in their resolve to end the menace of extremism whether through dialogue or otherwise and it appears that things are finally moving to a closure of this long standing issue. Pakistan has its share of problems however it has started to tackle these issues now. It may take sometime to resolve the issues pertaining to terrorism, economy and service delivery however the direction seems right and the people are hopeful. If you still have doubts, visit Pakistan sometime soon and a pleasant surprise shall indeed be waiting for you.

### Norms

#### Other countries aren’t drone threats

Zenko 2013 (Micah Zenko, Douglas Dillon fellow in the Center for Preventive Action at CFR, previously worked at Harvard Kennedy School and State Department, January 2013, “Reforming U.S. Drone Strike Policies,” CFR Special Report No 56)

Based on current trends, it is unlikely that most states will have, within ten years, the complete system architecture required to carry out distant drone strikes that would be harmful to U.S. national interests. However, those candidates able to obtain this technology will most likely be states with the financial resources to purchase or the industrial base to manufacture tactical short-range armed drones with limited firepower that lack the precision of U.S. laser-guided munitions; the intelligence collection and military command-and-control capabilities needed to deploy drones via line-of-sight communications; and cross- border adversaries who currently face attacks or the threat of attacks by manned aircraft, such as Israel into Lebanon, Egypt, or Syria; Russia into Georgia or Azerbaijan; Turkey into Iraq; and Saudi Arabia into Yemen. When compared to distant U.S. drone strikes, these contingen- cies do not require system-wide infrastructure and host-state support. Given the costs to conduct manned-aircraft strikes with minimal threat to pilots, it is questionable whether states will undertake the significant investment required for armed drones in the near term.

#### Aff can’t stop drone prolif

Metz 2013 [Steven Metz is a defense analyst and the author of "Iraq and the Evolution of American Strategy." His weekly WPR column, Strategic Horizons, appears every Wednesday 27 Feb 2013 World Politics Review “Strategic Horizons: The Strategy Behind U.S. Drone Strikes” http://www.worldpoliticsreview.com/articles/12747/strategic-horizons-the-strategy-behind-u-s-drone-strikes]

Both of these arguments are shaky. There is little or no evidence that nations facing a serious enemy base their response on U.S. actions. States do what they feel they have to do. The implication that if the United States did not use drones against insurgents other nations would not simply defies common sense. On the second point, there is no doubt that drone strikes create anger. Unfortunately, this does tend to be directed at the United States rather than at the extremists who elected to use human shields in the first place. But again there is no evidence that a significant number of potential terrorists or terrorist supporters were motivated exclusively or primarily by American drone strikes.

#### Other countries cannot export drones

Zenko 2013 [Micah Zenko is the Douglas Dillon fellow in the Center for Preventive Action (CPA) at the Council on Foreign Relations (CFR). Previously, he worked for five years at the Harvard Kennedy School and in Wash- ington, DC, at the Brookings Institution, Congressional Research Ser- vice, and State Department’s Office of Policy Planning January 2013 Council on Foreign Relations Special Report no. 65 “Reforming U.S. Drone Strike Policies”]

There are also few examples of armed drone sales by other countries. After the United States, Israel has the most developed and varied drone capabilities; according to the Stockholm International Peace Research Institute (SIPRI), Israel was responsible for 41 percent of drones exported between 2001 and 2011.57 While Israel has used armed drones in the Palestinian territories and is not a member of the MTCR, it has pre- dominantly sold surveillance drones that lack hard points and electri- cal engineering. Israel reportedly sold the Harop, a short-range attack drone, to France, Germany, Turkey, and India. Furthermore, Israel allows the United States to veto transfers of weapons with U.S.-origin technology to select states, including China.58 Other states invested in developing and selling surveillance drones have reportedly refrained from selling fully armed versions. For example, the UAE spent five years building the armed United-40 drone with an associated Namrod missile, but there have been no reported deliveries.59 A March 2011 analysis by the mar- keting research firm Lucintel projected that a “fully developed [armed drone] product will take another decade.”60

#### The impact is a decade away and not likely

Zenko 2013 [Micah Zenko is the Douglas Dillon fellow in the Center for Preventive Action (CPA) at the Council on Foreign Relations (CFR). Previously, he worked for five years at the Harvard Kennedy School and in Wash- ington, DC, at the Brookings Institution, Congressional Research Ser- vice, and State Department’s Office of Policy Planning January 2013 Council on Foreign Relations Special Report no. 65 “Reforming U.S. Drone Strike Policies”]

Based on current trends, it is unlikely that most states will have, within ten years, the complete system architecture required to carry out distant drone strikes that would be harmful to U.S. national interests. However, those candidates able to obtain this technology will most likely be states with the financial resources to purchase or the industrial base to manufacture tactical short-range armed drones with limited firepower that lack the precision of U.S. laser-guided munitions; the intelligence collection and military command-and-control capabilities needed to deploy drones via line-of-sight communications; and cross- border adversaries who currently face attacks or the threat of attacks by manned aircraft, such as Israel into Lebanon, Egypt, or Syria; Russia into Georgia or Azerbaijan; Turkey into Iraq; and Saudi Arabia into Yemen. When compared to distant U.S. drone strikes, these contingen- cies do not require system-wide infrastructure and host-state support. Given the costs to conduct manned-aircraft strikes with minimal threat to pilots, it is questionable whether states will undertake the significant investment required for armed drones in the near term.

#### No China war over territorial claims

Carlson 2-21 [Allen Carlson Associate Professor in the Government Department of Cornell University 2-21-2013 Foreign Affairs “China Keeps the Peace at Sea” http://www.foreignaffairs.com/articles/139024/allen-carlson/china-keeps-the-peace-at-sea]

The nuclear test, though, is a red herring in terms of the conflict over the disputed islands. In truth, the roots of the conflict -- and the reasons it has not yet exploded -- are much deeper. Put simply, China cannot afford military conflict with any of its Asian neighbors. ¶ It is not that China believes it would lose such a spat; the country increasingly enjoys strategic superiority over the entire region, and it is difficult to imagine that its forces would be beaten in a direct engagement over the islands, in the South China Sea or in the disputed regions along the Sino-Indian border. However, Chinese officials see that even the most pronounced victory would be outweighed by the collateral damage that such a use of force would cause to Beijing's two most fundamental national interests -- economic growth and preventing the escalation of radical nationalist sentiment at home. These constraints, rather than any external deterrent, will keep Xi Jinping, China's new leader, from authorizing the use of deadly force in the Diaoyu Islands theater. ¶ For over three decades, Beijing has promoted peace and stability in Asia to facilitate conditions amenable to China's economic development. The origins of the policy can be traced back to the late 1970s, when Deng Xiaoping repeatedly contended that to move beyond the economically debilitating Maoist period, China would have to seek a common ground with its neighbors. Promoting cooperation in the region would allow China to spend less on military preparedness, focus on making the country a more welcoming destination for foreign investment, and foster better trade relations. All of this would strengthen the Chinese economy. Deng was right. Today, China's economy is second only to that of the United States. ¶ The fundamentals of Deng's grand economic strategy are still revered in Beijing. But any war in the region would erode the hard-won, and precariously held, political capital that China has gained in the last several decades. It would also disrupt trade relations, complicate efforts to promote the yuan as an international currency, and send shock waves through the country's economic system at a time when it can ill afford them. There is thus little reason to think that China is readying for war with Japan. ¶ At the same time, the specter of rising Chinese nationalism, although often seen as a promoter of conflict, further limits the prospects for armed engagement. This is because Beijing will try to discourage nationalism if it fears it may lose control or be forced by popular sentiment to take an action it deems unwise. Ever since the Tiananmen Square massacre put questions about the Chinese Communist Party's right to govern before the population, successive generations of Chinese leaders have carefully negotiated a balance between promoting nationalist sentiment and preventing it from boiling over. In the process, they cemented the legitimacy of their rule. A war with Japan could easily upset that balance by inflaming nationalism that could blow back against China's leaders. Consider a hypothetical scenario in which a uniformed Chinese military member is killed during a firefight with Japanese soldiers. Regardless of the specific circumstances, the casualty would create a new martyr in China and, almost as quickly, catalyze popular protests against Japan. ¶ Demonstrators would call for blood, and if the government (fearing economic instability) did not extract enough, citizens would agitate against Beijing itself. Those in Zhongnanhai, the Chinese leadership compound in Beijing, would find themselves between a rock and a hard place. ¶ It is possible that Xi lost track of these basic facts during the fanfare of his rise to power and in the face of renewed Japanese assertiveness. It is also possible that the Chinese state is more rotten at the core than is understood. That is, party elites believe that a diversionary war is the only way to hold on to power -- damn the economic and social consequences. ¶ But Xi does not seem blind to the principles that have served Beijing so well over the last few decades. Indeed, although he recently warned unnamed others about infringing upon China's "national core interests" during a foreign policy speech to members of the Politburo, he also underscored China's commitment to "never pursue development at the cost of sacrificing other country's interests" and to never "benefit ourselves at others' expense or do harm to any neighbor." ¶ Of course, wars do happen -- and still could in the East China Sea. Should either side draw first blood through accident or an unexpected move, Sino-Japanese relations would be pushed into terrain that has not been charted since the middle of the last century. ¶ However, understanding that war would be a no-win situation, China has avoided rushing over the brink. This relative restraint seems to have surprised everyone. But it shouldn't. Beijing will continue to disagree with Tokyo over the sovereign status of the islands, and will not budge in its negotiating position over disputed territory. However, it cannot take the risk of going to war over a few rocks in the sea. On the contrary, in the coming months it will quietly seek a way to shelve the dispute in return for securing regional stability, facilitating economic development, and keeping a lid on the Pandora's box of rising nationalist sentiment. The ensuing peace, while unlikely to be deep, or especially conducive to improving Sino-Japanese relations, will be enduring.

