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#### Interp - “The” means all parts

Encarta 9 (World English Dictionary, “The”, http://encarta.msn.com/encnet/features/dictionary/DictionaryResults.aspx?refid=1861719495)

2. indicating generic class: used to refer to a person or thing considered generically or universally
****Exercise is good for the heart.
She played the violin.
The dog is a loyal pet.

#### “Government” is all three branches

Black’s Law 90 (Dictionary, p. 695)

“[*Government*] In the United States, government consists of the executive, legislative, and judicial branches in addition to administrative agencies. In a broader sense, includes the federal government and all its agencies and bureaus, state and county governments, and city and township governments.”

#### Aff uses congress to implement a drone court - makes them not topical – voting issue for jurisdiction

#### 2ac Clarification is a doesn’t check – should have been in the 1ac,– normal means debates are inhibit so the only predictable standard is holding them to USFG in the plan text which is key to limits and negative ground.
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#### Terrorist capabilities are degraded- they still have operational intent though

McLaughlin 2013 [John McLaughlin was a CIA officer for 32 years and served as deputy director and acting director from 2000-2004. He currently teaches at the Johns Hopkins University's School of Advanced International Studies and is a Non-Resident Senior Fellow at the Brookings Institution July 12, 2013 “Terrorism at a moment of transition” http://security.blogs.cnn.com/2013/07/12/terrorism-at-a-moment-of-transition/]

On targets, jihadists are now pulled in many directions. Many experts contend they are less capable of a major attack on the U.S. homeland. But given the steady stream of surprises they’ve sprung – ranging from the 2009 “underwear bomber” to the more recent idea of a surgically implanted explosive – it is hard to believe they’ve given up trying to surprise us with innovations designed to penetrate our defenses.¶ We especially should remain alert that some of the smaller groups could surprise us by pointing an attacker toward the United States, as Pakistan’s Tehrik e Taliban did in preparing Faizal Shazad for his attempted bombing of Times Square in 2010.¶ At the same time, many of the groups are becoming intrigued by the possibility of scoring gains against regional governments that are now struggling to gain or keep their balance – opportunities that did not exist at the time of the 9/11 attacks.¶ Equally important, jihadists are now learning from their mistakes, especially the reasons for their past rejection by populations where they temporarily gained sway.¶ Documents from al Qaeda in the Islamic Maghreb, discovered after French forces chased them from Mali, reveal awareness that they were too harsh on local inhabitants, especially women. They also recognized that they need to move more gradually and provide tangible services to populations – a practice that has contributed to the success of Hezbollah in Lebanon.¶ We are now seeing a similar awareness among jihadists in Syria, Tunisia, Libya, and Yemen. If these “lessons learned” take hold and spread, it will become harder to separate terrorists from populations and root them out.¶ Taken together, these three trends are a cautionary tale for those seeking to gauge the future of the terrorist threat.¶ Al Qaeda today may be weakened, but its wounds are far from fatal. It is at a moment of transition, immersed in circumstances that could sow confusion and division in the movement or, more likely, extend its life and impart new momentum.¶ So if we are ever tempted to lower our guard in debating whether and when this war might end, we should take heed of these trends and of the wisdom J. R. R. Tolkien has Eowyn speak in “Lord of the Rings”: "It needs but one foe to breed a war, not two ..."

#### Civilian trials would send Al Qaeda fighters back to battle

Taylor 2009 [Stuart S. Taylor, Jr. is an author and freelance journalist focusing on legal and policy issues, National Journal contributing editor, (occasionally) Stanford Law School lecturer and practicing lawyer, and nonresident senior fellow at the Brookings Institution January 30, 2009 National Journal “Obama's Dangerous Detainees” http://www.nationaljournal.com/njmagazine/or\_20090117\_2727.php]

Indeed, the Pentagon said on January 13 that 18 of the approximately 500 Guantanamo detainees already released have definitely returned "to the fight" against America and that another 43 are suspected of doing so. Critics gave these claims little credibility because the Pentagon refused to provide details.¶ Meanwhile, human-rights activists have been seeking to create the false impressions that not many of the Guantanamo detainees are dangerous; that those who are can be prosecuted; and that the rest can be safely released.¶ But the military has determined that only about 60 of the 250 detainees could be released relatively safely, if other countries would take them, and that only 80 of the rest (including 9/11 mastermind Khalid Shaikh Mohammed) could face trial for war crimes by Bush's special "military commissions."¶ Obama may decide that more than 60 are not dangerous. Otherwise, that leaves 110 or so detainees who are considered both too dangerous to release and not-prosecutable; at least, military commission prosecutors have found no basis for charging them or (in some cases) the charges have been dismissed.¶ The number who could be prosecuted might well be lower than 80 if Obama follows through on his declared intent to move any and all prosecutions of detainees to ordinary federal or military courts. The president-elect reportedly, and in my view rightly, plans to suspend use of the military commissions. They have been an international embarrassment, in part because their rules allow for use of some evidence obtained through coercive interrogation.¶ Some of the apparently dangerous detainees could not be convicted because there is no (or not enough) evidence that they have acted on their declared intent to kill Americans; some because the evidence against them was obtained by intelligence sources and methods too sensitive to be aired in a public trial or even shown to defendants; and some (perhaps including Qahtani) because the only strong evidence was obtained through coercive interrogation, involves hearsay, or is otherwise inadmissible.¶ The "prosecute or release" approach demanded by groups such as the ACLU and Amnesty International "fails to recognize the United States' legitimate interest in holding individuals fighting against it in armed conflict," in the words of a recent commentary by Georgetown law professor David Cole, whose view on this carries extra weight because he is a leading human-rights lawyer and Bush critic.¶ "There are .... as many as 100 detainees, who may not be prosecutable for a specific offense but who are too dangerous to release -- e.g., admitted Al Qaeda or Taliban fighters who have said that they would return to the battle in Afghanistan if released," Cole added. "These individuals can continue to be held for the duration of the ongoing armed conflict with the Taliban and Al Qaeda -- as prisoners of war, without criminal charge or criminal trial."

#### Terrorism causes nuclear war

Ayson 2010 (Robert Ayson, Professor of Strategic Studies and Director of the Centre for Strategic Studies: New Zealand at the Victoria University of Wellington, “After a Terrorist Nuclear Attack: Envisaging Catalytic Effects,” Studies in Conflict & Terrorism, Volume 33, Issue 7, July, Available Online to Subscribing Institutions via InformaWorld)

