**1NC**

**Debt Ceiling DA**

**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.

**Plan results in fierce congressional opposition – empirics and bellicose congress members**

**Ackerman 5/23** Spencer Ackerman, Senior reporter for the Danger Room @ Wired, recently won the 2012 National Magazine Award for Reporting in Digital Media, “Exclusive: Congressman Preps Bill to End Terror War Authority”, Wired, May 23rd, 2013, http://www.wired.com/dangerroom/2013/05/schiff-aumf/

Rep. Adam Schiff (D-Calif.) is preparing a piece of legislation that would “sunset” the 2001 Authorization to Use Military Force (AUMF), a foundational law passed in the days after the 9/11. “The current AUMF is outdated and straining at the edges to justify the use of force outside the war theater,” Schiff tells Danger Room.¶ Repealing the AUMF would be the boldest restriction of presidential war powers since 9/11. Both the Bush and Obama administrations have relied on the document to authorize everything from the warrantless electronic surveillance of American citizens to drone strikes against al-Qaida offshoots that did not exist on 9/11. Getting rid of it is certain to invite fierce opposition from more bellicose members of Congress, who have repeatedly demagogued efforts to roll back any post-9/11 wartime authority, let alone the most important one.¶ Rep. Barbara Lee (D-Calif.), the only legislator to vote against the authorization in 2001, has long fought unsuccessfully to repeal the AUMF. But Schiff is a moderate, not a firebreathing liberal, and while sunsetting the AUMF is sure to be a big legislative challenge, even conservative legislators like Rand Paul (R-Ky.) are raising fundamental questions about the merits of a never-ending war.

**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**, 200**3**; 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).

**Global economic crisis causes nuclear war**

Cesare **Merlini 11**, nonresident senior fellow at the Center on the United States and Europe and chairman of the Board of Trustees of the Italian Institute for International Affairs, May 2011, “A Post-Secular World?”, Survival, Vol. 53, No. 2

Two neatly opposed scenarios for the future of the world order illustrate the range of possibilities, albeit at the risk of oversimplification. The first scenario entails the premature crumbling of the post-Westphalian system. One or more of the acute tensions apparent today evolves into an open and traditional **conflict** between states, perhaps even **involving the use of nuclear weapons.** The crisis might be triggered by a collapse of the global economic and financial system, the vulnerability of which we have just experienced, and the prospect of a second Great Depression, with consequences for peace and democracy similar to those of the first. Whatever the trigger, the unlimited exercise of national sovereignty, exclusive self-interest and rejection of outside interference would self-interest and rejection of outside interference would likely be amplified, emptying, perhaps entirely, the half-full glass of multilateralism, including the UN and the European Union. Many of the more likely conflicts, such as between Israel and Iran or India and Pakistan, have potential religious dimensions. Short of war, tensions such as those related to immigration might become unbearable. Familiar issues of creed and identity could be exacerbated. One way or another, the secular rational approach would be sidestepped by a return to theocratic absolutes, competing or converging with secular absolutes such as unbridled nationalism**.**

**Basing CP**

**The United States federal government should develop and implement a mobile Sea Basing naval capability aimed at ensuring adequate United States forward deployment and power projection capabilities.**

**Seabasing solves all their conflict scenarios.**

**Perry 9** (Commander Michael F, US Navy, 6-5-09, “IMPORTANCE OF SEABASING TO LAND POWER GENERATION”, USAWC PROGRAM RESEARCH. http://www.dtic.mil/cgi-bin/ GetTRDoc?AD=ADA508337& Location=U2&doc=GetTRDoc.pdf

**This study reaches six conclusions regarding the importance and future of Seabasing. First, given America’s increasingly limited access to overseas bases, Seabasing is essential to land power generation and will likely become even more essential throughout the 21st Century**. Specifically, **land power is of little use without access to the internal lines of communication that it seeks to sever and control. Seabasing provides the most efficient and effective means of placing boots on the ground, particularly in the increasingly frequent case where modern air and seaports are unavailable due to underdevelopment, devastation or anticipated losses.** Rather, **Seabasing allows applying force directly to an objective from the relative security of the sea**. Second, Corbett was right. **The ultimate center of gravity of any opponent is its homeland and internal lines of communication. Sea and air power lack the direct and sustained influence required to achieve a decisive and lasting victory. Thus, historically, and for the foreseeable future, “imposing one’s will on an enemy involves threatening the integrity of his state” by “threatening or conducting an invasion of his homeland**.”98 **Such “gun boat diplomacy” works best when one clearly has the ways and means to impose a desired end. Seabasing allows Joint Force Commanders to rapidly mass and move land power around the periphery of a continental opponent and attack at the times and places of their choosing. This clearly communicates the ability of U.S. forces to rapidly respond anywhere in the world.** **Nothing could be more important to deterring aggression against the U.S. and its allies and supporting American foreign policy**.99 **Thus, Seabasing “is the most promising option available to national security planners, both civilian and military, because it can achieve political purpose in a manner which most other joint capabilities cannot match.”**

**Turkey CP**

**The United States Federal Government should establish a policy that it will:**

**unless the Government of Turkey acknowledges that Turkey was responsible for the genocide of Armenians.**

**Observation One – CP competes**

**It tests the word “resolved” which means “to make a firm decision about”, the word “should” which is “used to imply obligation or duty”That’s American Heritage Dictionary at dictionary.com**

**Observation Two – net benefit**

**U.S. pressure on Turkey to recognize the Armenian genocide is key to shatter the global silence – Turkey would say no.**

Vahe **Tazian**, writer @ Detroit News, 4-24-**2006**, U.S. must demand Turkey admit Armenian genocide, the Detroit News

Armenians worldwide today will commemorate the 91st anniversary of the Armenian genocide. This year's remembrance of the massacre of more than 1 million Armenians by the Young Turk government of the Ottoman Empire carries particular significance. With Turkey's desire for European Union membership looming, international pressure has never been stronger on Turkey to address its own history. And Ankara's political elites have never been so steadfast in furthering the myths used to explain the crime. **There is no better opportunity** than now **to hold Turkey accountable for the crimes of its culture's past**. In December 2005, the ghost of the 1915 Armenian genocide appeared on the European Union scene when French Foreign Minister Michel Barnier announced that Turkey would be expected to recognize the event during EU accession negotiations. "This is an issue that we will raise during the negotiation process," he said. "We will have about 10 years to do so and the Turks will have about 10 years to ponder their answer." Perhaps **Turkey already has its answer: Blame the victim and employ tactics to confuse and divert attention from the truth**. Turkey has accused Armenians of rebelling during the war, helping the Russians and killing Turks. But no credible evidence supports this contention, and historians, academics and survivors agree what happened to the Armenians in 1915 amounts to genocide. Recently, Turkish President Ahmet Necdet Sezer said the accusations of genocide are baseless and "upset and hurt the feelings of the Turkish nation," adding, "It is wrong for our European friends to press Turkey on this issue." **Efforts to silence those who speak of the atrocity indicate Turkey's denial campaign**. The best-selling Turkish novelist Orhan Pamuk was prosecuted last year for "insulting Turkish identity" by referring to the Armenian genocide in a Swiss newspaper interview. "One million Armenians and 30,000 Kurds were killed in these lands and nobody but me dares talk about it," Pamuk said. The charges against Pamuk -- for a crime punishable by up to three years in prison -- were dropped in February after considerable international protest. Any event relating to the genocide -- film, conference, memorial, publication -- is fought by Turkish embassies, including, in some instances, by mobilizing Turkish immigrant communities. **Such determined efforts by the Turkish government are** partly **the reason why the Armenian genocide is barely known and has not been formally recognized by** so many countries, including **the** United States. **For too long, the** United States **has caved to politics, failing to pressure Turkey** for fear of upsetting an ally. Yet, its National Archives are filled with thousands of pages documenting the premeditated extermination of Armenians. Thirty-six states, including California, New York and Michigan, have formally recognized the genocide and more than 170 members of Congress are co-sponsors of the Armenian Genocide Resolution. **Continuing to ignore the occurrence of this human tragedy is acquiescing in Turkey's denial. U.S.** lawmakers and the international community **should** join members of the European Union, **demand**ing **Turkey finally recognize the murder of the Armenians as genocide**. **The silence that has greeted calls for Armenian Genocide remembrance must be replaced with a global outcry**, as was echoed by Henry Morgenthau, U.S. ambassador to Turkey during the genocide.

**Turkey loves American predator drones. They are seeking increased cooperation on drones policy for their own regional interests.**

**World Tribune 2013** 3/22 “Strained ties with Israel frustrating Turkey’s request for advanced U.S. drones” <http://www.worldtribune.com/2013/03/22/strained-ties-with-israel-frustrating-turkeys-request-for-advanced-u-s-drones/>

The U.S. military’s European Command said that the government of Turkish Prime Minister Recep Erdogan was growing increasingly restless amid demands for an expanded defense alliance with the United States. Eucom said Ankara was seeking advanced combat platforms from Washington, including the Predator unmanned aerial vehicle. The report, submitted by Eucom chief Adm. James Stavridis, said the U.S. military was concerned over Turkey’s poor relationship with Israel. Officials said Erdogan has banned Israel from military exercises, including those with NATO states. “Turkey’s eroding relationship with Israel bears special emphasis,” the report said. “Resumption of good relations between these two U.S. allies, and willingness to facilitate these relations on a military-to-military level, remain a priority for European Command.” “Turkey’s status as a stable, democratic nation, its sizable security resources, and its influence as a regional power broker combine to make this NATO ally a critical component in achieving U.S. regional objectives,” Eucom said. “In return, Turkey is raising its expectations for U.S. cooperation and partnership, specifically with access to high-end Foreign Military Sales, cooperation on counter-terrorism activity, and increased leadership opportunities in NATO and coalition political/military structures.” In a report to the Senate Armed Services Committee on March 19, Eucom cited Turkish cooperation with the United States on a range of regional issues. The report said Eucom and the Turkish General Staff were engaged in a dialogue that included the Sunni revolt in neighboring Syria. But officials said Erdogan has become frustrated by the U.S. refusal to supply a range of combat assets, particularly Predator. They cited State Department objections to the sale of Predator, which could be fitted with air-to-ground missiles. Instead, Washington has urged Ankara to wait for the development of Predator XP, designed solely as a reconnaissance platform. Over the last few years, Eucom has restored cooperation with Turkey’s military. The two sides drafted a memorandum of understanding meant to define new areas of cooperation, including special forces. “After a two-year hiatus to develop a new memorandum of understanding with Turkey, we are once again working closely with our Turkish SOF counterparts,” the report said. “The establishment of the MoU with Turkish Army Special Forces will greatly improve the U.S.-Turkish bilateral SOF relationship, enabling exchanges that will continue to pay strong dividends for both countries in the near future. Special Operations Command Europe key leader engagements with CT forces from the Turkish Ministry of the Interior have also increased potential for important future cooperation.”