#### Legitimacy is not key to cooperation

Kagan 2006 (Robert, The Washington Post, 1/15, http://www.carnegieendowment.org/publications/index.cfm?fa=view&id=17894&prog=zgp&proj=zusr

The striking thing about the present international situation is the degree to which America remains what Bill Clinton once called "the indispensable nation." Despite global opinion polls registering broad hostility to George W. Bush's United States, the behavior of governments and political leaders suggests America's position in the world is not all that different from what it was before Sept. 11 and the Iraq war. The much-anticipated global effort to balance against American hegemony -- which the realists have been anticipating for more than 15 years now -- has simply not occurred. On the contrary, in Europe the idea has all but vanished. European Union defense budgets continue their steady decline, and even the project of creating a common foreign and defense policy has slowed if not stalled. Both trends are primarily the result of internal European politics. But if they really feared American power, Europeans would be taking more urgent steps to strengthen the European Union's hand to check it. Nor are Europeans refusing to cooperate, even with an administration they allegedly despise. Western Europe will not be a strategic partner as it was during the Cold War, because Western Europeans no longer feel threatened and therefore do not seek American protection. Nevertheless, the current trend is toward closer cooperation. Germany's new government, while still dissenting from U.S. policy in Iraq, is working hard and ostentatiously to improve relations

#### International system resilient – no conflict

Christopher Preble (director of foreign policy studies at the Cato Institute) August 2010 “U.S. Military Power: Preeminence for What Purpose?” http://www.cato-at-liberty.org/u-s-military-power-preeminence-for-what-purpose/

Most in Washington still embraces the notion that America is, and forever will be, the world’s indispensable nation. Some scholars, however, questioned the logic of hegemonic stability theory from the very beginning. A number continue to do so today. They advance arguments diametrically at odds with the primacist consensus. Trade routes need not be policed by a single dominant power; the international economy is complex and resilient. Supply disruptions are likely to be temporary, and the costs of mitigating their effects should be borne by those who stand to lose — or gain — the most. Islamic extremists are scary, but hardly comparable to the threat posed by a globe-straddling Soviet Union armed with thousands of nuclear weapons. It is frankly absurd that we spend more today to fight Osama bin Laden and his tiny band of murderous thugs than we spent to face down Joseph Stalin and Chairman Mao. Many factors have contributed to the dramatic decline in the number of wars between nation-states; it is unrealistic to expect that a new spasm of global conflict would erupt if the United States were to modestly refocus its efforts, draw down its military power, and call on other countries to play a larger role in their own defense, and in the security of their respective regions. But while there are credible alternatives to the United States serving in its current dual role as world policeman / armed social worker, the foreign policy establishment in Washington has no interest in exploring them. The people here have grown accustomed to living at the center of the earth, and indeed, of the universe. The tangible benefits of all this military spending flow disproportionately to this tiny corner of the United States while the schlubs in fly-over country pick up the tab.

#### Drone prolif will be used for surveillance- ensures tensions don’t escalate to war because its not a human that is getting shot down

Foust 10-21 [Joshua Foust is a fellow at the American Security Project and the author of Afghanistan Journal: Selections from Registan.net. He is also a member of the Young Atlanticist Working Group. 10-21- 2013 “Drones: Scary, but Good for Peace” https://medium.com/war-is-boring/4b34e1826a76]

Looking more broadly, it’s clear that remotely piloted aircraft like the BZK-005, the Global Hawk, and the dozens of other models being developed by most advanced militaries will come to dominate military overflights — the ancient sabre-rattling that seems to accompany any two advanced militaries operating nearby to each other.¶ Though relatively expensive to develop and operate, drones allow for a much longer flight time over sensitive areas, and the lack of a pilot inside the aircraft makes it expendable should something bad happen and it gets shot down or crashes.¶ So should Japan start swatting Chinese drones out of the sky, it will matter — tensions will almost certainly get worse. But it also won’t involve the lives of pilots being put at risk, which lowers the chance of another Hainan Island incident (when a U.S. EP-3 spy plane collided with a Chinese F-8 interceptor).¶ And maybe, that’s something to look forward to: conflict with the stakes lowered so much they don’t compel both sides to outright war.

#### Drones prevent conflict- ensures distinction that prevents escalation

Stimson 13 Charles “Cully” Stimson, Manager, National Security Law Program and Senior Legal Fellow, served as deputy assistant secretary of defense for detainee affairs. He advised then-Secretary of Defense Donald Rumsfeld and coordinated the Pentagon’s global detention policy and operations, including at Guantanamo Bay and in Iraq and Afghanistan, holds a law degree from the George Mason University School of Law. He is a graduate of Kenyon College and studied at Harvard and Exeter universities. An avid runner and triathlete, he serves on the board of the U.S. Soccer Foundation. He and his wife reside in Maryland with their four children and a black Labrador Retriever, “Law of Armed Conflict and the Use of Military Force”, Heritage Foundation, May 16th, 2013, http://www.heritage.org/research/testimony/2013/05/the-law-of-armed-conflict

These principles are particularly important to keep in mind when, for example, discussing the Committee’s questions concern the use of remotely piloted aircraft, or “drones.” Although the technology may be new, drones are simply tools subject to the same principles for deployment as any other weapons system employed under the law of armed conflict. As my colleague Steven Groves has explained in an exhaustively detailed report on the legal basis for drone warfare, the Obama Administration’s framework for carrying out targeted strikes with drones appears to adhere to recognized principles of the law of war described above.[4] Indeed, drones may allow a greater degree of distinction than previous generations of weapons technology, reducing expected collateral damage and injuries. In this way, the United States may carry out the necessities of warfare in a highly efficient and targeted fashion.¶ I also agree with the point raised by the Brookings Institution’s Benjamin Wittes that any thoughtful discussion of drone warfare must distinguish between policy and means. Much criticism of drone warfare is actually criticism of broader policies, such as the application of the law of armed conflict to the present conflict, geographical limitations on such conflict, and targeting decisions. Whether a strike is carried out by a drone or an airplane (with the pilot in the vehicle itself) has little or no bearing on these broader policy issues.[5] As Wittes explains, drone use is appropriate in the context of an armed conflict.

# 2NC

## 2NC T

### A2: w/m Restrict Ability to Act Without Judicial Review/ Authority Interp

#### Restriction on authority must limit presidential discretion

**Lobel, 8** - Professor of Law, University of Pittsburgh Law School (Jules, “Conflicts Between the Commander in Chief and Congress: Concurrent Power over the Conduct of War” 392 OHIO STATE LAW JOURNAL [Vol. 69:391, <http://moritzlaw.osu.edu/students/groups/oslj/files/2012/04/69.3.lobel_.pdf>)

So  too, the congressional power to declare or authorize war has been long held to permit Congress to authorize and wage a limited war—“limited in place, in objects, and in time.” 63 When Congress places such restrictions on the President’s authority to wage war, it limits the President’s discretion to conduct battlefield operations. For example, Congress authorized President George H. W. Bush to attack Iraq in response to Iraq’s 1990 invasion of Kuwait, but it confined the President’s authority to the use of U.S. armed forces pursuant to U.N. Security Council resolutions directed to force Iraqi troops to leave Kuwait. That restriction would not have permitted the President to march into Baghdad after the Iraqi army had been decisively ejected from Kuwait, a limitation recognized by President Bush himself.64

#### Targeted killing authority is based on imminence of the threat- only an ex ante restriction can limit action based on that

McKelvey 11 (Benjamin, JD Candidate, Senior Editorial Board – Vanderbilt Journal of Transnational Law, “Due Process Rights and the Targeted Killing of Suspected Terrorists: The Unconstitutional Scope of Executive Killing Power,” Vanderbilt Journal of Transnational Law, November, 44 VAND. J. TRANSNAT'L L. 1353, <http://www.vanderbilt.edu/jotl/2012/06/due-process-rights-and-the-targeted-killing-of-suspected-terrorists-the-unconstitutional-scope-of-executive-killing-power/>)

¶ Therefore, the President was justified in using lethal force to protect the nation against Aulaqi, or any other American, if that individual presented a concrete threat that satisfied the “imminence” standard.109 However, the judiciary may, as a matter of law, review the use of military force to ensure that it conforms with the limitations and conditions of statutory and constitional grants of authority.110 In the context of targeted killing, a federal court could evaluate the targeted killing program to determine whether it satisfies the constitutional standard for the use of defensive force by the Executive Branch. Targeted killing, by its very name, suggests an entirely premeditated and offensive form of military force.111 Moreover, the overview of the CIA’s targeted killing program revealed a rigorous process involving an enormous amount of advance research, planning, and approval.112 While the President has exclusive authority over determining whether a specific situation or individual presents an imminent threat to the nation, the judiciary has the authority to define “imminence” as a legal standard.113 These are general concepts of law, not political questions, and they are subject to judicial review.114

[Continues to Footnote]

114. Al-Aulaqi Response, supra note 2, at 24–25 (acknowledging its authority to define “imminence” yet declining to do so because it would require the court to determine “ex ante the permissible scope of particular tactical decisions”); Dehn & Heller, supra note 16, at 179 (referring to the government’s motion to dismiss on the basis that it “involv[es] an executive-branch decision to target an individual in the context of a congressionally authorized, armed conflict”); id. at 187 (noting Aulaqi’s request for the court to make a legal determination of the correct standard for the targeted killing of a U.S. citizen).

### A2: Restrictions Can Happen After the Fact

#### Supervision isn’t a restriction – prefer comparative ev

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

3. The ordinary definition of the term "restrictions" also does not include the reporting and monitoring or supervising terms and conditions that are included in the 2001 Stipulation. ¶ Black's Law Dictionary, 'fifth edition,(1979) defines "restriction" as; ¶ A limitation often imposed in a deed or lease respecting the use to which the property may be put. The term "restrict' is also cross referenced with the term "restrain." Restrain is defined as; To limit, confine, abridge, narrow down, restrict, obstruct, impede, hinder, stay, destroy. To prohibit from action; to put compulsion on; to restrict; to hold or press back. To keep in check; to hold back from acting, proceeding, or advancing, either by physical or moral force, or by interposing obstacle, to repress or suppress, to curb. ¶ In contrast, the terms "supervise" and "supervisor" are defined as; To have general oversight over, to superintend or to inspect. See Supervisor. A surveyor or overseer. . . In a broad sense, one having authority over others, to superintend and direct. The term "supervisor" means an individual having authority, in the interest of the employer, to hire, transfer, suspend, layoff, recall, promote, discharge, assign, reward, or discipline other employees, or responsibility to direct them, or to adjust their grievances, or effectively to recommend such action, if in connection with the foregoing the exercise of such authority is not of a merely routine or clerical nature, but required the use of independent judgment. ¶ Comparing the above definitions, it is clear that the definition of "restriction" is very different from the definition of "supervision"-very few of the same words are used to explain or define the different terms. In his 2001 stipulation, Mr. Kincheloe essentially agreed to some supervision conditions, but he did not agree to restrict his license.

#### A. Most logical—the significance of one-of-many issues is minimal. Constraints inherently increase meaning.

#### B. It’s a precursor—education is inevitable, unfocused education isn’t productive. Limits determine the direction and productivity of learning.