A terrorist nuclear attack, and even the use of nuclear weapons in response by the country attacked in the first place, would not necessarily represent the worst of the nuclear worlds imaginable. Indeed, there are reasons to wonder whether nuclear terrorism should ever be regarded as belonging in the category of truly existential threats. A contrast can be drawn here with the global catastrophe that would come from a massive nuclear exchange between two or more of the sovereign states that possess these weapons in significant numbers. Even the worst terrorism that the twenty-first century might bring would fade into insignificance alongside considerations of what a general nuclear war would have wrought in the Cold War period. And it must be admitted that as long as the major nuclear weapons states have hundreds and even thousands of nuclear weapons at their disposal, there is always the possibility of a truly awful nuclear exchange taking place precipitated entirely by state possessors themselves. But these two nuclear worlds—a non-state actor nuclear attack and a catastrophic interstate nuclear exchange—are not necessarily separable. It is just possible that some sort of terrorist attack, and especially an act of nuclear terrorism, could precipitate a chain of events leading to a massive exchange of nuclear weapons between two or more of the states that possess them. In this context, today’s and tomorrow’s terrorist groups might assume the place allotted during the early Cold War years to new state possessors of small nuclear arsenals who were seen as raising the risks of a catalytic nuclear war between the superpowers started by third parties. These risks were considered in the late 1950s and early 1960s as concerns grew about nuclear proliferation, the so-called n+1 problem. It may require a considerable amount of imagination to depict an especially plausible situation where an act of nuclear terrorism could lead to such a massive inter-state nuclear war. For example, in the event of a terrorist nuclear attack on the United States, it might well be wondered just how Russia and/or China could plausibly be brought into the picture, not least because they seem unlikely to be fingered as the most obvious state sponsors or encouragers of terrorist groups. They would seem far too responsible to be involved in supporting that sort of terrorist behavior that could just as easily threaten them as well. Some possibilities, however remote, do suggest themselves. For example, how might the United States react if it was thought or discovered that the fissile material used in the act of nuclear terrorism had come from Russian stocks,40 and if for some reason Moscow denied any responsibility for nuclear laxity? The correct attribution of that nuclear material to a particular country might not be a case of science fiction given the observation by Michael May et al. that while the debris resulting from a nuclear explosion would be “spread over a wide area in tiny fragments, its radioactivity makes it detectable, identifiable and collectable, and a wealth of information can be obtained from its analysis: the efficiency of the explosion, the materials used and, most important … some indication of where the nuclear material came from.”41 Alternatively, if the act of nuclear terrorism came as a complete surprise, and American officials refused to believe that a terrorist group was fully responsible (or responsible at all) suspicion would shift immediately to state possessors. Ruling out Western ally countries like the United Kingdom and France, and probably Israel and India as well, authorities in Washington would be left with a very short list consisting of North Korea, perhaps Iran if its program continues, and possibly Pakistan. But at what stage would Russia and China be definitely ruled out in this high stakes game of nuclear Cluedo? In particular, if the act of nuclear terrorism occurred against a backdrop of existing tension in Washington’s relations with Russia and/or China, and at a time when threats had already been traded between these major powers, would officials and political leaders not be tempted to assume the worst? Of course, the chances of this occurring would only seem to increase if the United States was already involved in some sort of limited armed conflict with Russia and/or China, or if they were confronting each other from a distance in a proxy war, as unlikely as these developments may seem at the present time. The reverse might well apply too: should a nuclear terrorist attack occur in Russia or China during a period of heightened tension or even limited conflict with the United States, could Moscow and Beijing resist the pressures that might rise domestically to consider the United States as a possible perpetrator or encourager of the attack? Washington’s early response to a terrorist nuclear attack on its own soil might also raise the possibility of an unwanted (and nuclear aided) confrontation with Russia and/or China. For example, in the noise and confusion during the immediate aftermath of the terrorist nuclear attack, the U.S. president might be expected to place the country’s armed forces, including its nuclear arsenal, on a higher stage of alert. In such a tense environment, when careful planning runs up against the friction of reality, it is just possible that Moscow and/or China might mistakenly read this as a sign of U.S. intentions to use force (and possibly nuclear force) against them. In that situation, the temptations to preempt such actions might grow, although it must be admitted that any preemption would probably still meet with a devastating response. As part of its initial response to the act of nuclear terrorism (as discussed earlier) Washington might decide to order a significant conventional (or nuclear) retaliatory or disarming attack against the leadership of the terrorist group and/or states seen to support that group. Depending on the identity and especially the location of these targets, Russia and/or China might interpret such action as being far too close for their comfort, and potentially as an infringement on their spheres of influence and even on their sovereignty. One far-fetched but perhaps not impossible scenario might stem from a judgment in Washington that some of the main aiders and abetters of the terrorist action resided somewhere such as Chechnya, perhaps in connection with what Allison claims is the “Chechen insurgents’ … long-standing interest in all things nuclear.”42 American pressure on that part of the world would almost certainly raise alarms in Moscow that might require a degree of advanced consultation from Washington that the latter found itself unable or unwilling to provide. There is also the question of how other nuclear-armed states respond to the act of nuclear terrorism on another member of that special club. It could reasonably be expected that following a nuclear terrorist attack on the United States, both Russia and China would extend immediate sympathy and support to Washington and would work alongside the United States in the Security Council. But there is just a chance, albeit a slim one, where the support of Russia and/or China is less automatic in some cases than in others. For example, what would happen if the United States wished to discuss its right to retaliate against groups based in their territory? If, for some reason, Washington found the responses of Russia and China deeply underwhelming, (neither “for us or against us”) might it also suspect that they secretly were in cahoots with the group, increasing (again perhaps ever so slightly) the chances of a major exchange. If the terrorist group had some connections to groups in Russia and China, or existed in areas of the world over which Russia and China held sway, and if Washington felt that Moscow or Beijing were placing a curiously modest level of pressure on them, what conclusions might it then draw about their culpability? If Washington decided to use, or decided to threaten the use of, nuclear weapons, the responses of Russia and China would be crucial to the chances of avoiding a more serious nuclear exchange. They might surmise, for example, that while the act of nuclear terrorism was especially heinous and demanded a strong response, the response simply had to remain below the nuclear threshold. It would be one thing for a non-state actor to have broken the nuclear use taboo, but an entirely different thing for a state actor, and indeed the leading state in the international system, to do so. If Russia and China felt sufficiently strongly about that prospect, there is then the question of what options would lie open to them to dissuade the United States from such action: and as has been seen over the last several decades, the central dissuader of the use of nuclear weapons by states has been the threat of nuclear retaliation. If some readers find this simply too fanciful, and perhaps even offensive to contemplate, it may be informative to reverse the tables. Russia, which possesses an arsenal of thousands of nuclear warheads and that has been one of the two most important trustees of the non-use taboo, is subjected to an attack of nuclear terrorism. In response, Moscow places its nuclear forces very visibly on a higher state of alert and declares that it is considering the use of nuclear retaliation against the group and any of its state supporters. How would Washington view such a possibility? Would it really be keen to support Russia’s use of nuclear weapons, including outside Russia’s traditional sphere of influence? And if not, which seems quite plausible, what options would Washington have to communicate that displeasure? If China had been the victim of the nuclear terrorism and seemed likely to retaliate in kind, would the United States and Russia be happy to sit back and let this occur? In the charged atmosphere immediately after a nuclear terrorist attack, how would the attacked country respond to pressure from other major nuclear powers not to respond in kind? The phrase “how dare they tell us what to do” immediately springs to mind. Some might even go so far as to interpret this concern as a tacit form of sympathy or support for the terrorists. This might not help the chances of nuclear restraint.
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#### Debt deal happening now but PC is key to prevent Republican hardline stance on spending cuts – our evidence assumes dem concessions

Kapur 9/9 Sahil Kapur, TPM's senior congressional reporter and Supreme Court correspondent, his articles covering politics and public policy have been published in The Huffington Post, The Guardian and The New Republic, “{Is House GOP Backing Down In Debt Limit Fight?”, Talking Points Memo, Seotember 9th, 2013, http://tpmdc.talkingpointsmemo.com/2013/09/house-gop-cantor-memo-debt-ceiling-cr-sequester-immigration.php?ref=fpb

House Republicans are taming members’ expectations ahead of the debt limit showdown, signaling that they may not be able to extract significant concessions from Democrats.¶ A Friday memo to GOP members by Majority Leader Eric Cantor (R-VA) says “the House will act to prevent a default on our obligations before” the mid-October deadline the Obama administration has established. “House Republicans,” he says, “will demand fiscal reforms and pro-growth policies which put us on a path to balance in ten years in exchange for another increase in the debt limit.”¶ The language is vague — intentionally so, in order to maintain wiggle room for Republicans to avert a disastrous debt default. President Barack Obama has vowed not to pay a ransom to ensure the U.S. can meet its obligations.¶ If and when they do cave, Republicans will be hard-pressed to show their base they got something in return for raising the debt ceiling. In January, they got Senate Democrats to agree to pass a non-binding budget resolution. This time around, the possibilities for symbolic concessions range from a doomed Senate vote to delay or defund Obamacare or instructions to initiate the process of tax reform.¶ There are a number of demands rank-and-file Republicans have urged leaders to make which could genuinely complicate the battle, such as dollar-for-dollar spending cuts or unwinding Obamacare. Cantor’s memo mentioned neither. GOP members have also called on leadership not to bring up any debt limit bill that lacks the support of half the conference. Boehner hasn’t committed to this and Cantor didn’t mention it in his memo.¶ There are several reasons Republicans will have a hard time extracting concessions. Back in January, when Obama held firm and refused to negotiate on the debt limit, Republicans folded and agreed to suspend the debt ceiling without substantial concessions but rather symbolic ones. And due to deep divisions within the conference, House Republicans will face enormous challenges in rounding up 218 votes to pass any conceivable debt limit hike.

#### Previous attempts to alter executive detainment prove the plan sparks fights in congress– ideological backlash

Herb and Kasperowicz 13 Jeremy Herb, Pete Kasperowicz, reporters for the Hill, “Lawmakers back indefinite detention for terror suspects in US” The Hill, May 18th, 2013,

http://thehill.com/blogs/defcon-hill/policy-and-strategy/228293-house-backs-indefinite-detention-on-us-soil

In two votes Friday morning, the House backed the president’s powers to indefinitely detain terror suspects captured on U.S. soil.¶ Lawmakers rejected an amendment that would have barred military detention for terror suspects captured in the United States on a 182-231 vote, beating back the proposal from a coalition of liberal Democrats and libertarian-leaning Republicans led by Reps. Adam Smith (D-Wash.) and Justin Amash (R-Mich.).¶ Instead, the House passed, by a vote of 243-173, an amendment to the National Defense Authorization Act (NDAA) sponsored by Reps. Louie Gohmert (R-Texas), Jeff Landry (R-La.) and Scott Rigell (R-Va.) that affirmed U.S. citizens would not be denied habeas corpus rights.¶ Smith and Amash had hoped to attract enough support from libertarian-leaning Republicans to pass their measure, but only 19 Republicans voted for it, while 19 Democrats voted against.¶ The detainee fight is shaping up to be one of the biggest for this year's $643 billion defense authorization bill. The issue nearly derailed passage of last year's version.¶ Smith’s amendment would have changed last year’s defense authorization legislation and the 2001 Authorization for Use of Military Force (AUMF) so that terror suspects captured on U.S. soil would be handled by civilian courts, not the military.¶ The debate on the detainee amendments began after midnight Thursday, as part of a late night on the House floor to get through more than 140 amendments to the defense authorization bill.¶ Smith argued that indefinite detention gave the president an “extraordinary” amount of power, and said the federal courts have successfully prosecuted hundreds of terrorists since the Sept. 11 attacks.¶ Smith and his allies said Gohmert’s amendment was redundant, since it affirms what is already true — that American citizens have habeas corpus rights.¶ Gohmert’s amendment was “offered as a smokescreen,” Smith said.¶ “It doesn’t protect any rights whatsoever,” he said.¶ But supporters of indefinite detention suggested that the Smith-Amash amendment would incentivize terrorists to come to the United States, because they would receive more rights on U.S. soil than outside the country.¶ Gohmert suggested at one point that terrorists “supported” Smith’s amendment.¶ “We cannot look to guarantee those who seek to harm the U.S. the constitutional rights granted to Americans,” said Rep. Allen West (R-Fla.). “If we extend that to them, this war on terror, now it’s a criminal action.”¶ Like the detainee issue last year, the debate in the wee hours of Friday morning saw the two sides often talking past one another.¶ Both sides have claimed the Constitution and the courts are on their side, but legal experts say the federal courts have yet to take a firm position about terror suspects on U.S. soil being detained indefinitely.

#### Default collapses international status of the dollar – fiscal security is the ONLY reason surplus countries still invest

Masters 13 Jonathan Masters, has a graduate degree in social theory from The New School University where he focused on media and international relations. He also holds a B.A. in political science from Emory University, writes on issues related to national security and civil liberties, and contributes to CFR's Renewing America initiative that focuses on the economic underpinnings of U.S. foreign policy, “U.S. Debt Ceiling: Costs and Consequences”, Council on Foreign Relations, January 2nd, 2013, http://www.cfr.org/international-finance/us-debt-ceiling-costs-consequences/p24751#p8

Historically, the U.S. Treasury market has been driven by huge investments from surplus countries like Japan and China, which view the United States as the safest place to store their savings. A 2011 Congressional Research Service report suggests that a loss of confidence in the debt market could prompt foreign creditors to unload large portions of their holdings, thus inducing others to do so, and causing a run on the dollar in international markets. However, others claim that a sudden sell-off would run counter to foreign economic interests, as far as those interests run parallel to a robust U.S. economy.¶ While many U.S. exporters would benefit from dollar depreciation because it would increase foreign demand for their goods (effectively making them cheaper), the same firms would also bear higher borrowing costs from rising interest rates.¶ A potential long-term concern of some U.S. officials is that persistent volatility of the dollar will add force to recent calls by the international community for an end to its status as the world's reserve currency. A 2010 survey performed by the McKinsey Global Institute found fewer than 20 percent of business executives surveyed expected the dollar to be the dominant global reserve currency by 2025.