**The CP’s pressure uniquely prevents future genocides.**

Marian Mesrobian **MacCurdy**, Special Assistant to the President, Professor of Writing, Ithaca College, 6-26-**2009**, Armenians, Turks, and the Question of Genocide, Chronicle of Higher Education

Mr. **Parini expresses shock that such genocides can occur, but he does not attempt to explain what permits them to happen**, which is the real story: **Genocides exist because they can** -- that is, the murderers are allowed to get away with it. **In order to protect its relationship with the Turks, who have denied the existence of the Armenian genocide** for more than 90 years (and have intensively lobbied the United States to do the same), **our government has not acknowledged the historical truth of the Armenian genocide**. In spite of election promises to the contrary, President Obama has joined President George W. Bush in refusing to call the events of 1915-22 by their accurate name -- genocide. **The last stage in the trauma of genocide is denial. Our country's unwillingness to tell the truth is what should shock us because it is what permits future genocides. Remember Hitler's response to his advisers** in 1939 **when he proposed the** ~~Holocaust~~ **and was told that he couldn't get away with it: "Who, after all, speaks today of the annihilation of the Armenians**?" Who indeed.

**Genocide risks widespread death and destruction on a global level – allowing future genocide risks human extinction (gender modified)**

Kenneth J. **Campbell**, assistant professor of **political science** and international relations **at** the University of **Delaware**, **2001**, Genocide and the Global Village, p. 15-16

Regardless of where or on how small a scale it begins, the crime of genocide is the complete ideological repudiation of, and a direct murderous assault upon, the prevailing liberal international order. **Genocide is** fundamentally incompatible with, and **destructive of an open, tolerant, democratic, free market international order.** As genocide scholar Herbert Hirsch has explained: **The unwillingness of the world community to take action to end genocide and political massacres is not only immoral but also impractical. [W]ithout** some semblance of **stability, commerce,** travel, **and the international** and intranational **interchange of goods** and information **are subjected to severe disruptions. Where genocide is permitted to proliferate, the liberal international order cannot long survive.** No group will be safe; every group will wonder when they will be next. **Left unchecked, genocide threatens to destroy whatever security, democracy, and prosperity exists in the present international system.** As Roger Smith notes: **Even** the most powerful **nations**—those armed **with nuclear weapons—may end up in struggles that will lead** (accidentally, intentionally, insanely) **to the ultimate genocide in which they destroy not only each other, but [humankind]** mankind **itself, sewing the fate of the earth forever with a final genocidal effort.** In this sense, **genocide is a grave threat to the very fabric of the international system and must be stopped**, even at some risk to lives and treasure. The preservation and growth of the present liberal international order is a vital interest for all of its members—states as well as non-states—whether or not those members recognize and accept the reality of that objective interest. Nation states, as the principal members of the present international order, are the only authoritative holders of violent enforcement powers. Non-state actors, though increasing in power relative to states, still do not possess the military force, or the democratic authority to use military force, which is necessary to stop determined perpetrators of mass murder. Consequently, **nation-states have a special responsibility to prevent, suppress, and punish all malicious assaults on the fundamental integrity of the prevailing international order.**

**CIA CP**

**Text: The President of the United States should reform the practice of targeted killing by expanding the role of the Central Intelligence Agency's Inspector General and publishing public reports on their findings, publicly recommending the establishment of congressional sub-committees for review of targeted killing practices, and expansion of public disclosure of legal arguments for the placement of names on kill/capture lists.**

**Reform planks key to accountability – only cp solves (Inspector General reform, public reports, new sub committees, disclosure, legal justification, vetting)**

**Alston 11** (Philip, John Norton Pomeroy Professor of Law, New York University School of Law, Harvard National Security Journal, 2 Harv. Nat'l Sec. J. 283, The CIA and Targeted Killings Beyond Borders¶)

The second response is to accept that there is a deficit, at least in terms of transparency if not also in accountability, but to argue that it can be remedied through the adoption of relatively straightforward reforms. These include suggestions that: the role of the CIA's Inspector General should be expanded and public reports issued, n519 the Privacy and Civil Liberties Board should be revitalized, new congressional sub-committees should be established, n520 there needs to be more openness about the fact that the policy is being pursued and a careful vetting process must be ensured before names are placed on kill/capture lists, n521 and in order to achieve the necessary "public legitimacy," the executive should articulate more clearly the basis for its legal arguments (while not revealing "secret [\*421] facts, programs, activities, and other things that ought to remain secret"). n522 But none of these suggestions has been taken seriously in any of the relevant quarters and, in any event, none has the potential to make the slightest difference in the absence of a fundamental change of policy on the part of the CIA and its executive masters.¶ The third response is to accept that there is a deficit and to lament the fact, but to conclude that the degree of national security sensitivity involved means there is no alternative but to address any such concerns in secret. Thus, for Robert Chesney, the power to assess compliance "lies with the government itself, for good or ill." The key is for the government to make sure it develops effective internal procedures, even if these must remain secret. But maximizing transparency is also desirable, "if only by providing better information to the public about the abstract nature" of the standards followed. n523 Kenneth Anderson goes marginally further by conceding that there is a "good moral argument" for strengthening congressional oversight, particularly when American citizens are being targeted. But his bottom line is that "the public cannot be made part of the debate" and that there is no alternative but to rely on "our political leadership to act as stewards and fiduciaries on our behalf." n524 But investing such blind faith in the executive flies in the face of all experience of such matters, as illustrated by the survey of past CIA accountability undertaken above.

**Case-drones**

**Other countries aren’t drone threats**

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

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

**Aff can’t stop drone prolif**

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

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

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

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

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

**Other countries cannot export drones**

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

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

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

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

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

**Deterrence prevents India/Pakistan conflict**

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

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

**No US/China war—It’s in neither country’s best interest**

**Ackerman 2011** (Robert Ackerman, May 10, 2011, “War Between China, U.S. Not Likely,” http://www.afcea.org/signal/signalscape/index.php/2011/05/10/11510/)

**The United States and China are not likely to go to war with each other** because **neither** country **wants it and it would run counter to both nations’ best interests.** That was the conclusion of a plenary panel session hosted by former Good Morning America host David Hartman at the 2011 Joint Warfighting Conference in Virginia Beach. **Adm.** Timothy J. **Keating**, USN (Ret.), former head of the U.S. Pacific Command, **noted that China** actually **wants the United States to remain active in the Asia-Pacific region as a hedge against any other country’s adventurism.** And, most of the other countries in that region want the United States to remain active as a hedge against China. Among areas of concern for China is North Korea. Wallace “Chip” Gregson, former assistant secretary of Defense for Asian and Pacific Security Affairs, said that **above all China fears instability**, and a North Korean collapse or war could send millions of refugees streaming into Manchuria, which has economic problems of its own.

**No SCS conflict—economics and deterrence**

**Creehan 12** – Senior Editor of the SAIS (school of advanced international studies, johns Hopkins) Review of International Affairs (Sean, “Assessing the Risks of Conflict in the South China Sea,” Winter/Spring, SAIS Review, Vol. 32, No. 1)

Regarding Secretary Clinton’s first requirement, the risk of actual **closure of the South China Sea remains remote, as instability in the region would affect the entire global economy, raising the price of various goods and commodities**. According to some estimates, for example, as much as 50 percent of global oil tanker shipments pass through the South China Sea— that represents more than three times the tanker traffic through the Suez Canal and over five times the tanker traffic through the Panama Canal.4 **It is in no country’s interest to see instability there, least of all China’s, given the central economic importance of Chinese exports originating from the country’s major southern ports and energy imports coming through** the **S**outh **C**hina **S**ea (annual U.S. trade passing through the Sea amounts to $1.2 trillion).5 Invoking the language of nuclear deterrence theory, **disruption in these sea lanes implies mutually assured economic destruction, and that possibility should moderate the behavior of all participants**. Furthermore, **with the United States continuing to operate from a position of naval strength** (or at least managing a broader alliance that collectively balances China’s naval presence in the future), **the sea lanes will remain open. While small military disputes within such a balance of power are, of** course**, possible, the economic risks of extended conflict are so great that significant changes to the status quo are unlikely**.