#### Small schools- Huge topic with constantly developing literature magnifies resource disparities- Big programs can have a new aff every other round- No topic generics sufficient to restore balance

#### Key to fairness- essential to ensure that debates at the end of the year have meaningful clash over the mechanism

### A2: Ex Ante Illegal

#### Ex ante is not unconstitutional

Epstein, 11 [Michael, Michigan State University College of Law “Targeted Killing Court: Why The United States Needs To Adopt International Legal Standards For Targeted Killings And How To Do So In A Domestic Court”, SSRN]

Although the FISA Court and the NSA’s use of surveillance techniques under FISA have been recently challenged by the ACLU375, FISA has generally been upheld as being constitutional.376 FISA has been upheld not to violate Article III of the Constitution, the political question doctrine, or the separation of powers doctrine377; the disparate treatment of domestic and foreign targets under FISA has been upheld as rationally related to the purposes of acquiring information necessary to national defense and the conduct of foreign affairs.378 Specifically, FISA has been held to meet the warrant requirements under the Fourth Amendment by providing a neutral and detached judicial officer;379 and comport with due process when applications are properly made in accordance with the FISA procedures.380 While the National Security Agency (“NSA”)’s claim that the AUMF pre-empted the need to follow FISA procedures was held to violate the Constitution381

#### Congressional creation of the court solves the reasons ex ante review has been rejected

Opderbeck 2013 [David Opderbeck Professor of Law, Seton Hall University Law School, and Director, Gibbons Institute of Law, Science & Technology “Drone Courts” August 2, 2013 Seton Hall Public Law Research Paper No. 2305315 SSRN]

A related objection to a specialized court is that existing judicial procedures can address abuses under existing law.314 This does not seem to be the case with respect to ex ante remedies, however. Notably, the father of Anwar Al-Aulaqi, an American citizen who was killed in a drone strike on September 30, 2011, had sought an injunction in 2010 to bar the U.S. from carrying out such a strike on his son. The case was dismissed on numerous grounds, including lack of standing, sovereign immunity, and the political question doctrine.315 With respect to the political question doctrine, the district court was particularly concerned that an injunction would violate separation of powers principles by intruding on the Executive’s authority over military decisions.316 Judge Bates stated that, “[t]o be sure, this Court recognizes the somewhat unsettling nature of its conclusion—that there are circumstances in which the Executive's unilateral decision to kill a U.S. citizen overseas is ‘constitutionally committed to the political branches’ and judicially unreviewable. But this case squarely presents such a circumstance.”317 A statute providing for judicial review, of course, would eliminate this concern.

### Precision

#### Precision-Lexicography is key to understanding the resolution

Dash No Date [Nilardi Sekhar Dash Linguistic Research Unit, Indian Statistical Institute, worked in the area of corpus linguistics and language technology for more than 15 years No Date “Linguistics- The Art of Lexicography” Encyclopedia of Life Support Systems http://www.eolss.net/Sample-Chapters/C04/E6-91-16.pdf]

Lexicography also studies lexicon but from a different angle. While lexicology concentrate on the general properties and features that can be viewed as systematic, lexicography typically deals with the individuality of each lexical unit (Zgusta 1973: 14). Lexicography is thus defined as the art of writing a dictionary or the science of compiling a dictionary. While lexicology studies words as elements of a system, lexicography approaches words as individual units with respect to their meaning and usage. We use a dictionary in order to learn about words in the process of language learning, comprehending a text in a better way or checking correct spellings and pronunciations of words, etc.

### 2NC Reasonability

#### Reasonability begs the question of which interpretation is more correct - if we win a link to precision or limits it outweighs

#### It’s subjective—the difference is impossible to quantify—debate should emphasize 2 competing claims—that encourages debate—best for education.

#### Judge intervention may be inevitable – but offense/defense is key to prevent the worst and most arbitrary form

#### Explodes limits—dozens of exceptions to our interpretation can be made to explode the topic.

## Terrorism

### No kick out

#### Alliances and intel sharing are permanent

NYT, 1/30/’13

(“Drone Strike Prompts Suit, Raising Fears for U.S. Allies”)

The issue is more complex than drone-strike foes suggest, the current and former officials said, and is based on decades of cooperation rather than a shadowy pact for the United States to do the world’s dirty work. The arrangements for intensive intelligence sharing by Western allies go back to World War II, said Richard Aldrich, professor of international security at the University of Warwick, when the United States, Canada, Britain, Australia and New Zealand agreed to continue to collaborate. “There’s a very high volume of intelligence shared, some of which is collected automatically, so it’s impossible to track what every piece is potentially used for,” said Mr. Aldrich, who is also the author of a history of the Government Communications Headquarters, the British signal-intelligence agency. Britain’s history and expertise in South Asia means that the intelligence it gathers in Pakistan, Afghanistan and the tribal areas in between is in high demand, Mr. Aldrich said. The arrangement has been focused recently by a chill in relations between the United States and Pakistan, and by the shared war in Afghanistan. Other nations, too, intercept communications in the region that are shared broadly with the United States, he said. In Afghanistan, for example, German and Dutch forces run aggressive electronic interception operations, he said, because their rules on collaborating with local interpreters are less stringent than those of the United States. A spokesman for the coalition forces in Afghanistan, Lt. Col. Lester Carroll, declined to give details about intelligence sharing, saying agreements were classified. But he confirmed that American military forces “do share information with other U.S. government organizations on a need-to-know basis.” Few argue against the notion that European nations, many of which have been attacked by terrorists, have benefited from the drone killing, however controversial, of many of the most hardened Islamic extremist leaders.

### A2: Domestic Constraints on Drones Inevitable

#### We will still use them- defense budget cuts

Masters 2013 [Jonathan Masters, Deputy Editor Council on Foreign Relations May 23, 2013 “Targeted Killings Backgrounder” Council on Foreign Relations http://www.cfr.org/counterterrorism/targeted-killings/p9627]

Analysts point to several factors that indicate U.S. targeted killings are likely to expand in the near term. Drone strikes and special operations raids put fewer Americans in harm's way and provide a low-cost alternative to expensive and cumbersome conventional forces, especially given likely cuts in the defense budget and a waning public appetite for long wars.

#### Tech advances will make them more palatable

Masters 2013 [Jonathan Masters, Deputy Editor Council on Foreign Relations May 23, 2013 “Targeted Killings Backgrounder” Council on Foreign Relations http://www.cfr.org/counterterrorism/targeted-killings/p9627]

Other experts say technological advances, including precision-guided munitions and enhanced surveillance, have given the United States a greater ability to target these particular individuals while reducing collateral damage. In July 2011, Chief Counterterrorism Adviser Brennan, provided a portent of things to come: "Going forward, we will be mindful that if our nation is threatened, our best offense won't always be deploying large armies abroad but delivering targeted, surgical pressure to the groups that threaten us."

## 2NC Accountability

### Yemen

#### Yemenis have a pragmatic view on drones- will never shift to AQAP

Emker 2013 [Stacey Emker is a second year Master’s candidate at the Whitehead School of Diplomacy and International Relations. She specializes in international security and foreign policy analysis with a focus on asymmetric warfare January 14, 2013 “Analyzing the US Counterterrorism Strategy in Yemen” http://blogs.shu.edu/diplomacy/2013/01/analyzing-the-us-counterterrorism-strategy-in-yemen/]

Despite the general antipathy for drone strikes, a majority of the Yemeni’s interviewed expressed that AQAP posed a serious threat to their country and had a pragmatic view of the U.S. drone campaign. As long as drones target legitimate terrorists, Yemenis grudgingly acknowledge their utility. With this, it is important to note Yemen’s religious majority and nationalism. The population of Yemen is almost entirely Muslim, made up of Zaydis and Shaf’is. Zaydis are found mostly in North and Northwest Yemen and belong to a branch of Shi’a Islam. Zaydis form the the Huthi insurgent movement, and AQAP statements in Inspire have connected the movement to threats posed by Shi’a in eastern Saudi Arabia, Iran and Iraq. Since AQAP has attacked two Huthi processions in 2010 and threatened supporters, Zaydi Yemenis do not represent practical recruitment options for AQAP. On the hand, the majority of Yemenis are Shafi’is making up the South and East. The Shafi’is school follows one of the four Sunni schools of Islamic jurisprudence and is considered a relatively moderate form of Islam. While Islamic radicalism is prevalent within the country, Shafi’is is culturally very different and is not exactly fertile breeding grounds for extremist ideology. As a result, the Al-Qaeda ideology does not go hand-in-hand with the majority of the Yemeni people.

### Middle East War

#### Prefer our literature base – theirs overinflates threats about the outbreak of conflict

Edward Luttwak (CSIS senior associate and has served as a consultant to the Office of the Secretary of Defense, the National Security Council, the U.S. Department of State, the U.S. Army, Navy, and Air Force, and a number of allied governments as well as international corporations and financial institutions) May 2007 “The middle of nowhere” http://www.prospectmagazine.co.uk/2007/05/themiddleofnowhere/

Why are middle east experts so unfailingly wrong? The lesson of history is that men never learn from history, but middle east experts, like the rest of us, should at least learn from their past mistakes. Instead, they just keep repeating them. The first mistake is “five minutes to midnight” catastrophism. The late King Hussein of Jordan was the undisputed master of this genre. Wearing his gravest aspect, he would warn us that with patience finally exhausted the Arab-Israeli conflict was about to explode, that all past conflicts would be dwarfed by what was about to happen unless, unless… And then came the remedy—usually something rather tame when compared with the immense catastrophe predicted, such as resuming this or that stalled negotiation, or getting an American envoy to the scene to make the usual promises to the Palestinians and apply the usual pressures on Israel. We read versions of the standard King Hussein speech in countless newspaper columns, hear identical invocations in the grindingly repetitive radio and television appearances of the usual middle east experts, and are now faced with Hussein’s son Abdullah periodically repeating his father’s speech almost verbatim. What actually happens at each of these “moments of truth”—and we may be approaching another one—is nothing much; only the same old cyclical conflict which always restarts when peace is about to break out, and always dampens down when the violence becomes intense enough. The ease of filming and reporting out of safe and comfortable Israeli hotels inflates the media coverage of every minor affray. But humanitarians should note that the dead from Jewish-Palestinian fighting since 1921 amount to fewer than 100,000—about as many as are killed in a season of conflict in Darfur.

### Pakistan UQ

#### Pakistan stable – governments are politically stable, militancy is decreasing

Omar Khan Saturday, October 26, 2013 Good news from Pakistan

<http://www.thenews.com.pk/Todays-News-2-210329-Good-news-from-Pakistan>

Pakistan today is proud to complete its first full democratic cycle and peaceful handover of power to the next elected government. Prime Minister Nawaz Sharif is a third time seasoned prime minister and people have shown their confidence by electing him during this critical phase in our national history. All the provincial and federal governments are politically stable and co-existing with each other focusing on development of the poor people while the military stands firmly behind the democratically elected government. The people of Pakistan have shown their resolve against extremism by rejecting any such forces again and again during elections and world ought to respect this resilience on the part of the people. The people of Pakistan are united in their resolve to end the menace of extremism whether through dialogue or otherwise and it appears that things are finally moving to a closure of this long standing issue. Pakistan has its share of problems however it has started to tackle these issues now. It may take sometime to resolve the issues pertaining to terrorism, economy and service delivery however the direction seems right and the people are hopeful. If you still have doubts, visit Pakistan sometime soon and a pleasant surprise shall indeed be waiting for you.