#### Dollar hegemony status is key to overall US economic and military leadership

William Clark, 2003; economic consultant and journalist, January (revised March 2003), “The Real Reasons for the Upcoming War with Iraq”, <http://www.ratical.org/ratville/CAH/RRiraqWar.html>

This unique geo-political agreement with Saudi Arabia in 1974 has worked to our favor for the past 30 years, as this arrangement has eliminated our currency risk for oil, raised the entire asset value of all dollar denominated assets/properties, and allowed the Federal Reserve to create a truly massive debt and credit expansion (or `credit bubble' in the view of some economists). These structural imbalances in the U.S. economy are sustainable as long as: 1. Nations continue to demand and purchase oil for their energy/survival needs 2. the world's monopoly currency for global oil transactions remains the US dollar 3. the three internationally traded crude oil markers remain denominated in US dollars These underlying factors, along with the `safe harbor' reputation of U.S. investments afforded by the dollar's reserve currency status propelled the U.S. to economic and military hegemony in the post-World War II period. However, the introduction of the euro is a significant new factor, and appears to be the primary threat to U.S. economic hegemony. Moreover, in December 2002 ten additional countries were approved for full membership into the E.U. Barring any surprise movements, in 2004 this will result in an aggregate E.U. GDP of $9.6 trillion and 450 million people, directly competing with the U.S. economy ($10.5 trillion GDP, 280 million people).

#### Nuclear war

Khalilzad 11 [Zalmay Khalilzad, counselor at CSIS, served as US Ambassador to Iraq, Afghanistan, and the UN under Bush II, former Asst. Prof of Poli Sci @ Columbia, PhD from University of Chicago, “The Economy and National Security,” Feb 8 2011, http://www.nationalreview.com/articles/259024/economy-and-national-security-zalmay-khalilzad]

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

## **Off**

#### Text: The executive of the US should refrain from indefinitely detaining persons related to terror investigations

#### Solves the entire aff- only the innocent will be sent home which means that criminals can still be charged**By**[**Michael Crowley**](http://swampland.time.com/author/crowley100/) **May 30, 2013**Why Gitmo Will Never Close

President Obama wants to shut down the controversial prison but not the policies it has come to represent. <http://swampland.time.com/2013/05/30/why-gitmo-will-never-close/#ixzz2bt3p80Gt>
Understanding why Gitmo hasn’t closed requires understanding who exactly is there. The camp holds three types of inmates, each posing different challenges. The first group consists of those 86 detainees deemed safe to release to their home countries or third nations, so long as they can be monitored and accounted for to ensure they don’t take up arms against the U.S. The second group consists of suspected terrorists whom the Administration is prosecuting or plans to charge with specific crimes. The third group consists of prisoners too dangerous to simply release—for reasons that could include a suspected organizational role in al-Qaeda, explosives training or in some cases an openly stated desire to kill Americans—but also impossible to put on trial, maybe because of evidence rendered inadmissible by torture; because the troops who captured them didn’t collect evidence; or because they supported al-Qaeda before the U.S. made that a crime for foreigners overseas. (**MORE:** [Guantánamo’s Starving Students](http://nation.time.com/2013/05/03/guantanamos-starving-students/)) The first group is the easiest to deal with. Obama has the freedom to send the 86 men home on his own. Fifty-six of them are from Yemen—all of whom could be there by now had al-Qaeda’s Yemeni affiliate, whose leaders included an ex–Gitmo detainee, not tried to bomb a Northwest Airlines flight on Christmas Day 2009, leading Obama to halt detainee transfers back to the country. Obama now says improvements in the Yemeni government’s ability to monitor repatriated detainees allows him to lift his self-imposed moratorium on returning detainees there. He can likewise dispatch the rest of the cleared inmates to other countries unilaterally.

#### **Presidential self constraint produces huge cred and popularity.**

Druck ’12 NOTE¶ DRONING ON: THE WAR POWERS RESOLUTION¶ AND THE NUMBING EFFECT OF¶ TECHNOLOGY-DRIVEN WARFARE¶ Judah A. Druck’13 † B.A., Brandeis University, 2010; J.D. Candidate, Cornell Law School, 2013; Notes¶ Editor, Cornell Law Review, Volume 98. http://www.lawschool.cornell.edu/research/cornell-law-review/upload/Druck-final.pdf

Naturally, some have argued that an unchecked President is not¶ necessarily an issue at all. Specifically, in The Executive Unbound, Eric¶ Posner and Adrian Vermeule argue that the lack of presidential constraint¶ is actually a rational development: we want a President who can¶ act with alacrity, especially in a world where quick decisions may be¶ necessary (e.g., capturing a terrorist).153 But rather than worry about¶ this progression, Posner and Vermeule argue that sufficient political¶ restraints remain in place to prevent a president from acting recklessly,¶ making the inability of legal constraints (such as the WPR) to¶ curtail presidential action a moot point.154 Specifically, a mix of “elections,¶ parties, bureaucracy, and the media” acts as an adequate constraint¶ on presidential action, even absent any legal checks on the executive.155 Posner and Vermeule find that presidential credibility¶ and popularity create a deep incentive for presidents to constrain¶ their own power. This restraint does not arise from a sense of upholding¶ the Constitution or fear of political backlash, but from the public¶ itself.156 Because of these nonlegal constraints, the authors conclude¶ that the fear of an unconstrained President (one that has the potential¶ to go so far as tyranny) is unwarranted.157

#### Strong presidency is essential to avert nuclear annihilation

Paul 1998 (Joel- Professor at University of Connecticut School of Law, “The Geopolitical Constitution: Executive Expediency and Executive Agreements,” California Law Review, Jul)

Whatever the complexity of causes that led to the Cold War - ideology, economics, power politics, Stalin's personality, Soviet intrigue, or American ineptitude - the tension of the bipolar order seemed real, immutable, and threatening to the U.S. public. 135 The broad consensus of U.S. leadership held that the immediacy of the nuclear threat, the need for covert operations and intelligence gathering, and the complexity of U.S. relations with both democracies and dictatorships made it impractical to engage in congressional debate and oversight of foreign policy-making. 136 The eighteenth-century Constitution did not permit a rapidresponse to twentieth-century foreign aggression. The reality of transcontinental ballistic missiles collapsed the real time for decision-making to a matter of minutes. Faced with the apparent choice between the risk of nuclear annihilationor amending the constitutional process for policy-making, the preference for a powerful executive was clear. 137 Early in the Cold War one skeptic of executive power, C.C. Rossiter, acknowledged that [“]thesteady increase in executive power is unquestionably a cause for worry, but so, too, is the steady increase in the magnitude and complexity of the problems the president has been called uponby the American people to solve in their behalf. They still have more to fear from the ravages of depression, rebellion, and especially atomic war than they do from whatever decisive actionsmay issue from the White House in an attempt to put any such future crises to rout....It is not too much to say that the destiny of this nation in the Atomic Age will rest in the capacity of the Presidency as an institution of constitutional dictatorship.

## **Case**

#### Plan text: They don’t do anything to repeal Obama’s power to detain- the plan text releases prisoners. Obama likes indef deten which means he will roll back your aff

### 1NC Existence pre-req

#### Existence is a prerequisite to ontological questioning

Paul **Wapner**, pub. date: Winter 20**03**, assoc. professor and director of the Global Environmental Policy Program at American University, “Leftist criticism of,” <http://www.dissentmagazine.org/article/?article=539>

THE THIRD response to eco-criticism would require critics to acknowledge the ways in which they themselves silence nature and then to respect the sheer otherness of the nonhuman world. Postmodernism prides itself on criticizing the urge toward mastery that characterizes modernity. But isn't mastery exactly what postmodernism is exerting as it captures the nonhuman world within its own conceptual domain? Doesn't postmodern cultural criticism deepen the modernist urge toward mastery by eliminating the ontological weight of the nonhuman world? What else could it mean to assert that there is no such thing as nature? I have already suggested the postmodernist response: yes, recognizing the social construction of "nature" does deny the self-expression of the nonhuman world, but how would we know what such self-expression means? Indeed, nature doesn't speak; rather, some person always speaks on nature's behalf, and whatever that person says is, as we all know, a social construction. All attempts to listen to nature are social constructions-except one. Even the most radical postmodernist must acknowledge the distinction between physical existence and non-existence. As I have said, postmodernists accept that there is a physical substratum to the phenomenal world even if they argue about the different meanings we ascribe to it. This acknowledgment of physical existence is crucial. We can't ascribe meaning to that which doesn't appear. What doesn't exist can manifest no character. Put differently, yes, the postmodernist should rightly worry about interpreting nature's expressions. And all of us should be wary of those who claim to speak on nature's behalf (including environmentalists who do that). But we need not doubt the simple idea that a prerequisite of expression is existence. This in turn suggests that preserving the nonhuman world-in all its diverse embodiments-must be seen by eco-critics as a fundamental good. Eco-critics must be supporters, in some fashion, of environmental preservation.

### 1NC Extinction outweighs

#### The risk of extinction outweighs all other values – magnitude outweighs probability

Jonathan **Schell**, pub. date: 19**82**, writer for the New Yorker and nuclear weapons expert, The Fate of the Earth

But the mere risk of extinction has a significance that is categorically different from, and immeasurably greater than, that of any other risk, and as we make our decisions we have to take that significance into account. Up to now, every risk has been contained within the frame of life; extinction will shatter the frame. It represents not the defeat of some purpose but an abyss in which all human purposes would be drowned for all time. We have no right to place the possibility of limitless, eternal defeat on the same footing as risks that we run in the ordinary conduct of our affairs in our particular transient moment of human history. To employ a mathematical analogy, we can say that although the risk of extinction may be fractional, the stake is, humanly speaking, infinite, and a fraction of infinity is still infinity. In other words, once we learn that a holocaust might lead to extinction, we have no right to gamble, because if we lose, the game will be over, and neither we nor anyone else will ever get another chance. Therefore, although, scientifically speaking, there is all the difference in the world between the mere possibility that a holocaust will bring about extinction and the certainty of it, morally they are the same, and we have no choice but to address the issue of nuclear weapons as though we knew for a certainty that their use would put an end to our species.