**Hegemony doesn’t solve war – causes instability and prolif – drags US in causes bigger conflicts**

Ben **Friedman** (research fellow in defense and homeland security, Cato. PhD candidate in political science, MIT) July **2010** “Military Restraint and Defense Savings” 20 July 2010, http://www.cato.org/testimony/ct-bf-07202010.html

Another argument for high military spending is that U.S. military hegemony underlies global stability. Our forces and alliance commitments dampen conflict between potential rivals like China and Japan, we are told, preventing them from fighting wars that would disrupt trade and cost us more than the military spending that would have prevented war. The theoretical and empirical foundation for this claim is **weak**. It overestimates both the American military's contribution to international stability and the danger that instability abroad poses to Americans. In Western Europe, U.S. forces now contribute little to peace, at best making the tiny odds of war among states there slightly more so.7 Even in Asia, where there is more tension, the history of international relations suggests that without U.S. military deployments potential rivals, especially those separated by sea like Japan and China, will generally achieve a stable balance of power rather than fight. In other cases, as with our bases in Saudi Arabia between the Iraq wars, U.S. forces probably create more unrest than they prevent. Our force deployments can also generate instability by prompting states to develop nuclear weapons. Even when wars occur, their economic impact is likely to be limited here.8 By linking markets, globalization provides supply alternatives for the goods we consume, including oil. If political upheaval disrupts supply in one location, suppliers elsewhere will take our orders. Prices may increase, but markets adjust. That makes American consumers less dependent on any particular supply source, undermining the claim that we need to use force to prevent unrest in supplier nations or secure trade routes.9 Part of the confusion about the value of hegemony comes from misunderstanding the Cold War. People tend to assume, falsely, that our activist foreign policy, with troops forward supporting allies, not only caused the Soviet Union's collapse but is obviously a good thing even without such a rival. Forgotten is the sensible notion that alliances are a necessary evil occasionally tolerated to balance a particularly threatening enemy. The main justification for creating our Cold War alliances was the fear that Communist nations could conquer or capture by insurrection the industrial centers in Western Europe and Japan and then harness enough of that wealth to threaten us — either directly or by forcing us to become a garrison state at ruinous cost. We kept troops in South Korea after 1953 for fear that the North would otherwise overrun it. But these alliances outlasted the conditions that caused them. During the Cold War, Japan, Western Europe and South Korea grew wealthy enough to defend themselves. We should let them. These alliances heighten our force requirements and threaten to drag us into wars, while providing no obvious benefit.

**Case-pk**

Relations are back on track – energy cooperation

**APP, 2013** (Associated Press of Pakistan, August 2, 2013, “Pakistan says resumption of strategic talks with US ‘most significant’” lexis)

Islamabad, 2 Aug: Pakistan on Friday [2 August] described resumption of strategic dialogue process with the United States as the most significant outcome of the recent visit of Secretary of State John Kerry to Pakistan during which both the countries discussed all the bilateral issues including drone attacks. Foreign Office Spokesman Aizaz Ahmed Chaudhry, in weekly press briefing here at Foreign Office, said Pakistan and the United States have an important relationship based on mutual respect and trust. He said the bilateral relations of Pakistan and United States have many points of convergences and divergences, and after the resumption of strategic dialogue process, all these issues would be taken up. He said the working on various subjects like energy cooperation, investment and trade between Pakistan and United States will be started very soon and ministerial-level talks on these subjects will be held within six months as said by John Kerry following the talks between the two countries.

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

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

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

**Interdependence**

**Mamoon and Murshed 2010** (Dawood Mamoon, and Mansoob Murshed, Economics of Governance, 2010, Vol. 11 Issue 2, p145-167, 23p, Political Science Complete)

Conflict between India and Pakistan, which spans over most of last 60 years since their independence from British rule, has significantly hampered bilateral trade between the two nations. However, we also find that the converse is also true; **more trade between India and Pakistan decreases conflict and any measures to improve the bilateral trade share is a considerable confidence building measure.** A regional trade agreement along the lines of a South Asian Free Trade Agreement (SAFTA) has a high potential for the improvement of relations between India and Pakistan on a long-term basis. Pakistan and India’s general degree of openness to world (and not bilateral) trade is, however, the dominant economic factor in conflict resolution. It would be interesting to see whether India and Pakistan will be able sustain their recent impressive growth, and consequently continue with peace talks confirming the liberal peace arguments. In an ideal world increased dyadic democracy between pairs of nation should reduce inter-state hostility according to the democratic peace hypothesis; this relationship in our case is present but weak. Peace initiatives, it should be remembered, are not the sole prerogative of democracies; they can also be made by countries which are less than perfectly democratic out of economic self- interest. Pakistan, at present, is making unilateral concessions on many disputed issues with India. Our findings, however, veer towards the liberal peace hypothesis. **Economic progress and poverty reduction combined with greater openness to international trade in general are more significant drivers of peace between nations like India and Pakistan**, rather than the independent contribution of a common democratic polity. So it is more economic interdependence rather than politics which is likely to contribute towards peaceful relations between India and Pakistan in the near future. In many ways, our results for an individual dyad echo Polcahek’s (1997) work across several dyads, where it is argued that democracies cooperate not because they have common political systems, but because their economies are intricately and intensively interdependent. As pointed by Hegre (2000), **it is at these higher stages of economic development that the contribution of common democratic values to peace becomes more salient.** Meaningful democracy cannot truly function where poverty is acute and endemic, even in ostensible democracies such as India. In the final analysis, it may be that democracy itself is an endogenous by-product of increased general prosperity, as suggested nearly half a century ago by Lipset (1960). Then and only then, will nations be able to fully appreciate Angell-Lanes’ (1910) arguments regarding the futility of inter-state conflict.

**No solvency—means limitations are case-dependent contingencies**

**Geltzer 11** (Boalt Hall School of Law, University of California, Berkeley 2011 Berkeley Journal of International Law 29 Berkeley J. Int'l L. 94 Decisions Detained: The Courts' Embrace of Complexity in Guantanamo-Related Litigation NAME: Joshua Alexander Geltzer a third-year student at Yale Law School, where he is editor-in-chief of the Yale Law Journal. He received his Ph.D. in War Studies from King's College London. His dissertation was published by Routledge as US Counter-Terrorism Strategy and al-Qaeda: Signalling and the Terrorist World-View. Lexis)

[\*112] **In addition to producing narrow rulings and flexible opinions, the courts' focus on means** rather than time or space as limiting the war against terrorism **has laid the groundwork for** potential **inconsistency as circumstances change. That future cases might produce** new **rulings** moving **in new directions is,** of course, **simply in the nature of** common law **jurisprudence. But the decisions** discussed here have been so narrow and **rested on such contingent factors that slight alteration of those** factors **would seem to invite** potentially **contrary rulings**, as inconsistent as those might seem. **The finding of jurisdiction in Rasul rested on the U**nited **S**tates' **"plenary and exclusive jurisdiction" over Guantanamo**. 93 Yet, **what if the U**nited **S**tates **were** formally **to relinquish jurisdiction** over Guantanamo - would Rasul's narrow holding still apply**?** The outcome in Hamdi relied on American troops' patent "active combat" **in Afghanistan**. 94 **What if** those **troops** were to become **engaged only in training** local forces, **or** in **sporadic special operations** - would Hamdi's narrow holding survive? The questions are endless. Perhaps most dramatically, **Hamdan** relied on what the Court deemed Congress' lack of intent to strip jurisdiction over pending habeas petitions from Guantanamo. 95 **Congress** soon **thrust back by** unmistakably **stripping the courts of statutory habeas jurisdiction**, thus **changing the circumstances that had underpinned the previous, statutory decision**. Consequently, in Boumediene, the Court had to find a new basis - now a constitutional one - in order for habeas jurisdiction over Guantanamo to survive. 96 **Narrow holdings, based on the war-making means** that happen to be employed by the political branches at the moment when such holdings are handed down, **lack the broad, definitive**, and enduring **coherence that holdings based on the less malleable factors of time and space would possess.** Thus, a result of courts' focus on the most complex factor limiting the scope of the war against terrorism is potential doctrinal inconsistency in light of changed circumstances.

**lower courts fail**

Vladeck 11 (Stephen I., Professor of Law and Associate Dean for Scholarship, American University Washington College of Law. October 20, 2011, Columbia Law Review Sidebar, “ARTICLE: THE PASSIVE-AGGRESSIVE VIRTUES”)

In contrast to the judicial self-preservation theme underlying the cases discussed above, the only way to understand **the Court's other three major terrorism decisions** since September 11 comes from their procedural posture: As the captions suggest, in each of Ashcroft v. Iqbal, Holder v. Humanitarian Law Project, and Ashcroft v. al-Kidd, **the court of appeals had ruled against the government, and either** had **invalidated, or appeared poised to invalidate, some aspect of post-September 11 counterterror**ism **policy.¶ In Iqbal**, for example, **the Second Circuit had largely rejected claims of qualified immunity by** a host of **senior federal officials arising out of the alleged mistreatment of** (and discrimination against) **a detainee** subsequent to his arrest as part of the investigation into the September 11 attacks. n64 **The** Supreme **Court granted certiorari and reversed, holding that Iqbal had failed to plead sufficient facts to support virtually all of his claims**. n65 In addition, in a far less noticed aspect of Justice Kennedy's opinion, **the Court also appeared categorically to reject the availability of supervisory liability** in Bivens actions, even as it said nothing about the potential merits of Iqbal's claims. n66¶ In Humanitarian Law Project v. Mukasey, **the Ninth Circuit** had **held that** [\*131] several **provisions of the federal "material support" statute**, which makes it a crime to provide material support to designated foreign terrorist organizations, n67 **were unconstitutionally vague.** n68 In particular, the court of appeals struck down the statute's ban on the provision of "training," "service," and "other specialized knowledge," even as it upheld other provisions that had been amended by Congress in response to earlier decisions in the same case. n69 **The Supreme Court reversed, unanimously concluding that the challenged provisions were not vague at least as applied to the plaintiffs**, n70 even as it divided 6-3 on whether the statute otherwise violated the First Amendment.¶ Finally, in al-Kidd v. Ashcroft, **the Ninth Circuit had affirmed the district court's denial of a motion to dismiss a damages suit claiming that** then-Attorney General **Ashcroft had used the material witness statute** n71 **as a pretext for detaining terrorism suspects against whom there was insufficient evidence to support criminal charges.** n72 Specifically, the court of appeals held that the Fourth Amendment prohibits pretextual arrests absent probable cause, and that Attorney General Ashcroft was not entitled to absolute or qualified immunity. n73 **The Supreme Court** once again **reversed, unanimously concluding that Ashcroft was entitled to qualified immunity whether or not his conduct was in fact unlawful.** n74 In addition, **a** 5-3 **majority held that, on the merits, Ashcroft's alleged conduct could not have violated the Fourth Amendment**, because subjective intent is irrelevant to the propriety of an arrest made pursuant to a validly obtained material witness warrant. n75¶

# 2NC

**CP**

**Solvency**

**CP solves the aff while avoiding the link to politics and the terror DA – the CP has Obama use self-restraint and exercise transparency with drones – our 1NC solvency evidence makes the distinction between legislative attempts to impose regulation on the president and the CP which has the executive take responsibility for his actions – the CP is justification for why statutory or judiciary restrictions are the best policy option to limit executive power**

Solves better than the aff.