Rising stability in Pakistan – reforms and policies to resolve militancy and other challenges.

Dawn Report, 10-21 Pakistan emerging place to invest in, says Sharif <http://dawn.com/news/1050961/pakistan-emerging-place-to-invest-in-says-sharif>

But the prime minister acknowledged that the country also faced a number of daunting challenges. “Acute energy shortages, a week economy and militancy do post huge problems for Pakistan,” he said, but assured prospective investors that his government had a “well thought out policy and plans of action”, to overcome these problems. Besides dealing firmly with the challenges of terrorism and extremism, the government was also “keeping the doors open for those who are willing to be reconciled with”, he said. The prime minister said his government had inherited a broken economy with average GDP growth of 3 per cent in the last five years, lowest investment to GDP at 14 per cent, unbearable federal fiscal deficit of 8.2 per cent, mounting 63.5 per cent public debt to GDP and an all-time low of 8.5 per cent tax-GDP. “Our government has taken immediate stability measures and structural reforms and has embarked upon a clear roadmap of bringing macro-economic stability in Pakistan in the next three years,” he said.

## Norms Adv

### Drone Prolif Good

#### Doesn’t lower the threshold for conflict

Carpenter and Shaikhouni 2011 [Charli Carpenter is associate professor of international relations at the University of Massachusetts, Amherst, and blogs about human security at the Duck of Minerva. Lina Shaikhouni is completing a degree in political science at the University of Massachusetts, Amherst, with an emphasis on human rights and humanitarian law. June 7 2011 Foreign Policy “Don’t Fear the Reaper” http://www.foreignpolicy.com/articles/2011/06/07/dont\_fear\_the\_reaper?page=0,1]

Misconception No. 2: Drones Make War Easy and Game-Like, and Therefore Likelier. Remote-controlled violence even with a human in the loop also has people concerned: Nearly 40 percent of the op-eds we studied say that remote-control killing makes war too much like a video game. Many argue this increases the likelihood of armed conflict.¶ It's a variation on an old argument: Other revolutions in military technology -- the longbow, gunpowder, the airplane -- have also progressively removed the weapons-bearer from hand-to-hand combat with his foe. Many of these advances, too, were initially criticized for degrading the professional art of war or taking it away from military elites. For example, European aristocrats originally considered the longbow and firearms unchivalrous for a combination of these reasons.¶ It's true that all killing requires emotional distancing, and militaries throughout time have worked hard to devise ways to ease the psychological impact on soldiers of killing for the state in the national interest. Yet it's not so clear whether the so-called Nintendo effect of drones increases social distance or makes killing easier. Some anecdotal evidence suggests the opposite: Drone pilots say they suffer mental stress precisely because they have detailed, real-time images of their targets, and because they go home to their families afterward rather than debriefing with their units in the field. Studies haven't yet confirmed which view is accurate or whether it's somehow both.¶ Even if some variant of the Nintendo effect turns out to be real, there is little evidence that distancing soldiers from the battlefield or the act of killing makes war itself more likely rather than less. If that were true, the world would be awash in conflict. As former Lt. Col. Dave Grossman has documented, at no time in history has the combination of technology and military training strategies made killing so easy -- a trend that began after World War I. Yet as political scientist Joshua Goldstein demonstrates in a forthcoming book, the incidence of international war -- wars between two or more states -- has been declining for 70 years.¶ The political debate over drones should move away from the fear that military advancements mean war is inevitable and instead focus on whether certain weapons and platforms are more or less useful for preventing conflict at a greater or lesser cost to innocent civilian lives. Activists should keep pressure on elected officials, military personnel, and other public institutions to make armed conflict, where it occurs, as bloodless as possible. For example, some human rights groups say the Nintendo effect itself could be harnessed to serve humanitarian outcomes -- by embedding war law programming into game designs.

#### No risk of an impact – deterrence and political ramifications check just like nuke weapons

Singh 4/13 Joseph Singh, researcher at the Center for a New American Security, reporter for Time, “Betting Against a Drone Arms Race”, August 13th, 2012, http://nation.time.com/2012/08/13/betting-against-a-drone-arms-race/

Bold predictions of a coming drones arms race are all the rage since the uptake in their deployment under the Obama Administration. Noel Sharkey, for example, argues in an August 3 op-ed for the Guardian that rapidly developing drone technology — coupled with minimal military risk — portends an era in which states will become increasingly aggressive in their use of drones.¶ As drones develop the ability to fly completely autonomously, Sharkey predicts a proliferation of their use that will set dangerous precedents, seemingly inviting hostile nations to use drones against one another. Yet, the narrow applications of current drone technology coupled with what we know about state behavior in the international system lend no credence to these ominous warnings.¶ Indeed, critics seem overly-focused on the domestic implications of drone use.¶ In a June piece for the Financial Times, Michael Ignatieff writes that “virtual technologies make it easier for democracies to wage war because they eliminate the risk of blood sacrifice that once forced democratic peoples to be prudent.”¶ Significant public support for the Obama Administration’s increasing deployment of drones would also seem to legitimate this claim. Yet, there remain equally serious diplomatic and political costs that emanate from beyond a fickle electorate, which will prevent the likes of the increased drone aggression predicted by both Ignatieff and Sharkey.¶ Most recently, the serious diplomatic scuffle instigated by Syria’s downing a Turkish reconnaissance plane in June illustrated the very serious risks of operating any aircraft in foreign territory.¶ States launching drones must still weigh the diplomatic and political costs of their actions, which make the calculation surrounding their use no fundamentally different to any other aerial engagement.¶ This recent bout also illustrated a salient point regarding drone technology: most states maintain at least minimal air defenses that can quickly detect and take down drones, as the U.S. discovered when it employed drones at the onset of the Iraq invasion, while Saddam Hussein’s surface-to-air missiles were still active.¶ What the U.S. also learned, however, was that drones constitute an effective military tool in an extremely narrow strategic context. They are well-suited either in direct support of a broader military campaign, or to conduct targeted killing operations against a technologically unsophisticated enemy.¶ In a nutshell, then, the very contexts in which we have seen drones deployed. Northern Pakistan, along with a few other regions in the world, remain conducive to drone usage given a lack of air defenses, poor media coverage, and difficulties in accessing the region.¶ Non-state actors, on the other hand, have even more reasons to steer clear of drones:¶ – First, they are wildly expensive. At $15 million, the average weaponized drone is less costly than an F-16 fighter jet, yet much pricier than the significantly cheaper, yet equally damaging options terrorist groups could pursue.¶ – Those alternatives would also be relatively more difficult to trace back to an organization than an unmanned aerial vehicle, with all the technical and logistical planning its operation would pose.¶ – Weaponized drones are not easily deployable. Most require runways in order to be launched, which means that any non-state actor would likely require state sponsorship to operate a drone. Such sponsorship is unlikely given the political and diplomatic consequences the sponsoring state would certainly face.¶ – Finally, drones require an extensive team of on-the-ground experts to ensure their successful operation. According to the U.S. Air Force, 168 individuals are needed to operate a Predator drone, including a pilot, maintenance personnel and surveillance analysts.¶ In short, the doomsday drone scenario Ignatieff and Sharkey predict results from an excessive focus on rapidly-evolving military technology.¶ Instead, we must return to what we know about state behavior in an anarchistic international order. Nations will confront the same principles of deterrence, for example, when deciding to launch a targeted killing operation regardless of whether they conduct it through a drone or a covert amphibious assault team.¶ Drones may make waging war more domestically palatable, but they don’t change the very serious risks of retaliation for an attacking state. Any state otherwise deterred from using force abroad will not significantly increase its power projection on account of acquiring drones.¶ What’s more, the very states whose use of drones could threaten U.S. security – countries like China – are not democratic, which means that the possible political ramifications of the low risk of casualties resulting from drone use are irrelevant. For all their military benefits, putting drones into play requires an ability to meet the political and security risks associated with their use.¶ Despite these realities, there remain a host of defensible arguments one could employ to discredit the Obama drone strategy. The legal justification for targeted killings in areas not internationally recognized as war zones is uncertain at best.¶ Further, the short-term gains yielded by targeted killing operations in Pakistan, Somalia and Yemen, while debilitating to Al Qaeda leadership in the short-term, may serve to destroy already tenacious bilateral relations in the region and radicalize local populations.¶ Yet, the past decade’s experience with drones bears no evidence of impending instability in the global strategic landscape. Conflict may not be any less likely in the era of drones, but the nature of 21st Century warfare remains fundamentally unaltered despite their arrival in large numbers.

### Heg D

#### International system resilient – no conflict

Christopher Preble (director of foreign policy studies at the Cato Institute) August 2010 “U.S. Military Power: Preeminence for What Purpose?” http://www.cato-at-liberty.org/u-s-military-power-preeminence-for-what-purpose/

Most in Washington still embraces the notion that America is, and forever will be, the world’s indispensable nation. Some scholars, however, questioned the logic of hegemonic stability theory from the very beginning. A number continue to do so today. They advance arguments diametrically at odds with the primacist consensus. Trade routes need not be policed by a single dominant power; the international economy is complex and resilient. Supply disruptions are likely to be temporary, and the costs of mitigating their effects should be borne by those who stand to lose — or gain — the most. Islamic extremists are scary, but hardly comparable to the threat posed by a globe-straddling Soviet Union armed with thousands of nuclear weapons. It is frankly absurd that we spend more today to fight Osama bin Laden and his tiny band of murderous thugs than we spent to face down Joseph Stalin and Chairman Mao. Many factors have contributed to the dramatic decline in the number of wars between nation-states; it is unrealistic to expect that a new spasm of global conflict would erupt if the United States were to modestly refocus its efforts, draw down its military power, and call on other countries to play a larger role in their own defense, and in the security of their respective regions. But while there are credible alternatives to the United States serving in its current dual role as world policeman / armed social worker, the foreign policy establishment in Washington has no interest in exploring them. The people here have grown accustomed to living at the center of the earth, and indeed, of the universe. The tangible benefits of all this military spending flow disproportionately to this tiny corner of the United States while the schlubs in fly-over country pick up the tab.