#### The slightest chance of nuclear weapons exchange must be rejected. The mere possibility of extinction nullifies any other calculation – the use of an actual nuclear weapon between countries declares war on all of humanity including indigenous populations\*\*\*

George **Kateb**, pub. dtae: 19**92**, William Nelson Cromwell Professor of Politics, Emeritus, @ Princeton University, “The Inner Ocean: Individualism and Democraitic Culture,” p. 111-3

Shells work attempts to force on us an acknowledgement that sounds far-fetched and even ludicrous, an acknowledgement that the possibility of extinction is carried by any use of nuclear weapons, no matter how limited or **seemiliy rational or** seemingly morally justified. He himself acknowledges that ther is a difference between a possibility and a certainty. But in a matter that is more than a matter, more than one practical matter in a vast series of political matters, in the “matter” of extinction, we are obliged to treat a possibility –a genuine possibility- as a certainty. Humanity is not to take any step that contains even the slightest risk of extinction. The doctrine of no-use is based on the possibility of extinction. Shell’s perspectives transforms the subject. He takes us away from the arid stretches of strategy and askes us to feel continuosly, if we can, and feel keenly if only for an instant now and then, how utter distinct the nuclear world is. Nuclear discourse must vividly register that distinctiveness. It is of no moral account that extinction may be only a slight possibility. No one can say how great the possibility is, but no one has yet credibly denied that by some sequence or other a particular use of nuclear weapon may lead to human and natural extinction. **I**f it is no impossible it must be treated as certain: the loss signified by extinction **nullifies all calculations of probability as it** nullifies all calculations of costs and benefits**.** Abstractly put, the connections between any use of nuclear weaons and human and natural extinction are several. Most obviously, **a sizable exchange of strategic nuclear weapons can, by chain of events of nature, lead to the earth uninhabitability**, to “nuclear winter,” or to Shell’s “republic of insects and grass.” But the consideration of extinction cannot rest with the possibility of a sizable exchange of strategic weaons. It cannot rest with the imperative that a sizable exchange must not take place. A so-called tactical or “theater” use, or a so-called limited use, is also prohibited absolutely, because of the possibility of **immediate** escalation into a sizable exchange or because, in even if there is not **an immediate** escalation, the possibility of extinction would reside in the precedent for future use sety by any use **whatever in a world in which more than one power possesses nuclear weapons**. Add other consequences: the contagious effect on nonnuclear powers who may feel compelled by a mixture of fear and vanity try to acquire their own weapons, thus increasing the possibility of use by increasing the number of nuclear powers; and the unleashed emotions of indignation, retribution, and reventch, which, if not acted on immediately in the form of escalation, can be counted on to seek expression later. **Other than full strategic uses are not confined, no matter how small the explosive power:** each would be a cancerous transformation of the world. All nuclear roads lead to the possibility of extinction. It is true by definition, but let us make it expilicit: the doctrine of no-use excludes any first or retaliatory or later use, whether sizable or not. No-use is the imperative derived form the possibility of extinction. By containing the possibility of extinction, any use is tantamount to a declaration of war against humanity. It is not merely a **war crime or a single** crime against humanity. Such a war is waged by the user of nuclear weapons against every human individual as individual (present and future), **not as citizen of this or that country**. It is not only a war against the country that is the target. To respond with nuclear weapons, where possible, only increases the chances of extinction and can never, therefore, be allowed. The use of nuclear weapons establishes the right of any person or group, acting officially or not, violently or not, to try to punish those responsible for the use. The aim of the punishment is to deter later uses and thus to try to reduce the possibility fo extinction, if, by chance, the particular use in question did no directly lead to extinction. The form of the punishment cannot be specified. Of course the chaos ensuing from a sizable exchange could make punishment irrelevant. The important point, however, is to see that those who use nuclear weapons are qualitatively worse than criminals, and at the least forfeits their offices.

### 1NC Life w/o value > Death

#### Life without value is better than death

Kenneth **Waltz**, pub. date: 19**59**, Institute of War and Peace Studied; Father of realism, Man, The State, and War

St. Augustine had observed the importance of self-preservation in the hierarchy of human motivations. When we see that even the most wretched “fear to die, and will rather live in such misfortune than end it by death, is it not obvious enough,” he asks, “how nature shrinks from annihilation?”10 The desire for self-preservation is, with Augustine, an observed fact. It is not a principle sufficient to explain the whole of man’s behavior. For Spinoza, however, the end of every act is the self-preservation of the actor. The laws of nature are simply statements of what this single end requires: natural right, a statement of what it logically permits.11 The man who lives according to reason will demonstrate both courage and high-mindedness. That is, he will strive to preserve himself in accordance with the dictates of reason, and he will strive to aid other men and unite them to him in friendship. This is not a description of actual behavior; it is a description of behavior that is ideally rational. It is not because they are duties that the man who follows the dictates of reason behaves with courage and high-mindedness. Instead

#### It’s a personal choice – external actors can’t decide the value of people’s lives\*\*\*

Lisa **Schwartz**, pub. date:20**04,** Medical Ethics, <http://www.fleshandbones.com/readingroom/viewchapter.cfm?ID=399>

Those who choose to reason on this basis hope that if the quality of a life can be measured then the answer to whether that life has value to the individual can be determined easily. This raises special problems, however, because the idea of quality involves a value judgement, and value judgements are, by their essence, subject to indeterminate relative factors such as preferences and dislikes. Hence, quality of life is difficult to measure and will vary according to individual tastes, preferences and aspirations. As a result, no general rules or principles can be asserted that would simplify decisions about the value of a life based on its quality. Nevertheless, quality is still an essential criterion in making such decisions because it gives legitimacy to the possibility that rational, autonomous persons can decide for themselves that their own lives either are worth, or are no longer worth, living. To disregard this possibility would be to imply that no individuals can legitimately make such value judgements about their own lives and, if nothing else, that would be counterintuitive. 2 In our case, Katherine Lewis had spent 10 months considering her decision before concluding that her life was no longer of a tolerable quality. She put a great deal of effort into the decision and she was competent when she made it. Who would be better placed to make this judgement for her than Katherine herself? And yet, a doctor faced with her request would most likely be uncertain about whether Katherine’s choice is truly in her best interest, and feel trepidation about assisting her. We need to know which considerations can be used to protect the patient’s interests. The quality of life criterion asserts that there is a difference between the type of life and the fact of life. This is the primary difference between it and the sanctity criterion discussed on page 115. Among quality of life considerations rest three assertions: 1. there is relative value to life 2. the value of a life is determined subjectively 3. not all lives are of equal value. Relative value The first assertion, that life is of relative value, could be taken in two ways. In one sense, it could mean that the value of a given life can be placed on a scale and measured against other lives. The scale could be a social scale, for example, where the contributions or potential for contribution of individuals are measured against those of fellow citizens. Critics of quality of life criteria frequently name this as a potential slippery slope where lives would be deemed worthy of saving, or even not saving, based on the relative social value of the individual concerned. So, for example, a mother of four children who is a practising doctor could be regarded of greater value to the community than an unmarried accountant. The concern is that the potential for discrimination is too high. Because of the possibility of prejudice and injustice, supporters of the quality of life criterion reject this interpersonal construction in favour of a second, more personalized, option. According to this interpretation, the notion of relative value is relevant not between individuals but within the context of one person’s life and is measured against that person’s needs and aspirations. So Katherine would base her decision on a comparison between her life before and after her illness. The value placed on the quality of a life would be determined by the individual depending on whether he or she believes the current state to be relatively preferable to previous or future states and whether he or she can foresee controlling the circumstances that make it that way. Thus, the life of an athlete who aspires to participate in the Olympics can be changed in relative value by an accident that leaves that person a quadriplegic. The athlete might decide that the relative value of her life is diminished after the accident, because she perceives her desires and aspirations to be reduced or beyond her capacity to control. However, if she receives treatment and counselling her aspirations could change and, with the adjustment, she could learn to value her life as a quadriplegic as much or more than her previous life. This illustrates how it is possible for a person to adjust the values by which they appraise their lives. For Katherine Lewis, the decision went the opposite way and she decided that a life of incapacity and constant pain was of relatively low value to her. It is not surprising that the most vociferous protesters against permitting people in Katherine’s position to be assisted in terminating their lives are people who themselves are disabled. Organizations run by, and that represent, persons with disabilities make two assertions in this light. First, they claim that accepting that Katherine Lewis has a right to die based on her determination that her life is of relatively little value is demeaning to all disabled people, and implies that any life with a severe disability is not worth living. Their second assertion is that with proper help, over time Katherine would be able to transform her personal outlook and find satisfaction in her life that would increase its relative value for her. The first assertion can be addressed by clarifying that the case of Katherine Lewis must not be taken as a general rule. Deontologists, who are interested in knowing general principles and duties that can be applied across all cases would not be very satisfied with this; they would prefer to be able to look to duties that would apply in all cases. Here, a case-based, context-sensitive approach is better suited. Contextualizing would permit freedom to act within a particular context, without the implication that the decision must hold in general. So, in this case, Katherine might decide that her life is relatively valueless. In another case, for example that of actor Christopher Reeve, the decision to seek other ways of valuing this major life change led to him perceiving his life as highly valuable, even if different in value from before the accident that made him a paraplegic. This invokes the second assertion, that Katherine could change her view over time. Although we recognize this is possible in some cases, it is not clear how it applies to Katherine. Here we have a case in which a rational and competent person has had time to consider her options and has chosen to end her life of suffering beyond what she believes she can endure. Ten months is a long time and it will have given her plenty of opportunity to consult with family and professionals about the possibilities open to her in the future. Given all this, it is reasonable to assume that Katherine has made a well-reasoned decision. It might not be a decision that everyone can agree with but if her reasoning process can be called into question then at what point can we say that a decision is sound? She meets all the criteria for competence and she is aware of the consequences of her decision. It would be very difficult to determine what arguments could truly justify interfering with her choice. Subjective determination The second assertion made by supporters of the quality of life as a criterion for decisionmaking is closely related to the first, but with an added dimension. This assertion suggests that the determination of the value of the quality of a given life is a subjective determination to be made by the person experiencing that life. The important addition here is that the decision is a personal one that, ideally, ought not to be made externally by another person but internally by the individual involved. Katherine Lewis made this decision for herself based on a comparison between two stages of her life. So did James Brady. Without this element, decisions based on quality of life criteria lack salient information and the patients concerned cannot give informed consent. Patients must be given the opportunity to decide for themselves whether they think their lives are worth living or not. To ignore or overlook patients’ judgement in this matter is to violate their autonomy and their freedom to decide for themselves on the basis of relevant information about their future, and comparative consideration of their past. As the deontological position puts it so well, to do so is to violate the imperative that we must treat persons as rational and as ends in themselves.