**Dodds’11**2 E EXECUTIVE UNBOUND: AFTER THE MADISONIAN REPUBLIC, by Eric A. Posner and Adrian Vermeule. New York: Oxford University Press, 2011. 256pp. Cloth $29.95. ISBN 9780199765331. ¶ Reviewed by Graham G. Dodds, Department of Political Science, Concordia University, Montreal. g.dodds [ at ] concordia.ca

In Chapter Four, Posner and Vermeule foreshadow the book’s conclusion and argue that even if constitutional norms and laws cannot constrain the executive, politics can. They invoke principal-agent theory and suggest the president can effectively serve as the people’s agent. However, their main point seems to be that politics can prompt presidents to exercise self-restraint: “the system of elections, the party system, and American political culture constrain the executive far more than do legal rules created by Congress or the courts; and although politics hardly guarantees that the executive will always act in the public interest, politics at least limits the scope for executive abuses” (p.113). Thus, the presence of these de facto constraints should render the absence of de jure constraints less troubling

Solves targeted killings- here’s some examples where the CP worked

**Sales’12** by NA Sales - [Related articles](http://scholar.google.com/scholar?client=safari&rls=en&q=posner+vermeule+presidential+self+constrain&bav=on.2,or.r_cp.r_qf.&bvm=bv.48572450,d.aWc&biw=1274&bih=684&um=1&ie=UTF-8&lr&q=related:1PuVXzR0CFZ8hM:scholar.google.com/)¶ Aug 7, 2012 – jnslp.com/wp-content/uploads/.../08\_\_Sales\_Master\_6-28-12-NS.pd [Self-Restraint and National Security - Journal of National Security ...](http://jnslp.com/wp-content/uploads/2012/08/08__Sales_Master_6-28-12-NS.pdf) Nathan A. Sales is an Assistant Professor of Law at George Mason University School of Law. He teaches national security law, administrative law, and criminal law. Sales was the first Deputy Assistant Secretary for Policy Development at the U.S. Department of Homeland Security. Sales served at the Office of Legal Policy at the U.S. Department of Justice

This article tries to explain these restraints by consulting public choice**¶** theory – in particular, the notion that government officials are rationally self**¶** interested actors who seek to maximize their respective welfare. Part I¶ develops an analytical framework. Part II identifies four examples of selfrestraint.¶ Parts III and IV offer hypotheses for why the government adopts¶ them.¶ One example of self-restraint is Executive Order 13,491, which limits**¶** counterterrorism interrogations, including those conducted by the CIA, to**¶** the techniques listed in the Army Field Manual. The AFM prohibits or**¶** severely restricts a number of fairly mild interrogation methods such as**¶** low-grade threats, the “good cop, bad cop” routine, and other staples of**¶** garden-variety law enforcement investigations. A second example,**¶** sketched above, is the White House’s onetime reluctance to use targeted**¶** killings against Osama bin Laden, despite its belief that doing so would be**¶** consistent with domestic and international laws against assassination.**¶** Third, lawyers in the Judge Advocate General corps sometimes reject**¶** military strikes that would be permissible under the law of war, but that**¶** they regard as problematic for moral, economic, social, or political reasons.**¶** A fourth example is the Justice Department’s erection of a “wall” that**¶** restricted information sharing between intelligence officials and criminal**¶** investigators, despite the fact that the applicable statute (the Foreign¶ Intelligence Surveillance Act of 1978) contained no such limits, and despite**¶** the fact that the governing DOJ guidelines established mechanisms for swapping such data.**¶** The question then becomes why officials adopt these restraints even¶ when they believe them to be legally unnecessary. Public choice theory¶ suggests two possible explanations.¶

**A2 PD CP**

**Perm severs out of the term “federal government” -**

**The means all parts**

**Merriam-Websters, 8 [Online Collegiate Dictionary, http://www.m-w.com/cgi-bin/dictionary]**

4 -- used as a function word before a noun or a substantivized adjective to indicate reference to a group as a whole <the elite>

**Federal government is central government**

**Webster’s 76** NEW INTERNATIONAL DICTIONARY UNABRIDGED, p. 833.

Federal government. Of or relating to the central government of a nation, having the character of a federation as distinguished from the governments of the constituent unites (as states or provinces).

**That’s a voting issue-Makes the aff a moving target and destroys predictable negative ground**

**The counterplan competes - “statutory restrictions” require congressional action**

**Mortenson 11**

(Julian Davis Assistant Professor, University of Michigan Law School, “Review: Executive Power and the Discipline of History Crisis and Command: The History of Executive Power from George Washington to George W. Bush John Yoo. Kaplan, 2009. Pp vii, 524,” Winter 2011, University of Chicago Law Review 78 U. Chi. L. Rev. 377)

At least two of Yoo's main examples of presidential power are actually instances of presidential deference to **statutory restrictions** during times of great national peril. The earliest is Washington's military suppression of the Whiskey Rebellion (III, pp 66-72), a domestic disturbance that Americans viewed as implicating adventurism by European powers and threatening to dismember the new nation. n60 The Calling Forth Act of 1792 n61 allowed the President to mobilize state militias under federal control, but included a series of mandatory procedural checks--including judicial [\*399] approval--that restricted his ability to do so. n62 Far from defying these comprehensive restrictions at a moment of grave crisis, Washington satisfied their every requirement in scrupulous detail. He issued a proclamation ordering the Whiskey Rebels to disperse. n63 When they refused to do so, he submitted a statement to Justice James Wilson of the Supreme Court describing the situation in Pennsylvania and requesting statutory certification. n64 Only when Wilson issued a letter precisely reciting the requisite statutory language (after first requiring the President to come back with authentication of underlying reports and verification of their handwriting n65) did Washington muster the troops. n66 Washington's compliance with **statutory restrictions** on his use of force continued even after his forces were in the field. Because Congress was not in session when he issued the call-up order, Washington was authorized **by statute** to mobilize militias from other states besides Pennsylvania--but only "until the expiration of thirty days after the commencement of the ensuing [congressional] session." n67 When it became clear that the Pennsylvania campaign would take longer than that, Washington went back to Congress to petition for extension of the statutory time limit that would otherwise have required him to [\*400] disband his troops. n68 Far from serving as an archetypal example of presidential defiance, the Whiskey Rebellion demonstrates exactly the opposite. FDR's efforts to supply the United Kingdom's war effort before Pearl Harbor teach a similar lesson. During the run-up to America's entry into the war, **Congress passed** a series of Neutrality **Acts** that supplemented longstanding **statutory restrictions** on providing assistance to foreign belligerents. Despite these restrictions, FDR sent a range of military assistance to the future Allies. n69 Yoo makes two important claims about the administration's actions during this period. First, he claims the administration asserted that "[a]ny statutory effort by Congress to prevent the President from transferring military equipment to help American national security would be of 'questionable constitutionality'" (III, p 300). Second, he suggests that American military assistance in fact violated the neutrality statutes (III, pp 295-301, 310, 327-28).

**A2 Object Fiat Bad**

**Prez CP’s test resolution words – authority, restriction, statutory AND judicial**

**The primary question is where the authority should LIE, not HOW it is used – their model prioritizes the secondary question of how to USE authority over the primary question of WHO should decide**

**Our ev says SR is the best policy – artificially excluding by theory stacks the deck AFF**

**XO counterplans are also object fiat – precedent makes our CP predictable means they can’t solve abuse**

**The SQ is self restraint – the CP at worse clarifies an ambiguous SQ**

**The CP ambiguous proportionate to strategic aff vagueness – Instead of holding NEG to a higher standard, the better remedy would be to interpret CP as prez authority which meets their argument.**

**Limiting the aff to legal advantages better tests a legal topic – making those outweigh is their job to justify a legal topic**

**Reject the arg, not the team**

**A2 Executive Rollback**

**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.**

**Most executive policies aren’t overturned.**

**Murray 99**

[Frank, “Clinton’s Executive Orders are Still Packing a Punch: Other Presidents Issued More, but His are Still Sweeping” Washington Times http://www.englishfirst.org/13166/13166wtgeneral.html]

Clearly, Mr. Clinton knew what some detractors do not: Presidential successors of the opposite party do not lightly wipe the slate clean of every order, or even most of them. Still on the books 54 years after his death are 80 executive orders issued by Franklin D. Roosevelt. No less than 187 of Mr. Truman's ordersremain, including one to end military racial segregation, which former Joint Chiefs of Staff Chairman Colin Powell praised for starting the "Second Reconstruction." "President Truman gave us the order to march with Executive Order 9981," Mr. Powell said at a July 26, 1998 ceremony marking its 50th anniversary. Mr. Truman's final order, issued one day before he left office in 1953, created a national security medal of honor for the nation's top spies, which is still highly coveted and often revealed only in the obituary of its recipient.