#### No credible threats now

Doug Bandow (senior fellow at the Cato Institute. He is a former special assistant to President Reagan) January 2010 “Military Spending — For What?” http://www.cato.org/pub\_display.php?pub\_id=11143

The United States dominates the globe militarily. The threats facing America pale compared to its capabilities. Why, then, is Washington spending so much on the military? In 2010 the U.S. will spend roughly $700 billion on the military. This is an increase of 2 percent (after inflation) from the Obama administration's original nonwar defense budget of $534 billion. Despite initial plans for zero growth in defense spending in coming years, there are rumors that the Department of Defense will receive a 2 percent increase in real outlays through 2015. Still, some conservatives want to enshrine a military buildup in a law mandating fixed outlays at 4, 5 or even 6 percent of gross domestic product. Hawks focus on the percentage of GDP going to the military — currently about 4.4 percent — since that figure has fallen over the years. America spends more inflation- adjusted dollars on the military today than at any time since the end of World War II. Figured in 2000 dollars, the U.S. devoted $774.6 billion to the military in 1945, the final year of World War II. In 1953, the final year of the Korean War, military outlay ran to $416.1 billion. Expenditure during the Vietnam War peaked at $421.3 billion in 1968. By contrast, in 2010 — even before the Afghan surge and other unplanned expenditure — the administration expected to spend $517.8 billion. That's more than during the lengthy, but often warm, Cold War. Expenditure as a percentage of GDP has fallen because the U.S. economy has grown. GDP in 2010 (in 2000 dollars) will run to about $11.7 trillion. That is almost twice as much as in 1986, more than three times as much as in 1968, and nearly six times as much as in 1953. Military outlay should be tied to threats, not economic growth. Can anyone credibly claim the military threat facing America is two, three, or six times as great today as during those years? Today the U.S. does not face a significant military threat. As Colin Powell famously declared in 1991 when chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff: "I'm running out of enemies. I'm down to Castro and Kim Il Sung." The U.S. has no great power enemies. Relations with China and Russia are at times uneasy,

but not confrontational, let alone warlike. Washington is allied with every other industrialized state. America possesses the most sophisticated nuclear arsenal and the most powerful conventional force. Washington's reach exceeds that of Rome and Britain at their respective peaks. Other nations, most notably China, are stirring, but it will take years before they match, let alone overtake, the U.S. Even subtracting the costs of the Afghanistan and Iraq wars leaves American military outlay around five times that of China and 10 times that of Russia. Combine a gaggle of adversaries, enemies and rogues — Burma, Cuba, Iran, North Korea, Syria — and the U.S. spends perhaps 25 times as much. The United States is not alone. The European Union has 10 times the GDP and three times the population of Russia. Military outlay by the U.S. plus its NATO allies accounts for about 70 percent of world military spending. Add in America's other allies and friends, such as South Korea, and the total share of global military outlay hits 80 percent. In short, Washington spends what it spends not to defend America but to maintain the ability to overpower other nations. But it will become increasingly expensive for America to preserve the ability to attack countries like China. Terrorism remains a pressing security threat. However, terrorist attacks, though horrid, do not pose an existential danger. Al-Qaida is no replacement for Nazism and Communism, nuclear-topped ICBMs and armored divisions. Nor is traditional military force the best way to combat terrorism. Indeed, foreign intervention often promotes terrorism, like swatting a hornet's nest. America's military spending is determined by its foreign policy. America's commitments are a matter of choice. They don't make sense today. Engagement is good, but military force is not the only form of engagement. And any international involvement must balance costs and benefits. Adjusting commitments would allow a vastly different, and less expensive, force structure. The U.S. could make significant cuts and still maintain the globe's strongest and most sophisticated military — one well able to defend Americans.

# 1NR

### Turns Case

**Outweighs and turns the case--- Economic growth is a prerequisite to US engagement and credibility--- B + H--- decline causes immediate ext, theirs is indeterminate and solved by interdependence**

**Turns Heg--- Burrows and Harris**

#### Economic decline collapses Pakistan

**Warrick, Washington Post, ‘8 (Joby, November 15, “Experts See Security Risks in Downturn, http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/content/article/2008/11/14/AR2008111403864.html)**

Intelligence officials are warning that the deepening global financial crisis could weaken fragile governments in the world's most dangerous areas and undermine the ability of the United States and its allies to respond to a new wave of security threats. U.S. government officials and private analysts say the economic turmoil has heightened the short-term risk of a terrorist attack, as radical groups probe for weakening border protections and new gaps in defenses. A protracted financial crisis could threaten the survival of friendly regimes from Pakistan to the Middle East while forcing Western nations to cut spending on defense, intelligence and foreign aid, the sources said. The crisis could also accelerate the shift to a more Asia-centric globe, as rising powers such as China gain more leverage over international financial institutions and greater influence in world capitals. Some of the more troubling and immediate scenarios analysts are weighing involve nuclear-armed Pakistan, which already was being battered by inflation and unemployment before the global financial tsunami hit. Since September, Pakistan has seen its national currency devalued and its hard-currency reserves nearly wiped out. Analysts also worry about the impact of plummeting crude prices on oil-dependent nations such as Yemen, which has a large population of unemployed youths and a history of support for militant Islamic groups. The underlying problems and trends -- especially regional instability and the waning influence of the West -- were already well established, but they are now "being accelerated by the current global financial crisis," the nation's top intelligence official, Director of National Intelligence Mike McConnell, said in a recent speech. McConnell is among several top U.S. intelligence officials warning that deep cuts in military and intelligence budgets could undermine the country's ability to anticipate and defend against new threats.

#### China adventurism

Mead 09 (Walter Russell, Senior Fellow in U.S. Foreign Policy at the Council on Foreign Relations, New Republic, February 4, http://www.tnr.com/politics/story.html?id=571cbbb9-2887-4d81-8542-92e83915f5f8&p=2)

The damage to China's position is more subtle. The crisis has not--yet--led to the nightmare scenario that China-watchers fear: a recession or slowdown producing the kind of social unrest that could challenge the government. That may still come to pass--the recent economic news from China has been consistently worse than most experts predicted--but, even if the worst case is avoided, the financial crisis has nevertheless had significant effects. For one thing, it has reminded China that its growth remains dependent on the health of the U.S. economy. For another, it has shown that China's modernization is likely to be long, dangerous, and complex rather than fast and sweet, as some assumed. In the lead-up to last summer's Beijing Olympics, talk of a Chinese bid to challenge America's global position reached fever pitch, and the inexorable rise of China is one reason why so many commentators are fretting about the "post-American era." But suggestions that China could grow at, say, 10 percent annually for the next 30 years were already looking premature before the economic downturn. (In late 2007, the World Bank slashed its estimate of China's GDP by 40 percent, citing inaccuracies in the methods used to calculate purchasing power parity.) And the financial crisis makes it certain that China's growth is likely to be much slower during some of those years. Already exports are falling, unemployment is rising, and the Shanghai stock market is down about 60 percent. At the same time, Beijing will have to devote more resources and more attention to stabilizing Chinese society, building a national health care system, providing a social security net, and caring for an aging population, which, thanks to the one-child policy, will need massive help from the government to support itself in old age. Doing so will leave China fewer resources for military build-ups and foreign adventures. As the crisis has forcefully reminded Americans, creating and regulating a functional and flexible financial system is difficult. Every other country in the world has experienced significant financial crises while building such systems, and China is unlikely to be an exception. All this means that China's rise looks increasingly like a gradual process. A deceleration in China's long-term growth rate would postpone indefinitely the date when China could emerge as a peer competitor to the United States. The present global distribution of power could be changing slowly, if at all. The greatest danger both to U.S.-China relations and to American power itself is probably not that China will rise too far, too fast; it is that the current crisis might end China's growth miracle. In the worst-case scenario, the turmoil in the international economy will plunge China into a major economic downturn. The Chinese financial system will implode as loans to both state and private enterprises go bad. Millions or even tens of millions of Chinese will be unemployed in a country without an effective social safety net. The collapse of asset bubbles in the stock and property markets will wipe out the savings of a generation of the Chinese middle class. The political consequences could include dangerous unrest--and a bitter climate of anti-foreign feeling that blames others for China's woes. (Think of Weimar Germany, when both Nazi and communist politicians blamed the West for Germany's economic travails.) Worse, instability could lead to a vicious cycle, as nervous investors moved their money out of the country, further slowing growth and, in turn, fomenting ever-greater bitterness. Thanks to a generation of rapid economic growth, China has so far been able to manage the stresses and conflicts of modernization and change; nobody knows what will happen if the growth stops.

### Uniqueness

#### There’s a crucial framing argument for uniqueness – only moderate GOP members matter. Conservatives won’t vote for immigration no matter what and affirmative evidence quoting them is irrelevant. The only evidence that matters is how moderates react – and Obama can work with them now, and capital is key

**Balz, 10/17/13** (Dan, Washington Post, “Can Obama seize the moment and make Washington work?” <http://www.washingtonpost.com/politics/can-obama-seize-the-moment-to-make-washington-work/2013/10/17/d84c1934-3753-11e3-80c6-7e6dd8d22d8f_story_1.html>)

Obama will continue to face unyielding opposition from the tea party Republicans in the House and the Senate. Sen. Ted Cruz (R-Tex.) made that clear Wednesday when he denounced the Senate compromise and praised those in the House whose opposition to the health-care law triggered the crisis.

The key now is whether the president has a strategy to govern around them by winning support from what he called the responsible Republicans.

Obama’s agenda

On Thursday, Obama called on Congress to focus on three priorities. But he offered few specifics about what he will ask and what he will give. Nor is it clear whether he has a strategy to win the support of some Republicans.

The first priority he talked about was the economy and the budget. Budget negotiations will resume with the goal of reaching an agreement by mid-December, lest the country face a repeat of what just happened.

Obama wants to replace the across-the-board spending reductions that have cut indiscriminately with more sensible spending priorities. He also says he is willing to negotiate over entitlements programs. He wants any agreement to include more revenue, although Republicans say he got his revenue package at the end of 2012. Republicans who opposed the shutdown (but quietly went along with it) are skeptical that Obama is truly willing to make concessions to get a satisfactory deal.

The two other legislative priorities the president cited were immigration reform and passage of the farm bill. No one can say what the prospects are for passage of an immigration bill. Much of that still depends on how House GOP leaders decide whether it is in the party’s long-term interest to pass it. Obama did not mention what should be his other major priority, the health-care law, whose implementation has gotten off to a stumbling start, to put it mildly.

All of that is on the table. Meanwhile, there is a question of how engaged Obama will be in the grinding work of trying to produce compromise with potentially willing Republicans.

#### Will pass with pressure – claims otherwise are just posturing.

GREG SARGENT October 25 at 12:00 pm Immigration reform is dead. Or maybe it isn’t.