# **2NC**

## ESR

#### No risk of rollback-Fiat is durable and means that the plan is implemented and can’t be rolled back –That’s Reciprocal – aff gets durable fiat means the neg should too. Also critical to education – avoids should/would debates and focuses on the merits of the plan.

####  won’t be rolled back – presidential powers

Moe & Howell 99(Terry and WG, William Bennett Munro professor of political science at Stanford University,Sydney Stein Professor in American Politics in the Harris School School of Public Policy Studies, Oxford University Press, “The presidential power of unilateral action” abstract, 1999, <http://jleo.oxfordjournals.org/content/15/1/132.short>, Accessed 7/23/12)

In this article we highlight a formal basis for presidential power that has gone largely unappreciated to this point, but has become so pivotal to presidential leadership and so central to an understanding of presidential power that it virtually defines what is distinctively modern about the modern presidency. This is the president's formal capacity to act unilaterally and thus to make law on his own. Our central purpose is to set out a theory of this aspect of presidential power.We argue that the president's powers of unilateral action are a force in American politics precisely because they are not specified in the Constitution. They derive their strength and resilience from the ambiguity of the contract. We also argue that presidents have incentives to push this ambiguity relentlessly to expand their own powers - and that, for reasons rooted in the nature of their institutions, neither Congress nor the courts are likely to stop them. We are currently in the midst of a research project to collect comprehensive data for testing this theory - data on what presidents have done, as well as on how Congress and the courts have responded. Here we provide a brief history of unilateral action, with special attention to the themes of our theoretical argument. We also make use of some early data to emerge from our project. For now it appears that the theory is well supported by the available evidence. This is a work in progress, however, and more is clearly needed before definitive conclusions can be justified.

#### Congress won’t rollback even the most controversial presidential decisions.

Howell 3 [William G, Assistant Professor of Gov’t @ Harvard, Powers Without Persuasion: The Politics of Direct Presidential Action pg. 112]

The real world, obviously, is much more complicated than the unilateral politics model supposes. Uncertainties abound, and presidents frequently set policies without any assurance of congressional acquiescence. It is worth considering then, how presidents fare on those occasions when Congress does respond to a presidential directive. Do presidents tend to win most of the time? Or does Congress consistently crack the legislative whip, effectively enervating imperialistic presidents? Our theoretical expectation are relatively clear. Because the president has access to more (and better) information about goings-on in the executive branch, members of Congress will try to change only a small fraction of all status quo policies in any legislative session, and we should anticipate that members will leave alone the majority of unilateral directives that the president issues. While the president may occasionally overreach on a particularly salient issue, provoking a congressional response, in most instances Congress either will do nothing at all or will endorse the president’s actions

## Terror

#### Terrorist attack collapses the economy

Matthew **Bunn**, senior research associate in the Project on Managing the Atom in the Belfer Center for Science and International Affairs at the John F. Kennedy School of Government, Issues in Science and Technology, Winter **2005**

Fifth, such a crude terrorist bomb would potentially be capable of incinerating the heart of any city. A bomb with the explosive power of 10,000 tons of TNT (smaller than the Hiroshima bomb), if set off in midtown Manhattan on a typical workday, could kill half a million people and**.**cause more than $ 1 trillion in direct economic damage. **Devastating economic aftershocks would reverberate throughout the world**

### Link

#### Judicial review of detention crushes the war on terror

Wittes 2008 [Benjamin Wittes is a senior fellow in Governance Studies at The Brookings Institution. He co-founded and is the editor-in-chief of the Lawfare blog, which is devoted to sober and serious discussion of "Hard National Security Choices," and is a member of the Hoover Institution's Task Force on National Security and Law 2008 “LAW AND THE ¶ LONG WAR ¶ THE FUTURE OF JUSTICE ¶ IN THE AGE OF TERROR” Chapter 4 “The Necessity and ¶ Impossibility of Judicial ¶ Review” Penguin Press https://webspace.utexas.edu/rmc2289/National%20Security%20and%20the%20Courts/Law%20and%20the%20Long%20War%20%20Chapter%204.pdf]

A broad conception of judicial review in this conflict also suffers from an ¶ unrealistic assessment of judicial competence and capacity to evaluate military actions. This is true partly because of the limits of judges as people untrained in military matters and the limits of evidence collected in a fashion so ¶ far removed from the one to which judges are accustomed. Even when the ¶ military uses evidence it did not obtain through any untoward coercion, it will ¶ generally not have observed such standard law enforcement practices as preserving chains of custody of physical evidence. Society asks a lot of a judge ¶ who has never been to Afghanistan, who has never served in the military, and ¶ who has no intimacy with the day-to-day conduct of its overseas antiterrorism 'operations to decide not merely how to handle a morass of evidence of ¶ questionable probative value about a detainee who may pose an extreme danger if allowed to walk free but also to make up the rules and standards under ¶ , ¶ which he will consider that evidence. The temptation among some judges in ¶ that situation, understanding their own limitations, will be to defer absolutely ¶ to the military's judgment. Other judges, like the carpenter whose only tool is ¶ hammer and for whom every problem therefore resembles a nail, will try to ¶ apply criminal justice evidentiary standards to combat operations. The public ¶ should find neither reaction an appealing prospect.

#### The term terrorism is a critical uniting term for critical studies. The alternative would silence these voices and leaves the term to be utilized in its most violent form.

Jeroen **Gunning** (lecturer in international politics at the Department of International Politics at the University of Wales) **2007** “A Case for Critical Terrorism Studies?” Blackwell Synergy

Without a central concept like ‘terrorism’, many of these disparate voices are unlikely to converge. Yet without an explicit acknowledgement of the difficulties of this concept, and of the effects of ‘problem-solving’ approaches on the study of ‘terrorism’, many of those same voices are unlikely to converge under a ‘traditional terrorism studies’ umbrella. It is for this reason that it is necessary to instigate an explicitly ‘critical turn’ in ‘terrorism studies’ since only a field that explicitly problematizes some of the key aspects of ‘traditional terrorism studies’ is likely to facilitate the coming together of all these disparate voices. It is for the same reason that any critically constituted field may have to maintain the term ‘terrorism’ as the central unifying concept, despite its many drawbacks and the lack of an agreed definition, since without it there would be little reason for these fragmented voices to converge. In my own work on Hamas and Hizbollah, most of what I want to understand or explain can be said without reference to the term ‘terrorism’ (unless it concerns the way ‘terrorism’ discourse is used to demonize Hamas and Hizbollah).83 The decision of these organizations to target civilians can be explained without the term ‘terrorism’, and this is only one aspect of a much larger picture. Where ‘terrorism’ does come into its own is as a delineation of research dealing with similar issues. Without ‘terrorism’ as a conceptual umbrella, it is unlikely that I would have been aware of the model Ross and Gurr developed to explain the demise of political violence in North America, or of the similarities between the dynamics between massmovement, violent organization and state forces in 1970s Italy and 1990s Israel/Palestine.84 Thus, as a comparative conceptual category, ‘terrorism’ and the research that has been carried out into it is useful. Besides offering a central, organizing concept under which these fragmented voices can converge, there are two further reasons for retaining the term ‘terrorism’. One of the key tasks of a critically constituted field is to investigate the political usage of this term. For that reason alone, it should be retained as a central marker. But, even more compellingly, the term ‘terrorism’ is currently so dominant that a critically constituted field cannot afford to abandon it. Academia does not exist outside the power structures of its day. However problematic the term, it dominates public discourse and as such needs to be engaged with, deconstructed and challenged, rather than abandoned and left to those who use it without problematization or purely for political ends. Using the term also increases the currency and relevance of one's research in both funding and policy circles, as § Marked 10:09 § well as among the wider public. It is because of this particular constellation of power structures that a ‘critical’ field cannot afford, either morally or pragmatically, to abandon the term ‘terrorism’.

#### Censoring the word ‘terrorist’ is a perverted linguistic act that fractures true political debate, disconnects us from reality, and rationalizes atrocities

**Investor’s Business Daily 2005** (“Use the ‘T’ Word.” July 13, http://www.investors.com/editorial/issues01.asp?v=7/13

Most people agree words should have meaning. That's why it's so disturbing when major media outlets can't bring themselves to use the word "terrorism" to describe despicable acts against civilians. One of the most troubling aspects of the war on terror is that many in the media don't even think terrorism exists. At least, not as average people understand it. That was driven home last week after six terrorist bombs ripped through London's subway and a double-decker bus, killing 52 innocent people. Clearly an act of terrorism by terrorists, right? Hold on. The BBC, which is funded by British taxpayers, isn't so sure. The BBC did use the T-word in early reports. But then it thought better of it and went back and re-edited bits of coverage to delete descriptions of the evil-doers as terrorists. In the space of hours, Thursday morning's terrorists had become mere "bombers." Why? BBC "guidelines" on usage provide an answer. "The word 'terrorist' itself can be a barrier rather than an aid to understanding," they say, and should be "avoided." That's how language, and thus political debate, gets debased. Calling things what they are becomes "a barrier to understanding" — pure linguistic perversion. The beloved "Beeb" isn't solely responsible for this. Indeed, expunction of the noun "terrorist" is endemic among major media. It started shortly after the 9-11 attack, when the Reuters news service declared it would no longer use the "t" word in its reports. After all, "one man's terrorist is another man's freedom fighter," as one top Reuters editor put it at the time. Yeah, right. And one man's Nazi is another man's "misunderstood nationalist." The Associated Press, New York Times, Los Angeles Times and National Public Radio are among the media outlets that have joined in this collective dishonesty — to their everlasting shame. No wonder a Gallup poll showed the media's standing with the public has fallen to a new low, or that a Pew poll showed that many Americans believe the media undermine national security. George Orwell, in his "Politics and the English Language," inveighed against the use of weasel words. "The result," said the author of "1984," "is an increase in slovenliness and vagueness." That describes today's media perfectly, especially with regard to terrorism. They are slovenly and vague, using terms like "militant" and "insurgent" for the more concrete — and factually accurate — terrorist. Our democracy deserves better.