**Political barriers check – new, stronger constituencies**

**Branum 2**

[Tara L, Associate, Fulbright & Jaworski L.L.P, “President or King? The Use and Abuse of Executive Orders in Modern Day America” Journal of Legislation]

Congressmen and private citizens besiege the President with demands  [\*58]  that action be taken on various issues. [n273](http://www.lexisnexis.com/us/lnacademic/frame.do?tokenKey=rsh-20.689002.875983458&target=results_DocumentContent&reloadEntirePage=true&rand=1220903297496&returnToKey=20_T4511783216&parent=docview" \l "n273) To make matters worse, once a president has signed an executive order, he often makes it impossible for a subsequent administration to undo his action without enduring the political fallout of such a reversal. For instance, President Clinton issued a slew of executive orders on environmental issues in the weeks before he left office. [n274](http://www.lexisnexis.com/us/lnacademic/frame.do?tokenKey=rsh-20.689002.875983458&target=results_DocumentContent&reloadEntirePage=true&rand=1220903297496&returnToKey=20_T4511783216&parent=docview" \l "n274) Many werecontroversial **and the need** for the policies he instituted was **debatable**. [n275](http://www.lexisnexis.com/us/lnacademic/frame.do?tokenKey=rsh-20.689002.875983458&target=results_DocumentContent&reloadEntirePage=true&rand=1220903297496&returnToKey=20_T4511783216&parent=docview" \l "n275) Nevertheless, President Bush found himself unable to reverse the orders without invoking the ire of environmentalists across the country. [n276](http://www.lexisnexis.com/us/lnacademic/frame.do?tokenKey=rsh-20.689002.875983458&target=results_DocumentContent&reloadEntirePage=true&rand=1220903297496&returnToKey=20_T4511783216&parent=docview" \l "n276) A **policy became law by the action of one man without the healthy debate and discussion in Congress intended by the Framers**. Subsequent presidents undo this policy and send the matter to Congress for such debate only at their own peril. This is not the way it is supposed to be.

**Links**

**Court action severely limits presidential powers**

**Ashcroft 2k4** Copyright 2004 The Federal News Service, Inc. Federal News Service November 12, 2004 Friday SECTION: JUSTICE DEPARTMENT HEARING LENGTH: 3336 words HEADLINE: REMARKS BY ATTORNEY GENERAL JOHN ASHCROFT AT THE FEDERALIST SOCIETY FOR LAW AND PUBLIC POLICY CONVENTION

The general grant of executive power in Article II ensures that the president has the necessary flexibility -- and, I might add, agility -- to act quickly, decisively, effectively in responding to the innumerable unanticipated developments and threats that may confront a nation, especially in these complex and dangerous times of the modern world. Ours may be a government of limited legislative powers, but it is not a weak government. The founders saw to it that the president would be endowed with all necessary executive power to enforce the Constitution and laws and treaties of the United States, to protect our national security, and to pursue and uphold the values of freedom and justice. We have all seen the tremendous energy and resolve of President Bush and how decisively he has risen up to the fight, and how he has taken the awful scourge of terrorism facing America and addressed it, and he's addressed other challenges that we are called upon as a nation to meet. In all of these important areas, the exercise of executive authority in the administration of the law involved some necessary portion of discretion in the executive. And it is firmly accepted as essential in our constitutional system that reviewing courts should accord some corresponding degree of deference to the determinations made by the executive in administering the law.

**Politics**

**Overview**

**Allowing a default is immoral. Vote neg to preserve morality.**

**Lee** 20**13**. Timothy B. Lee, Forbes, “Hitting the Debt Ceiling is Much Worse Than a ‘Government Shutdown,’” http://www.forbes.com/sites/timothylee/2013/01/09/hitting-the-debt-ceiling-is-much-worse-than-a-government-shutdown/

And there’s also a moral issue to consider. Even assuming that President Obama were legally and logistically able to, say, halt Medicare reimbursements, doing so wouldn’t be fair to those who are owed payments by the Medicare system. Maybe you think Medicare should be overhauled or even abolished. But a hospital that provides a medical service to a senior citizen is entitled to be reimbursed according to the laws in place at the time the service is provided. Halting payments would mean stiffing people—hospitals, defense contractors, suppliers, perhaps even bondholders—who have already performed services for the government and are legally entitled to compensation. That’s not right.

Economic collapse causes war with China – growth is the only internal to deterrence

Jeremy **Hsu**, InnovationNewsDaily Senior Writer, 11/1/**11**, “Economic Ties Could Help Prevent US-China War”, TechNewsDaily, <http://www.technewsdaily.com/5318-china-military-cyber-national-security.html>

As the U.S. faces China's economic and military rise, it also holds a dwindling hand of cards to play in the unlikely case of open conflict. Cyberattacks aimed at computernetworks, targeted disabling of satellites or economic warfare could end up bringing down both of the frenemies. That means ensuring the U.S. economy remains strong and well-balanced, with China's economy possibly representing the best deterrent, according to a new report.¶ The Rand Corporation's analysts put low odds on a China-U.S. military conflict taking place, but still lay out danger scenarios where the U.S. and China face greater risks of stumbling into an unwanted war with one another. They point to the economic codependence of both countries as the best bet against open conflict, similar to how nuclear weapons ensured mutually assured destruction for the U.S. and Soviet Union during the Cold War.¶ "It is often said that a strong economy is the basis of a strong defense," the Rand report says. "In the case of China, a strong U.S. economy is not just the basis for a strong defense, it is itself perhaps the best defense against an adventurous China."¶ Such "mutually assured economic destruction" would devastate both the U.S. and China, given how China represents America's main creditor and manufacturer. The economic fallout could lead to a global recession worse than that caused by the financial crisis of 2008-2009.

**Econ collapse turns prolif**

**Burrows and Windrem 1994 – \***NYT journalist, professor of journalism at New York University and the founder and director of its graduate Science and Environmental Reporting Program, \*\*Senior Research Fellow at the NYU Center on Law and Security, former NBC producer (William and Robert, “Critical Mass: the dangerous race for superweapons in a fragmenting world”, p. 491-2, Google Books)

**Economics is** in many respects **proliferation’s catalyst**. As we have noted, **economic desperation drives Russia and** some of the former **Warsaw Pact nations to peddle** **weapons** and technology. The possibility of considerable **profits** or at least balanced international payments also **prompts Third World countries like China, Brazil, and Israel to do the same. Economics**, as well as such related issues as overpopulation, **drive proliferation just as surely as** do purely **political motives**. Unfortunately, that subject is beyond the scope of this book. Suffice it to say that, all things being equal, **well-off, relatively secure societies like** today’s **Japan are less likely to buy** or sell superweapon **technology** **than those that are** insecure, **needy**, or desperate. Ultimately, **solving economic problems,** especially as they are driven by population pressure, **is the surest way to defuse proliferation** and enhance true national security.

Turns China and global relations

**Bennett 01** **Richard Bennett is a strategist at Armed Forces Intelligence, the international research organization, The Express, As America's Relations with Russia and China Take a Nosedive...; is the World on the Brink of a New Cold War? April 12, 2001 Lexis**

**With the evident cooling of relations between America and** both **Russia and China the hopes for greater understanding and co-operation in the new post-cold war world have been buried.** A mere 10 years **after the collapse of much of the communist world, confrontation and distrust have returned to haunt an international community already riven with economic collapse**, conflict, famine and the growing threat of severe climatic changes. The new US administration already finds itself confronted with a tit-for-tat spy expulsion feud with Vladimir Putin's newly resurgent Russia, the US Navy's EP-3 "spy plane" stand-off with an increasingly aggressive China, the growing threat of war in the Middle East and the re-establishment of anti-Western alliances. There are in addition a number of other potential crisis areas, including world environmental issues where President **Bush** has already moved strongly out of step with much of the international community by refusing to ratify agreements on cutting the emissions of greenhouse gases. He also **faces a domestic economic slow-down that threatens the stability of US industry and Wall Street.** The old cold war certainties have been replaced by an uncertain and confused international situation. Regions once neatly divided into "them and us" are now beset with ever-changing alliances and re-alignments. Both China and now, increasingly, Russia see their long-term interests being served more by a confrontationalist attitude towards the US than by begging for crumbs from the tables of the rich and privileged. Both China and Russia wish to establish themselves as countries whose views are listened to and whose influence is enhanced rather than simply ignored - or, worse still, actively undermined. They want their position as regional, if not world, superpowers to be respected. **The US**, on the other hand, **can see little value in allowing its status as the world's single global superpower reduced** in any meaningful way simply **to satisfy the largely internal needs of two nations that are** quite **unable to challenge the US economically** or militarily. Russia has failed to see the large-scale Western investment and international acceptance expected by Yeltsin and the economic reformers following the overthrow of the communist system. **The economic benefits promised by the West during the political turmoil of the early Nineties have simply failed to materialise for** the vast majority of **Russia**n citizens. Instead, Russia has been stripped of its superpower status and most of its influence; while the US has tended to ignore the feelings of this - temporarily at least - militarily impotent nation, particularly over some of its traditional areas of interest such as Serbia and Iraq. The missile attack on the Chinese embassy in Belgrade during the bombing of Serbia in 1999 - made in the sure knowledge of China's inability to retaliate - angered that nation's government far more than the West was prepared to accept or even, such is the intolerance of the powerful, recognise as having any justification. China's eventual response was the hard line now being taken over the spy plane forced to land on Hainan island. Though China has finally agreed to release the crew, the countries' mutual suspicion has helped turn an unfortunate incident into a potential international crisis. The demands for an apology over a surveillance flight made in international airspace, the determination to hold the crew of 24 captive for as long as possible and the virtual dismantling of this super-secret aircraft on the tarmac of Lingshui airbase in full view of US intelligence satellites has left little doubt in the minds of US analysts that China has every intention of using this unexpected intelligence and diplomatic windfall to extract as much political advantage out of the crisis as possible. The international humiliation of the US, and President Bush in particular, is a bonus that President Jiang Zemin will not easily forgo. There are problems in other areas of the world. Cracks are developing in the united front shown by the international community since the Iraqi invasion of Kuwait and the resulting Gulf War in 1991. These are caused in part by US support for Israel, particularly in the light of an increasingly more aggressive military response to the continuing violence of the Palestinian Intifida and in part by the reaffirmation of the determination to both maintain sanctions and military pressure on Iraq in a final attempt to rid the area of Saddam Hussein. The new US administration will need to tread carefully and think long and hard over its response to these events. Diplomatic policy may well have to be re-assessed and defence strengthened. T**he international "warming" that followed the end of the cold war has been put in reverse**, certainly in the short term, **and the world is now witnessing the dawn of a new age of uncertainty.**