This morning, Politico stirred the immigration reform pot with this: House Republican leadership has no plans to vote on any immigration reform legislation before the end the year. The House has just 19 days in session before the end of 2013, and there are a number of reasons why immigration reform is stalled this year. Following the fiscal battles last month, the internal political dynamics are tenuous within the House Republican Conference. A growing chorus of GOP lawmakers and aides are intensely skeptical that any of the party’s preferred piecemeal immigration bills can garner the support 217 Republicans — they would need that if Democrats didn’t lend their votes. Republican leadership doesn’t see anyone coalescing around a single plan, according to sources across GOP leadership. Leadership also says skepticism of President Barack Obama within the House Republican Conference is at a high, and that’s fueled a desire to stay out of a negotiating process with the Senate. Republicans fear getting jammed. Distrust of Obama is at a high, after the GOP defeat in the ill conceived shutdown fight, so we can’t vote on anything involving immigration reform? This is akin to saying: ”Obama didn’t give us what we demanded last time, so we ended up having to shoot ourselves in the foot. This time, Obama is offering us what we need to avoid shooting ourselves in the foot, but we can’t trust him, so let’s go ahead and pull the trigger, anyway.” Politico is far better sourced with the House GOP leadership than this blog is, so maybe there won’t be any vote this year. However, one House GOP leadership aide, asked to confirm the story, emailed me this: “We hope to move something before year’s end, but there’s no specific timetable right now.” Either GOP leaders are leaking that there will be no vote, in order to quiet fears on the right while they decide what to vote on. Or they are letting it be known that they “hope” to have a vote, to defer any political fallout that might come from killing reform, in the full intention of doing just that. Take your pick. For what it’s worth, Democratic aides and immigration reform advocates don’t believe House GOP leaders have made any decision to kill reform or on whether to hold votes this year. They think leaks are meant to buy maneuvering room while the various proposals – Eric Cantor’s Kids Act, which only gives citizenship to the DREAMers, or the piecemeal legalization proposal being worked on — take shape. This maneuvering room would also allow pro-reform Republicans time to bring other GOP lawmakers who are open to reform but are still steamed by the shutdown defeat — such as Raul Labrador — back into the fold. The optimistic — or perhaps naively hopeful – endgame being talked about by Dems and reform advocates looks like this. The premise is that — with business, evangelical, and pro-reform conservative groups set to mount major pressure campaigns — it isn’t as easy for House GOP leaders to avoid voting on reform as many claim it is. House Republicans end up holding piecemeal votes before the end of the year on border security and E-Verify, and on, say, the Kids Act, which could perhaps get a majority of House Republicans. Those pass, but there’s no vote on any politically difficult proposal to legalize the 11 million.

#### Votes

The Hill, 10-23-2013 <http://thehill.com/homenews/administration/330295-obama-to-ramp-up-pressure-on-immigration-reform>

President Obama will look to ramp up pressure on the House to begin deliberations on a comprehensive immigration reform bill with a speech Thursday morning from the White House.¶ The president will urge Congress to take up a reform effort in a "bipartisan way," a White House official told Reuters.¶ The president identified immigration as one of three legislative priorities — in addition to a budget and farm bill — he hoped Congress would tackle by the end of the legislative year during a speech shortly after the end of the government shutdown.¶ "The majority of Americans think this is the right thing to do, and it's sitting there waiting for the House to pass it," he said. "Now if the House has ideas on how to improve the Senate bill, let's hear them. Let's start the negotiations. But let's not leave this problem to keep festering for another year, or two years, or three years."¶ White House press secretary Jay Carney said Wednesday that the White House had been consulting with congressional staff about how to best move forward.¶ Republicans have said that they do not favor a comprehensive bill, instead favoring a piecemeal approach to immigration reform. They argue a single bill would be too unwieldy and difficult to implement. But Democrats believe Republicans intend to pass new border security measures without also including a pathway to citizenship.¶ On Wednesday, House Speaker John Boehner (R-Ohio) said he was "hopeful" the House would address the "important subject" of immigration reform.¶ Democratic lawmakers echoed the president's call to pass a bill by the end of the year in a press conference outside the Capitol.¶ “I think the only group that is not saying ‘let’s get immigration reform done’ seems to be the Republican majority in the House of Representatives,” House Minority Whip Steny Hoyer (D-Md.) said.¶ “Bring this bill to the floor. Bring an immigration reform bill to the floor. We will pass it,” he added.

### Thumper 1

Focus on immigration reform necessary – chances of passage decrease with each day that it is pushed away

Sioux City Journal 10-25 Why President Obama racing against clock on immigration <http://siouxcityjournal.com/ap/lee/why-president-obama-racing-against-clock-on-immigration/article_d8139615-6712-5419-8622-9db8b9680920.html>

President Barack Obama used a very urgent tone Thursday in remarks designed to press House Republicans to pass immigration reform, calling on them at least twice to try to get it done “this year.”

“Let’s not wait,” the president said. “It doesn’t get easier to just put it off. Let’s do it now.” Politically speaking, the president is right. The longer the immigration debate drags on, the lower the odds it will culminate in a bill on his desk. Here’s why. Every day that goes by is a day closer to the 2014 midterm elections. And the months leading up to Election Day are a time for lawmakers to campaign, raise money, and do everything they can to hold on to their jobs. It’s not a time for a contentious legislative debate that could complicate the fall campaign. That’s why history has shown that little gets done legislatively right before the election. Members are in their districts and states more and more often and less and less willing to take risks in Congress. And immigration reform is a risky proposition for many House Republicans. Despite national polls showing the public largely in favor of overhauling the nation’s laws, the calculus is often different back home. This is in large part why months after the Senate passed a sweeping bipartisan immigration bill, the House has yet to act. But that doesn’t mean it won’t. Republicans have already moved ahead on some piecemeal measures. And House Speaker John Boehner, R-Ohio, said Wednesday that he was “hopeful” something could get done by the end of the year. Coming off a fiscal battle that badly damaged the Republican brand, there is, arguably, more political incentive for Boehner to act on immigration than there has been in the past. Republicans need to repair their image. Helping pass broadly popular reforms is one way to do that. But there isn’t much time left on the legislative calendar this year, and it’s not clear whether Boehner will bring immigration to a vote before the year is up. But this much we do know: Every day that goes by makes it increasingly difficult to pass new immigration laws.

### Thumper 2

#### Future budget fights---

#### Time and political will is tight on immigration- carefully balanced to avoid missing the window

USA Today, 10-20-2013 <http://www.usatoday.com/story/news/nation/2013/10/20/hopes-dim-for-immigration-reform/3062199/>

But many of the crucial pieces of immigration legislation in the House, such as a bill that could address the legal status of undocumented immigrants already settled in the United States, have yet to surface.¶ Recognizing time is running out,immigration activists and reform advocates are pressuring lawmakers in pursuit of a breakthrough before Thanksgiving or, at the latest, mid-December.¶ Reform supporters say if the House delays action on immigration reform until 2014, it's as good as dead because there will be little appetite to debate such a hot-button issue in a congressional midterm election year. If that happens, there likely won't be another serious legislative push until after the 2016 presidential race.

#### Obama care----

#### Obama is focused on immigration despite Obamacare rollout issues

NewsMax, 10-24-2013 <http://www.newsmax.com/Newsfront/Obama-Immigration-obamacare-speech/2013/10/24/id/532792>

Obama Trying to Change Subject from Obamacare to Immigration¶ President Barack Obama is using the bully pulpit to insist that Congress pass legislation overhauling the nation's immigration system.¶ Obama will issue that call to Congress when he speaks Thursday in the East Room of the White House.¶ The president wants Congress to act on immigration before the end of the year, now that the partial government shutdown has ended and a potential default has been temporarily averted.¶ House Speaker John Boehner says he's optimistic the House could act on immigration by year's end. But it's not certain that Republicans will support the comprehensive approach that Obama is seeking.¶ The Senate passed a wide-ranging bill in June with bipartisan support, but the measure stalled in the House. Most House Republicans want a piece-by-piece approach.

#### Immigration changed the conversation

**Pareene, 10/24/13** (Alex, Salon, “Immigration reform still incredibly unlikely to happen this year”

<http://www.salon.com/2013/10/24/immigration_reform_still_incredibly_unlikely_to_happen_this_year/singleton/>

President Obama has every reason to bring up immigration reform all the time. It’s true that he sincerely wants the Senate bill to pass, because he believes it would help millions of people. It’s necessary to point this out because it is commonly accepted on the right that Obama wants reform to fail so that he can use it as a cudgel against Republicans. That isn’t actually true, but it is true that as long as Republicans keep failing on this issue Democrats will point that fact out to people. It’s also true that bringing up immigration now serves to distract from bad things that are going on — the embarrassing failure of the health insurance exchange site, the still-crappy economy, etc. — because while pundits and Republicans recognize it as an attempt to change the national subject, it still reliably leads to a lot of Sunday show talk and political columns (like this one!) about whether Congress can accomplish this thing.

#### Piecemeal—

#### Piecemeal reform will be bundled in the conference committee to pass CIR

**Nowicki, 10/20/13** (Dan, The Arizona Republic, “Time running out for immigration reform”

<http://www.usatoday.com/story/news/nation/2013/10/20/hopes-dim-for-immigration-reform/3062199/>)

'Could see floor action'

Boehner this year frustrated some immigration activists by declaring the Senate's comprehensive bill dead on arrival in the House and by signaling that any of the other smaller bills must be supported by a majority of his GOP conference. The piecemeal approach also likely would include bills focusing on border security, visas for foreign workers and immigration enforcement. Five measures already have cleared committees, so Boehner could easily set aside a week this fall to hold a series of immigration votes. He has said doing nothing on immigration is not an option.

"We're still committed to moving forward on step-by-step, common-sense reforms," Boehner spokesman Michael Steel told The Arizona Republic in an email. "The Judiciary Committee has already passed several bills that could see floor action."

Rep. Ed Pastor, D-Ariz., said he believes House Republican leaders are sincere and sees a potential opening for immigration reform in the next several weeks. If five or so immigration bills are passed, the legislation could be bundled and provide the basis for a joint House-Senate conference committee that would hammer out a final version based on the legislation that each chamber passed.

### A2: Intrinsicness

#### Politics is intrinsic – inherent barriers and links prove the disad is intrinsic cost of action

#### Our interpretation is that the judge is a policy analyst deciding whether or not the plan is a good idea or not based on the current political climate

#### Intrinsicness is bad -

#### Infinitely regressive - no disad is intrinsic- cuts off all stable negative link ground- there is no logical limit to intrinsicness tests

#### Politics education is good – allows us to learn about political climate which is a prerequisite to political activism.

### A2: Fiat Solves the Link

#### Defer to link specificity – the opponents of the plan are enough to trigger ground.

#### Our interpretation is that they can fiat the outcome, not the process –

#### That is key to ground because they justify no-linking all perception disads – that makes them a moving target – that crushes core neg ground and the basis for education.

#### Politics education is good – allows us to learn about political climate which is a prerequisite to political activism.

### PC--- Got it?

#### Yes PC – despite issues

[Mike Littwin, 10-11-13 http://www.coloradoindependent.com/144401/shutdown-strategy-report-obamacare-popularity-boosted-house-gop-popularity-tanked](file:///C:\Users\Heather\Dropbox\My%20War%20Powers%20files\Mike%20Littwin,%2010-11-13%20http:\www.coloradoindependent.com\144401\shutdown-strategy-report-obamacare-popularity-boosted-house-gop-popularity-tanked)

I’ll give you just a few of the headline NBC/WSJ poll numbers. We’ll start with this: Obamacare is now more popular than when the shutdown began. Yes, more popular. Obama’s approval ratings are also edging . . . up. Yes, up.