#### Censoring language merely shifts that meaning to another term that creates new forms of harassment and aggressivity magnifying the impacts

Slavoj **Zizek 1999** “The Ticklish Subject” p. 253-4

Take politically correct probing into hate speech and sexual harassment: the trap into which this effort falls is not only that it makes us aware of (and thus generates) new forms and layers of humiliation and harassment (we learn that ‘fat’, ‘stupid’, ‘shortsighted’… are to be replaced by weight-challenged, etc; the catch is, rather, that this censoring activity itself, by a kind of devilish dialectical reversal, starts to participate in what is purports to censor and fight – it is not immediately evident how, in designating somebody as ‘mentally cahllenged’ instead of ‘stupid’, an ironic distance can always creep in and give rise to an excess of humiliating aggressivity – one adds insult to injury, as it were, by the supplementary polite patronizing dimension (it is well known that aggressvity coated politeness can be much more painful than directly abusive words, since violence is heightened by the additional contrast between the aggressive content and the polite surface form…). In short, what Foucault’s account of the discourses that discipline and regulate sexuality leaves out of consideration is the process by means of which the power mechanism itself becomes eroticized, that is, contaminated by what it endeavours to repress. It is not enough to claim that the ascetic Christian subject who, in order ot fight temptation, enumerates and categorizes the various forms of temptation, actually proliferates the object he tries to combat; the point is, rather, to conceive of how the ascetic who flagellates in order to resist temptation finds sexual pleasure in this very act of inflicting wounds on himself

## Case

#### Kato is wrong – we have computer simulations conduct nuclear testing now, we haven’t conducted a nuclear test in over 12 years

Laura **Fleege 2005** “A Journey of a Thousand Miles” Talking Back Volume 4, Issue 1 http://writing.colostate.edu/gallery/talkingback/v4.1/fleege.htm

While the health problems caused by testing in the general population are well known, there is little focus of the catastrophic impacts testing has on indigenous cultures. Masahide Kato, professor of political science at the University of Hawaii, calls the nuclear testing **that occurs on the sovereign territory of Indigenous Nations “**undeclared nuclear warfare” (Kato 339). **Kato** also claims that the First World only recognizes Hiroshima and Nagasaki as the victims of nuclear disaster and fails to recognize **“the crude fact** that nuclear war has been taking place **on this earth** in the name of ‘nuclear testing’ since **the first nuclear explosion at Alamogordo in** 1945... The primary targets of warfare [are] invariabl[y] the Sovereign Nations of the Fourth World and Indigenous Nations” (Kato 348). The indigenous cultures in the United States include the Shoshone and Navajo, who occupy the Western U.S. as well as the Marshall, Bikini, and Christmas Islands in the South Pacific. Since former President Truman established the Nevada Test Site on their land, the Newe people, a faction of the Western Shoshone, became the most bombed nation on Earth, being the victim of 120 atmospheric and over 700 underground weapons explosions. Fallout contaminated areas from Idaho to Mexico. Not only have indigenous cultures had their land taken from them for use at test sites, but the tests have poisoned the water, killed the vegetation used for food and medicine, and hurt their livestock. Furthermore, these people are disproportionately affected by radioactive fallout. Corbin Harney, the spiritual leader of the Western Shoshone, calls radiation “our biggest enemy” (Swords). The health risks and the racism inherent in testing are not the only concerns we should consider when evaluating the CTBT. There is the ever-increasing threat of nuclear proliferation. The danger of terrorist organizations acquiring nuclear weapons is growing (Halter). Think about what would happen if this occurred. The September 11 th attacks would look like a trashcan fire compared to the catastrophe that would occur if the attack were carried out with nuclear weapons. Additionally, several nuclear weapons states, including Iran and North Korea, are threatening to abandon their commitments to the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty, spread nuclear technology and continue to develop their nuclear arsenals. The U.S. State Department asserts the “illicit, rapid spread of nuclear weapons and related technology constitutes a threat to international peace and security” (State News Service). Clearly, the time is now to take a step toward disarmament and non-proliferation. Former Secretary of State Colin Powell believes that “the treaty is necessary for the safety and reliability of the world because it will reduce the threat of nuclear weapons attacks” (Gordon). Science magazine even went as far as to say the “CTBT is the cornerstone of the worldwide effort to limit the spread of nuclear weapons and reduce the nuclear danger” (Drell, Jeanloz, and Peurifoy 1119). It is evident that action needs to be taken to reduce proliferation of nuclear weapons and decrease the dangers that nuclear weapons testing causes. However, critics question the CTBT’s ability to accomplish these goals. One of the treaty’s biggest criticisms is the effectiveness of its monitoring capabilities. However, of the over 300 International Monitoring Systems (IMS) the CTBT allows for, almost 200 are currently in full functioning condition even though the treaty has yet to enter into force. These stations are set up throughout the globe and operated by the CTBT Organization, headquartered in Vienna, Austria (CTBTO). The IMS uses four different types of monitoring systems: radionuclide, seismic, hydroacoustic, and infrasound signals. Radionuclide and seismic signals are primarily used to monitor underground tests, and hydroacoustic and infrasound signals can detect explosions in the atmosphere and underwater. An independent committee established to test the verification mechanisms found that “ the system is expected to detect with a very high level of con fi dence—and hence deterrence—a nonevasively conducted explosion of at least one kiloton (kt)…there is also a considerable deterrent e ff ect against clandestine testing below one kt” (Independent Commission on the Verifiability of the CTBT). The fear of a country evading the verification regime is not feasible either. **The commission found the only credible example of evasion is decoupling a nuclear weapon** (detonating it underground to minimize shockwaves), but **found that it is “unlikely that an emergent nuclear weapon state would have su ffi cient experience or resources to conduct successfully a fully decoupled, completely contained clandestine nuclear test explosion.** The most sophisticated nuclear weapon states would themselves have di ffi culty in carrying out such an explosion, even at low yield” (Independent Commission on the Verifiability of the CTBT). While modern science has shown that the verification mechanisms needed to facilitate CTBT’s entry into force are effective, there is still apprehension about the United States’ ability to maintain a credible nuclear deterrent under the treaty. To meet this concern, **The** D**epartment** o**f** E**nergy** developed **the Stockpile Stewardship Program** (SSP**),** a computer program that uses highly complex scientific algorithms to simulate nuclear tests. Although § Marked 10:13 § this program is still being developed, it will soon serve as a replacement to underground testing (Drell, Jeanloz, and Peurifoy 1119). The SSP also serves as a means to better understand the mechanics of nuclear explosions and can be used to assess the health of our nuclear stockpile (Committee on Technical Issues Related to Ratification of the Comprehensive Nuclear Test Ban Treaty 19). Furthermore, nuclear weapons are made up of over 6,000 parts, and the warhead is the only part of the weapon that the treaty prohibits testing. All of the other components, including the delivery system, could be tested under the CTBT. The ability to test the other parts of the weapon would increase confidence in the weapons performance, and if the need for new warheads arose because of compatibility issues with new delivery systems, the SSP would be capable to create new weapons designs (Committee on Technical Issues Related to Ratification of the Comprehensive Nuclear Test Ban Treaty 20). Moreover, during the 1980’s, the U.S. established a policy to test our aging stockpile annually and to monitor its condition. However, “no need was ever identified for a program that would periodically subject stockpile weapons to nuclear tests. Thus, nuclear testing never provided—and was never intended to provide—a statistical basis for confidence in the performance of stockpiled weapons” (Committee on Technical Issues Related to Ratification of the Comprehensive Nuclear Test Ban Treaty 21). Even though the United States has not performed a nuclear test in over 12 years, “the United States’ ratification is essential to persuade other countries to accept the treaty and strengthen other methods to curtail the spread of nuclear arms” (Gordon). U.S. accession to the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty is critical first step to sending a positive message that we must “step back from the shadows of war and seek out the way of peace. And if that journey is a thousand miles, or even more, let history record that we, in this land, at this time, took the first step” (“Kennedy”).

# 1NR

## Politics

#### Strong GOP opposition to the plan, dems split as well

[JOSH GERSTEIN](http://www.politico.com/reporters/JoshGerstein.html) | 7/24/13
Senate Panel Weighs Plans To Close Guantanamo
<http://www.politico.com/story/2013/07/guantanamo-closing-plans-94693.html>

A series of Senate Democrats called urgently Wednesday for the closure of the Guantanamo Bay prison, but appeared divided on the question of how to make that happen. The Senate hearing hinted at disagreements about what to do with the 166 war-on-terror detainees currently at the facility, and at strong House opposition to President Barack Obama’s vow to close the detention center. “Every day it remains open, Guantanamo prison weakens our alliances, inspires our enemies, and calls into question our commitment to human rights,” said Sen. Dick Durbin (D-Ill.) “I am sorry that it’s been five years since we had a hearing on Guantanamo.”The depth of resistance in the Congress to closing the prison was hard to assess at Wednesday’s hearing. The only Republican senator to attend, Ted Cruz of Texas, sounded a highly skeptical note about the idea. “It’s easy to say ‘close Guantanamo’ and get an applause from various audiences. The harder question, then, is what do you do with these terrorists,” Cruz said. He said a recent study by the Director of National Intelligence found that 28 percent of detainees previously released from Guantanamo were suspected or confirmed to have joined up with terrorist groups after leaving U.S. custody. Cruz also pointed to reports earlier this week that hundreds of Al Qaeda fighters escaped from the Iraqi-government-run Abu Ghraib prison.