**Courts Links**

**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.”

**Agencies don’t shield and no risk of a turn---Obama is velcro and will only get blamed---no credit**

**Nicholas & Hook 10** Peter and Janet, Staff Writers---LA Times, “Obama the Velcro president”, LA Times, 7-30, http://articles.latimes.com/2010/jul/30/nation/la-na-velcro-presidency-20100730/3

**If** Ronald **Reagan was** the classic **Teflon** president, Barack **Obama is made of Velcro.¶** Through two terms, **Reagan eluded much** of the **responsibility** for recession and foreign policy scandal. In less than two years, Obama has become ensnared in blame.¶ Hoping to better insulate Obama, White House aides have sought to give other Cabinet officials a higher profile and additional public exposure. They are also crafting new ways to explain the president's policies to a skeptical public.¶ But Obama remains **the colossus of his administration** — to a point where trouble anywhere in the world is often his to solve.¶ The president is on the hook to repair the Gulf Coast oil spill disaster, stabilize Afghanistan, help fix Greece's ailing economy and do right by Shirley Sherrod, the Agriculture Department official fired as a result of a misleading fragment of videotape¶ **What's** not sticking to Obama **is a legislative track record that his recent predecessors might envy.** Political dividends **from passage of a healthcare overhaul or a financial regulatory bill** have been fleeting**.**¶ Instead, voters are measuring his presidency by a more immediate yardstick: Is he creating enough jobs? So far the verdict is no, and that has taken a toll on Obama's approval ratings. Only 46% approve of Obama's job performance, compared with 47% who disapprove, according to Gallup's daily tracking poll.¶ "I think the accomplishments are very significant, but I think most people would look at this and say, 'What was the plan for jobs?' " said Sen. Byron L. Dorgan (D-N.D.). "The agenda he's pushed here has been a very important agenda, but it hasn't translated into dinner table conversations."¶ **Reagan was able to glide past controversies with his popularity largely intact**. He maintained his affable persona as a small-government advocate while seeming above the fray in his own administration.¶ Reagan was untarnished by such calamities as the 1983 terrorist bombing of the Marines stationed in Beirut and scandals involving members of his administration. In the 1986 Iran-Contra affair, most of the blame fell on lieutenants.¶ **Obama lately has tried to rip off the Velcro veneer**. In a revealing moment during the oil spill crisis, he reminded Americans that his powers aren't "limitless." He told residents in Grand Isle, La., that he is a flesh-and-blood president, not a comic-book superhero able to dive to the bottom of the sea and plug the hole.¶ "I can't suck it up with a straw," he said.¶ But as a candidate in 2008, he set sky-high expectations about what he could achieve and what government could accomplish.¶ Clinching the Democratic nomination two years ago, Obama described the moment as an epic breakthrough when "we began to provide care for the sick and good jobs to the jobless" and "when the rise of the oceans began to slow and our planet began to heal."¶ Those towering goals remain a long way off. And most people would have preferred to see Obama focus more narrowly on the "good jobs" part of the promise.¶ A recent Gallup poll showed that 53% of the population rated unemployment and the economy as the nation's most important problem. By contrast, only 7% cited healthcare — a single-minded focus of the White House for a full year.¶ At every turn, Obama makes the argument that he has improved lives in concrete ways.¶ Without the steps he took, he says, the economy would be in worse shape and more people would be out of work. There's evidence to support that. Two economists, Mark Zandi and Alan Blinder, reported recently that without the stimulus and other measures, gross domestic product would be about 6.5% lower.¶ Yet, Americans aren't apt to cheer when something bad doesn't materialize.¶ Unemployment has been rising — from 7.7% when Obama took office, to 9.5%. Last month, more than 2 million homes in the U.S. were in various stages of foreclosure — up from 1.7 million when Obama was sworn in.¶ "Folks just aren't in a mood to hand out gold stars when unemployment is hovering around 10%," said Paul Begala, a Democratic pundit.¶ **Insulating the president from bad news has proved impossible**. **Other White Houses have tried doing so with more success**. Reagan's Cabinet officials often took the blame, shielding the boss.¶ **But the Obama administration is about one man. Obama is the White House's chief spokesman, policy pitchman, fundraiser and negotiator. No Cabinet secretary has emerged as an adequate surrogate**. Treasury Secretary Timothy F. Geithner is seen as a tepid public speaker; Energy Secretary Steven Chu is prone to long, wonky digressions and has rarely gone before the cameras during an oil spill crisis that he is working to end.¶ So, more falls to Obama, reinforcing the Velcro effect: **Everything sticks to him**. He has opined on virtually everything in the hundreds of public statements he has made: nuclear arms treaties, basketball star LeBron James' career plans; Chelsea Clinton's wedding.¶ Few audiences are off-limits. On Wednesday, he taped a spot on ABC's "The View," drawing a rebuke from Democratic Pennsylvania Gov. Edward G. Rendell, who deemed the appearance unworthy of the presidency during tough times.¶ "Stylistically he creates some of those problems," Eddie Mahe, a Republican political strategist, said in an interview. "His favorite pronoun is 'I.' When you position yourself as being all things to all people, the ultimate controller and decision maker with the capacity to fix anything, you set yourself up to be blamed when it doesn't get fixed or things happen."¶ A new White House strategy is to forgo talk of big policy changes that are easy to ridicule. Instead, aides want to market policies as more digestible pieces. So, rather than tout the healthcare package as a whole, advisors will talk about smaller parts that may be more appealing and understandable — such as barring insurers from denying coverage based on preexisting conditions.¶ **But at this stage, it may be late in the game to downsize either the president or his agenda.**

**Obama will take the fall – even if he doesn’t want to**

**Politico, 1-7-10**, p. http://www.politico.com/news/stories/0110/31259.html

**Taking a decidedly different tack from his predecessor in the face of a government failure**, President Barack **Obama** on Thursday **took the blame for shortcomings that led to a failed Christmas Day bombing plot, saying, “The buck stops with me**.” ¶ Aides to Obama signaled **that he was consciously seeking to be the anti-Bush, airing the administration’s dirty laundry and stepping up to take his share of the responsibility.** ¶ “**The president also wanted to do something, I think, unusual today,” National Security Council Chief of Staff** Denis McDonough **said** during a webchat after Obama’s speech. **“Not only was this a very quick accounting, not only did the president accept responsibility for it, but the president also wanted to do this as transparently as possible.”** ¶ **Quick, transparent, willing to take the blame — all things Obama has said President George W. Bush was not.**

**Requires Congressional authority**

**Lovell 2k** – Assistant Professor of Government, College of William and Mary (George, 17 Const. Commentary 79)

An initial problem with this complaint is that it is not entirely accurate. Even in a world with delegation, voters can usually trace regulatory decisions to "yes" or "no" votes cast by their representatives in Congress. It is true that **members of Congress do not cast "yes" or "no" votes on particular rules created by agencies, but they do quite often need to go on record with "yes" or "no" votes that make agency activities possible. Legislators must cast votes to establish executive branch agencies and to give those agencies the authority to make regulatory decisions**. The democratic controls created by such votes weaken over time. (Most of the voters who voted for the legislators who passed the Agricultural Adjustment Act are now dead). **But members of Congress** need to take at least one **vote** per year (**on the relevant appropriations bill) in order for any regulatory program to continue**, and circumstances sometimes force members to cast additional votes on particular programs. **Since** no regulatory program can operate without being **created and continually authorized by Congress, there is nothing about delegation that prevents an unhappy electorate from holding members of Congress accountable for regulatory power exercised by the agencies**. Opponents of incumbents are certainly free to make such votes an issue in the next campaign, and they sometimes do. Representative George Nethercutt (R-Washington) recently found this out the hard way from an ad sponsored by some of his political opponents. Nethercutt probably did not know that he had voted for the Endangered [\*91] Species Act twelve times until he saw an ad that recounted his votes on various appropriations and authorizations items. 21

**PC Key**

**Without Obama’s strength a negotiated deal would include additional spending cuts.**

**AP / September 12,** 2013 Boehner: Must address spending in debt limit fight <http://www.boston.com/news/nation/washington/2013/09/12/boehner-must-address-spending-debt-limit-fight/ctoiix5CC5eaIQWMWCdlbP/story.html>

House Speaker John Boehner says Republicans will insist on curbing spending in the fight over the debt limit. President Barack Obama has said he won’t negotiate over extending the government’s ability to borrow money when it runs out, probably next month. But Boehner says that presidents of both parties have agreed to budget constraints as the price for extending the debt limit, and that this time is no different.

**New spending cuts will destroy economic recovery**

Neera **Tanden** is the President of the Center for American Progress **and** Michael **Linden** is the Managing Director for Economic Policy at the Center. **9-10**-13

<http://www.americanprogress.org/issues/budget/report/2013/09/10/73749/the-dirty-truth-about-boehners-clean-continuing-resolution/>

These spending cuts have not been kind to the U.S. economy. The contraction in federal government consumption and investment has caused a direct drag on economic growth in eight of the past 10 quarters, including the past three quarters consecutively. Although down from its peak several years ago, the unemployment rate remains greater than the level most forecasters had predicted three years ago, when Congress began cutting federal spending. And for many American families, the recession is not over. Indeed, median household income today is lower than it was when the Great Recession technically came to a close in June 2009.