Meanwhile, Republican congressional approval ratings are at 24 percent, the lowest in the poll’s history. And even more damaging: 70 percent think Republicans are in the battle only to further their own agenda. That’s not a bad number. That’s a catastrophic number. House Republicans are not only risking the full faith and credit of the country. They’re also risking the full faith and credit of their party. (And, for the record, the respected NBC/WSJ poll is conducted jointly by Democratic and Republican pollsters. Just sayin’.)

#### Obama resolve key- debt ceiling proves

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

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

### PC--- Key?

#### Republicans

Eleanor Clift Oct 25, 2013 5:45 AM EDT Obama, Congress Get Back to the Immigration Fight

<http://www.thedailybeast.com/articles/2013/10/25/obama-congress-get-back-to-the-immigration-fight.html>

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

#### Democrats

**Sanders, 10/22/13** - columnist for the Fort Worth Star-Telegram (Bob, “There's no better time for Obama to push for immigration reform” <http://www.mcclatchydc.com/2013/10/22/206078/bob-ray-sanders-theres-no-better.html>)

Obama got re-elected partly on his promise to pursue the issue aggressively, receiving 71 percent of the Latino vote. He has not been as aggressive as many would like, even though they're willing to cut him a little slack because of all the uncontrollable international crises and manufactured domestic distractions (like the shutdown of the government) he has had to deal with.¶ But he shouldn't let anything get in his way this time, even though Republicans in the House are vowing not to negotiate with him because the president stood his ground and refused to negotiate on his healthcare law in connection with raising the debt ceiling and ending the government shutdown.¶ House Speaker John Boehner, who has refused to bring the Senate bill to a vote, has said he won't bring any immigration legislation to the floor until a majority of his Republican caucus agrees.¶ That, in effect, means never. Or, if there is a bill that the majority of his party would support, you can almost bet it will be terribly inadequate, one that would not pass the Senate and one that the president wouldn't sign if it did.¶ Boehner, who has been on the losing end a lot lately, ought to be pressured into bringing the Senate bill to a vote. It's clear that on many of the important matters facing this country, the majority of his party in the House will reject just about anything the president supports.¶ Therefore, it will be left up to the House Democrats and the moderate Republicans who are not afraid of the "tea party" to get an immigration bill passed.¶ Since the government shutdown fiasco, in which the GOP unmistakably was the loser, the president has the upper hand, and he should take the opportunity to press forward with his agenda.¶ By no means am I suggesting that Obama become a bully or deliberately attempt to undermine Boehner's leadership, but he shouldn't back away from this fight again.

### 2NC/1NR Drones link extension

#### Obama would veto drone restrictions – kills his political capital

Newman 13 (Alex, writer for The New American, March 28th, <http://www.thenewamerican.com/usnews/constitution/item/14936-gop-lawmakers-seek-to-restrain-obama-on-killing-americans>) CC

Critics of the administration’s extra-judicial assassination program have been winning the battle for public opinion by a landslide. In fact, a Gallup poll released this week revealed that about 80 percent of Americans were opposed to using drones to attack U.S. citizens suspected of terrorism in the “Homeland.” Just 13 percent supported the idea, while seven percent were undecided. Killing American “suspected terrorists” in other countries is also opposed by a majority of citizens — not that constitutionally guaranteed rights could be infringed upon based on public sentiment anyway. ¶ Even the most ruthless Third World despots would never dare to claim openly that they have the authority to murder anyone, anywhere, anytime, without trial or even charging the target with a crime. The “establishment” wing of both the Democrat Party and the GOP, however, despite swearing an oath to uphold the Constitution, has come out swinging to support Obama’s lawlessness on the issue. ¶ Among Democrats, even House Minority Leader Nancy Pelosi — who duped voters into believing she opposed war and supported civil liberties — announced her support of the president’s extrajudicial killing spree last month. Speaking to a liberal reporter, Rep. Pelosi of California said she was not even sure whether the Obama administration should tell the public after it executes an American without due process. "Maybe,” she responded. “It just depends."¶ In the Republican Party, two of the most prominent so-called RINOs – Republicans In Name Only — have also admitted they support Obama’s murder-by-drone machinations. Sen. Lindsey Graham of South Carolina even proposed a resolution to commend the president for his extra-judicial assassination program. Sen. John McCain from Arizona, meanwhile, rightly opposed torture, yet for some reason claimed to believe that opposition to execution of Americans without charge or trial is a hallmark of what he childishly called “wacko birds” before publicly apologizing. ¶ Obama claims his invented authority to murder or indefinitely detain anyone applies only to suspected “al-Qaeda” terrorists, their supporters, or vaguely defined “associated forces.” However, with indisputable evidence that the administration has itself been supporting self-styled al-Qaeda leaders in both Libya and Syria, the question of who might be labeled a suspected terrorist becomes crucial. If al-Qaeda is getting U.S. weapons, funding, and training from Obama to overthrow certain Middle Eastern regimes, whom does the president really consider to be a terrorist? ¶ According to official documents released by multiple federal agencies and departments in recent years, the real terror threat to the “Homeland” is actually regular Americans: pro-life activists, gun owners, conservatives, constitutionalists, Ron Paul supporters, libertarians, veterans, opponents of illegal immigration, and others. Even a U.S. military “think tank” recently put out a shoddy “study” claiming that conservatives were the real danger. The Justice Department, meanwhile, was exposed last year training state and local police to consider mundane political bumper stickers as possible indicators of domestic terrorism.¶ The legislation to prohibit the assassination of Americans on U.S. soil was filed last week and has now been referred to the House Judiciary, Armed Services, and Intelligence committees. No hearings have been scheduled yet, according to legislative staffers. If the bill eventually reaches the president’s desk, Obama may well try to veto it, of course — though doing so would likely be an albatross around his neck even among his most ardent supporters. ¶ Still, lawmakers could override a potential veto. With 80 percent of Americans opposed to drone strikes targeting Americans on U.S. soil, members of Congress from both parties would probably have a very tough time explaining their opposition to the legislation to constituents. Activists are already rallying to support “Life, Liberty, and Justice for All Americans.” Whether more lawmakers will follow suit remains to be seen.

Obama will attempt to block any congressional limitations.

Weber 13 (Peter, The Week, degree from Northwestern, “Will Congress curb Obama's drone strikes? “, February 6, 2013, <http://theweek.com/article/index/239716/will-congress-curb-obamas-drone-strikes>, ZBurdette)

One problem for lawmakers, says The New York Times in an editorial, is that when it comes to drone strikes, the Obama team "utterly rejects the idea that Congress or the courts have any right to review such a decision in advance, or even after the fact." Along with citing the law authorizing broad use of force against al Qaeda, the white paper also "argues that judges and Congress don't have the right to rule on or interfere with decisions made in the heat of combat." And most troublingly, Obama won't give Congress the classified document detailing the legal justification used to kill American al Qaeda operative Anwar al-Awlaki.

Even if there is some support for the plan, it is massively hyped.

**Weber 13** (Peter, The Week, degree from Northwestern, “Will Congress curb Obama's drone strikes? “, February 6, 2013, <http://theweek.com/article/index/239716/will-congress-curb-obamas-drone-strikes>, ZBurdette)

It's interesting to watch conservatives show (or at least feign) outrage over a policy that "would have been met with right-wing hosannas under Bush/Cheney," says Steve M. at No More Mister Nice Blog. But even with the grumbling from the Left and Right, "I don't think any of this is going to stop the drone strikes."

I can't really see righties and lefties banding together to do something upliftingly democratic and bipartisan like forcing a reconsideration of the policy via combined public pressure (when was the last time something like that happened in America?) — there are too many people in office, from both parties, who like what's being done by the administration. [No More Mister Nice Blog]

"Outrage is being dutifully ginned up" not just by politicians and pundits — straight reporting on the white paper "clearly assumes that we are supposed to be outraged," too, says Eric Posner at Slate. "But the memo is utterly conventional as legal analysis," and the only thing you need to understand about it, really, is that "Obama administration lawyers have enthusiastically endorsed the once-vilified Bush administration decision to classify security operations against al Qaeda as 'war' rather than as 'law enforcement.'" Congress allowed that by authorizing "war" not just with Afghanistan but with al Qaeda and its affiliates in 2001, and if we are at war with the terrorists, they can be killed on sight. "And it doesn't matter if you're an al Qaeda member who happens to be a U.S. citizen, just as it didn't matter if you were a German soldier who happened to be an American citizen during World War II."

Obama and Bush administration lawyers have stretched the Constitution and traditional rules of international law to accommodate the threat posed by terrorism. Some people will say they violated the law. But given the political consensus supporting these moves within the U.S., it is more accurate to say that the law has evolved. It gives the president the discretion he needs, or at least wants, to address an amorphous threat. Let's hope he uses that discretion wisely. [Slate]

The plan sparks Congressional turf battles over oversight.

**Munoz 13** (Carlo, The Hill, “Turf battle builds quietly in Congress over control of armed drone program”, 04/09/13, <http://thehill.com/homenews/administration/292501-turf-battle-builds-quietly-over-control-of-armed-drone-program->, ZBurdette)

A turf war is quietly building between congressional defense and intelligence committees over who will oversee the Obama administration’s controversial armed drone program.

Lawmakers are scrambling to make their case for or against a White House proposal that would hand control of the drones to the Pentagon.

Gordon Adams, a senior defense analyst at the Stimson Center, called the looming battle a “turf fight in the [disguise] of a policy debate.”

The Pentagon and CIA operate their own armed drone programs, which are both geared toward eliminating senior al Qaeda leaders and other high-level terror targets around the world. Under the Obama administration’s proposal, the CIA would continue to supply intelligence on possible targets, but actual control over the drone strikes would fall to the Pentagon.

Senate Intelligence Committee Chairwoman Dianne Feinstein (D-Calif.) publicly questioned whether the Defense Department (DOD) would be able to shoulder the program alone.

“We’ve watched the intelligence aspect of the drone program, how they function, the quality of the intelligence, watching the agency exercise patience and discretion,” Feinstein told reporters in March. “The military [armed drone] program has not done that nearly as well.”

Sen. John McCain and other defense lawmakers say the drone program would be better off being run by the Pentagon.

“It’s not the job of the Central Intelligence Agency. ... It’s the military’s job,” the Arizona Republican said in March.

The fight is a typical battle over who on Capitol Hill will retain power over the program, according to several analysts, who described it as predictable.

**“There is** always going to be a turf battle**” when dealing with congressional oversight**, said Lawrence Korb, a former DOD official and defense analyst at the liberal-leaning Center for American Progress.