#### CONTROVERSIAL COURT DECISIONS SPARK CONGRESSIONAL BACKLASH – CITIZENS PROVES.

ZELENY 10 JEFF, “Political fallout from the Supreme Court ruling” New York Times -- Jan 21 -- <http://thecaucus.blogs.nytimes.com/2010/01/21/political-fallout-from-the-supreme-court-ruling/>

Today’s ruling upends the nation’s campaign finance laws, allowing corporations and labor unions to spend freely on behalf of political candidates. With less than 11 months before the fall elections, the floodgates for political contributions will open wide, adding another element of intrigue to the fight for control of Congress.¶ At first blush, Republican candidates would seem to benefit from this change in how political campaigns are conducted in America. The political environment – an angry, frustrated electorate seeking change in Washington – was already favoring Republicans. Now corporations, labor unions and a host of other organizations can weigh in like never before.¶ But the populist showdown that was already brewing – President Obama on Thursday sought to limit the size of the nation’s banks – will surely only intensify by the Supreme Court’s ruling. The development means that both sides will have even louder megaphones to make their voices and viewpoints heard.¶ Mr. Obama issued a statement – a rare instance of a president immediately weighing in on a ruling from the high court – and said his administration would work with Congressional leaders “to develop a forceful response to this decision.”¶ “With its ruling today, the Supreme Court has given a green light to a new stampede of special interest money in our politics,” Mr. Obama said. “It is a major victory for big oil, Wall Street banks, health insurance companies and the other powerful interests that marshal their power every day in Washington to drown out the voices of everyday Americans.”¶ Republicans, of course, hailed the ruling as a victory for the First Amendment.¶ “I am pleased that the Supreme Court has acted to protect the Constitution’s First Amendment rights of free speech and association,” said Senator John Cornyn of Texas, chairman of the National Republican Senatorial Committee. “These are the bedrock principles that underpin our system of governance and strengthen our democracy.”¶ Democrats, not surprisingly, said the ruling would be bad for democracy.¶ “Giving corporate interests an outsized role in our process will only mean citizens get heard less,” said Senator Robert Menendez of New Jersey, chairman of the Democratic Senatorial Campaign Committee. “We must look at legislative ways to make sure the ledger is not tipped so far for corporate interests that citizens voices are drowned out.”

#### CONTROVERSIAL DECISIONS EMBOLDEN CONGRESS AND THE MEDIA.

Greenwald 6 (Glenn, Civil Rights Lawyer and Author “How would a Patriot Act?”, <http://glenngreenwald.blogspot.com/2006_06_01_glenngreenwald_archive.html>)

Additionally, court opinions historically have a political impact as well as legal effects. Despite the concerted, destructive attacks on the credibility of the Supreme Court by the likes of Mark Levin and Rush Limbaugh, who hate and wage war on any institution (such as the media) which dares to challenge the Powers of the President, Americans still retain a respect for the Supreme Court as an important and credible institution. The Court's proclamation that the President has been acting beyond his legal and constitutional authority strengthens that argument as a political matter.¶ It is also likely to further galvanize those in Congress and the media who have been gradually taking a stand against the Administration. A Supreme Court ruling that is this decisive, on an issue this significant, is virtually never confined to the legal realm, but almost always has impact, often profound impact, in the political realm as well.

#### Court decision would be blamed on Obama because he wants to close Gitmo- seen as a win for him

#### No Syria focus – every credible indicator points to debt ceiling focus for Obama’s PC

Sink 9/12 Justin Sink, reporter for the Hill, “Obama signals shift back to economic focus”, The Hill, September 12th, 2013, http://thehill.com/blogs/on-the-money/economy/321793-obama-signals-shift-back-to-focus-on-the-economy

The White House is signaling it wants to shift back to the economy after two weeks in which the Syrian crisis has dominated President Obama’s schedule and workload.¶ Obama will be “focusing” on issues related to the economy in the coming weeks, White House press secretary Jay Carney said Wednesday at his daily briefing.¶ He said the president wants to push forward with economic policies that the White House believes will grow the middle class.¶ Obama himself in his prime-time address to the nation Tuesday on Syria said voters wanted him focused on the economy and not on Syria. Public support for a military intervention in Syria is low.¶ “I know Americans want all of us in Washington — especially me — to concentrate on the task of building our nation here at home: putting people back to work, educating our kids, growing our middle class,” Obama said.¶ The president had wanted to use the beginning of September to press forward on his economic policies ahead of fights with Congress on government spending and debt.

#### Obama will be able to stand strong over Republicans now in avoiding acrimonious debt ceiling battles

Politico, 9-12-13 Read more: http://www.politico.com/story/2013/09/white-house-obamacare-debt-negotiations-96741.html#ixzz2epOKtixt

Senate Democratic leaders echoed White House arguments in a Capitol Hill press conference on Thursday, and they feel confident that their solidarity will prevail over a fractured House Republican Conference that just had to pull a stopgap bill to keep the government funded into the fall because it wouldn’t gut Obamacare. “The biggest thing has been the uniformity in the refusal to negotiate on the debt ceiling,” said Matt House, the communications director for Sen. Chuck Schumer (D-N.Y.). “We think at the last minute they’re going to be the ones that have to blink and come to us.”

House Republicans are badly fractured over spending. They can’t agree among themselves on whether to keep spending on its current trajectory, cut it further than the caps agreed to in previous budget deals, or, as a handful of Republicans believe, raise it a little bit. More important at the moment, they are divided over whether to shut down the government in the name of starving Obamacare.

## Impact

#### Debt ceiling battle will trigger economic collapse – not symbolic fight, last time triggered dramatic swings in economic growth.

Ian Shepherdson, Contributor WALL STREET | 9/13/2013 @ 1:21PM |126 views http://www.forbes.com/sites/ianshepherdson/2013/09/13/the-debt-ceiling-fight-is-not-just-political-theater-your-portfolio-is-at-risk/

It is tempting to view the looming fight over raising the debt ceiling as little more than political theater. After all, the U.S. is not about to default on its obligations or pass a budget so tight that the debt ceiling would not need to be raised, thereby triggering a deep recession. Before you fetch the popcorn, though, remember that this position is not much different to 2011, when Congressional squabbling over the debt ceiling triggered a dramatic rollover in consumer and small business confidence, and a 16.7% plunge in the S&P 500 in just two-and-a-half weeks. You might believe that this time will be different because we have been here before and everyone knows a deal will be done, eventually. I hope you’re right, but that view is no more than an untested assertion, and it makes sense at least to contemplate the alternative. Your portfolio might thank you for it.

#### Psychoanalysis can’t explain international politics

Sharpe, lecturer, philosophy and psychoanalytic studies, and Goucher, senior lecturer, literary and psychoanalytic studies – Deakin University, ‘10

(Matthew and Geoff, **Žižek and Politics: An Introduction**, p. 182 – 185, Figure 1.5 included)

Can we bring some order to this host of criticisms? It is remarkable that, for all the criticisms of Žižek’s political Romanticism, no one has argued that the ultra- extremism of Žižek’s political position might reflect his untenable attempt to shape his model for political action on the curative final moment in clinical psychoanalysis. The differences between these two realms, listed in Figure 5.1, are nearly too many and too great to restate – which has perhaps caused the theoretical oversight. The key thing is this. Lacan’s notion of traversing the fantasy involves the radical transformation of people’s subjective structure: a refounding of their most elementary beliefs about themselves, the world, and sexual difference. This is undertaken in the security of the clinic, on the basis of the analysands’ voluntary desire to overcome their inhibitions, symptoms and anxieties.¶ As a clinical and existential process, it has its own independent importance and authenticity. The analysands, in transforming their subjective world, change the way they regard the objective, shared social reality outside the clinic. But they do not transform the world. The political relevance of the clinic can only be (a) as a supporting moment in ideology critique or (b) as a fully- fl edged model of politics, provided that the political subject and its social object are ultimately identical. Option (*b*), Žižek’s option, rests on the idea, not only of a subject who becomes who he is only through his (mis) recognition of the objective sociopolitical order, but whose ‘traversal of the fantasy’ is immediately identical with his transformation of the socio- political system or Other. Hence, according to Žižek, we can analyse the institutional embodiments of this Other using psychoanalytic categories. In Chapter 4, we saw Žižek’s resulting elision of the distinction between the (subjective) Ego Ideal and the (objective) Symbolic Order. This leads him to analyse our entire culture as a single subject–object, whose perverse (or perhaps even psychotic) structure is expressed in every manifestation of contemporary life. Žižek’s decisive political- theoretic errors, one substantive and the other methodological, are different (see Figure 5.1)¶ The *substantive problem* is to equate any political change worth the name with the total change of the subject–object that is, today, global capitalism. This is a type of change that can only mean equating politics with violent regime change, and ultimately embracing dictatorial government, as Žižek now frankly avows (*IDLC* 412–19). We have seen that the ultra- political form of Žižek’s criticism of everyone else, the theoretical Left and the wider politics, is that no one is sufficiently radical for him – even, we will discover, Chairman Mao. We now see that this is because Žižek’s model of politics proper is modelled on a pre- critical analogy with the total transformation of a subject’s entire subjective structure, at the end of the talking cure. For what could the concrete consequences of this governing analogy be?¶ We have seen that Žižek equates the individual fantasy with the collective identity of an entire people. The social fantasy, he says, structures the regime’s ‘inherent transgressions’: at once subjects’ habitual ways of living the letter of the law, and the regime’s myths of origin and of identity. If political action is modelled on the Lacanian cure, it must involve the complete ‘traversal’ – in Hegel’s terms, the abstract versus the determinate negation – of all these lived myths, practices and habits. Politics must involve the periodic founding of entire new subject–objects. Providing the model for this set of ideas, the fi rst Žižekian political subject was Schelling’s divided God, who gave birth to the entire Symbolic Order before the beginning of time (*IDLC* 153; *OB* 144–8).¶ But can the political theorist reasonably hope or expect that subjects will simply give up on all their inherited ways, myths and beliefs, all in one world- creating moment? And can they be legitimately asked or expected to, on the basis of a set of ideals whose legitimacy they will only retrospectively see, after they have acceded to the Great Leap Forward? And if they do not – for Žižek laments that today subjects are politically disengaged in unprecedented ways – what means can the theorist and his allies use to move them to do so?