It is in this economic context that conservatives in Congress are demanding even more cutbacks. The Congressional Budget Office has reported that implementing the sequester cuts in 2014 will reduce real gross domestic product, or GDP, by 0.7 percent and reduce employment by 900,000 jobs. Since Speaker Boehner’s approach would cement most of these cuts into place, the immediate negative economic consequences alone should be enough for Congress to reject it.

Adding to the absurdity of considering further cuts is the simple fact that the allegedly worrisome federal fiscal situation—the stated rationale for these cuts—is not nearly as worrisome today as it once was. Measured as a share of GDP, this year’s federal budget deficit is expected to come in at its lowest level since 2008. More importantly, the projections of future budgets have improved dramatically over the past three years. The federal debt-to-GDP ratio was once expected to rise to unprecedented levels by the end of the decade; it is now expected to decline for the next five years and only then rising slowly, to end in 2023 at the same level it is today.

Part of the reason for the improvement in the future fiscal picture is that Congress has already cut a lot of spending. Not only are current funding levels for nondefense discretionary programs significantly below those of 2010, but overall discretionary spending is slated to hit its lowest level on record, measured as a share of GDP, by 2017. And that is without sequestration. If Speaker Boehner’s plan goes forward and Congress ends up adopting those levels for the year, it would mean even more cuts to vital programs, services, and investments.

**Internal**

**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.

**Impasse on debt ceiling causes loss of consumer confidence collapsing the recovery**

John **Morgan 9-1-13**  IBD: White House Distorts the Budget Crisis Sunday, 01 Sep 2013 01:43 PM Read Latest Breaking News from Newsmax.com http://www.moneynews.com/Economy/budget-debt-ceiling-Obama-US/2013/09/01/id/523326#ixzz2epkNsTK3

The Washington Post predicted that when federal lawmakers get back to Washington next month and start addressing the budget and debt ceiling, "an impasse could diminish Americans' confidence about the economy." The Post said data from Gallup show two noticeable dips in confidence during the Obama presidency so far — one during the debt limit standoff during the summer of 2011, and the other during the fiscal cliff impasse at the end of 2012. "For a sense of what economic confidence will be like around the country this fall, it's well worth tuning into what is going on at both ends of Pennsylvania Avenue," The Post concluded. If Congress and the White House cannot agree on terms to raise the debt ceiling, it could result in another credit downgrade for the United States, according to The Christian Science Monitor.

**Fjkd**

**No thumpers – literally everything is being taken off the table**

**Bump 9/13** Phillip Bump, reporter for the Atlantic Wire. “John Boehner's Negotiations Are Going Worse Than John Kerry's”, the Atlantic Wire, September 13th, 2013, http://www.theatlanticwire.com/politics/2013/09/john-boehners-negotiations-are-going-worse-john-kerrys/69385/

Capitol Hill Republicans have returned their focus to the war with the white house up the street over the national debt, Obamacare, and how to use one to stop the other. The combination of the August recess and the now-delayed Syria vote has meant nearly six weeks of legislative inaction, despite looming deadlines. Issues like immigration reform have been taken off the stove completely, given how quickly Congress needs to act on a measure that will authorize funding for the government and, slightly less quickly, an increase to the debt ceiling. Both things which could have been addressed earlier in the year, of course, but, thanks to Congress' near-historic inaction, weren't. With an October 1 deadline for funding the government, House Majority Leader Eric Cantor has threatened to cancel the House's September recess. That recess would have begun two weeks after the House returned from its August recess.

US is key to the global economy

**Arcega 12**(Mil, reporter, 12/19/12, “US Economic Health Key to Global Growth in 2013” Voice of America) <http://www.voanews.com/content/us-economic-health-key-to-global-growth-in-2013/1568204.html>

Given the inter-connected nature of commerce, a shock to the world's largest economy would have ripple effects. Bruce Stokes is an economist at the Pew Research Center. "There's an old saying that if we get the sniffles, the rest of the world gets a cold and so if we end up going to a recession as well, I think everybody is going to suffer,"¶ Despite recent progress in Europe, the IMF trimmed its global forecast in 2013, citing slower growth in emerging markets.

**Decline magnifies the severity of other conflicts – WWII proves**

**Miller 8** – G. Robert M. Miller, journalist for Digital Journal, 10-25, 2008, “Guns vs. Shovels – The Central Question Behind Our Next Economy,” online: <http://www.digitaljournal.com/article/261595>

But before we look at the modern ‘Guns versus Butter’ model, it first has to be noted that this phrase was originally popularized in a time where securing economic prosperity was a primary concern in nearly every nation. More importantly, when these nations did experience economic collapse, nearly all of them chose Guns. There is no question that Nazi aggression spawned World War II, however, what was happening in Europe became a world war for a purpose as central to the heart of the capitalist as was the instantaneous end of the holocaust to the heart of the compassionate; economic prosperity. Simply said, big wars are big money; and to truly break from the embrace of the Great Depression, a big commitment to the economy was necessary. And due to the leadership that guided the balance between ‘Guns and Butter’ in the US through World War II, the economy was considerably improved; this was true for many western nations.
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**Solv**

**Can’t solve—politics links prove Congress just readjusts and magnifies them**

**Landau 12** (ARTICLE: CHEVRON MEETS YOUNGSTOWN: NATIONAL SECURITY AND THE ADMINISTRATIVE STATE Joseph Landau Associate Professor, Fordham Law School. December, 2012 Boston University Law Review 92 B.U.L. Rev. 1917. Lexis)

 Although the Court rejected all bases supplied by the Bush Administration as authorization for its commissions, **four Justices specifically noted that Congress could authorize them via statute**. In perhaps the clearest articulation of this point, Justice Kennedy pointed out in his concurrence that **Congress could, "after due consideration," alter the law if it were to "deem**[] **it appropriate to change the controlling statutes."** 260 Justice Breyer also noted in his concurrence that "nothing prevents the President from returning to Congress to seek the authority he believes necessary." 261 These opinions reinforce **the importance of congressional delegations**, both **during times of heightened national security as well as** during **ordinary circumstances.**

**Executive repudiation is shameless**

**Geltzer 11** (Boalt Hall School of Law, University of California, Berkeley 2011 Berkeley Journal of International Law 29 Berkeley J. Int'l L. 94 Decisions Detained: The Courts' Embrace of Complexity in Guantanamo-Related Litigation NAME: Joshua Alexander Geltzer a third-year student at Yale Law School, where he is editor-in-chief of the Yale Law Journal. He received his Ph.D. in War Studies from King's College London. His dissertation was published by Routledge as US Counter-Terrorism Strategy and al-Qaeda: Signalling and the Terrorist World-View. Lexis)

**Even when the courts** found an opportunity to **rule on key issues that went beyond** just **their own jurisdiction, the political branches repudiated the** judiciary's **determinations**. In Hamdan, a plurality of four **justices held that the charge of conspiracy**, not widely recognized outside the Anglo-American judicial tradition**, "is not triable by law-of-war military commission."** 176 That holding, the potential significance of which surprised even Hamdan's lawyer, 177 would bar the charge of conspiracy from use before a military commission. **The political branches, in defiance of the** Supreme **Court**'s understanding of the law of war, **responded by specifically empowering Guantanamo's military commissions to try detainees on the charge of conspiracy**. 178 **The executive** branch **then proceeded to include conspiracy charges in Hamdan's** new **military proceedings;** ultimately, he was acquitted on the conspiracy charges and convicted of other charges. 179

**Application of administrative deference fails on national security—review’s insubstantial during emergency**

**Landau 12** (ARTICLE: CHEVRON MEETS YOUNGSTOWN: NATIONAL SECURITY AND THE ADMINISTRATIVE STATE Joseph Landau Associate Professor, Fordham Law School. December, 2012 Boston University Law Review 92 B.U.L. Rev. 1917. Lexis)

F. Chevron, Youngstown, and the Rule of Law

One critic of such a rule-of-law framework for national security is Adrian Vermeule who, in a recent article, argues that **national security cases expose** [\*1975] **the lack of any rule-of-law basis to administrative law.** 367 **Vermeule rejects the idea that Chevron's delegation-based foundation can provide a taming influence on national security doctrine**. For Vermeule, **administrative law has**, at its core, **legal holes that, during times of emergency, inevitably lead to judicial abdication. Some** of these holes (which he calls "black holes") **are** "themselves **created by law"** 368 **and exempt executive policy decisions from judicial review.** 369 **Other** holes (which he calls "grey holes") **include open-ended standards** 370 **that courts can "dial up" or** "dial **down" as needed.** 371 Vermeule asserts that **these holes account for the lack of any "real" judicial review of emergency-law questions because they allow courts to dial down** review **entirely, at which point** judicial **review becomes more apparent than real.** 372 He argues that **these holes evidence the impossibility "that executive action arising from war or emergency be governed by "ordinary' administrative law,** as opposed to some extraordinary law applicable during emergencies." 373

**Case-dr**

**We would have to get rid of guns then**

**Brooks 2012** [Rosa Brooks is a law professor at Georgetown University and a Schwartz senior fellow at the New America Foundation. She served as a counselor to the U.S. defense undersecretary for policy from 2009 to 2011 and previously served as a senior advisor at the U.S. State Department “What's Not Wrong With Drones?” September 5, 2012 Foreign Policy http://www.foreignpolicy.com/articles/2012/09/05/whats\_not\_wrong\_with\_drones?page=0,3]

Really? If killing from a safe distance (say, Creech Air Force Base in Nevada) is somehow "wrong," what should be our preferred alternative -- stripping troops of body armor, or taking away their guns and requiring them to engage in hand-to-hand combat? If drone strikes enable us to kill enemies without exposing our own personnel, this is presumably a good thing, not a bad thing. Maybe we shouldn't kill anyone, or maybe we're killing the wrong people -- but these are assertions about ethics, intelligence and strategy, not about drones.¶ Drones don't present any "new" issues not already presented by aerial bombing -- or by any previous historical method of killing from a distance. In the early 1600s, Cervantes called artillery a "devilish invention" allowing "a base cowardly hand to take the life of the bravest gentleman," with bullets "coming nobody knows how or from whence." (Much like drones.)