But that battle could become particularly heated, given the high-profile nature of the drone program, which since the Sept. 11, 2001, attacks has become a huge factor in shaping counterterrorism policy, given its success, Korb said.

### B/L

**Caps cause backlogs**

Seth R. **Leech** (partner with Whiteman Osterman & Hanna LLP and is a member of the Firm’s Immigration and International Trade and Business Practice Groups, adjunct professor of immigration law at Albany Law School) **and** Emma **Greenwood** (graduate of the law program at Oxford University in the United Kingdom) **2010** “KEEPING AMERICA COMPETITIVE: A PROPOSAL TO ELIMINATE THE EMPLOYMENT-BASED IMMIGRANT VISA QUOTA” http://www.albanygovernmentlawreview.org/files/Spring\_Book\_Leech.pdf

EB immigrant visa caps give rise to long waiting times and uncertainty. Therefore, many immigrants in high-tech professions are choosing to return home. 24 Although the U.S. government does not track people who leave, making it difficult to quantify this trend, Indian and Chinese newspapers report extensively on returnees.25 For example, Bangalore, India is home to over 35,000 returnees, many of whom have come from the United States.26 The Wall Street Journal has reported that, “Tata Consultancy Services, India’s Information Technology giant, reports a seven-fold increase in résum[é]s from expatriates.”

### Econ Collapse =War

#### Global economic crisis causes war---strong statistical support

Royal 10 – Jedediah Royal, Director of Cooperative Threat Reduction at the U.S. Department of Defense, 2010, “Economic Integration, Economic Signaling and the Problem of Economic Crises,” in Economics of War and Peace: Economic, Legal and Political Perspectives, ed. Goldsmith and Brauer, p. 213-214

Less intuitive is how periods of economic decline may increase the likelihood of external conflict. Political science literature has contributed a moderate degree of attention to the impact of economic decline and the security and defence behaviour of interdependent states. Research in this vein has been considered at systemic, dyadic and national levels. Several notable contributions follow. First, on the systemic level, Pollins (2008) advances Modelski and Thompson’s (1996) work on leadership cycle theory, finding that rhythms in the global economy are associated with the rise and fall of pre-eminent power and the often bloody transition from one pre-eminent leader to the next. As such, exogenous shocks such as economic crises could usher in a redistribution of relative power (see also Gilpin, 10981) that leads to uncertainty about power balances, increasing the risk of miscalculation (Fearon, 1995). Alternatively, even a relatively certain redistribution of power could lead to a permissive environment for conflict as a rising power may seek to challenge a declining power (Werner, 1999). Seperately, Polllins (1996) also shows that global economic cycles combined with parallel leadership cycles impact the likelihood of conflict among major, medium, and small powers, although he suggests that the causes and connections between global economic conditions and security conditions remain unknown. Second, on a dyadic level, Copeland’s (1996,2000) theory of trade expectations suggests that ‘future expectation of trade’ is a significant variable in understanding economic conditions and security behavior of states. He argues that interdependent states are likely to gain pacific benefits from trade so long as they have an optimistic view of future trade relations. However, if the expectation of future trade decline, particularly for difficult to replace items such as energy resources, the likelihood for conflict increases , as states will be inclined to use force to gain access to those resources. Crises could potentially be the trigger for decreased trade expectations either on its own or because it triggers protectionist moves by interdependent states. Third, others have considered the link between economic decline and external armed conflict at a national level. Blomberg and Hess (2002) find a strong correlation between internal conflict and external conflict, particularly during periods of economic downturn. They write, The linkages between internal and external conflict and prosperity are strong and mutually reinforcing. Economic conflict tends to spawn internal conflict, which in turn returns the favour. Moreover, the presence of a recession tends to amplify the extent to which international and external conflicts self-reinforce each other. (Blomberg & Hess, 2002, p.89). Economic decline has also been linked with an increase in the likelihood of terrorism (Blomberg, Hess, & Weerapana, 2004), which has the capacity to spill across borders and lead to external tensions. Furthermore, crises generally reduce the popularity of a sitting government. ‘Diversionary theory’ suggests that, when facing unpopularity arising from economic decline, sitting governments have increased incentives to create a ‘rally round the flag’ effect. Wang (1996), DeRouen (1995), and Blomberg, Hess and Thacker (2006) find supporting evidence showing that economic decline and use of force are at least indirectly correlated. Gelpi (1997) Miller (1999) and Kisanganie and Pickering (2009) suggest that the tendency towards diversionary tactics are greater for democratic states than autocratic states, due to the fact that democratic leaders are generally more susceptible to being removed from office due to lack of domestic support. DeRouen (2000) has provided evidence showing that periods of weak economic performance in the United States, and thus weak presidential popularity, are statistically linked to an increase in the use of force.

### K Econ

#### Immigration reform is key to the economy

Krudy 13

(Edward, “Analysis: Immigration reform could boost U.S. economic growth” Jan 29, 2013, Reuters)

The sluggish U.S. economy could get a lift if President Barack Obama and a bipartisan group of senators succeed in what could be the biggest overhaul of the nation's immigration system since the 1980s. Relaxed immigration rules could encourage entrepreneurship, increase demand for housing, raise tax revenues and help reduce the budget deficit, economists said. By helping more immigrants enter the country legally and allowing many illegal immigrants to remain, the United States could help offset a slowing birth rate and put itself in a stronger demographic position than aging Europe, Japan and China. "Numerous industries in the United States can't find the workers they need, right now even in a bad economy, to fill their orders and expand their production as the market demands," said Alex Nowrasteh, an immigration specialist at the libertarian Cato Institute. The emerging consensus among economists is that immigration provides a net benefit. It increases demand and productivity, helps drive innovation and lowers prices, although there is little agreement on the size of the impact on economic growth. President Barack Obama plans to launch his second-term push for a U.S. immigration overhaul during a visit to Nevada on Tuesday and will make it a high priority to win congressional approval of a reform package this year, the White House said. The chances of major reforms gained momentum on Monday when a bipartisan group of senators agreed on a framework that could eventually give 11 million illegal immigrants a chance to become American citizens. Their proposals would also include means to keep and attract workers with backgrounds in science, technology, engineering and mathematics. This would be aimed both at foreign students attending American universities where they are earning advanced degrees and high-tech workers abroad. An estimated 40 percent of scientists in the United States are immigrants and studies show immigrants are twice as likely to start businesses, said Nowrasteh. Boosting legal migration and legalizing existing workers could add $1.5 trillion to the U.S. economy over the next 10 years, estimates Raul Hinojosa-Ojeda, a specialist in immigration policy at the University of California, Los Angeles. That's an annual increase of 0.8 percentage points to the economic growth rate, currently stuck at about 2 percent. REPUBLICANS' HISPANIC PUSH Other economists say the potential benefit to growth is much lower. Richard Freeman, an economist at Harvard, believes most of the benefits to the economy from illegal immigrants already in the United States has already been recorded and legalizing their status would produce only incremental benefits. While opposition to reform lingers on both sides of the political spectrum and any controversial legislation can easily meet a quick end in a divided Washington, the chances of substantial change seem to be rising. Top Republicans such as Governor Bobby Jindal of Louisiana are not mincing words about the party's need to appeal to the Hispanic community and foreign-born voters who were turned off by Republican candidate Mitt Romney's tough talk in last year's presidential campaign. A previous Obama plan, unveiled in May 2011, included the creation of a guest-worker program to meet agricultural labor needs and something similar is expected to be in his new proposal. The senators also indicated they would support a limited program that would allow companies in certain sectors to import guest workers if Americans were not available to fill some positions. An additional boost to growth could come from rising wages for newly legalized workers and higher productivity from the arrival of more highly skilled workers from abroad. Increased tax revenues would help federal and state authorities plug budget deficits although the benefit to government revenues will be at least partially offset by the payment of benefits to those who gain legal status. In 2007, the Congressional Budget Office estimated that proposed immigration reform in that year would have generated $48 billion in revenue from 2008 to 2017, while costing $23 billion in health and welfare payments. There is also unlikely to be much of a saving on enforcement from the senators' plan because they envisage tougher border security to prevent further illegal immigration and a crackdown on those overstaying visas. One way to bump up revenue, according to a report co-authored by University of California, Davis economist Giovanni Peri, would be to institute a cap-and-trade visa system. Peri estimated it could generate up to $1.2 billion annually. Under such a system, the government would auction a certain number of visas employers could trade in a secondary market. "A more efficient, more transparent and more flexible immigration system would help firms expand, contribute to more job creation in the United States, and slow the movement of operations abroad," according to a draft report, soon to be published as part of a study by the Hamilton Project, a think tank. There was no immediate sign that either the Obama or the senators' plan would include such a system. The long-term argument for immigration is a demographic one. Many developed nations are seeing their populations age, adding to the burden of pension and healthcare costs on wage-earners. Immigration in the United States would need to double to keep the working-age population stable at its current 67 percent of total population, according to George Magnus, a senior independent economic adviser at UBS in London, While Magnus says a change of that magnitude may prove too politically sensitive, the focus should be on attracting highly skilled and entrepreneurial immigrants in the way Canada and Australia do by operating a points system for immigrants rather than focusing mainly on family connections. "The trick is to shift the balance of migration towards those with education (and) skills," he added. HARD ROAD Academics at major universities such as Harvard and the Massachusetts Institute of Technology often lament that many of their top foreign graduates end up returning to their home countries because visas are hard to get. "We have so much talent that is sitting here in the universities," said William Kerr, a professor at Harvard Business School. "I find it very difficult to swallow that we then make it so hard for them to stay." The last big amnesty for illegal immigrants was in 1986 when President Ronald Reagan legalized about 3 million already in the country. Numerous studies have shown that subsequently their wages rose significantly. Research on how immigration affects overall wages is inconclusive. George Borjas at Harvard says immigration has created a small net decrease in overall wages for those born in the United States, concentrated among the low-skilled, while Giovani Peri at UC Davis found that immigration boosts native wages over the long run. Hinojosa-Ojeda stresses that any reform needs to make it easier for guest workers to enter the country to avoid a new build-up of illegal workers. "If we don't create a mechanism that can basically bring in 300,000 to 400,000 new workers a year into a variety of labor markets and needs, we could be setting ourselves up for that again," said Hinojosa-Ojeda. Nowrasteh at Cato also believes an expanded guest worker program would stem illegal immigration and allow industries to overcome labor shortages. He found that harsher regulations in recent years in Arizona were adversely affecting agricultural production, increasing financial burdens on business and even negatively impacting the state's struggling real estate market. Some large companies have fallen foul of tougher enforcement regulations. Restaurant chain Chipotle Mexican Grill Inc fired roughly 500 staff in 2010 and 2011 after undocumented workers were found on its payrolls. Putting the chill on other employers, it is now subject of an ongoing federal criminal investigation into its hiring. "The current system doesn't seem to work for anyone," Chipotle spokesman Chris Arnold said.