#### No empirical basis for applying psychology to state action

Epstein, senior lecturer in government and IR – University of Sydney, ‘10

(Charlotte, “Who speaks? Discourse, the subject and the study of identity in international politics,” European Journal of International Relations XX(X) 1–24)

One key advantage of the Wendtian move, granted even by his critics (see Flockhart, 2006), is that it simply does away with the level-of-analysis problem altogether. If states really are persons, then we can apply everything we know about people to understand how they behave. The study of individual identity is not only theoretically justified but it is warranted. This cohesive self borrowed from social psychology is what allows Wendt to bridge the different levels of analysis and travel between the self of the individual and that of the state, by way of a third term, ‘group self’, which is simply an aggregate of individual selves. Thus for Wendt (1999: 225) ‘the state is simply a “group Self” capable of group level cognition’. Yet that the individual possesses a self does not logically entail that the state possesses one too. It is in this leap, from the individual to the state, that IR’s fallacy of composition surfaces most clearly.¶ Moving beyond Wendt but maintaining the psychological self as the basis for theorizing the state¶ Wendt’s bold ontological claim is far from having attracted unanimous support (see nota­bly, Flockhart, 2006; Jackson, 2004; Neumann, 2004; Schiff, 2008; Wight, 2004). One line of critique of the states-as-persons thesis has taken shape around the resort to psy­chological theories, specifically, around the respective merits of Identity Theory (Wendt) and SIT (Flockhart, 2006; Greenhill, 2008; Mercer, 2005) for understanding state behav­iour.9 Importantly for my argument, that the state has a self, and that this self is pre-social, remains unquestioned in this further entrenching of the psychological turn. Instead questions have revolved around how this pre-social self (Wendt’s ‘Ego’) behaves once it encounters the other (Alter): whether, at that point (and not before), it takes on roles prescribed by pre-existing cultures (whether Hobbessian, Lockean or Kantian) or whether instead other, less culturally specific, dynamics rooted in more universally human char­acteristics better explain state interactions. SIT in particular emphasizes the individual’s basic need to belong, and it highlights the dynamics of in-/out-group categorizations as a key determinant of behaviour (Billig, 2004). SIT seems to have attracted increasing interest from IR scholars, interestingly, for both critiquing (Greenhill, 2008; Mercer, 1995) and rescuing constructivism (Flockhart, 2006).¶ For Trine Flockart (2006: 89–91), SIT can provide constructivism with a different basis for developing a theory of agency that steers clear of the states-as-persons thesis while filling an important gap in the socialization literature, which has tended to focus on norms rather than the actors adopting them. She shows that a state’s adherence to a new norm is best understood as the act of joining a group that shares a set of norms and val­ues, for example the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO). What SIT draws out are the benefits that accrue to the actor from belonging to a group, namely increased self-esteem and a clear cognitive map for categorizing other states as ‘in-’ or ‘out-group’ members and, from there, for orientating states’ self–other relationships.¶ Whilst coming at it from a stance explicitly critical of constructivism, for Jonathan Mercer (2005: 1995) the use of psychology remains key to correcting the systematic evacuation of the role of emotion and other ‘non-rational’ phenomena in rational choice and behaviourist analyses, which has significantly impaired the understanding of inter­national politics. SIT serves to draw out the emotional component of some of the key drivers of international politics, such as trust, reputation and even choice (Mercer, 2005: 90–95; see also Mercer, 1995). Brian Greenhill (2008) for his part uses SIT amongst a broader array of psychological theories to analyse the phenomenon of self–other recog­nition and, from there, to take issue with the late Wendtian assumption that mutual recognition can provide an adequate basis for the formation of a collective identity amongst states.¶ The main problem with this psychological turn is the very utilitarian, almost mecha­nistic, approach to non-rational phenomena it proposes, which tends to evacuate the role of meaning. In other words, it further shores up the pre-social dimension of the concept of self that is at issue here. Indeed norms (Flockhart, 2006), emotions (Mercer, 2005) and recognition (Greenhill, 2008) are hardly appraised as symbolic phenomena. In fact, in the dynamics of in- versus out-group categorization emphasized by SIT, language counts for very little. Significantly, in the design of the original experiments upon which this approach was founded (Tajfel, 1978), whether two group members communicate at all, let alone share the same language, is non-pertinent. It is enough that two individuals should know (say because they have been told so in their respec­tive languages for the purposes of the experiment) that they belong to the same group for them to favour one another over a third individual. The primary determinant of individual behaviour thus emphasized is a pre-verbal, primordial desire to belong, which seems closer to pack animal behaviour than to anything distinctly human. What the group stands for, what specific set of meanings and values binds it together, is unimportant. What matters primarily is that the group is valued positively, since posi­tive valuation is what returns accrued self-esteem to the individual. In IR Jonathan Mercer’s (2005) account of the relationship between identity, emotion and behaviour reads more like a series of buttons mechanically pushed in a sequence of the sort: posi­tive identification produces emotion (such as trust), which in turn generates specific patterns of in-/out-group discrimination.¶ Similarly, Trine Flockhart (2006: 96) approaches the socializee’s ‘desire to belong’ in terms of the psychological (and ultimately social) benefits and the feel-good factor that accrues from increased self-esteem. At the far opposite of Lacan, the concept of desire here is reduced to a Benthamite type of pleasure- or utility-maximization where mean­ing is nowhere to be seen. More telling still is the need to downplay the role of the Other in justifying her initial resort to SIT. For Flockhart (2006: 94), in a post-Cold War con­text, ‘identities cannot be constructed purely in relation to the “Other”’. Perhaps so; but not if what ‘the other’ refers to is the generic, dynamic scheme undergirding the very concept of identity. At issue here is the confusion between the reference to a specific other, for which Lacan coined the concept of *le petit autre*, and the reference to *l’Autre*, or Other, which is that symbolic instance that is essential to the making of *all* selves. As such it is not clear what meaning Flockhart’s (2006: 94) capitalization of the ‘Other’ actually holds.¶ The individual self as a proxy for the state’s self¶ Another way in which the concept of self has been centrally involved in circumventing the level-of-analysis problem in IR has been to treat the self of the individual as a proxy for the self of the state. The literature on norms in particular has highlighted the role of individuals in orchestrating norm shifts, in both the positions of socializer (norm entre­preneurs) and socializee. It has shown for example how some state leaders are more sus­ceptible than others to concerns about reputation and legitimacy and thus more amenable to being convinced of the need to adopt a new norm, of human rights or democratization, for example (Finnemore and Sikkink, 1998; Keck and Sikkink, 1998; Risse, 2001). It is these specific psychological qualities pertaining to their selves (for example, those of Gorbachev; Risse, 2001) that ultimately enable the norm shift to occur. Once again the individual self ultimately remains the basis for explaining the change in state behaviour.¶ To summarize the points made so far, whether the state is literally considered as a person by ontological overreach, whether so only by analogy, or whether the person stands as a proxy for the state, the ‘self’ of that person has been consistently taken as the reference point for studying state identities. Both in Wendt’s states-as-persons thesis, and in the broader psychological turn within constructivism and beyond, the debate has con­sistently revolved around the need to evaluate which of the essentialist assumptions about human nature are the most useful for explaining state behaviour. It has never ques­tioned the validity of starting from these assumptions in the first place. That is, what is left unexamined is this assumption is that what works for individuals will work for states too. This is IR’s central fallacy of composition, by which it has persistently eschewed rather than resolved the level-of-analysis problem. Indeed, in the absence of a clear dem­onstration of a logical identity (of the type A=A) between states and individuals, the assumption that individual interactions will explain what states do rests on little more than a leap of faith, or indeed an analogy.

#### Threat construction isn’t sufficient to cause wars

Kaufman, Prof Poli Sci and IR – U Delaware, **‘9**

(Stuart J, “Narratives and Symbols in Violent Mobilization: The Palestinian-Israeli Case,” *Security Studies* 18:3, 400 – 434)

**Even when hostile narratives**, group **fears, and opportunity are** strongly **present, war occurs only if these factors are harnessed.** **Ethnic narratives and fears must combine to create significant** ethnic **hostility among** mass **publics. Politicians must** also **seize the opportunity to manipulate that hostility**, evoking hostile narratives and symbols to gain or hold power by **riding a wave of chauvinist mobilization.** Such mobilization is often spurred by prominent events (for example, episodes of violence) that increase feelings of hostility and make chauvinist appeals seem timely. If the other group also mobilizes and if each side's felt security needs threaten the security of the other side, **the result is a security dilemma spiral** of rising fear, hostility, and mutual threat that results in violence. **A virtue of** this **symbolist theory is that symbolist logic explains why** ethnic **peace is more common than ethnonationalist war.** **Even if hostile narratives**, fears, and opportunity **exist, severe violence** usually **can** still **be avoided if** ethnic **elites** skillfully **define group needs in moderate ways and collaborate across group lines** to prevent violence: this is consociationalism.17 War is likely only if hostile narratives, fears, and opportunity spur hostile attitudes, chauvinist mobilization, and a security dilemma.

#### Economic growth is necessary to fund the fight against AIDS, Tuberculosis, and Malaria which causes endless suffering

Shah 9 (Anup, Degree in Computer Science and Founder of Globalissues.org, 11-29, http://www.globalissues.org/ article/90/aids-in-africa#Globalfundshelpglobalfinancialcrisishinders, 6-21-11, AH)

The global financial crisis—a problem largely caused by rich nations—has led to some African countries cutting their health and HIV budgets. Their health budgets and resources have been constrained for many years already, so this crisis makes a bad situation worse: “Already, large percentages of households in Sub-Saharan Africa are poor, and the large number of people on treatment means ever-increasing treatment program costs. Yet, Sub-Saharan Africa only accounts for one percent of global health expenditure and two percent of the global health workforce. Currently, only one third of HIV-positive Africans in need of antiretroviral (ARV) treatment can access it. … Dr Bactrin Killingo, chairperson of the Nairobi-based Collaborative Fund for HIV Treatment Preparedness [says, ] “If current cost constraints faced by HIV treatment programmes are not addressed, while the demand for expensive second-line treatment increases, we will soon find ourselves in a situation similar to the 1990s, where millions of lives were lost unnecessarily because people could not afford the treatment they needed to stay alive.” And it is not just poor nations’ health funds at risk. IPS adds that even international donor organizations have started to feel the financial crunch: “The Global Fund to Fight AIDS, Tuberculosis and Malaria recently announced it is at least $4 billion short of the money it will need to continue funding essential HIV, TB and malaria services in 2010. The coalition believes there is a $10.7 billion funding gap for regional implementation of the Global Plan to Stop TB alone.”