**Its no worse than a cruise missile**

**Brooks 2012** [Rosa Brooks is a law professor at Georgetown University and a Schwartz senior fellow at the New America Foundation. She served as a counselor to the U.S. defense undersecretary for policy from 2009 to 2011 and previously served as a senior advisor at the U.S. State Department “What's Not Wrong With Drones?” September 5, 2012 Foreign Policy http://www.foreignpolicy.com/articles/2012/09/05/whats\_not\_wrong\_with\_drones?page=0,3]

Writing in the Guardian, Phillip Allston (the United Nations special rapporteur on extrajudicial, summary or arbitrary executions) and Hina Shamsi of the ACLU decry "the PlayStation mentality" created by drone technologies. "Young military personnel raised on a diet of video games now kill real people remotely using joysticks. Far removed from the human consequences of their actions, how will this generation of fighters value the right to life?"¶ But are drones more "video game-like" than, say, having cameras in the noses of cruise missiles? Those old enough to remember the first Gulf War will recall the shocking novelty of images taken by cameras inside U.S. Tomahawk missiles, the jolting, grainy images in the crosshairs before everything went ominously black.

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

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

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

**Chinese leadership wouldn’t risk miscalc**

**Ross 2009** (Robert S. Ross is Professor of Political Science at Boston College and Associate of the John King Fairbank Center for East Asian Research at Harvard University, September 2009 “Myth The Great Debate” http://nationalinterest.org/greatdebate/dragons/myth-3819)

Professor Friedberg's concluding suggestion that China's illiberal political system exacerbates the China threat fails to grasp that **Beijing's authoritarian system is its greatest vulnerability.** The **Chinese leadership dares not risk war; it is** acutely **aware of its vulnerability** to the will of its people **and the necessity to minimize** strategic adventurism and the **risk of military defeat, lest it be the cause of its own demise.** A balanced rather than an ideological assessment of the Sino-American dynamic offers the United States the confidence to compete with China and secure U.S. interests, and simultaneously promote U.S.-China cooperation.

**SCS won’t escalate—global economic interest in minimizing SLOC disruption there, especially for China, key to their imports and exports—US naval strength also deters—that’s Creehan**

**Multiple factors ensure cooperation**

**Zhu ’12** – professor in the School of International Studies and the deputy director of the Center for International and Strategic Studies at Beijing University (Zhu Feng, “No One Wants a Clash,” May 3, New York Times, <http://www.nytimes.com/roomfordebate/2012/05/02/are-we-headed-for-a-cold-war-with-china/no-one-wants-a-cold-war-between-the-us-and-china>)

However **there is little worry that the two powers will collide into a “new cold war.”** First of all, **China’s authoritarian system has been tremendously mobilized for international integration**. **Beijing** has been pretty conservative and doesn’t welcome democratization. But it **does not strictly adhere to traditional communism** either. **Any new confrontation like the cold war would risk a huge backlash in China by greatly damaging the better-off Chinese people. Such a conflict could ultimately undermine the Communist Party’s ruling legitimacy**.¶ Second, **the power disparity between Washington and China hasn’t significantly narrowed, regardless of Chinese achievements in the past decades**. My view is that Beijing remains an adolescent power, and should learn how to be a great power rather than unwisely rushing to any confrontation. Though some Chinese want the nation to assert itself more forcefully, **the huge disparity in power should keep China in place. China is in no position to challenge the U.S. But China will be more enthusiastic and straightfoward about addressing and safeguarding its legal interests. Competition between Washington and Beijing will intensify, but that does not automatically mean that the relationship will be unmanageable**.¶ Lastly, **the cycle of action and reaction has mostly turned out to be fruitful for the U.S. and China. Further competition is promising. The U.S. doesn’t want to put China in a corner, or force Beijing to stand up desperately. The dealings over many thorny issues have** respond? The country’s cold war experience offers a useful strategy. **The stalemate imposed by “mutually assured destruction” that prevented the US-Soviet conflict from igniting created a sense of stability**. Today, **the US and China are locked in a new form of “proved that each side wants to handle the conflict, not escalate it**. Chen Guangcheng’s departure from the U.S. Embassy is telling evidence. Neither side wants diplomatic confrontation. Rather, it seems that both sides are struggling to react constructively.¶ In the years to come, **China-U.S. relations will continue to be very complicated, but also very important. The glue to keep these two nations together is not pragmatism only, but mutual interest — especially in trade**.

**Case-pk**

**No pass buck**

**Reducing drone strikes destabilizes Pakistan**

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

Now, as President Obama’s landmark policy speech on Thursday made clear, all of that is changing. Drone strikes are dwindling, the war in Afghanistan is drawing to a close and the battle against Al Qaeda is receding.¶ Pakistani leaders who have long demanded an American exit from their region may get their wish, but a broader disengagement is also likely to diminish the financing, prestige and political importance Pakistan held as a crucial player in global counterterrorism efforts, and could upset its internal stability.¶ The diminution of the drone campaign may ease a major point of friction between Pakistan and the West, but the tribal belt in northwestern Pakistan, where about 360 drone strikes have landed in the past decade, remains a hotbed of Islamist militancy, largely outside government control. Although many senior leaders of Al Qaeda sheltering there have been felled by C.I.A. missiles, they have been largely replaced by committed Pakistani jihadists with ties that span the border with Afghanistan.¶ With American combat troops leaving Afghanistan in 2014, and the drone campaign already winding down in Pakistan, analysts fear that unless the Pakistani Army can assert itself conclusively, the tribal region could be plunged into deeper chaos.¶ “It’s going to be a lot of trouble,” said Hasan Askari-Rizvi, a Pakistani academic and defense analyst. “If the insurgency increases in Afghanistan, it will spill into Pakistan’s tribal areas, where the Taliban will become very confident.”

**Actually they are lower- drones allow for greater precision**

**Brooks 2012** [Rosa Brooks is a law professor at Georgetown University and a Schwartz senior fellow at the New America Foundation. She served as a counselor to the U.S. defense undersecretary for policy from 2009 to 2011 and previously served as a senior advisor at the U.S. State Department “What's Not Wrong With Drones?” September 5, 2012 Foreign Policy http://www.foreignpolicy.com/articles/2012/09/05/whats\_not\_wrong\_with\_drones?page=0,3]

But to paraphrase the NRA, "Drones don't kill people, people kill people." At any rate, drone strikes kill civilians at no higher a rate, and almost certainly at a lower rate, than most other common means of warfare. Drones actually permit far greater precision in targeting. Today's unmanned aerial vehicles (UAVs) can carry small bombs that do less widespread damage, and there's no human pilot whose fatigue might limit flight time. Their low profile and relative fuel efficiency combines with this to permit them to spend more "time on target" than any manned aircraft.¶ Drones can engage in "persistent surveillance.­" That means they don't just swoop in, fire missiles and swoop out: they may spend hours, days, or even months monitoring a potential target. Equipped with imaging technologies that enable operators even thousands of miles away to see details as fine as individual faces, modern drone technologies allow their operators to distinguish between civilians and combatants far more effectively than most other weapons systems.

**Tech improvements and more stringent doctrine already solves**

**Brooks 2012** [Rosa Brooks is a law professor at Georgetown University and a Schwartz senior fellow at the New America Foundation. She served as a counselor to the U.S. defense undersecretary for policy from 2009 to 2011 and previously served as a senior advisor at the U.S. State Department “What's Not Wrong With Drones?” September 5, 2012 Foreign Policy http://www.foreignpolicy.com/articles/2012/09/05/whats\_not\_wrong\_with\_drones?page=0,3]

But drone strikes have also gotten far less lethal for civilians in the last few years: the New America Foundation concludes that only three to nine civilians were killed during 72 U.S. drone strikes in Pakistan in 2011, and the 2012 number -- so far -- is zero civilians killed in 36 strikes. In part, this is due to technological advances over the last decade, but it's also due to far more stringent rules for when drones can release weapons.

**Neither will strike first**

Eric Vas (retired Lieutenant general) 2007 “Can India Avoid a Military conflict with Pakistan?” http://inpad.org/res45.html

Many urge India to stand down in order to decrease the tension between the two countries. As long as freedom remains a distant dream in Pakistan and its official media continues to preach hatred against India, our security forces must continue to remain alert. India's responses to Pakistan's current moves on the five fronts are on the right lines. **India has declared that it will not be the first to use nuclear weapons**, but that it is prepared to give a befitting response to any Pakistani nuclear threat. India has stressed that it is prepared to discuss any issue, including J&K with Pakistan, but only when it stops its support of cross border terrorism. Meanwhile our security forces continue to intercept intruders and deal with armed terrorists within the State, while the government attempts to improve the administration and encourage dissidents to join the political system. J&K State elections are due in September. These will be fair and open elections, which may be witnessed by foreign observers in their individual capacities. Dissidents have been invited to take part in the elections to prove that they have public support. However, official Pakistani media continues its barrage of virulent anti-India propaganda. There are no visible signs that steps are being taken to stop and undo the damage being done by these tactics. Thus, to answer the question posed at the head of this article, **while the Indo-Pak cold war continues, the military front is unlikely to escalate into a nuclear exchange or a full-fledged military conflict. It would be imprudent for Pakistan to do this, and it would not be cost effective for India** to initiate an all out war. If cross border infiltration and terrorist attacks against innocent citizens continue the Government may order the armed forces to take appropriate action against terrorist bases within POK. The danger of an Indian raid across the LOC against a terrorist camp escalating into a major battle cannot be overruled.

**Deterrence prevents India/Pakistan conflict**

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

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